



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 18, 2018

No. 121

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 18, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES J. FLEISCHMANN 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.

UPDATE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when the Endangered Species Act was signed into law in 1973, its goal was simple: safeguard endangered species and assist in the recovery of their population.

Until last week, no recent attempts have been made to reform this essential piece of legislation. Over the past

several years, the Congressional Western Caucus has been working together to determine what parts of the Endangered Species Act are broken and to develop solutions to repair this law.

The Endangered Species Act is in dire need of modernization and reform, which is why, last week, the Western Caucus, which I am proud to belong to, rolled out some solutions; among them is to address the broken litigation process that incentivizes litigation for profit at the expense of the taxpayer, address the lack of clear listing and delisting criteria, address the lack of transparency in Endangered Species Act decisionmaking and data collection, consider the needs of States more seriously, and address the unnecessary impediments to economic development and land management that affect endangered species.

Mr. Speaker, as far as statutes that require costly litigation, the Endangered Species Act was the third most expensive for the Department of Agriculture and the most expensive for the Department of the Interior.

Endangered Species Act litigation cost the Department of Agriculture and the Federal taxpayers \$1.63 billion from 2000 to 2010. It cost the Department of the Interior \$22 billion from 2000 to 2010, all at the expense of the taxpayer. These frivolous lawsuits have severe consequences on local economies.

Additionally, the absence of State consultation weakens the overall data that can be used to justify the Endangered Species Act listings and recovery plans, a complete lack of transparency. State and local expertise is needed to strengthen and streamline the Endangered Species Act listing and delisting process.

I am happy to say that these issues are addressed in some of the bills that were introduced last week. I proudly cosponsored a number of the bills that will make progress on this front, in-

cluding the LOCAL Act, which was introduced by my colleague SCOTT TIPTON. This bill would set up new incentives and opportunities for voluntary conservation by establishing a private party conservation grants program and a habitat conservation planning loan program for State and local governments. These programs will save the taxpayers money while boosting conservation.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the majority of the recent species that have been delisted happened not as a result of the Endangered Species Act or the Fish and Wildlife Service, but through voluntary conservation with the leadership of the Department of Agriculture.

The LAMP Act, introduced by my colleague Congressman DON YOUNG, permits the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative management agreements with States, local governments, Tribes, and other non-Federal persons in order to better manage species and improve habitat conservation. The bill also empowers States with robust species conservation programs already in place to take the lead in managing and preserving such species when meeting certain qualifying conditions.

Mr. Speaker, these are just two examples of great pieces of legislation that have been introduced in the House to upgrade, modernize, and bring into the 21st century the Endangered Species Act.

The Endangered Species Act is in dire need of modernization, and I am eager to work with my colleagues to address these needs and reform this outdated law. I urge my colleagues to examine these commonsense bills, look at the facts behind them, and cosponsor them today.

THE WHOLE WORLD IS WATCHING

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

☐ 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.

H6467

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the world witnessed the single worst performance by an American President on the world stage in world history. It was a culmination of the worst week an American President has ever had. As a citizen, I am shocked and embarrassed for our Nation.

Given evidence, indictments, and facts, the President was given the choice of taking America's side or taking President Putin's side. The President chose Putin. I believe the American people, our Armed Forces, our allies, our lawmakers, and the President's own Cabinet deserve an immediate apology from the President for his actions.

Having insulted and demeaned our closest military allies and trading partners, the President doubled down by insulting world leaders individually and in public, especially those who are most friendly to the United States. It was disgraceful.

The President even went as far as to say that Germany is totally controlled by Russia, a comment that makes the President quite literally the laughing stock of the world. To then go on and take President Putin's side in defending the Kremlin's attack on the United States—an attack which this Congress, our intelligence and law enforcement agencies, our allies, and the American people know in fact took place—was nothing short of treasonous.

The President has proven himself unable to separate his own personal interests from his current job as leader of the free world and has consistently, repeatedly, and now, in full view of the world, definitively put his own interests above those of the United States and the free world by siding with the petty, antidemocratic dictator of our international rival.

The campaign of repression and the straight-up murder of political and business rivals by President Putin is well established. It is not something any American leader can or should debate. Using foreign agents to murder people overseas is the Kremlin's MO, and the President seems to feel that is okay.

Let us not forget that Russia, on more than one occasion, has allowed paranoia, fear, and impunity to escalate to such a level that they have literally shot passenger airliners out of the sky, killing all on board.

Invading other countries and using the pretext of national security to expand the Russian empire is not only condoned by this President, apparently, in some ways, he is seeking to emulate Putin's behavior by using national security as a pretext for trade wars with our closest allies and for policies to take babies, toddlers, and other children from people lawfully seeking asylum in the United States.

Russia is not a government to be condoned; it is a government to be contained. Yet our President was unable to be critical of the dictator of our greatest rival in public—and God knows what he did in private.

Mr. Speaker, it is well established that I believe our current President is a threat to American democracy, which is why I was one of the first Members of Congress to sign on to Articles of Impeachment last year. I have already begun consulting with my colleagues about whether those Articles of Impeachment can be expanded and updated to include the betrayal witnessed by the American people in the world this week.

While it is already a full-time job, I will redouble my efforts to prevent the House of Representatives from taking actions to actively obstruct justice and undermine law enforcement and the FBI, while seeking to give the President cover and relief from a genuine, thorough investigation into the attack on our country by the Russians in 2016 and the attacks that are continuing to this day.

This body, the House, the institution that I love so much and have served for more than 25 years, cannot be sullied or diminished by this President or his inability to see the facts about the attack on the United States.

As a body, we must take action to relieve the President of his duties. Most Americans probably doubt that the House of Representatives is even up to the task of being fair, being honest, being impartial enough to call a spade a spade when it comes to Russian aggression.

But I call on my fellow Democrats and my fellow Members on the other side of the aisle: If you still believe in truth, if you believe in democracy, if you believe in the rule of law and our Constitution, you will join me in holding this President accountable for his actions, in holding Russia accountable for the attacks on the United States and her people, and will stand up to defend your country and not just your party or your own income and career.

This is a moment of destiny when the House as an institution must rise to the occasion. Mr. Speaker, the whole world is watching.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

CONDEMNING EVO MORALES' DEPLORABLE HUMAN RIGHTS RECORD

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, following the Castro playbook, Evo Morales has taken systematic steps to curtail the basic rights of the people of Bolivia and solidify his legacy to maintain his evil grip on power.

Evo Morales has ruled Bolivia for over 12 years and expects to do so indefinitely. Two years ago, he imposed a constitutional referendum to eliminate presidential term limits so that he could run for yet another term, his fourth term, in 2019.

After a resounding "no" vote from the people of Bolivia, this thug turned to the courts, which he totally controls, to stomp on the will of the people. The courts sided with him—what a surprise—and went as far as declaring that Morales' indefinite reelection is a human right. What an insult that is to the Bolivian people and to all of us who cherish true democratic ideals.

Just like Castro, Evo Morales also continues to clamp down on the opposition, sending his national police to deploy repressive tactics and silence dissent brutally. Just last month, his henchmen killed a young student from the Public University in the city of El Alto, where students peacefully protested, calling for additional resources for their university.

The latest State Department human rights report states that Morales' power over the judicial system, the denial of a fair and timely public trial, and prosecutions of political opponents are at the top of his human rights abuses, his greatest hits.

It is no wonder that over 1,200 Bolivian political exiles are now living in Brazil, Peru, Paraguay, Spain, and here in our wonderful country, including my lovely south Florida community.

Mr. Speaker, Evo Morales' anti-imperialist rhetoric, expelling all of our agencies—DEA, USAID, and the U.S. Ambassador to Bolivia—and his coziness with rogue regimes are just further proof of the threat his regime poses for the stability and security of our allies in our hemisphere and beyond.

Using Bolivia's status as a nonpermanent member of the United Nations Security Council, Morales has sided with Syria and its abysmal human rights record; undermined our ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel; and consistently attacked the United States and our efforts to uphold and promote the values of freedom and democracy in the region and around the world.

Simply put, Morales is no friend of democratic values, and just like the dictatorships in Cuba, Venezuela, and Nicaragua, his regime has solidified control at the expense of the people and our own national security interests.

The Bolivian people need our help, Mr. Speaker, and we must start paying attention to what is happening right here in our own hemisphere.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ROBERT TRAUIG

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to hear of the passing of Robert Traurig, a revered leader who helped build south Florida and someone who Dexter and I proudly called a dear friend. Bob passed away recently, but he left an incredible legacy of legal brilliance and leadership in our community.

Founder of Greenberg Traurig in 1967, which is now one of the world's top and largest law firms, Bob was an expert zoning lawyer who helped develop Miami-Dade County into the metropolitan area that it is today.

Bob was influential in expanding Brickell Avenue and Coconut Grove, areas which I proudly represent and are central residential communities that also attract thousands of visitors every year. He also led efforts for the development of the Florida Grand Opera and Performing Arts Center Foundation, among many other enterprises.

Bob constantly fought for the best interests of his clients and our communities, and the mark he left on south Florida is evidence of his remarkable passion. Bob Traurig's work to develop Miami-Dade County, in addition to his charitable and philanthropic spirit, will become the lasting legacy of this dedicated leader.

Farewell, my friend.

□ 1015

HONORING CONNIE KURTZ

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Connie Kurtz, an LGBT rights activist who passed away recently at the age of 81.

Connie was born and raised in Brooklyn, New York, where she met and fell in love with the woman who would become her wife, Ruthie Berman. Ruthie and Connie became a couple in 1974, long before same-sex couples were afforded equal rights.

Ruthie was a school counselor, and, in 1988, they found themselves at the forefront of the gay rights movement when they joined two other couples and sued the New York Department of Education for domestic partner benefits for same-sex couples. Their advocacy led to the city extending healthcare benefits to same-sex couples in 1994.

Ruthie and Connie's activism did not stop there. They continued to fight for LGBT rights, including rights for older LGBT Americans. They recognized the unique healthcare, social, emotional, and housing needs of our aging LGBT population, and they sought to help minimize these disparities.

I am honored to have introduced the Ruthie and Connie LGBT Elder Americans Act with my colleagues Congressman TED DEUTCH and Congressman CHARLIE CRIST. This legislation defines LGBT seniors as a vulnerable population, requires the Health and Human Services Assistant Secretary of Aging to collect data on the unique needs of this population, and provides grants for service organizations that are working to improve the health and long-term outcomes of the aging LGBT population.

Since Connie's passing, Ruthie has vowed to continue her activism. Ruthie said of her wife: "Connie took on responsibilities as an activist with the belief that her role had a beginning, a middle, and an end. Working to pass the Ruthie and Connie LGBT Elder Americans Act was Connie's last political action before she passed away on

May 27, 2018. I hope Congress will honor Connie by passing this law so, like Connie, all LGBT older adults can age with the dignity and respect they deserve. Let's make this happen."

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree with her more. Today, in honor of Connie's life, I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation. Together, we can take another step toward equality for LGBT older Americans.

HONORING CORPORAL JOSEPH MACIEL

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Corporal Joseph Maciel of the Third Infantry Division, who died in the line of duty in Afghanistan on July 7.

Corporal Maciel was an excellent soldier who had served in the Army for 2 years in the Third ID. He had been stationed in Afghanistan since February of this year. His quality work ethic, positive attitude, and honorable service earned him a number of accolades, including the Army Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal, and the Army Service Ribbon. He was highly respected by his fellow soldiers.

Corporal Maciel's passing occurred during an insider attack in Afghanistan in which two other soldiers were wounded. As our soldiers risk their lives in Afghanistan and other nations to spread the values of democracy, we must keep our soldiers and their families in our thoughts and prayers.

HONORING CAPTAIN MICHAEL MCFADDEN

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Captain Michael McFadden of the Savannah Fire Department, who lost his life in the line of duty earlier this year at 44 years of age.

A life dedicated to public service, Captain McFadden served in the United States Marine Corps for 8 years before joining the Savannah Fire Department. His high level of training and successful missions allowed him to rise through the ranks from master firefighter to, eventually, captain.

Captain McFadden collapsed suddenly one day with a heart problem. Unfortunately, firefighters are at high risk for severe cardiac problems because of their strenuous physical activity, emotional stress, exposure to pollutants, and smoke inhalation.

With more than a million firefighters across the U.S., I hope that everyone will keep these brave men and women in their thoughts as they go to work each day to keep us and our communities safe.

Captain McFadden's family will continue to be in our thoughts and prayers.

HONORING RONNIE THOMPSON

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of

Mr. Ronnie Wayne Thompson, who passed away Sunday, July 8, at the age of 71.

A lifetime resident of Savannah in Georgia's First Congressional District, Mr. Thompson is leaving a lasting legacy on the city. Mainly, he will be remembered for owning and operating the famous Mrs. Wilkes Boarding House restaurant, which serves some of the best home-style southern cooking in Savannah.

Founded by his grandmother-in-law, Mrs. Wilkes, Mr. Thompson did a seamless job of maintaining the quality of food and the southern atmosphere at the restaurant with which he worked for 40 years.

He was spotted often in downtown Savannah, enjoying coffee with friends, attending the St. Patrick's Day parade, and just generally making other people's days a little bit brighter.

He met his wife, Marcia, at the age of 12 on Tybee Island and spent a great deal of time there in his later years with his grandchildren.

A U.S. Marine Corps veteran, longtime Savannahian, small-business owner, husband, father, grandfather, and overall genuine person, Ronnie Thompson truly will be missed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TOM RHODES

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

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of regret that I cannot join family and friends of Jesse Thomas Rhodes, known as Tom, as he is laid to rest today.

Tom was, as he would often remind us, the first baby born on January 1, 1955, in Memphis, Tennessee. He is survived by his loving wife, Beth, and his children, Jessica and Robert.

Clarence Darrow once said: "Justice has nothing to do with what goes on in a courtroom; justice is what comes out of a courtroom."

Over the years, there has been many a lawyer in this great country who has dedicated his or her life to securing justice for their clients in courtrooms all across this land. Today, I pay tribute to those advocates and to Tom Rhodes, the lawyer.

Tom Rhodes was everything a lawyer should be. Tom Rhodes was a fierce advocate. Tom Rhodes was a compassionate counselor. Tom Rhodes was a consummate negotiator. Tom Rhodes communicated with a degree of clarity that always exposed the truth.

It was not his considerable courtroom presence, his skill as a lawyer, or the ferocity of his advocacy, however, that left such a lasting impression with most of the people with whom he crossed paths. Instead, it was his generosity and his infectious sense of humor that people will always remember.

He constantly made small gestures of kindness to total strangers. He went

out of his way to help family, friends, and the people who worked for him. He felt a constant need to give back to the community and to the world.

After the terror attacks of 9/11, he volunteered his services, representing the families of the victims. When Hurricane Katrina devastated the Gulf Coast in Texas, he not only opened his wallet but donated his time, helping to get supplies to the people affected.

His firm has, for many years, sponsored the Respect Project in the San Antonio area, awarding monetary prizes to area elementary students based on essays regarding what it means to respect others.

He donated time and money to many other causes, such as halfway houses, women's shelters, and foundations providing a safe environment for children to reconnect with abusive parents.

For all of us, life is the final verdict. For the lawyer, there can be no better final verdict than that of his client, that he was a lawyer his client could always trust, that he was a lawyer his clients could always depend upon, that he was a lawyer his client always knew had his back. Without question, Tom Rhodes was that lawyer.

RECOGNIZING JONATHAN WALSH

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 a conscientious young citizen in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who recently was named the Upper Bucks YMCA Role Model of the Year.

Jonathan Walsh of Quakertown received this award for his participation in the YMCA's Teen Fusion after-school program, where he stood out amongst his peers for his respect, his sense of responsibility, and his honesty. I commend Jonathan for this impressive achievement, and I look forward to seeing what this future leader will accomplish in the years ahead.

I also want to commend the Upper Bucks YMCA for recognizing Jonathan and wish this organization well as it celebrates its 50th year of service to the community. I would especially like to thank Upper Bucks YMCA Executive Director Pat Edwards and President of the Board of Directors Dale Westwood for all the work they do in our community.

RECOGNIZING JENNA RUFO AND TODD BAUER

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two education professionals in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, whose dedication to our community's students has led to their appointment as assistant superintendents for the North Penn School District.

Jenna Rufo and Todd Bauer were sworn in on July 9 at the Montgomery County courthouse and have recently accepted their new responsibilities.

Before becoming assistant superintendent, Jenna was the North Penn

School District's director of special education, while Todd served as principal of the North Penn High School. In their new roles, Jenna will focus primarily on school safety, mental health, professional development, and cultural issues; and Todd will focus on accountability, athletics, summer school, redistricting, and school board policies.

We commend these fine public servants for their work and wish them the best of luck as they begin this new chapter in their careers.

I also thank former Assistant Superintendent Diana Holben for her service as well and wish her all the best in her retirement.

RECOGNIZING MATT PHELAN

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a dedicated public servant in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. On July 3, Matt Phelan was officially sworn in as police chief of Tincicum Township by Magisterial District Judge Gary Gambardella. He had been serving as acting police chief since January, upon the appointment of James Sabath to chief of the Newtown Borough Police Department.

The Tincicum Township Police Department hired Chief Phelan in 1998 at the age of 22, after he studied at Bloomsburg University and graduated at the top of his class from Temple Police Academy.

His record of selflessness, courage, and professionalism speaks for itself. In 2015, then-Sergeant Phelan prevented an armed home invasion suspect from fleeing the crime scene, risking his life in the pursuit of justice.

We congratulate you, Chief Phelan, on this well-deserved appointment, and we are grateful for your service to our community, along with the entire Tincicum Police Department.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S COMMENTS IN HELSINKI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, viewing Monday's display in Helsinki as a devastating manner is not exaggeration. It is not hyperbole. It is not exaggerating.

Frankly, I think it is important for the Congress to adhere to its responsibilities in Article I, which indicates that all legislative powers herein are vested in this Congress.

We must do our job on behalf of the American people.

So let me read: "President Trump, you first. Just now, President Putin denied having anything to do with the election interference in 2016. Every U.S. intelligence agency has concluded that Russia did. My first question for you, sir, is: Who do you believe?"

This is a reporter from the AP.

"My second question is: Would you now, with the whole world watching, tell President Putin—would you denounce what happened in 2016, and would you warn him to never do it again?"

The answer of the President of the United States: "So let me just say that we have two thoughts. You have groups that are wondering why the FBI never took the server. Why haven't they taken the server? Why was the FBI told to leave the office of the Democratic National Committee? I've been wondering that. I've been asking that for months and months, and I've been tweeting it out and calling it out on social media. Where is the server? I want to know, where is the server, and what is the server saying? With that being said, all I can do is ask the question.

"My people came to me. Dan Coats came to me, and some others, and they said they think it's Russia. I have President Putin; he just said it's not Russia. I will say this: I don't see any reason why it would be.

"But I really do want to see the server. But I have confidence in both parties. I really believe that this will probably go on for a while, but I don't think it can go on without finding out what happened to the server."

□ 1030

He goes on to say:

So I have great confidence in my intelligence people, but I will tell you that President Putin was extremely strong and powerful in his denial today.

And what he did is an incredible offer.

He offered to have his people working with our people. Thank you.

In response, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, a POW, said these words: "Today's press conferences in Helsinki was one of the most disgraceful performances by an American President in memory. The damage inflicted by President Trump's naivete, egotism, false equivalence, and sympathy for autocrats is difficult to calculate. But it is clear that the summit in Helsinki was a tragic mistake."

"President Trump proved not only unable, but unwilling to stand up to Putin. He and Putin seem to be speaking from the same script, as the President made a conscious choice to defend a tyrant against the fair questions of a free press and to grant Putin an uncontested platform to spew propaganda and lies to the world."

Let me remind you that the question of the reporter was: My first question to you, sir, is, who do you believe, Mr. President? My second question is: Would you now, with the world watching, tell President Putin would you denounce what happened in 2016?

It is clear that the Russians invaded and altered the election of 2016. It has been stated by our intelligence community, Director Coats, that at least they invaded and impacted and that they are doing it now.

It is time for the Congress to ask or subpoena the translator's notes. It is time for us to have a detailed relaying to the Congress, in a classified manner, what were the contents, what were the discussions, what were the agenda items, what was said in the meeting singularly by our President and President Putin. Then we must pass legislation for extreme sanctions on anyone

that even thinks of interfering with the elections of 2018 and those who interfered with 2016.

Finally, I believe it is important for a full-throated apology of the White House to the intelligence community and the American people. I remind you that I do not stand here singularly by myself. I stand here standing on a constitutional democracy which is the United States of America.

Article I powers of this Congress is that we must act. We cannot correct it with a typographical correction—wouldn't over would. The reporter directly asked: Who do you believe? It was never answered that it was the American people in the intelligence community, Mr. Speaker. It was indicated that Mr. Putin gave a strong response of denial, and it was implied in that, that I believe Mr. Putin, and I am not going to answer the question to say that I believe my intelligence community. Therefore, I would indicate it is time for the Congress to act.

SECURITY CLEARANCES FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this week's stunning betrayal by President Trump, choosing Russian President Vladimir Putin over our own intelligence agencies, begs questions that we should never have to ask about an American President: What does Putin have on President Trump? Is he literally being blackmailed? Do we have a Manchurian candidate as our President?

It is difficult to imagine any other explanation for Trump's constant bowing and scraping at the feet of the Russian dictator or of his refusal to hold Putin accountable for his election interference, even after numerous indictments, including 12 Russian military officials, and even after the arrest of a Russian national who was caught trying to use the NRA as a tool to change U.S. policy toward Russia.

And it is hard to find any other explanation for Trump's constantly calling Special Counsel Mueller's investigation a "witch hunt," even after so many indictments and multiple guilty pleas.

On Monday, our security interests of this country demanded that our President speak out and seek accountability from the foreign adversary who attacked it. But instead, the American people witnessed a Manchurian moment, exposing that President Trump is so deeply compromised on Russia that he is willing to alienate our European allies, to blame our country for the strains in the relationship with Russia, and to betray our intelligence and law enforcement communities by casting doubt on their conclusions and accepting Putin's self-serving denials.

And so the world wonders: What does Putin have over Trump? Now, it could

be some compromising or embarrassing financial information, which would explain Trump's refusal to release his tax returns.

Now, let's remember, candidate Donald Trump promised, if elected, promised unequivocally that he would publicly release his tax returns just like every other modern President. We are still waiting. But Trump's position has evolved to an outright refusal, making him the only President in modern history to refuse to share this information with the American people.

Now, it could also be his nefarious dealings with Russia that Trump wants to keep secret. Now, we know Trump and his family and his campaign had a web of contacts with Russia going back several years. The degree of collusion in the 2016 election is still unknown, but we know that, at the very least, they explored receiving illegal foreign election assistance, and we know that assistance was actually provided by Russia.

Or it could be more straightforward blackmail. We know about the reports that Russia had compromising information on Trump that includes not just financial entanglements, but a sex tape.

Now, I am confident that whatever President Trump is hiding, Special Counsel Mueller's investigation will get to the bottom of it. And that is why I have joined my colleagues here on the floor to demand that the Mueller investigation be protected from political interference and that we let the special counsel's office do its job.

But we should also think about how we got into this surreal situation in the first place. How did a Presidential candidate with such potentially disqualifying baggage slide through the process without a way for voters to know about it? There is a clear public interest in ensuring that Presidential candidates are not deeply compromised or vulnerable to blackmail.

And that is why today I introduce the Protecting Access to Classified Information in Elections Act. It is a new bill designed to protect the national security of our country by allowing Presidential candidates to voluntarily undergo a national security clearance investigation well before the election. Candidates who are granted a security clearance would have the option of publicly disclosing that fact on a website maintained by the director of national intelligence.

Current law doesn't work that way. Presidential candidates start getting classified briefings before they take office, but it is based on an informal grant of access by the sitting President, and voters may assume that candidates have security clearances, but they don't actually have to get one and not all of them do.

By providing an early security clearance process, candidates can provide a real assurance to the American people that there is nothing in their back-

ground, such as financial or personal vulnerabilities, that should prevent them from receiving our Nation's top secret information. And if a candidate chooses not to seek that security clearance, voters can consider that fact, too, when they cast their vote.

An early security clearance would also virtually rule out the possibility that a Presidential candidate is vulnerable to foreign coercion, compromise, or manipulation, because among the things scrutinized by background investigators are tax returns and financial dealings. Investigators would learn if an applicant has been accused of sexual misconduct.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support to this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

A CALL TO ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call this body to action. Two days ago, we watched, the world watched in horror in Finland as our President took Putin's side instead of our intelligence community's side. Our intelligence community told us, told him that Russia attacked our democracy and attacked our elections. For whatever reason, President Trump seems unable to clearly state that he agrees with intelligence.

Just yesterday, when he said he misspoke, he then shifted and went back to it could be others. Why? We have to ask ourselves why. The Republican majority has been determined to do absolutely nothing in response when it is clear that there is much that we can and must do. Why?

They have declined to pass additional legislation to serve as a deterrent to Russia and that would sanction Russia if they attacked our elections again. Why? Especially when we have been warned that Russia intends to interfere with our elections in just a few months.

They have this whole Congress, but still Republicans have not passed any legislation to strengthen our election security system to mitigate this threat. Instead, congressional Republicans are trying to cut—this is unbelievable—trying to cut election security grants by hundreds of millions of dollars. Why? Don't they at least want to protect us going into the future?

They have blocked votes to force the President to release his tax returns so we can know whether his business deals are affecting his decisions in the office of the Presidency. Why?

And, most importantly, they have consistently refused to vote to protect Special Counsel Mueller's investigation. Why?

Speaker RYAN controls the floor. Republicans are the ones who put all of

the legislation on the floor. They could do this now, but they refuse to, even though they have the power. Why won't they? Why won't they let us investigate? Why won't they let us have a vote?

America and the world is watching. They are wondering how long it will take for this Republican Congress to act. When will it be too much?

We have heard some Republican heroes like JOHN MCCAIN and others who have said this was the most horrific performance and that we must—must talk about this, and yet we don't. Why?

TIME TO REFLECT ON WHAT IT MEANS TO BE PATRIOTIC

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor because today is the birthday of my friend, my partner in the fight for justice and equality, Nelson Mandela.

During the height of the civil rights movement and the early days of the labor movement, you had to make a decision: Which side are you on?

So, Mr. Speaker, on this day, of all days, I cannot, I will not stay silent when our Nation, our democracy, and the American people are under attack. We fought too hard and too long to stand on the sidelines when so much is at stake.

When you see something that is not right, that is not just, you have to find a way to get in the way. You have to get in good trouble—necessary trouble.

Now is the time to wake up. It is time to be brave, bold, and courageous. During the American Revolution, people suffered and died for the dream of democracy, for the sacred right to vote, and for the ability to choose their representatives. Hundreds and thousands of men and women lost their lives to preserve our union and to defend our values.

What I saw on Monday was a shame, an embarrassment, and a disgrace to their legacy, their memory, and what they sacrificed. During times like these, I encourage every person to take some time and have what I call an executive session with themselves and their very souls. Because today, Mr. Speaker, each of us faces the question of what it means to be patriotic.

Ask yourself, do you stand with the American people or do you stand with a dictator? Do you stand with democracy or do you stand with a czar? Do you stand with friends and allies or do you stand with someone who approves violent attacks on the media, human rights advocates, and struggling democracies?

Mr. Speaker, the American House is on fire, it is burning, and if we are not mindful, if we are not watchful, this fire will consume us all.

The United States Constitution began with the words: "We, the People." You see, the Founding Fathers'

very first priority, the very first article was to outline the role and the responsibilities of the United States Congress in our system of checks and balances.

□ 1045

The people who elected us are sounding the alarms. Never before has our constitutional mandate been more important. Never before have the pillars of our democracy been under attack.

Mr. Speaker, each and every one of us swore an oath of office. Whether Democrat or Republican, we all have an equal mission, an obligation, and a mandate to uphold this promise.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come, and the question is simple: Will you show up for duty?

Congress must speak up, we must speak out, and, Mr. Speaker, we must act. If we fail to do so, history and the American voters will not be kind.

The threat is occurring in realtime on our watch, and the ball is in our court. The clock is ticking, and there is no time to waste.

PRESIDENT TRUMP AND RUSSIA

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, President Trump had a straightforward mission in Europe last week: stand with our NATO allies and stand up to Russia's Putin. Instead, President Trump squandered U.S. influence and abdicated our leadership by abusing and dividing our allies and fawning over a tyrant who actively seeks to undermine our democracy.

While Putin may not be dictating American policy, President Trump is seemingly pushing forward his agenda. Putin wants to restore Russia as a great global power at the expense of the United States. He wants to expand Russian influence over Europe by weakening NATO and the European Union. In Putin's mind, when the United States and Europe flounder, Russia is stronger.

If Putin was calling the shots, he would have encouraged President Trump to criticize NATO and raise doubts on whether we would defend our allies if they haven't paid their bills. He would invite President Trump to undermine the European Union, our largest trading partner and investor, by lauding Brexit, denouncing trade, supporting antidemocratic populists, and undermining Germany and Chancellor Merkel. And that is exactly what happened.

Rather than projecting unity, President Trump's participation at the NATO summit generated nonstop images of division. Substantive issues received little or no attention.

Putin is the biggest winner from any disunity in NATO. During the Cold War, American and NATO troops held the line in Europe, containing and defeating the Soviet Union.

I served in Germany for 5 years at that time and witnessed firsthand how we won the Cold War. But we didn't do it through military power alone. We won because NATO military strength helped create the space for democratic dissidents in Eastern Europe to come together and bring down Soviet rule from within. This was the success of America's strategy—pursued by Presidents from Roosevelt to Kennedy, to Reagan—of advancing American values.

For seven decades, the NATO alliance has ensured that America's strength and influence are magnified around the globe. Our alliance has extended the promise of peace, security, and prosperity to much of the democratic world, and it has maintained the inviolable promise of collective defense.

America needed its allies after we were attacked on 9/11, and our allies came through. They fought and died with us.

And threats to our collective security have not vanished in the 21st century. These shared security challenges should have been at the top of President Trump's agenda, but they weren't.

Since Putin's annexation of Crimea, NATO has found renewed purpose and effectiveness, stepping up exercises and establishing the enhanced forward presence in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland.

Additional measures may be necessary to continue to confront Russian aggression. This includes Secretary Mattis' 30-30 plan to establish the readiness of 30 land battalions, 30 air fighter squadrons, and 30 ships ready to deploy within 30 days of being put on alert; Poland's proposal to bring more U.S. troops to the country and setting up a joint armored division with 15,000 American troops, and as many as 250 tanks and armored vehicles; and completion of the European missile shield by 2020. None of this was discussed.

Contrary to President Trump's declarations, NATO members have been increasing defense spending since 2014: almost \$46 billion, the biggest buildup by U.S. allies in 25 years.

NATO is also expanding its training mission in Afghanistan and launching a new one in Iraq, showcasing NATO's ongoing commitment to the fight against terrorism. Yet President Trump chose to deride our most important allies.

With as much passion as President Trump questions our European allies as freeloaders, his actions suggest a desire for a cozy relationship with Putin's Russia. Russia is one of our most aggressive adversaries, working to rupture the relationship between the United States and our closest partners, weaken our influence in the Middle East, and pose an ongoing cyber threat.

Other than elevating Putin and failing to mention Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea, what good did President Trump accomplish during this summit? I have no answer as to why he, unlike any of his Republican or

Democratic predecessors, is so unwilling to defend the interests of the United States and our allies against Russia. All that is clear is that, by embracing our adversaries and denigrating our allies, President Trump is inviting grave and historic consequences for the United States.

Mr. Speaker, today, I simply call on President Trump to unequivocally affirm the United States' commitment to our European allies and to condemn Russian aggression, meddling, and malign influence.

THE STALWART REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago this August, Russian tanks rolled across the border into the independent nation of Georgia. After 5 days of bloody fighting, with thousands of innocent Georgians displaced from their homes, the conflict ended with the Russians promising to pull back its forces.

I happened to be in Georgia 1 week after the Russian invasion and saw the tanks on the high ground and the destruction that the Russians made of Tbilisi. It is 10 years since that invasion and Moscow and its troops still occupy one-third of sovereign territory of the Republic of Georgia.

The Kremlin claims these Russian troops are in Georgia as peacekeepers. Are you kidding me? It is an invasion. They are a heavily armed battle group waiting to provoke Georgia into another fight. They have committed horrific human rights abuses against the Georgian people, often harassing civilians and denying Georgians the ability to move about their country freely.

The continued presence of Russian troops on Georgian soil presents a major violation of international law. America's response at the time was to condemn and issue sanctions against the Russians, but the Obama administration removed the punishing sanctions against Russia as part of its foolish reset with the Kremlin.

We now know this demonstration of weakness only encouraged further aggression from Russia, and it invaded a neighbor state in 2014. This time it seized and annexed Crimea from Ukraine, another independent sovereign state that Russia had sworn to respect. Then Russian tanks moved on and invaded eastern Ukraine and occupied part of that territory.

After 10 years of illegal occupation of Georgian territory, we need to do more to help our Georgian friends resist the Russian bear. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Georgia emerged as the beacon of hope in the region and hope for democracy. Georgia's faithful commitment to a strong democracy with free and fair elections serves as a shining example for other countries in Eastern Europe. Russia hoped to break

this beacon of hope 10 years ago, but Georgia has remained defiant.

As co-chair of the Congressional Georgia Caucus, I have long seen that major vulnerabilities remain that Russia could exploit. Georgia is a small country. It cannot afford to compete with the might of the Russian bear. That is why I have introduced the Georgia Support Act along with my caucus co-chair, Representative CONNOLLY from Virginia.

Through this important bill, we hope to significantly enhance Georgia's ability to combat and deter Putin's wicked activities. With our assistance, America can provide Georgia specific advantages that can make any new attempt by Russia a costly endeavor.

Also, with modern warfare extending to cyberspace, we can improve coordination to identify Russia's cyber attacks and build safeguards within. This means building up Georgia's ability to combat disinformation and propaganda from Russia.

As we have seen, Moscow is all over the world trying to undermine democracies by invading their elections, including our own. Working with Georgian partners, we can show Russia has been caught.

Additionally, this bill calls on President Trump to impose sanctions for serious human rights abuses in that occupied territory of Georgia. Not only will it help our Georgian friends on the front line of Russian aggression, but it sends a message to the Kremlin that America will and must stand up against that bad behavior and defend the international rule of law.

Czar Putin must be shown that his dream of rebuilding the Russian empire is not going to happen. We must show our freedom-loving friends around the globe that America will stand with them. The Georgian people have shown they will fight for freedom, even against overwhelming odds.

While the Kremlin believes that it has prevented Georgia's aspirations of joining the important organization of NATO by seizing territory, we can send a signal that that victory is hollow. Georgia is still on the path to greater integration with the West. Georgia must remain, with our help, free and prosperous. Russia will find itself isolated and full of regret for ever following Putin's foolish ambition of aggression in the region.

And that is just the way it is.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF PRESIDENT NELSON MANDELA

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of South African President Nelson Mandela on what would have been his 100th birthday.

President Mandela, or "Mandiba" as he was affectionately called, was a rev-

olutionary and transformative leader, who forever changed the world through his steadfast dedication to freedom, equality, and human rights.

After spending 27 years in prison, Nelson Mandela became the first Black South African to be elected President in what was also the first free, multiracial, democratic election in South African history.

While President Mandela used his administration to dismantle apartheid, combat institutional racism, and begin the process of racial reconciliation in his country, his efforts also taught the world the power of one man having the fortitude to sacrifice his own ideals for a cause greater than himself.

To me, Nelson Mandela is more than a world-renowned hero. I had the distinct honor and privilege of calling him a friend. His leadership of the international antiapartheid movement encouraged me to take action here in the United States, where I served as the Los Angeles chair of the Free South Africa Movement, organized countless antiapartheid rallies in Los Angeles, led a sit-in at the South African Consulate General's office in Los Angeles, and was even arrested during a protest at the Embassy of South Africa in Washington, D.C. I was also a board member of and worked nationally with TransAfrica, one of the most prominent antiapartheid advocacy groups in the United States.

As a member of the California State Assembly at that time, I fought for the passage of Assembly Bill 134, which forced California to divest \$12 billion in State pension funds tied to the apartheid regime in South Africa.

In 1990, I chaired the committee in Los Angeles that brought over 90,000 people together in the Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum to welcome Nelson Mandela into the United States, and I also traveled with the official U.S. delegation to South Africa in 1994 to attend his inauguration as President of South Africa.

In 1998, I was honored to welcome President Mandela to the United States once again, this time to receive the United States Congressional Gold Medal.

In honor of his 95th birthday in 2013, I organized an event here in Washington, D.C., called the Celebration of the Life, Legacy and Values of Nelson R. Mandela in Emancipation Hall of the United States Capitol Visitor Center. The celebration was attended by my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus, leaders from both the United States House and Senate, and representatives of national and international civil rights and humanitarian groups.

As we reflect on Nelson Mandela's memory today, let us remember what he once said: "What counts in life is not the mere fact that we have lived. It is what difference we have made to the lives of others that will determine the significance of the life we lead."

Few embody this quote better than Nelson Mandela himself, and it is my

sincere hope that my own career in public service can live up to his extraordinary example.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Chaplain John L. Vernon, Jr., High Point Police Department, High Point, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we stand in Your presence today, thankful for this great Nation we call home.

I pray for each of these men and women who have been chosen to serve their fellow citizens in this vital task of governing. I pray also for those who serve alongside them as members of their staff, and all their families.

I pray that today You will give these Members godly wisdom. Give them courage to do what is right in the best interest of our Nation and its people. Give them the humility that truly exemplifies servant leadership. May they each desire to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with You.

I pray also for those who protect us: members of our military in various parts of the world and first responders all across our Nation. Protect them as they protect us.

All these things I pray in Jesus' name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BIGGS 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 CHAPLAIN JOHN L. VERNON, JR.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the House's guest chaplain for the day, John Vernon, who comes to us from High Point, North Carolina.

John is an ordained minister in the Wesleyan Church and currently serves as chairman of the board of directors of the Wesleyan Christian Academy.

Beyond the Wesleyan Church, John also serves as lead chaplain for the High Point Police Department, where he has served faithfully for 18 years. Within the last year, John has taken on the role of lead chaplain for the High Point Fire Department.

John and his wife, Kim, will celebrate 37 years of marriage together this year. They have two sons, Travis and Kyle, and two wonderful daughters-in-law, Stephanie and Hillary. We are glad to have Kim, Kyle, and Hillary joining us in the gallery.

Among John and Kim's greatest joys in their lives is spending time with their three granddaughters, Sadie, Millie, and Nora.

I want to thank Chaplain Vernon for his service and for opening the House in prayer this morning. We are honored and privileged that he and his family call High Point home.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

TAX CUTS PRODUCE BOOM IN JOBS

(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, the latest results are in from the Republican tax cuts, with Trump deregulation, producing jobs: \$2,059 average tax cut for a typical family of four; \$2,000 new per child tax credit, double the old amount.

Sixteen regulations rolled back through the Congressional Review Act process, the most in history. Ninety percent of Americans are receiving bigger paychecks under the new withholding tables.

A 3.4 percent increase in real disposable income in the first quarter of 2018; a record high level of U.S. exports of goods and services, over \$200 billion; 3.7 million jobs created since November 2016; 1.3 million jobs created since the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act became law; 6.6 million job openings as of May 2018, meaning more jobs than job seekers. Sixty-five percent of Americans now say it is a good time to find a quality job.

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

MANDELA DAY

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the late, great President Nelson Mandela, whose 100th birthday we celebrate today.

Like many of my colleagues, I was first inspired by Mr. Mandela in the early 1970s. I was arrested in Berkeley, California, protesting apartheid, when our brave brothers and sisters in the labor movement refused to unload ships from South Africa that arrived at Oakland's port.

I remember very vividly when the African National Congress was designated a terrorist organization by the United States Government. It was illegal to meet with the freedom fighters in the United States, but many of us did anyway in safe places around the world.

I was so happy when we finally passed legislation, which I led, to lift President Mandela and the ANC off the terrorist watch list on his 90 birthday 10 years ago.

As an election observer, I will never forget the lines of people waiting to vote for Nelson Mandela as the first Black President of South Africa.

Madiba's impact was not limited to South Africa. He sparked social justice movements that reached around the world and reminded us of the power of the vote. As President Obama noted yesterday, he said Madiba "came to embody the universal aspirations of dispossessed people all around the world, their hopes for a better life."

President Mandela taught us many lessons, lessons in reconciliation, perseverance, and public service. Above all, he taught us that the fight for justice was never finished. His legacy will live forever.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE 2018 FARM BILL

(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, soon, the House will vote to go to conference with the Senate on the 2018 farm bill. As vice chair of the House Agriculture Committee, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of moving this important process forward.

As chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee, I am proud of the provisions we have included to give many Americans the skills needed to obtain a family-sustaining job and ultimate food security.

Food insecurity exists for so many in America today, and the workforce and job training provisions in the bill represent a significant opportunity to help millions of Americans find employment.

The Agriculture Committee has done its work. In fact, the Nutrition Subcommittee hosted 21 hearings on SNAP

and heard from more than 80 witnesses on how we can improve the program and work toward the ultimate goal of ending hunger in America.

Mr. Speaker, the House farm bill makes a historic investment in work programs so SNAP recipients have a chance to learn new skills and climb the rungs on the ladder of opportunity and escape poverty once and for all.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING WOODIE RUCKER-HUGHES

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, a passionate educator, a change-maker, and a powerhouse of a woman, that is how the community of Riverside would describe my dear friend, Waudieur "Woodie" Rucker-Hughes.

As a history teacher at John W. North High School and an administrator for the Riverside Unified School District, Woodie worked to demolish educational barriers and address the needs of all students.

As an activist and leader for the Riverside branch of the NAACP, Woodie challenged injustice and moved our communities forward every single day. As a mother and a friend, she touched my life and the lives of many others with her kindness and her steadfast support and encouragement.

Today, we remember Woodie, her legacy, and everything she stood for. I am going to leave you with Woodie's motto: Good, better, best. Never let them rest until the good becomes better and the better becomes best.

In honor of Woodie, let's keep working to make this country, and the world, an even better place than she left it.

CONGRATULATING CHRISTOPHER EVANS

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise today to honor Christopher Evans, a teacher at Basha High School in my district.

Mr. Evans was one of 52 Americans who received the James Madison Fellowship, which is awarded to one distinguished educator from each State. This award recognizes exceptional teachers of American history and social studies seeking "to strengthen their knowledge of the origins and development of American constitutional government, and to expose our future leaders to the knowledge of the Nation's constitutional heritage."

I congratulate Mr. Evans on this achievement, and I know he has a bright future in my home State of Arizona.

DEFENDING U.S. INTERESTS

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Russia is not our friend; Russia is our adversary.

We witnessed our President side with an autocrat and adversary of our country over his own intelligence community and blame the USA for our relationship with Russia.

From separating families at the southern border to embracing Putin over the protection of U.S. interests, Mr. Trump has thrown out that values that our country is founded on.

Putin may be Mr. Trump's friend, but he is not America's. Our President forgets that the U.S. interests go beyond his own personal interests and relationships. If Putin wants to return to the days with no pushback from the U.S., that is one thing. If our President wants to return to those days, rather than defend America and our allies, that is another.

It shouldn't matter whether you are a Republican or a Democrat. If the President of the United States won't defend our interests before those of our adversaries, Congress must.

LOWYAL'S TRAFFICKING STORY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Lowyal was just like any other teenager across America. When she was 13 years of age and in school, daily bullying started. Then her relationship with her mother became worse. So she dropped out of school, took drugs, and eventually joined a gang.

Eventually, her newfound "friends" introduced her to a "game" where she walked up and down the streets, under the constant watch of her owners. She was the victim of human trafficking, modern-day slavery. These older men manipulated her youth and stole her innocence on the marketplace of sex slavery.

My legislation, the Abolish Human Trafficking Act, will increase prosecutions for perpetrators like the slave traders who trafficked Lowyal and hold them accountable for their crimes of sex slavery.

America must support victims of human traffickers and put their predators where they belong: in the jailhouse. We as a community must rescue victims from this scourge of slavery that is taking place in our country.

And that is just the way it is.

KEEPING THE PRESIDENT IN CHECK

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, this week, we witnessed the weakening of the Presidency due to the actions of this President.

Now, I realize that President Trump is not constrained by customs, norms, or decorum, but his actions this week contravened his oath to preserve, protect, and defend the United States Constitution.

Yes, this President likes to act tough with tweets and trash talk, but he has proven that he is unwilling to get tough with adversaries when he stands face to face.

What is worse is that he is willing to sell out our intelligence agencies in order to suck up to the leader of a nation that has attacked us and continues to attack many democracies around the world.

Hopefully, his actions will motivate this body, our Congress, to act. Let's condemn these comments. Let's protect the special counsel. Let's protect the integrity of our elections. Let's fully implement the Russian sanctions passed last year and pass even harsher ones, if Russia does this again.

By doing anything, we can keep this President in check. When we do that, we restore the credibility of our Presidency. If we do that, we uphold the credibility of this Congress by fulfilling our oath to our democracy, so help us God.

INVASIVE ASIAN CARP

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

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise awareness about the single greatest threat to Tennessee's lake and river systems. Invasive Asian carp are destroying Tennessee's native fisheries across the State.

If ignored, these fish will decimate recreation, sporting, and tourism industries that rely on more than 60,000 miles of streams and rivers in my State.

For years, the focal point for combating Asian carp has been in the North, particularly the Great Lakes. However, this continued threat has spread through the Southeast. It is time to recognize that this species is invading States like Tennessee, Kentucky, and Alabama.

Congress needs to take action, or we are going to lose some of the most biologically diverse rivers and bass fishing in the country.

Asian carp have the capacity to destroy the food systems of highly valued recreational and commercial fisheries, which generate \$2 billion in economic impact annually in Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, this issue cannot be ignored, and I implore my colleagues to work with me to combat the invasion of Asian carp in Tennessee and throughout the Southeast.

□ 1215

GOP = GOVERNMENT OF PUTIN

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Helsinki will be remembered as the place where GOP became shorthand for "Government of Putin."

Just as Trump surrenders to Vladimir Putin, these Helsinki congressional Republicans surrender to Trump.

Trump's own intelligence chief, former Senator, lifelong Republican Dan Coats, says "the warning lights are blinking red again" on Russian attacks. Yet Helsinki Republicans refuse to act, providing zero funding to the States to protect election integrity today. Their refusal to appropriate a dime for state defense against Russian interference really represents nothing less than unilateral disarmament.

Enough excuses. Enough weakness. Instead of a President with no scruples and a congressional Republican majority with no spine, we need strong leadership, unafraid to protect our borders and unafraid to protect American families from the ongoing Russian aggression against our democracy.

ACKNOWLEDGING LAMAR SMITH FOR HIS WORK ON THE DYSLEXIA CAUCUS

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the work of Chairman LAMAR SMITH of the Congressional Dyslexia Caucus. His work on this important issue has brought much-needed attention in Congress to a learning disability affecting as many as one in five Americans.

He championed the READ Act, which mandated that the National Institutes of Health direct specific funds towards dyslexia research. This law is deepening our understanding of dyslexia and providing additional tools for us to help those with this learning disability.

Last week, I began serving as co-chair of the Dyslexia Caucus, alongside Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY. It is my hope that we can work together to continue the impressive work of Chairman SMITH and effect positive change for those living with dyslexia.

Individuals can overcome dyslexia and achieve greatness in their education and careers when they have the right tools and instruction. We will work hard in Congress to give them what is necessary to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank Chairman SMITH for his leadership and lifetime of dedication.

NO MORE PRESIDENTIAL WARS

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Article I, section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the exclusive authority to declare war, but the last time Congress officially declared war was December 8, 1941, the day the U.S. entered World War II. Ever since, Congress has failed to uphold their constitutional responsibility and has instead ceded power to the President.

So we remain in a state of perpetual war, led by Presidents in both parties, at great cost to the American people, with no declaration of war by Congress and no input from the American people.

The direct and indirect costs of these Presidential wars are astounding. They take a toll on our troops, our veterans, and on the American people.

Since 9/11 alone, we have spent trillions of dollars on regime-change wars and nation building, while people in our community suffer and struggle because of a lack of resources here at home—not to mention the cost borne by our troops, those who pay the ultimate price as well as those who come home with wounds that are both visible and invisible.

The American people deserve accountability. Mr. WALTER JONES and I have introduced bipartisan H. Res. 922 to make sure that Congress fulfills its constitutional role, ends Presidential wars, and has robust debate before making a decision to send our troops into battle.

SYRIAN LAW 10

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the pressing issue that has the potential to exponentially worsen the humanitarian crisis in the war-torn country of Syria.

I know I don't need to remind this body or the American people of the dire circumstance that the Syrian people face as their country continues to be ripped apart by a known war criminal, their President, Bashar al-Assad.

While millions of Syrians have fled the country, seeking asylum and safety in neighboring countries, the majority of these refugees' only hope is to one day return back to their home. However, the Syrian regime recently passed a law that will make that nearly impossible.

Law 10, passed in April of this year, forces all Syrians, regardless of where they are currently residing, to register and provide proof of ownership of their private properties in Syria within 30 days, or else they will be forced to hand their properties over to the state of Syria. This amounts to a massive land grab by the corrupt Syrian regime that would essentially push out the nearly 13 million displaced Syrians and ensure that they never have a chance to return home.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this body will understand this and we will speak loudly.

I urge my colleagues and this administration to take a serious and critical look at this law that would have far-reaching implications for the United States and our allies who have offered these refugees temporary asylum in our nations and the disastrous consequences for the Syrian people for generations to come.

HONORING THE LIFE OF NEYSA TONKS

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Neysa Tonks. Neysa attended the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

Neysa was a single mother to her three kids: Kaden, Braxton, and Greysen. She worked at Technologist in Las Vegas and was known as being a fireball from the minute she woke up to the minute she went to bed.

Neysa was spontaneous, adventurous, and full of life. She loved waterskiing, ziplining, hiking, jumping off waterfalls, and traveling. She had even competed in a Tough Mudder with very little training.

Despite her many adventures, she would always save time in the winter to carry out her tradition of packing hundreds of backpacks with supplies and delivering them to the less fortunate with her sons.

Neysa was compassionate and had plans to retire early so she could spend more time with her boys.

Neysa enjoyed going to concerts, laughing, and trying new things. Neysa is remembered as always being the life of the party.

I would like to extend my condolences to Neysa Tonks' family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieves with you.

NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION MONTH

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to speak about our national parks and our parks and recreational opportunities.

I grew up in California's San Joaquin Valley, where we are blessed with some of the Nation's most beautiful lands. Like many, I spent my youth exploring local Fresno recreational areas and the California State parks.

My family and I, many times, visited Kings Canyon National Park and one of the crown jewels of all national parks, Yosemite Valley, seen in this striking photograph.

Wallace Stegner, famous writer, historian, and environmentalist, once said: "Our national parks are the best idea we ever had. Absolutely American, absolutely democratic, they reflect us at our best rather than our worst."

July is Parks and Recreation Month, and I urge everyone across this great country to visit our parks and recreational areas. It is great for our families and for all of us. Share in something that reflects America at our best.

Let us also remember that wildfires are a regular threat to our parks during this season. Fires are, sadly, burning as we speak today near Yosemite National Park and throughout the West.

Our thoughts and prayers are with those brave men and women fighting those fires, and their families, while protecting some of America's most precious resources.

RUSSIAN ENERGY INTERESTS IN EUROPE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, control of energy equals national security. I rise to warn how Russia, through hybrid warfare, seeks to destabilize and divide our closest European allies through control of their energy supply.

As Americans well know, whoever controls the energy spigot controls the function of a nation. Russia uses its growing dominance of energy in Europe as its primary pressure point to destabilize the West and our allies. That is why I was floored that President Trump inserted himself so haphazardly into Europe's energy debate.

Nord Stream II poses new, troubling dependency threats by Russia on Europe's energy security and boosts undemocratic Russia's claw hold on the European continent. Russia is weaponizing energy in countries across Europe, including Germany and Ukraine, creating a dangerous new dependency by those recipient nations.

The fight for Ukraine's liberty depends on its energy independence in the future, and the free world must help Europe and Ukraine reduce their economic reliance on Russian gas.

Risking alienation of nations that share freedom's values is counter-productive and aids and abets our enemies.

Mr. Speaker, I will include in the RECORD President Trump's and President Putin's comments on this topic.

SPENDING BILL WILL DAMAGE OUR ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, later today the House will vote on a spending bill for the Department of the Interior. This bill is a travesty that will do enormous damage to our environment. It cuts critical funding that keeps our air clean and our water safe.

This bill eliminates \$100 million in funding from the Environmental Protection Agency, \$65 million from the Land and Water Conservation Fund,

and \$150 million from both the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and the Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Fund. It will make it more difficult to protect some bodies of water from pollution and endangered species from extinction.

Perhaps most troubling of all, it actually eliminates protections that help keep lead out of our water.

A vote for this bill is a vote to make our air more dangerous to breathe and our water less safe to drink. It is a reckless bill that should be opposed by all Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and to oppose this and to protect the quality of our air, our water, and our environment. Our constituents are depending upon us.

CONGRESS TO ELIMINATE FUNDING FOR THE ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I, along with so many Americans, looked on with great shock as we saw the President capitulate to Vladimir Putin. It was truly a stunning and worrisome moment for me.

In fact, in that European trip, the President insulted our allies and then openly embraced a man who attacked our democracy, invaded and annexed other countries, and authorized lethal attacks on his political enemies and other countries.

Yet the President still embraced him.

It is a moment of alarm for the whole Nation, but it is important to note that there is something we can do about it, as the President has also urged the U.S. Congress to eliminate funding for the Election Assistance Commission.

This is very serious because we know that Russia assisted in the hacking and attack of over 21 States' election systems. The President may not be concerned, but Congress ought to be.

Unfortunately, today we expect to have a vote in which we are voting on a bill that eliminates the funding of the Election Assistance Commission. This should be rejected, as we should reject the President's failure to stand up for our values.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S LATEST TWEETS

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, well, the latest tweets from the President:

"So many people at the higher ends of intelligence loved my press conference performance in Helsinki."

Obviously, he is referring to Putin, because there are not many people in the United States who saw that press conference as a success. In fact, it was an unmitigated disaster.

Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats said, "The red lights are blinking." Our election process, our critical infrastructure, is being attacked by Russia, and what is the House of Representatives doing today? Eliminating funding to protect our election process.

Obviously, those who vote for this reduction in funding are not at the higher levels of intelligence.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO DEFEND AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the President put the "hel" and the "sink" back in "Helsinki" because our Republic is sinking under the weight of his radical actions in capitulating to Vladimir Putin in the eyes of the world.

Now, some of my colleagues have called this appeasement. I want to correct that. Appeasement is a misguided policy where you give concessions in order to try to make peace and stability with a dangerous, aggressive foreign power.

This was not appeasement. This was simple surrender. The President wasn't trying to make peace with a hostile power. He was trying to capitulate and have us go over to the other side of the hostile power.

The President has sided with authoritarianism, with every kleptocrat, dictator, despot, and tyrant on the planet Earth today.

We the people of the United States and we in Congress have a responsibility now to defend American constitutional democracy. We must invest in our elections and fortify our elections so we can begin to restore the principles we have lost under the terrible leadership of Donald Trump.

□ 1230

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 18, 2018, at 11:28 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without an amendment H.R. 6042.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 119, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1001 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1001

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 119) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1001, providing for further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 119, expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy. The rule provides for consideration of the concurrent resolution under a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, my district in central Washington demonstrates the strength in utilizing a diverse portfolio of energy sources, while also working on the forefront of energy innovation in clean energy solutions for the future.

From the mighty Grand Coulee Dam, which is the largest hydroelectric power producer in the United States, to the Chief Joseph Dam, to the series of lower Snake and lower Columbia River dams, our region is undoubtedly blessed with low-cost, clean, reliable, and renewable hydropower.

In fact, hydropower provides our State with almost 70 percent of our energy needs. Improvements made to this

technology to improve the efficiency, the safety, and the productivity of hydro demonstrate the importance of constantly improving our energy technologies.

Now, while we do rely heavily on hydropower, Washington also utilizes an array of other energy sources, both produced and imported, including oil, natural gas, coal, and a number of renewable energy sources such as wind and solar.

My district is also blessed with the only nuclear generating station in the Pacific Northwest, and that is the Columbia Generating Station, which is operated by Energy Northwest. Columbia produces 10 percent of the electricity generated in Washington and is a reliable, clean energy producer not dependent on weather conditions like some renewables are.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, while I am sure you are fascinated by this brief rundown of Washington State's source of energy, you may be wondering why I am speaking about such matters with the resolution before us today.

The resolution says, quite simply, that it is the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy—a simple statement. And while I could be spending my time listening to many ways a harmful tax would harm our economy and the American people, I thought I would also offer a demonstration of the many resources we have at our disposal for strengthening America's energy dominance.

Many of my colleagues, much like myself, support what we can call an "all of the above" energy approach. We believe government should not be picking winners and losers and should not be placing the thumb on the economic free-market scale. A carbon tax would be exactly that, a devastating hammer to what is currently an economy on the rise.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution offered by the majority whip, Representative STEVE SCALISE from the great State of Louisiana, to oppose a carbon tax carbon tax as a solution to address carbon emissions and climate change, because, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it simply is not a solution.

However, that is not to say that I oppose reducing carbon emissions. My constituents and the people of the great Pacific Northwest most certainly want a clean, healthy environment, and we should be doing everything we can to limit emissions. But a burdensome new tax that would fundamentally bring our innovative energy sector and growing economy to a standstill is not the answer.

Further, a carbon tax fails to recognize the diversity of our Nation and the different energy resources that exist in the United States. Quite frankly, the resources that exist in the State of Washington certainly may not be present in the State of North Dakota or Louisiana or Massachusetts.

We should be making clean energy more affordable, not making traditional energy sources more expensive. We should be cutting burdensome regulations that constrain the development and deployment of energy, whether it be nuclear, fossil fuels, or hydropower. These regulatory burdens should be removed and reformed to spur clean energy innovation with the power of markets, not within the hands of government bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, we, in central Washington, have another prize gem in our backyard. I am proud to represent the people that work at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. This premier Department of Energy lab is on the forefront of energy innovation. From enabling safe and sustainable fossil fuel exploration production, transportation, conversion, and end use, to transforming the U.S. power grid to meet economic, environmental, and security priorities for the 21st century, our national labs like PNNL delivers distinctive science and technology solutions for efficient and sustainable energy.

I am a proud member of the House Appropriations Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee where we continue to prioritize strategic energy research and development that will increase U.S. economic growth, innovation, and competitiveness.

Congress should continue to work on utilizing and empowering public-private partnerships to rapidly develop new technologies and then let the market catalyze its growth and commercial liability. There are great examples of these efforts taking place in the innovative high-tech communities of the Tri-Cities, Washington, where experts from the private sector are partnering with research and support offered by PNNL to develop grid-scale storage solutions and small modular reactor technologies, fundamentally transforming the future of nuclear power generation and battery storage technologies.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents want energy security and want a clean environment. They want economic growth, job creation, and they want to keep their low-cost electricity. The way to a cleaner, more prosperous future for our Nation's energy needs is not through more government bureaucracy. It is through empowering American innovation. That is why a carbon tax is wrong for my district in central Washington State. It is wrong for the entire State of Washington, and it is wrong for the United States of America. We need to innovate, rather than regulate the future of America's energy dominance.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to debate a Republican sense of Congress resolution proclaiming that a carbon tax would be bad for the U.S. economy. That is it. That is how this majority is choosing to spend its precious legislative time. I mean, this is a big nothing burger.

Instead of considering legislation to address the administration's horrific child separation policy at the border or addressing the surging cost of prescription drugs or taking action to address gun safety, or finally, finally holding Russia accountable for their interference in the 2016 election, something the President himself has trouble acknowledging, we are here considering a sense of Congress stating that a carbon tax would be bad for America.

You know, I don't know how many of my Republican colleagues are scientists, but you might want to meet some and talk to some of them. They are smart people. They deal in facts. They deal in evidence. They deal in results.

Look, Mr. Speaker, as any third grader knows, the Earth revolves around the Sun, and if I drop a pen, it will fall to the table because of gravity. We know that smoking causes cancer, and we know that the Earth is not flat. We also know that climate change is real and that 97 percent of climate scientists agree that humans are the main cause. But Republicans are burying their heads in the sand with this glorified press release attacking a potential tool to combat it.

But even worse than what we are doing is what the Republican majority is blocking from consideration. This week they blocked an amendment that would have provided much needed funding to the Election Assistance Commission to protect our elections from further Russian interference. This is outrageous. Just days after President Trump sided with Putin over our own intelligence community, Republicans blocked funding to protect our elections. Essentially, the President sold out America in Helsinki.

So Republicans want to vote on a sense of Congress, let's consider the resolution reiterating Speaker RYAN's statement in response to the President's terrible performance in Helsinki. It acknowledges Russia's role in interfering in our election, and it affirms our support for the intelligence community. But, of course, the majority has blocked that resolution.

Instead, we are now debating our 92nd closed rule this Congress. This is the most closed Congress in history, with zero open rules. And for those in the gallery, the reason why this is important is because the majority of bills that have come to this floor have come in a way that nobody can amend them. Nobody can change even a word in the bill. I mean, this is supposed to be the people's House, not the Russia house.

Mr. Speaker, this, what we are doing today, is a waste of time. We have real issues to address—substantive issues to address. The American people deserve more than show votes that throw red meat to the oil lobby. I would say to my Republican colleagues: Do your job. Listen to the American people. Start addressing some of their concerns, like the fact that we need to protect our election system from more Russian interference. That is a serious matter. All of our intelligence agencies have said it is a serious matter, that it happened.

□ 1245

And what is your response? You zero out money in an appropriations bill to help protect our election system. Then you block an amendment that would allow us to put the money back in.

All we want is a fair fight. If you want to vote "no" on it, vote "no" on it. But the American people are concerned, even if you are not. Do your job.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from referring to occupants in the gallery and are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

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

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side seem to be focused on closed versus open rules. We hear that time and time again. They are ignoring that the structured amendment process has routinely been used by both parties when they were in the majority.

This majority has made it a priority to make in order amendments for floor consideration, which, I might point out, a majority of those amendments have been Democratic-sponsored or co-sponsored. In fact, as of July 12 of this year, Republicans in this Congress, the 115th Congress, provided for the consideration of more than 1,650 amendments on the House floor: 745 of those were Democrat amendments; 630 were Republican amendments; and 280 were, proudly, bipartisan amendments, Mr. Speaker. So by no means are we stopping the process. That doesn't even count the thousands and thousands of submissions that Members make, both Republican and Democrat, to committees for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the fact that this is a totally closed process. It is open for participation by every Member of the House who represents constituents across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 119, expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses and is not in the best interest of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague and friend from Massachusetts just said that we

need to be addressing real concerns. Well, I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that the loss of paychecks of tens of thousands of Kentuckians over the last decade, as a result of a war on fossil energy, is a major concern. Maybe not in Massachusetts, but men and women who have lost paychecks, whose lives have been devastated by overregulation, that is a real concern, Mr. Speaker.

This Congress, fortunately, in cooperation with this administration, is now leading our country back, not just toward energy independence, but energy dominance and strong economic growth, and, finally, jobs as a priority, and energy security, by rolling back onerous regulations that have harmed livelihoods and threatened our grid resiliency.

Mr. Speaker, implementing a carbon tax would not only harm these efforts, but it would result in massive job losses, lead to higher prices for families and businesses, and jeopardize our energy security.

My home State of Kentucky relies heavily on fossil fuels, as our coal resources provide our State thousands of jobs and deliver more than 83 percent of our electricity. This allows Kentuckians to enjoy some of the lowest average electricity rates in the Nation.

A carbon tax, Mr. Speaker, would be an attack on the poor. It would be an attack on people who cannot afford high electricity bills.

The implementation of a carbon tax would be detrimental not only to Kentucky's economy, but to the progress of our Nation, and the progress we are making toward energy resilience and freedom.

Instead of increasing government mandates and regulations on industries, and picking winners and losers, we should look for new, innovative ways to promote air quality and address environmental concerns. The best way to do that is not through central planning from Washington. It is to unleash free enterprises to encourage innovation and to harness the carbon cycle.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a climate denier. I am not a science denier. I am a climate thinker. I am a science thinker. Real science is not just about assessing cost only. It is about looking at benefits as well. Those supporting a carbon tax look only at costs, but not benefits, of coal and other fossil energy.

Coal provides cheap, plentiful, reliable energy over the long term. We should not want the most carbon-free energy. We should want the best energy. We should want the most reliable energy. We should want the most effective energy, energy that best facilitates human life, human flourishing, and human progress. And that is what fossil energy is.

Government mandates and central planning, like a carbon tax, add costs to private sector innovation, resulting in poor air quality and more, not less, global pollution.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the goal should not be green energy. The goal should be the advancement of the human condition.

Mr. Speaker, I support H. Con. Res. 119, and I thank Representative SCALISE, our whip, for his efforts on this important issue.

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

Mr. Speaker, I tried to get the gentleman from Kentucky to yield, but I guess he didn't want to get into an exchange. But he said that he is worried about Kentucky jobs. There is nothing in this bill that will protect one job anywhere.

We are not debating a carbon tax. This is a sense of Congress. This is a press release. This is not going to protect anybody's paycheck. This is ridiculous. Are you going to go home to your constituents and say, "Oh, I did something for you. I passed a press release"? I mean, give me a break.

The gentleman talks about the poor. If he is worried about the poor, then stop cutting Medicaid. If he is worried about the poor, stop cutting food assistance from people struggling in poverty, because that is what the Republican majority has been doing consistently in this Congress. So I don't need any lectures about that.

To the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my colleague, let me again say, because I think people need to have this sink in, this is the most closed Congress in the history of our country: 92 closed rules. That means that the majority of bills—I want my Republican colleagues to listen to this as well—the majority of bills have come to the floor where nobody, even Republicans, are allowed to offer any amendments—nothing.

Is this the people's House? Is this what you came to Washington to do, to shut out debate, to shut out good ideas?

It is a disgrace. My hope is that the people of this country are watching and that they will send you a message in November.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 12, the Voter Empowerment Act, introduced by my colleague, Representative JOHN LEWIS, which would ensure equal access to the ballot, modernize the voter registration system, and take steps to eliminate deceptive practices that deter voters from casting their ballots.

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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), to discuss that proposal.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this rule and to support the previous question.

In a democracy, the right to vote is the most powerful nonviolent tool we have. Many people marched and protested for the right to vote. Some gave a little blood, and others lost their lives.

Some of you have heard me say that the right to vote is precious, almost sacred. In my heart of hearts, I believe that we should make it simple and convenient for all of our citizens to be part of the democratic process. It should not matter whether you are Black or White, Latino, Asian-American, or Native American. We should be able to participate in the democratic process.

On March 7, 1965, I gave a little blood on the Edmund Pettus Bridge for the right to vote. Before the Voting Rights Act in 1965 was passed, some people had to count the number of bubbles in a bar of soap or the number of jelly beans in a jar.

All across America today, when people go out to attempt to vote, they stand in long, immovable lines. That is not right, that is not fair, and it is not just. We can do better, and we must do better.

We have a moral obligation, a mission, and a mandate to empower all of the American people, not just a select few. We must do what is right, what is fair, and what is just.

Today, our democracy is under attack, by forces within and forces abroad. We need to fix it and fix it now.

For these reasons, I am proud to sponsor H.R. 12, the Voter Empowerment Act, with my friends and my colleagues. It is a good bill, a necessary bill, and a patriotic bill to protect and to preserve our voting system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge each and every one of my colleagues to support the previous question.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS), my good friend.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues, as you have heard just a moment ago, in support of H. Con. Res. 119, which sends a strong message that a carbon tax would be devastating to the economy of the United States, and especially to my district in West Virginia.

I am so proud to cosponsor this resolution, along with the leadership of Majority Whip SCALISE, and thank him for his strong and powerful work on this important issue.

West Virginia is a coal State, unapologetic. Our coal miners and coal communities suffered greatly under the prior administration of Barack Obama and that administration's anti-coal policies.

But now, thanks to President Trump, West Virginia has hope for a better fu-

ture. West Virginia is the second largest producer of coal in the country. Between January and March of this year, mines in southern West Virginia produced more than 12 million short tons of coal, a signal that the President's policies are having a positive impact on the people of my State.

When miners are put to work in West Virginia, the State's economy flourishes. Check this out: West Virginia's 2017 gross domestic product growth rate was one of the highest rates in the entire country. What a game changer for West Virginia. It shows that the President's economic policies are working for everyday Americans.

A carbon tax would undo many of these good economic results and would increase expenses for everyday Americans, including increasing power rates and the cost of groceries. A carbon tax is a bad idea.

Wages could fall as much as 8.5 percent for American workers, and our manufacturers could see production halted by as much as 15 percent, stifling our economic recovery. Simply put, a carbon tax is an attack on the welfare of all Americans, especially on seniors and families on fixed incomes.

A vote in support of this rule and resolution is a vote supporting the hard-working men and women of West Virginia and America who make this country great.

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

Mr. Speaker, this week, Republicans have brought to the floor a bill that zeros out funding for a grant program to the Election Assistance Commission to help States and local governments secure our elections.

Now, a news flash, Mr. Speaker—I hope my Republican friends are listening—Russia was just caught meddling in our election. In fact, meddling is not strong enough. They attacked our country.

When we discovered this, Mr. QUIGLEY offered an amendment to restore this critical funding, and it was blocked in the Rules Committee. My friends in the Rules Committee won't even let us vote on it.

People may ask why, why can't we have a vote on putting money back in to secure our election system. Well, the reason why, I think, is because we might win and that Democrats—and there are probably a lot of Republicans—would join with us in supporting the amendment.

□ 1300

They denied it because it makes sense. It is common sense.

We should be funding this program and, instead, we are debating a press release that my friends on the other side are so passionate about, that will do nothing for anybody. It is just a press release. We are not debating a carbon tax. We are debating a press release. We ought to be protecting our election system.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for

the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, standing under the revered E Pluribus Unum, I ardently plea for unanimous consent to amend the rules to make in order the Quigley amendment to restore desperately needed funds to prevent the pernicious and nefarious Russian interference in our elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Washington yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate my earlier announcement that all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, and I will not yield for any other purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make in order the Quigley amendment to restore funds indispensable to prevent Russian interference in American elections in 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CICILLINE. Point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, does the vote on the matter pending before us include restoration of funding to protect our elections from Russian interference?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the pending measure.

Mr. CICILLINE. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the pending measure.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am now proud to yield to the gentleman from my home State of Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule and make in order the Quigley amendment to restore funds to prevent Russia from, again, interfering in our elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms.

GABBARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Quigley amendment to restore funds to help our States secure their vulnerable election systems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Quigley amendment to restore funds to prevent Russian interference in our elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Quigley amendment to restore funds to prevent Russian interference in our elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule in order that the Quigley amendment restore funds to prevent Russian interference in our elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Quigley amendment to prevent the Russians from interfering in American elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Quigley amendment to restore funds to prevent Russian interference in our elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to make in order the Quigley amendment to restore funds to prevent Russian interference in our elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule in order to make the Quigley amendment in order to restore urgently needed funds to prevent Russian interference in our upcoming elections.

And I would just ask the gentleman from Washington if he would yield for purposes of considering this unanimous consent amendment so that we can, together, Democrats and Republicans, work together to protect the integrity of our elections. Restore funding so we can look our voters in the face and say, "Your vote counted. We are going to protect it from Russian interference."

I am imploring my friend on the other side of the aisle to permit this unanimous consent question so we can restore this urgent funding. This shouldn't be a Republican or a Democratic issue. It is an American issue. This is the integrity of our democracy.

Will the gentleman yield to a unanimous consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington—

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague be permitted to answer the question. I have asked him will he yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be in order.

Mr. CICILLINE. I have asked the gentleman from Washington: Will he yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not in order and is no longer recognized.

Mr. CICILLINE. * * *

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

As the Chair advised on January 15, 2014, and March 26, 2014, even though a unanimous consent request is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such requests constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the hell else we can do over

here. I mean, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Washington only wants to yield for debate only, but how about yielding so that we can act?

I mean, I think the American people want us to do something. I mean, what happened in the 2016 election, what Russia did to our country, was a serious matter. And I am going to tell you, it is not just Democrats that are concerned. I know Republicans and Independents are concerned as well.

This is an American issue, and when our Nation is attacked, we come together. We put partisanship aside. We act. We just don't talk. We act.

We have been trying, using every procedural means we know. We have been appealing in the Rules Committee. We have been trying to bring these issues to the floor, and we get shut down every single time. This is unbelievable.

I mean, history is going to look back on the inaction of this Congress with great shame.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, getting back to the resolution at hand about moving away from regressive taxes and top-down, Big Government regulation, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the facts of the case tend to find themselves to the surface at some point or another, and, in fact, there was a vigorous debate at the Rules Committee last night, yesterday. There was a vigorous debate, and I do recognize that my Democratic colleagues simply lost the vote. It did not stop the debate, however, because an amendment was brought forward that each member of the Democratic Party voted for it at the Rules Committee.

And under testimony that was given last night, it would be a counter play for the Democratic Party. When Republicans said we should not have a carbon tax, my Democratic colleagues came to the Rules Committee and argued they would be for a bill that would raise hundreds of billions of dollars in taxes that would be placed on energy in this country, hundreds of billions of dollars, at minimum. That is what they stood for.

So the policy behind what we are talking about here is, we said we believe that America should have a robust energy policy that is not taxed, that harms the American people. We should have a system of not just economics, but of energy policy that would also include green energy; would also include nuclear energy, which I consider pretty clean since it is a non-emitting source; that we would also allow the marketplace to have natural gas and something which they vigorously want to defend, and that is, home heating fuel, which is diesel fuel to be dumped by the billions of gallons in the Northeast.

Mr. Speaker, what we talked about yesterday also included the discussion

about the Election Commission. In fiscal year 2018, funding provided \$380 million across the country for the Election Assistance Commission, which was a final payment that was made in 2002, of \$3.65 billion, because, you see, way back in 2002, just before that, there was an election that many people thought the outcome was wrong; so Republicans agreed we would put \$3.65 billion available for States to buy what they would choose for brand new voting machines to ensure the assistance was given from the Federal Government to States for the security of the voting public.

Of the 2018 funds this year, only weeks before the election, 39 percent of those dollars are still available. Thirty-nine percent has not even been asked for this year, and 19 States have yet to even ask for any application to be able to go in and update or change their system.

The House Administration and the Homeland Security Committees are working diligently with law enforcement to find out what, if any, difficulty there was in the balloting process.

I have no doubt—none, no doubt—that there was interference in this last campaign election by outside forces, maybe even Russians. And it might not have just been Russians. It might have been a number of people.

Special Counsel Robert Mueller said we were duped; the American people were duped. We did not recognize the interference.

But I don't know whether it was at the ballot box or getting people to the ballot box, their will or desire to vote, or how they would vote. I am not sure we know that yet. But the special counsel is going to let us know that.

So, as we were talking about funding for 2018, 2019, Mr. Speaker, at this time there is no request for even 40 percent of the funds that we have. It is at the end of \$3.65 billion. The States have had this fund available.

So we think that the facts of the case, as we give them today, should be enough evidence, not only to you, Mr. Speaker, but for the American people that there is not at this time a request necessary for more money.

□ 1315

I will cease my discussion now, Mr. Speaker, but will tell you that the resolution that is directly in front of us says we should not tax the middle class of this country, we should not tax further disabled people or the community of elderly people who have enjoyed the price of fuel going down because of what the Republican policy initiatives have enabled us to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I can't believe what is said on this House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, the distinguished chair of the Rules Committee, if he is so sure of his

arguments on this issue, then bring the amendment to the floor, present your case, and let the majority of this House determine what we should do. I guarantee you the majority of this House would vote to provide the money to the States and to local communities, because they are hearing from their constituencies about how concerned they are about potential Russian meddling in our election.

They are doubly concerned after the President's horrific performance in Helsinki where he seemed to go out of his way to cozy up to Putin. So people are concerned.

So the vote that we lost in the Rules Committee was not to enact this amendment, the Quigley amendment, to put the money back in so that the grants could go to States and local communities, the vote we lost—people need to understand this: the vote we lost was to have the ability to debate it and vote on it.

This is the United States House of Representatives. That is what we are supposed to do. Stop the obstructionism, especially on an issue like this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask Mr. MCGOVERN a question so we can get some clarity on where we are right now.

As I understand it, one position is that the State election systems are fine, they don't need any infusion of Federal help. And then there is another position, which you are advancing, which is that we need to put in hundreds of millions of dollars in order to secure the elections to prevent a repeat of the cyber sabotage and the cyber invasion that we experienced in 2016. And yet we are not getting a chance to vote on that. Is that right?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RASKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. That is correct, we cannot vote on that.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, why can we not vote on that? The American people are demanding that we defend our elections against foreign attack. Why can we not even vote on that in the House of Representatives?

Mr. MCGOVERN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, when I offered the Quigley amendment, which would have allowed us to have this vote, all the Republicans voted "no."

Mr. RASKIN. I just saw dozens of our colleagues ask unanimous consent that they reconsider that position so the American people can have a hearing on whether or not we are going to have real elections in 2018. Have you been able to discuss it with the other side about whether they would be willing to entertain another unanimous consent motion so we can actually have a debate on this?

Mr. MCGOVERN. We can try one more time. We have been trying and

trying and trying, but they are insistent on blocking this amendment from even being considered.

Mr. RASKIN. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this, but this is a point of national emergency right now. This is our democracy, this is our Constitution that is at stake. And as I understand it, every State of the Union wants election infusion funding coming from the Federal Government and needs it in order to fortify against cyber attack.

In my State, in Maryland, we just were able to determine that a private vendor that is one of the lead contractors in our election system has Russian ties and is being controlled by someone very close to Vladimir Putin. So we need an infusion of Federal help to fortify our election.

So please continue and do whatever you can with the Republicans just to allow us a vote on the floor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. What this House needs is a little democracy.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers on this side of the aisle, but before I reserve my time, I just want to remind my good friends on the other side of the aisle that my colleague and good friend from Illinois, Mr. QUIGLEY, did offer this amendment in the Appropriations Committee just last week. We did spend a great deal of time debating and discussing this idea.

As the good chairman from the Rules Committee said, and I will repeat, of the funds that were appropriated, there were \$380 million appropriated for the Election Assistance Commission, which was the last of the final payment of the \$3.65 billion originally authorized under the Help America Vote Act of 2002. Of these 2018 funds, there are still 39 percent of these dollars available to the States.

There is no crisis. The money is available to States that want those dollars for assistance. In fact, to date, my latest information, Mr. Speaker, there are still 19 States yet to submit an application.

So there is no crisis. There is help available. States have an opportunity to receive the resources necessary to make sure we have what all American people want, that our elections are held with the utmost honesty and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, all these excuses. As the gentleman knows, hundreds of Members of this House don't sit on the Appropriations Committee. Should they not have a voice on this issue?

And, by the way, since that vote in the Appropriations Committee, a lot has changed in this country. If you are reading the news, 12 Russians were in-

dicted for meddling in our election. The President of the United States went over to Helsinki and made nice with Vladimir Putin. That shocked not only the citizens of the United States, but the entire world.

So I disagree with the gentleman when he says there is no crisis. There is a crisis and we need to address it. We need to do everything we can to prepare ourselves for another attack. All we are asking for is a vote.

If the gentleman doesn't think there is a crisis, doesn't want to vote for this, he can vote "no," that is his right, but for the hundreds of Members of this Chamber who would like a debate and a vote on this, give them that opportunity.

The Rules Committee ought not to be a place where democracy goes to die, especially on issues like this.

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. I want to return to the fact that it is a scientific fact that climate change is occurring and that human activity is the primary cause of that change.

Its destructive physical and economic effects are already being felt throughout the United States and, in fact, throughout the world. This resolution simply denies that reality.

Entire American towns are beginning to be displaced due to sea level rise, and desperate attempts to save these communities through costly infrastructure projects are costing American taxpayers millions of dollars a year.

In my home State of California, wildfire seasons are becoming longer. Actually, it is not a season. It is now year-round. They are stronger, they are more destructive, and they are costing, thereto, American taxpayers millions of dollars each year.

Yet despite these rising costs, rather than working on a solution towards this pressing problem, House Republicans have put forth a resolution that denies that climate change is a costly problem and that we are passing it on to our kids and our grandkids. They put forth a resolution that attempts to shut the door on any conversation about policies that can both promote economic growth and at the same time curb harmful pollution and protect the planet.

Mr. Speaker, let's deal with reality rather than denying reality. The Safe Climate Caucus members have been calling for real conversations on the causes, impacts, and solutions of climate change for years.

Instead of proposing ways to reduce carbon pollution or allowing constructive congressional dialogue on how to avoid costly climate damages, the Republican majority continues to refuse to even have this conversation about how to address one of the greatest threats to human survival on this planet. We have not seen any serious solu-

tions put forth by Republicans in Congress in nearly a decade.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a waste of time, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Americans across our country are very much suffering the negative effects of climate change. They expect Congress to respond with a plan. We may not agree on all the details, but our constituents deserve a serious debate.

This resolution is not serious. It reflects an extreme rightwing climate inaction plan: embrace denial, sow disinformation, and cash checks from polluters.

This resolution reveals the hypocrisy of the Republican energy strategy.

They claim to care about innovation, but support budget cuts to critical research programs like ARPA-E and EERE.

They claim to care about economic growth, but ignore the millions of jobs that have been created in the clean energy universe and fail to see the opportunities to add millions more.

They claim to care about low-income Americans, but cheer the rollback of environmental standards that would protect them.

They claim to support free markets, but fail to speak out when President Trump suggests unprecedented market interventions to bail out uncompetitive coal plants at great expense to Americans, especially manufacturers.

Make no mistake: greenhouse gases are serious pollutants that will have long-term consequences. America needs a climate plan, not a love letter to polluters.

Members that support this resolution are sending a clear message to the American people that they care more about polluters' interests than the people we are asked to serve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today we speak about the most egregious acts from this administration, one after another after another, but I will not forget about our children.

I rise today to tell my fellow Members of Congress that I am appalled over reports of the mistreatment and abuse towards children at the Shiloh Residential Treatment Center.

The facility is under contract with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and located just south of Houston, Texas. The Shiloh facility is owned and operated by the same entity that formerly operated Daystar Treatment Center in Manvel, Texas.

You may remember this place. Daystar was closed because of the way in which they physically restrained children that led to the death of three teenagers. In most cases, children were hog-tied.

Now, instead of being hog-tied, they are drugging children into submission. One child was prescribed ten different shots and pills, including the antipsychotic drug Latuda, Geodon, and olanzapine. We are giving them Parkinson's medications, we are giving them pain medications, antidepressants, and cognizant enhancers. This is a disgrace.

Federal District Judge Laughrey recently explained: "Psychotropic drugs are powerful medications that directly affect the central nervous system. They are particularly potent when administered to children. . . . They are more vulnerable to psychosis, seizures, irreversible movement disorders, suicidal thoughts, and aggression. . . ."

This is a disgrace and this is un-American and it must stop now.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have a carbon tax. It is invisible, it is relentless, it is punitive, and it is entirely avoidable.

According to NOAA, in 2017, the U.S. had 16 disasters with damage exceeding a billion dollars each. With three devastating hurricanes, extreme wildfires, hail, flooding, tornados, and drought, the United States tallied a record high bill for weather-related disasters, \$306 billion. That is a carbon tax.

Western wildfires, fanned by hot, dry conditions, racked up \$18 billion in damage, triple the previous U.S. wildfire record. That is a carbon tax.

The U.S. has sustained, between 1980 and 2017, we had an average billion-dollar events of six a year; in the last 5 years, it has been close to 12.

□ 1330

In the coming decade, economic losses from extreme weather, combined with the health cost of air pollution, spiral upwards to at least \$360 billion every single year. That is a carbon tax.

The second thing I want to say is this: A confident nation faces its challenges. It doesn't deny them. If we acknowledge that we have a climate crisis, we can create jobs by solving it. Energy efficiency, renewable energy, storage batteries, all of these things that are being embraced by Vermont entrepreneurs are resulting in the biggest growth of jobs in our State, which is in the renewable energy sector. So we can make a better economy by acknowledging our problem.

And, third, I want to speak to Mr. JENKINS because he represents some of the hardest working, best people in this country, and those are the West Virginia coal miners. They kept the lights on in Vermont for us for a century, and I thank them. And it is why

I worked with Mr. MCKINLEY to make certain those coal miners got their healthcare benefits and why I am continuing to fight so that those coal miners get their pensions.

But we can help them with a carbon tax that returns all of whatever it is they contributed back to them and their communities so they can have a future.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I make an inquiry of the gentleman from Washington?

I know the gentleman said he has no further speakers, but we are being inundated with speakers on this side. Does the gentleman want to maybe send a few minutes our way?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, as tempting as that sounds, I think that the adequate 30 minutes per side is enough for both of us.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thought I would ask.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill. But as my colleague from Massachusetts said, this isn't really a bill. It is a press release. It is a love note to the fossil fuel industry.

We should have an open rule on the floor for this resolution so that we can talk about the real issues around climate change, so that we can talk about the effects of a changing growing season and the effects of extreme weather on our farms and fishing communities, so that we can talk about sea level rise and ocean acidification on our coastal communities, so that we can talk about the impacts of changing climates on health and healthcare costs.

We are seeing these problems in my home State and in the Gulf of Maine, in particular, where the water is warming at a rate 90 percent faster than the rest of the world. We don't know what impact that will have on the lobsters, groundfish, and future fisheries, but the fishermen are worried, and we are already starting to see the changes.

We are putting our heads in the sand if we just do nothing, if we keep supporting fossil fuels, and if we keep preventing even a simple debate on the costs of carbon and possible climate solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and oppose this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman from Maine, as well as the gentleman from Vermont, getting back to the debate at hand.

I just want to share a few things that I have learned from a recent poll conducted by the Institute for Energy Research. They found that a resounding 85 percent of respondents agreed that

we should not make energy more expensive.

Even more tellingly than that, though, when asked whether they trusted the Federal Government to spend the money from a tax on carbon emissions wisely, only 18 percent of the respondents felt that they would, while 74 percent said that they did not feel that way.

An overwhelming 73 percent of respondents agreed that the last thing that we need is higher taxes or more bureaucracy. And, lastly, 85 percent of respondents feared that consumers will wind up paying the cost associated with a tax or regulation, exactly what we have been saying.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the American people remain profoundly skeptical of government intrusion into the free markets, and like I said before, a carbon tax would be wrong for our Nation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, a debate on the topic of climate change on the floor of the House is long overdue. Those who care about the future of our planet and our species have waited for Congress to begin working on negotiating some sort of sensible solution to climate change for years. A topic of this gravity deserves our attention.

Now, Republicans have been in charge of Congress for the 5½ years that I have been here, but have they brought a new idea to the floor today? Have they proposed a solution? Are they taking the threat seriously? Do they believe in science? Today's debate makes it clear that the answer is no.

Instead of a proposed solution, we are wasting our time with an empty partisan resolution, a misleading and false resolution that doesn't do anything more than thoughtlessly swat away an idea that deserves careful consideration.

Solutions do exist. We can design market-based climate policies that would greatly reduce greenhouse gases. If we design the policy right, it can help low-income and middle class citizens, while creating jobs and spurring innovation.

I believe it is important for us to focus our attention on things like immigration, on the economy, on healthcare.

Well, climate change is impacting immigration. In 2017, The New York Times reported that 10 percent of Mexicans age 15 to 65 could eventually try to emigrate north as a result of rising temperatures.

Climate change is impacting the economy. Hurricanes Irma and Harvey cost this Nation \$280 billion.

That is just the beginning. Climate change is impacting our health. This includes extreme weather events, vector-borne diseases, chronic conditions, and things like that.

Today, instead of posing a sensible solution, instead of seeking a productive discussion on the options at our disposal, Republicans have decided utterly to reject a possible market-based solution without any evidence or justification, without any hearings or real debate, without regular order.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule and this resolution, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule that would permit a House vote on the most shortsighted, antimarket sense of the House on a carbon tax.

For decades, economists across the ideological spectrum have argued that carbon price is the most efficient way to discourage the use of fossil fuels and the best way to encourage the growth of energy efficiency measures, alternative energy sources, and market decisions on everything from housing to transportation.

Indeed, this is the preferred solution to climate change by those on the right, by the Republican public intellectuals and think tanks, which is why it is baffling that a Republican congressional leadership would want to attack their preferred policy option.

It is axiomatic economics that we tax the things we want to discourage. The scientific evidence continues to accumulate in prodigious amounts that carbon pollution is profoundly changing the climate of our Earth. The costs of inaction are staggering, into the billions.

Carbon pricing is the most market-oriented policy action we can take to combat this. Designed well, the economic dividend will put much more money into the hands of the American people and will grow our economy more quickly.

History will look back on this House resolution with sadness and regret. Once again, we will have chosen short-term profits of the fossil fuel titans over the long-term survival and prosperity of mankind on our planet.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the scientists have spoken. Climate change is happening, human behavior is contributing to it, and it is a long-term threat to our prosperity and our national security.

But climate change is also the ultimate, very large problem that moves very slowly, which makes it particularly poorly matched with the political system we have today. And what causes me great concern is when wrongheaded resolutions which I op-

pose—and I oppose the rule associated with it—are put to the floor of this House to discourage this House from proposing the most effective and most successful way of dealing with climate change, which is to put a price on carbon.

We can take all of those revenues and return them to the American people. We can wall them off from government spending. There is a whole variety of approaches we could take to ensure that the revenues generated from taxing carbon pollution are returned to the American people.

As a Congress, wouldn't we rather tax pollution than tax hardworking Americans? That is what a carbon tax will do. I encourage my colleagues to reject this resolution and allow us to have the real debate the American people deserve on this floor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution encapsulates what is wrong with the Republican management of this Congress. It is a cartoon that doesn't deal with the underlying issues. They conjure up an imaginary carbon tax when there are real proposals to price carbon before committees in Congress now.

Instead of engaging in fantasy, we could have a debate about real legislation that would satisfy their answers and be able to deal with what our responsibilities are in the future.

What we are talking about today encapsulates the failure of Republican leadership in this Congress. They can't deal with immigration. They can't deal meaningfully with climate change and carbon pollution. Instead, we are dealing with empty gestures.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly suggest we reject this rule and get down to business.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, can I just double-check and inquire of the gentleman whether he has any additional speakers over there?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. We are prepared to close on the Republican side.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, is my understanding correct that I have 1½ minutes remaining?

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that we are here debating a press release. We are not debating a carbon tax. We are debating a press release.

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle: If you are against the carbon tax, go back to your office and issue a press release and send it to your local newspapers, because that is what this is.

We are wasting precious time on this floor when there are other issues. We

have children being separated from their parents at the border. We have prescription drug prices that are skyrocketing. We need an infrastructure bill. We have gun violence in this country that is out of control, where there are massacres occurring on a regular basis. And what are we doing? We are doing a press release. This is shameful.

And on the issue of Russian interference in our elections, we ought to be having a debate on an amendment to provide more funds to States and local authorities to protect their election systems.

The gentleman from Washington says: Oh, there is still 39 percent of the money left. They don't need it. I think his information is old, because we are told that every single State has put in a request for additional assistance. Why don't we debate that and vote on it and do the right thing?

I am looking at a New York Times article that just appeared today where the President of the United States, Donald Trump, says Russia is no longer targeting the U.S. I mean, is this for real? What is wrong with him?

It is time for Congress to stage an intervention with him and tell him to listen to his intelligence agencies who contradict what he has just said this morning. This is urgent.

We can't count on the President of the United States to do the right thing. Congress needs to stand up. Congress needs to be counted.

Vote "no" on the previous question. Vote "no" on this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to engage with my good friend and colleague from the State of Massachusetts, especially on a particularly important issue such as carbon tax.

It is my feeling and the feeling of the majority of this House that we need to move away from aggressive taxes and top-down Big Government regulation.

We need to get behind innovative-centric solutions that remove bureaucratic barriers to clean, affordable, and reliable energy technology and allow for real global carbon emission reductions.

Our affordable and reliable energy supply must be the focus, along with a cleaner environment and a stronger economy. A carbon tax simply would not yield those kinds of results.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and support the underlying legislation, H. Con. Res. 119, which is simply this: Expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1001 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 2. 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. 12) to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes. 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 among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, Science, Space and Technology, Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform. 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 12.

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: "Al-

though it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

□ 1345

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

SUPPORTING UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 990) supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 990

Whereas the national security interests of the United States are dependent on the brave men and women who enforce our Nation's immigration laws;

Whereas abolishing United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) would mean open borders because it would eliminate the main agency responsible for removing people who enter or remain in our country illegally;

Whereas calls to abolish ICE are an insult to these heroic law enforcement officers who make sacrifices every day to secure our borders, enforce our laws, and protect our safety and security;

Whereas abolishing ICE would allow dangerous criminal aliens, including violent and ruthless members of the MS-13 gang, to remain in American communities;

Whereas during fiscal year 2017, ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) arrested more than 127,000 aliens with criminal convictions or charges;

Whereas ICE ERO made 5,225 administrative arrests of suspected gang members in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas criminal aliens arrested by ICE ERO in fiscal year 2017 were responsible for more than—

- (1) 76,000 dangerous drug offenses;
- (2) 48,000 assault offenses;
- (3) 11,000 weapon offenses;
- (4) 5,000 sexual assault offenses;
- (5) 2,000 kidnapping offenses; and
- (6) 1,800 homicide offenses;

Whereas ICE Homeland Security Investigations made 4,818 gang-related arrests in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas ICE identified or rescued 904 sexually exploited children;

Whereas ICE identified or rescued 518 victims of human trafficking;

Whereas abolishing ICE would mean that countless illegal aliens who could pose a threat to public safety would be allowed to roam free instead of being removed from American soil;

Whereas abolishing ICE would mean more dangerous illegal drugs flowing into our communities, causing more Americans to needlessly suffer;

Whereas ICE plays a critical role in combatting the drug crisis facing our Nation;

Whereas ICE seized more than 980,000 pounds of narcotics in fiscal year 2017, including thousands of pounds of the deadly drugs fueling the opioid crisis;

Whereas ICE seized 2,370 pounds of fentanyl and 6,967 pounds of heroin in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas ICE logged nearly 90,000 investigative hours directed toward fentanyl in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas abolishing ICE would leave these drugs in our communities to cause more devastation;

Whereas abolishing ICE would mean eliminating the agency that deports aliens that pose a terrorist threat to the United States;

Whereas ICE was created in 2003 to better protect national security and public safety after the 9/11 terrorists exploited immigration laws to gain entry into the United States;

Whereas the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks found that many of the 9/11 hijackers committed visa violations;

Whereas ICE identifies dangerous individuals before they enter our country and locates them as they violate our immigration laws; and

Whereas abolishing ICE would enable the hundreds of thousands of foreign nationals who illegally overstay their visa each year to remain in the United States indefinitely: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its continued support for all United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of ICE;

(2) denounces calls for the abolishment of ICE; and

(3) supports the efforts of all Federal agencies, State law enforcement, and military personnel who bring law and order to our Nation's borders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H. Res. 990, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H. Res. 990 introduced by CLAY HIGGINS to express our support for the men and women of the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Recently, Democrats nationwide, from the mayor of New York City to Senators GILLIBRAND and WARREN, have recklessly called for the abolishment of ICE, the agency within the Department of Homeland Security charged with enforcing Federal immigration laws within our Nation's interior.

They have used rhetoric that is both bewildering and deeply troubling. New York gubernatorial candidate Cynthia Nixon has gone so far as to call ICE a "terrorist organization." The Democratic candidate for the 14th Congressional District of New York just yesterday stated: "We have to occupy all of it. We need to occupy every airport. We need to occupy every border. We need to occupy every ICE office. . . ."

What is remarkable is that these calls would undo what has been our singular bipartisan achievement on immigration over the last two decades—the creation of ICE, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.

The late Barbara Jordan was one of the most distinguished persons ever to serve in this body. She was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom and NAACP's highest honor, the Spingarn Medal for highest and noblest achievement by a living African American. She was appointed by President Clinton to be chair of the U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform. Her commission found that:

Immigration law enforcement requires staffing, training, resources, and a work culture that differs from what is required for ef-

fective adjudication of immigration benefits. Separating enforcement and benefits functions will lead to more effective enforcement.

The commission is particularly concerned that although the removal system produced more than 100,000 final removal orders each year, the system did not have the corresponding capacity to remove the individuals subject to those orders.

It noted that:

The system is bogged down with increasing numbers of aliens who are put into removal proceedings, released due to a lack of detention space, and never appear at their hearings, or are never deported after a final order of removal is issued. We must enable the immigration system to deliver better on its commitment to actually remove those who are issued final orders.

Those are the words of Barbara Jordan's Commission.

Following upon the Barbara Jordan Commission's recommendation, SHEILA JACKSON LEE introduced the Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act establishing an Office of Immigration Enforcement to:

Implement the removal of deportable and inadmissible aliens from the United States.

Ms. JACKSON LEE has stated:

I have been a champion for years when it comes to restructuring the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I have been arguing for years that we need to separate out services and enforcement functions of the INS.

In 2001, then-Judiciary Committee Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER introduced the Barbara Jordan Immigration Reform and Accountability Act which proposed to abolish the INS and established separate offices for immigration enforcement and the provision of immigration benefits. The bill was a bipartisan juggernaut. It passed the Judiciary Committee by a vote of 32-2 and this body by a vote of 405-9.

ALCEE HASTINGS stated during floor consideration that:

I want to commend the authors of this bill. They have produced a bipartisan bill that is sure to improve performance and accountability. I think Mr. Sensenbrenner and Mr. Conyers have done an outstanding job.

The Barbara Jordan Immigration Reform and Accountability Act was, in effect, enacted into law as part of the Homeland Security Act. In creating DHS, it transferred over the INS's functions and placed responsibility over Immigration and Customs Enforcement in the same directorate. President Bush placed the final piece of the puzzle in 2003 when he submitted a DHS reorganization plan that created the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement with the primary mission of:

Enforcing the full range of immigration and customs laws within the interior of the United States.

In that bygone era, House Democrats were committed to effective enforcement of our immigration laws. This was further evidenced by the fact that in 1996, a majority of Democrats voted for LAMAR SMITH's omnibus immigration enforcement legislation that was to be enacted as the Illegal Immigra-

tion Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act.

That commitment has inexorably withered away. By 2005, only 36 House Democrats voted for JIM SENSENBRENNER's Border Protection, Anti-Terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act. Just a few weeks ago, not one Democrat voted for either of two bills that would have resuscitated immigration enforcement—the Securing America's Future Act or the Border Security and Immigration Reform Act.

House Democrats once worked collaboratively with Republicans to improve the effectiveness of Federal immigration enforcement. I hope that we will resume that soon. Now it appears that they are outraged when ICE has the audacity to actually enforce the laws that we have enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote on both sides of the aisle for H. Res. 990. Let's honor the work of Barbara Jordan and our Republican and Democratic colleagues who joined together to create ICE, and the brave men and women of ICE to whom we owe so much.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is the legislative equivalent of fiddling while Rome is burning. Our President takes to the world stage to side with a hostile foreign power over his own intelligence services. Here at home he engages in government-sponsored child abuse in the form of a family separation policy that continues to terrorize children as young as 6 months.

This nonbinding resolution before us would do nothing to bring about a fair and just immigration system. In fact, it would do nothing at all. It is just a meaningless political stunt to change the subject from the international and domestic shame unleashed on us by President Trump.

The President imposed the family separation policy, and his administration never even considered how to ensure that the children would eventually reunite with their families. Now, nearly 3,000 children remain separated, and they do not know when, or even if, they will ever see their parents again. Many of these children were ripped from the arms of their mothers and fathers, and their anguish is unimaginable.

But this bill would do nothing to reverse this disastrous and cruel family separation policy. It would do nothing to ensure that parents and children are accurately tracked so that families can be reunited, and it would do nothing to address the horrendous conditions separated children are being subjected to.

For example, 14-month-old Baby M—we must use a pseudonym—was separated from his mother for 85 days at 14 months and he returned so full of dirt and lice that it appeared he had not been bathed the entire time he was in Federal custody. His mother Olivia

says that he is not the same since they were reunited, and he cries whenever he does not see her out of fear that he might be left alone again.

Mr. Speaker, this is a humanitarian crisis. We do not have the time to waste with political stunts like this bill while the moral fiber of our country is torn apart.

I will be voting “present” on this bill, because I have no desire to play the Republican’s immoral games right now. We have much more important things to do.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), who is the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, for weeks now, the abolish ICE movement has been growing in popularity on the left with many Democrats embracing this radical policy stance.

I find it extremely ironic that calls to abolish the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency come only 1 year after 159 House Democrats voted to pass landmark legislation introduced by my colleague, Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL, reauthorizing ICE and other DHS agencies for the first time since their inception after 9/11.

Mr. Speaker, calls to abolish ICE are reckless, dangerous to America’s national security, and threaten the well-being of our ICE agents. As a member of the thin blue line, this attack on ICE is personal to me.

The men and women of ICE serve as America’s frontline defenders against human, drug, and weapons traffickers. ICE agents locate, arrest, and deport violent gang members and criminal aliens who threaten public safety.

Last year alone, ICE arrested more than 127,000 criminal aliens responsible for: 76,000 drug offenses, 48,000 assault offenses, 11,000 weapons offenses, 5,000 sexual assault offenses, 2,000 kidnapping offenses, and 1,800 homicide offenses.

Further, ICE agents made more than 4,800 gang-related arrests, rescued 518 victims of human trafficking, and seized 1 million pounds of narcotics last year.

The campaign against ICE is the latest rallying cry for open borders, the latest call to prioritize illegal immigrants over American citizens, and the latest shrill cacophony from the left to vilify and demonize frontline law enforcement in America.

Democrats are making it very clear to the American people that they stand against efforts to secure America’s borders. Americans overwhelmingly support law and order. I speak for a coalition of conservative Members of Congress as I introduce this resolution affirming support for ICE personnel and condemning the dangerous call from the left to abolish ICE.

Let me state further that affirming support for ICE should not be the end

of our efforts. We should be doing more to secure our borders and provide frontline defenders with the resources necessary to accomplish their mission, and we should end dangerous sanctuary policies.

Today the House will vote on our resolution formally stating congressional support for ICE personnel and their mission.

□ 1400

Despite the rhetoric being pushed by the left, the American people support Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Their service should be respected. Very soon, we the people will know where every Member of this Congress stands.

Mr. Speaker, it saddens me to say it has been brought to my attention that some of my colleagues across the aisle plan to vote “present” on today’s resolution. I would remind them that our constituents elected us as their voice in the people’s House. We were not elected to be silent. The American people deserve to know where every Member of this body stands. To vote “present” on this resolution reflects fear. The American citizenry deserves a courageous vote.

I urge my colleagues to look into their hearts, vote on this resolution reflective of your own deepest belief, and, as you do so, remember that we all have been elected to serve American citizens, American interests, and America’s future.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking Democrat on the Immigration and Border Security Subcommittee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I support fair and humane enforcement of our immigration laws, but that is not what this resolution is about. It is nothing but a ploy to distract us from critical issues facing our country.

A most urgent issue now is the need to reunify thousands of children, including babies, who were forcefully torn from their parents’ arms at the border. Despite court orders requiring reunification, more than 2,000 remain separated from their parents.

This bill does nothing to address that humanitarian crisis, a crisis created by President Trump’s so-called zero-tolerance policy.

The bill does nothing, for example, to more quickly reunify children like Jefferson, a 6-year-old boy taken from his father after traveling together from Guatemala, seeking asylum. They were kept apart for almost 2 heart-wrenching months.

When they were finally reunified 3 days ago, the traumatic effects of the separation were clear. Jefferson was unemotional, with a vacant look in his eyes. He thought, for those 2 excruciating months, that his father no longer loved him or that he was dead.

Jefferson had a cough, bruises, and a rash all over his body. It is not clear whether Jefferson will ever fully recover emotionally.

There are many more kids like Jefferson who remain separated from their parents.

As Members of Congress, we can’t sit on the sidelines as witnesses to government-sponsored child abuse. We must take concrete steps to end this tragedy and pass legislation to prevent it from ever happening again, and this resolution doesn’t do that. This resolution does not even acknowledge the plight of babies separated from their mothers, nor does it make any recommendations for family reunification.

This resolution is nothing more than a feeble attempt at political gamesmanship. The resolution shows the Republican majority is unwilling to solve our immigration crisis, just as they are unwilling to tackle rising healthcare costs, wage stagnation, a pending trade war, and the President’s lovefest with Russia.

With a little more than a week left before the August recess, the Republican majority is more interested in political games than actually governing.

Rather than doing anything meaningful for the American people, we are wasting our time on a political stunt. It is just shameful. I refuse to play this game. I intend to vote “present” on this meaningless resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the former chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the selfless men and women who serve at Immigration and Customs Enforcement. These brave individuals risk their lives every day to protect our Nation and enforce our laws. They deserve our admiration and support, not a “present” vote.

It is disgusting and unconscionable that Members of the political left, Members in this very Chamber, continue to denigrate these patriots. One prominent gubernatorial candidate declared ICE a terrorist organization. A House Member called ICE fascist. Another Member of this body said that ICE agents, who were just doing their job, were cowardly.

I wish that I was making this up. Talk about shameful statements, talk about inflammatory statements to a law enforcement agency that is responsible for the internal enforcement of both our immigration and customs laws.

Mr. Speaker, these attacks are utterly despicable. While #AbolishICE might make for a catchy bumper sticker for radical leftists, it is harmful to our law enforcement.

Today, I join with my colleagues in supporting this resolution and commending ICE agents for their hard work.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, what is disgusting is for Congress to sit idly by while children are ripped from the arms of their parents and abused.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, this is what it takes to have a debate on the floor about family separation.

It is outrageous that my Republican colleagues are playing pure politics with a resolution that does absolutely nothing to address the most pressing crisis before us, which is the separation of 3,000 children from their parents. It is about putting kids in cages and parents in prison who are seeking asylum.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of court orders, this administration still has yet to reunite these children with their families, and I will tell you that these are parents who even have been denied the opportunity to speak to their kids for more than 10 minutes twice a week.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does nothing to prevent President Trump from again ordering enforcement agents to rip breastfeeding babies from their mothers' arms. This isn't just rhetoric. This happened numerous times under Trump's zero-tolerance, zero-humanity policy.

In one case, for instance, an asylum seeker from Honduras reported that Federal agents took her daughter from her while she was breastfeeding in a Texas detention center. When she resisted, as any mother would—because I am a mother, I can say that, from the bottom of my heart—this mother was handcuffed, handcuffed for wanting to feed her baby.

Stripping babies from the arms of their mothers is cruel and inhumane, and this body should be debating that policy, should be fixing that policy, instead of putting forward a ridiculous, do-nothing, political resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to put their attention on real issues, instead of continuing to play games with children's lives.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to point out to my Democratic colleagues that every single one of them had the opportunity and every single one of them voted against H.R. 6136, which addressed this issue and a solution for DACA recipients. Every one of them voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the House majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Virginia for yielding. I especially want to thank my colleague Congressman HIGGINS from Louisiana for his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor.

And what does the resolution do? It simply says that we stand behind our ICE agents, those brave men and women who are keeping America safe. These are the people on the front lines of removing terrorists from our country. These are the people who, by the way, last year alone, removed 100,000 criminals from our country.

And they want to vote "present"? My colleagues on the other side are talking about voting "present."

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the numbers, last year, ICE agents rescued

or identified 518 victims of human trafficking. What if those ICE agents would have voted "present" that day instead of rescuing those victims of human trafficking? Luckily, Mr. Speaker, they didn't vote "present." They showed up and did their job to keep America safe.

What if, last year, Mr. Speaker, those ICE agents who rescued or identified 904 people who were sexually exploited children voted "present" that day, instead of rescuing those 904 sexually exploited children? Luckily, they didn't vote "present," Mr. Speaker. They showed up and did their job.

We need to stand up for them. We need to stand up for what is important at keeping this country safe.

Are we for open borders? Absolutely not.

On this resolution, there is one choice, one button to hit if you support these men and women who are keeping us safe, who are keeping us from open borders. That vote is "yes." Any other vote than a "yes" vote is for open borders and somehow not supporting these men and women.

Let's look at what is resolved in the resolution. We express our continued support for those ICE agents. We denounce calls to abolish ICE. And we support efforts of all Federal agencies—State law enforcement, military personnel—who bring law and order to our Nation's border.

The only vote on this resolution is "yes."

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Yes, every Democrat voted against H.R. 6136, which provided for indefinite detention of entire families, among other obnoxious provisions. So did many Republicans, thank God.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the ICE agents for being present.

It is unfortunate that our Republican colleagues are not present doing the business that cries out to be done.

I am voting "present" on this resolution because it is a sham and a distraction. It is an outrageous attempt to hide the continued suffering of children behind a partisan attack on Democrats.

This is exactly the kind of gotcha vote that alienates Americans from our government. It is as shameless as it is inappropriate. It is inappropriate because Republicans are not doing a single thing to address the crisis of children still separated from their parents, even after a court ruled that they need to be reunited.

Democrats refuse to play the Republicans' game when it comes to children's well-being and the safety of those who come here seeking asylum. We are not falling for this trap, and you can say we are doing it as much as you want. Democrats support secure borders and honor the service of all

whose lives are at risk in protecting our country and our people.

I take a back seat to no one in the House over the years in supporting our law enforcement personnel, but we will neither be silent nor will we cease fighting to bring an end to the dangerous and inhumane policies of the Trump administration that are traumatizing families and children at our borders, which Senator MCCAIN correctly called "an affront to the decency of the American people."

Shame on the Republican House majority for putting such blatant partisanship ahead of the children. Shame on you for using our law enforcement agents as pawns in your political games.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The gentleman from Virginia has 6¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), chairman of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the men and women of ICE who courageously serve our country every single day.

Recently, ICE agents have been the targets of vicious name-calling and partisan attacks. Some have even described ICE as a terrorist organization. To make matters worse, some politicians in Washington are now calling on Congress to abolish ICE.

But just last year, Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming bipartisan majority in the House, including Leader PELOSI, voted to authorize ICE into law for the first time. This kind of dishonest double standard is politics at its worst.

□ 1415

Abolishing ICE is a reckless and dangerous idea that jeopardizes the safety of American communities.

ICE was originally formed after 9/11 to help secure our homeland.

When I was a Federal prosecutor with the Joint Terrorism Task Force, ICE was instrumental in deporting potential terrorists on immigration violations. Today, ICE agents stop drug smugglers, murderers, human traffickers, and dangerous gangs like MS-13 along our border.

In 2017 alone, ICE agents stopped almost 1 million pounds of narcotics, including opioids, from entering our country. This included 7,000 pounds of heroin and 2,400 pounds of fentanyl. They arrested nearly 5,000 gang members and identified or rescued over 500 victims of trafficking.

These are not just hollow statistics. These numbers represent the great work and positive impact that ICE has on people's lives.

John Kennedy, the great President, a Democrat, talked about profiles in courage. I would argue a "present" vote is hardly a profile in courage.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ), the distinguished gentleman and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, when Democrats talk about immigrants, refugees, and asylum seekers, this is the mom and her children whom we are talking about. She is fleeing Central America to save the life of her children from violence, systematic corruption, extortion—yes—rape, and kidnapping.

But the other side wants to change the subject. On every TV screen this fall, Republicans will show pictures of tattooed gang members flashing gang signs, looking like murderers. We know. We get your strategy.

You take your marching orders from Laura Ingraham and Tucker Carlson quicker than the President takes his marching orders from the Kremlin.

In the same week that the President insulted the intelligence community of the United States, we are not going to let you insult the intelligence of the American voter. Immigrants, refugees, outsiders and outcasts, freed slaves, and survivors, just like this woman and her children, built this country.

Some of us had our land stolen; some of us were stolen from our land; and some of us made a very smart decision that we had to get away from the land we were in so that we could survive. That is who we are. That is what America is.

Every generation of Americans has had to withstand people in positions of power labeling the poor, the weak, the outsiders, and people of different races and ethnicities as criminals, threats, and the cause of all our problems, as the majority does today. Every generation of Americans has had to stand up to bullies and racists and power-hungry politicians and overcome their efforts to divide us as Americans.

That is also the story of America's greatness: our resilience and our ability as a nation to overcome the worst instincts of some of our leaders. That is the story of America, and that is what we are doing today.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, when a magician performs, they often utilize misdirection as a way to deceive an audience. Wikipedia defines "misdirection" as a form of deception in which the attention of the audience is focused on the one thing in order to distract its attention from another.

Today, the Republicans are performing a cruel trick on the American people. The Nation is repulsed by President Trump's directives that have forced the separation of over 3,000 children from their parents at the Nation's border, placed children in cages, and terrorized children. As one 9-year-old victim said, he was treated like a prisoner and a dog. This is cruel, inhumane, and un-American.

Rather than have Congress take up a directive to reunite children with their parents, the GOP is performing some misdirection to another issue, hoping that you won't notice that they will not stand up against the GOP's policy of family separation and putting kids in cages at our Nation's borders. Why? Because many of the GOP Members support the President's shameful actions.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. POCAN. Now they want to play politics and misdirect your attention.

I won't be complicit in their attempts. I will vote "present" today to be present for the children and parents separated at the border.

Shame on you for terrorizing children and ignoring pleas to help them.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 990.

The issue is not the law enforcement agencies or the personnel, but, rather, it is the administration's policies regarding enforcement.

ICE has become a lightning rod for the anger, quite honestly, about President Trump's hardline immigration policies. Our number one goal is to defend our homeland. ICE officers and special agents perform a vital role each day to keep our country safe. I want to make sure that we clear up some confusion about what ICE does, what their functions are.

ICE is split into two primary functions: one is the enforcement and removal operations, which is the one that enforces the Nation's immigration laws; the other, which is very, very important, is it investigates all types of cross-border criminal activities, which include financial crimes; money laundering; bulk cash smuggling; commercial fraud; intellectual property theft; cyber crimes; child pornography; human rights violations; human smuggling and trafficking; information, document, and benefit fraud; narcotics and weapons smuggling and trafficking; transnational gang activities; export enforcements; and international art and antiquity theft.

Again, as has been mentioned, the good work that ICE has done in FY 2017: 4,818 transnational gang members were arrested, over 11,000 narcotics criminal arrests were made, and 904 sexually exploited children were identified and rescued. I know that for a fact because my brother has worked with ICE, the sheriff down there, Martin Cuellar, and they have saved some of the kids there.

Again, the issue is not law enforcement agencies or personnel. It is not the men and women who are working there very hard every day, but it is, rather, the policies of the administration regarding this.

Again, I would ask Members to please look at this legislation and support it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, immigration is one of the more important issues that we must face around here. It is one we take seriously. This debate, sadly, is more about politics, in my view.

Our decisions affect people's lives and America's future. We must stop these partisan "gotcha" bills, empty-messaging resolutions, and ideological hijacking of our policy discussions. Rather, we must come together and do our work and create a fair and effective immigration system, one that reflects our values.

We must have and we need bipartisan, comprehensive immigration laws to fix our broken immigration system, much like was done in 2013. Unfortunately, it didn't pass. Then we must smartly enforce it.

We have big challenges. We must take care of the Dreamers stuck in DACA limbo; we must reunite families who are separated, secure our borders—yes, we must—using every effective means possible; and we must bring undocumented neighbors out of the shadows.

I will vote for this resolution, but it is not about abolish or support ICE.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this resolution, but it is not about abolish or support ICE. I respect the need for interior and immigration enforcement, and I have concerns about how this administration is doing it.

Enough of political games, catering to the loudest and most extreme voices in both parties. Let's check our ideology at the door. Let's get to work on bipartisan, commonsense immigration reform. That is what the people want us to do.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains for each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 6¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, here, the height of hypocrisy, the depth of duplicity. While this administration relentlessly, baselessly, and desperately attacks Federal law enforcement officials—the FBI, the Justice Department, our intelligence agencies—again and again, these same Republicans, so proud of law enforcement in one narrow area today, are silent. They stand by tweet-addicted Trump,

our President who, even this very day, has again denied that Russia poses any threat.

Where is your resolution to defend the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Where is your resolution to defend NATO, which has been disparaged by this shameful President?

No. What we have today is a shameless, spineless group of Republican congressional enablers who are enabling Trump, who totally ignore those dedicated to defending our borders from Russian aggression.

These Republicans claim that we have so much more to fear from little infants and toddlers who come across our southern border and seek to escape gang and domestic violence and, yet, are torn by ICE from their mothers' embrace, than from a murderous Vladimir Putin.

Of course we need immigration law enforcement and secure borders, but this resolution ignores many wrongs of ICE: hundreds of claims of harassment, sexual harassment, child separation, and an unresponsive bureaucracy. At the same time that they ignore those wrongs, they ignore the wrongs of Trump in impairing other Federal law enforcement.

Trump's own intelligence chief, a lifelong Republican whom he appointed, warns that our democracy is under sustained Russian assault, yet they are silent.

Trump is impotent in the face of Putin. We need to reject this complicity, the Trump child abuse, and the abuse of Federal law enforcement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Democratic leader of the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is really a very sad day in the Congress of the United States because we are ignoring the needs of children. As a mother of five children—I had five children in 6 years, so lots of little babies all around the house all the time, lots of joy—and understanding the connection between parent and child, and being a grandmother of nine now, I can't even imagine why the Republicans think it is a good idea to move forward with a bill that does nothing to unite families, to stop the separations, and to have the reuniting of families in a way that is humane—not to reunite and detain in prison, in detention, but to unite in a way that honors the humanity of America.

In church on Sunday, the sermon was about not being an enemy of humanity. Some of the activities that are happening now in relation to these children are actions that qualify as enmity to humanity.

What we have: 2,000 children remain separated from their parents, locked away in Federal custody and living in a state of terror and trauma.

This is a picture of a little boy being confronted by an armed official. Do we have any idea what the impact is on that child?

Republican leadership pushed multiple antifamily bills that would have made the horrific situation worse for children by enshrining the President's outrageous mass deportation agenda as the law of the land with his zero-tolerance policy. We should have zero tolerance for that policy.

My Republican colleagues have voted again and again against actions to force a vote on a bill that would require the government to reunite families, and now you are promoting a new political stunt, wasting the country's and the Congress' time with a meaningless vote on a nonbinding resolution that does nothing to protect the children and end the cruel crisis that President Trump has created.

□ 1430

This resolution does nothing to prevent the separation of babies from their mothers. You are parents. You know, in the night, if you hear a sound from the room down the hall, that connection is something beyond material. It is spiritual. It is about parent and child, mother and child, father and child, and now we are going to rip that apart.

It does nothing to prevent the separation of children with disabilities from their parents and caregivers. It does nothing to provide legal counsel to children in immigration court, including little babies who cannot even yet verbally communicate.

For example, Johan. Earlier this summer, a 1-year-old boy named Johan appeared in court without his parents—1 year old. He played with a toy. He drank from a bottle. Then he cried hysterically, because he did not have his mother or his father there to comfort or care for him. The immigration judge even reported that he was "embarrassed to ask" if little Johan could understand the proceedings. The judge is asking a 1-year-old child taking a bottle if he can understand the proceedings.

What sort of administration sends a 1-year-old child into a courtroom alone to make his case? This resolution is an assault to little children like Johan.

Congress should be working day and night to protect these traumatized children. Do you know the toll that you are taking on these children? I wish you would listen to the representatives of the Society of Pediatric Doctors and what they have to say about this, pediatricians, what they have to say about this.

We should be working day and night to ensure the President can never again enable children to be ripped from their parents' arms. Democrats will continue to fight for families.

Here is the thing I found very sad, because it was almost a year ago, say, 10 months ago, when I was informed by the administration that they were going to separate children from their parents. This is not something that has emerged. This is a decision that was made.

They said, these parents, especially the moms they were talking about, are unfit mothers because they have chosen to take their children across the desert, which is very dangerous. That makes them unfit.

Unfit? Really? If their choice is to stay home and be murdered, be raped, be victims of gang violence, and they are coming to find solace or refugee status? They are unfit, I was told by the administration, and we know better what is good for the children. We are going to take the children and send them to foster care or whatever—or whatever—foster care or whatever, taking children from their parents, as a decision of national policy.

Around that same time, we had a hearing—well, it was earlier. It was on the Muslim ban, so it was more like over a year ago, and the American Association of Evangelicals testified in that hearing. It was a Democratic hearing, because the Republicans would not have that hearing. They said that the U.S. refugee resettlement program is the crown jewel of American humanitarianism, the American Association of Evangelicals—the refugee resettlement program, the crown jewel of American humanitarianism.

So how is it that it can be so obvious to so many people that we are humanitarian, that all of these children are God's children, that all of them have a spark of divinity? Mr. President, they have a spark of divinity, and you do, too.

So let us all act on our and their spark of divinity and treat them with the level of respect that they deserve and not use children as a political shield for some other agenda.

This isn't about whether you support ICE or not. By the way, I will just close on this. On this subject, I want to remind our Republican colleagues that Democrats have been strong on protecting our borders all along. You recall after 9/11, a commission was formed, the 9/11 Commission. It took a couple of years to make recommendations. It took a while to make recommendations—a distinguished nonpartisan, bipartisan commission. It presented its recommendations in the summer of 2004.

The Republicans in Congress controlled the Congress at the time, and they would not take up those recommendations, which were about protecting our country.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York may remember it, because he has been a champion on this issue for such a long time, and since his district was affected by 9/11, in the forefront of that fight for us, to form a commission to begin with but also to

fit—it took us, until the Democrats took control of the Congress, in 2006—the first bill that we put on the floor, H.R. 1 in the new Congress, was to adopt the 9/11 Commission recommendations to keep the American people safe, protect and defend, which is our oath of office.

So don't make it look like you are either for protecting the border or not. This is about being enemies of humanity, by taking children away from their parents, keeping them separated, and when they unite them, to keep them under detention. It is not the crown jewel of our humanitarianism.

I urge a "no" vote. I am going to vote "present" on it, because they will use it politically, use it politically, use it politically. Vote "present" or however anyone wants to vote, but understand what it is.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women of ICE work every day to make our country and our communities safer. They secure our borders. They enforce our laws. They protect our safety. And I stand with them.

America's borders have been too open for too long. Drug cartels, dangerous gangs, and human traffickers exploit our weak borders and bring crime to our Montana communities. As America and Montana face an epidemic of drug abuse and addiction, ICE agents seized nearly 1 million pounds of illegal drugs last year, including nearly 2,400 pounds of fentanyl and 7,000 pounds of heroin.

ICE agents arrested more than 127,000 criminal aliens last year. These criminals were charged with weapons offenses, drug crimes, gang-related activity, sexual assault, kidnapping, and murder.

Now, some of my friends across the aisle have called for abolishing ICE. Abolishing ICE is a reckless idea. Abolishing ICE would embolden violent criminals, like members of the vicious MS-13 gang, intent on doing us harm. Abolishing ICE would jeopardize the safety and security of our Montana communities.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose abolishing ICE. And, Mr. Speaker, I proudly stand with ICE agents who are dedicated to making our Nation and Montana safer and more secure.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. NADLER.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. GIANFORTE and with Mr. CUELLAR. We have outstanding men and women in Immigration and Customs Enforcement. I am not going to do anything to disparage the many good men and women that we have, but I will never, never support these abominable policies coming out of the Trump administration that tear families apart, that

these men and women are having to implement because the White House has decided they are going to go into the immigrant communities and tear them apart.

This is a piece of legislation that is not necessary, and I say that to my friends on the Republican side. We support the good men and women in law enforcement as Democrats, but I will not support any of these policies or even look like I am supporting any of the immigration policies of this President. They are terrible, and they are hurting this country.

I urge a vote of "present" on this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from New York has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have only one speaker remaining to close the debate for our side. I believe we have the right to close.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to close. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of many Americans, enough—enough of cruelty disguised as border security, enough of inflicting pain on children to make their parents stay away, enough of picking on the weak to show that you are strong.

The people in this Chamber, who are the sons and daughters of immigrants from all over the world, should know the history of this Nation, and the fact that when the Irish came here, they were greeted with signs in New York and Boston that said: "No Irish need apply." Those of German descent were said to be too dirty to be Americans. Italians were interned during World War II.

Are we a Nation that learns from our mistakes, or are we not? Are we a country that adheres to our Constitution and strives to achieve the words inside it, or are we just pretending?

This is a special Nation, a Nation that has been blessed by people who have come here from all over the world, yet the policies of this administration denigrate the history of this country and denigrate its future.

These families must stop being separated. Just because you come up to a border or cross a border does not make you nonhuman. They should be treated as human beings, most especially by a country that is supposed to be a moral beacon for the world over.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, last week, Democrats introduced a bill to abolish ICE. That is the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency. In doing so, I think we should first review the agency's record.

As it turns out, ICE agents are on the front lines in the battle against crime.

In 2016, they arrested nearly 2,000 human traffickers, criminals who are involved in modern-day slavery. You wanted to abolish that.

Last year, they arrested more than 4,800 gang members, including more than 800 members of the MS-13, one of the most vicious gangs operating today. But you wanted to abolish that and put it into our communities.

They intercepted more than 1 ton of fentanyl that was headed for our communities. Now, we all should know what fentanyl will do, because we just debated more than 50-some bills on this floor, because 172 people who are Americans will die today because of an addiction. Fentanyl is so deadly that just a few grams will kill you. But you wanted to abolish that, to allow it into our communities.

Still, the Democrats say, not only will they want to introduce it, people will cosponsor it. But there is a problem, and I actually think there are two problems with this.

The first problem is that most Americans disagree with you. They actually support ICE. According to a recent poll, just one in four Americans thinks we should abolish it.

The second problem is that Democrats don't even agree with their own bill they introduced. They lack the courage of their so-called convictions, because when we offered the ability to bring up the bill, abolish ICE, that they put into the hopper and cosponsored, Democrats said they would vote "no."

They wanted the glory of introducing a bill to the far left of their own party, but they didn't have the guts to accept the consequences. That is the kind of leadership that the Democrats have to offer.

□ 1445

Mr. Speaker, I am even more confused listening to the Democratic leadership. I was here. I was on the floor. I listened, Mr. Speaker, to the leader on the Democratic side when she said: I recommend voting "no," or maybe vote "present," or vote however you want.

I am not sure what position she was requesting when she said all three. And I am not sure exactly what the author wanted to do when he put his bill across the aisle and asked the other Members of his own conference to cosponsor it, when he said he would vote "no," when he had the offer to bring it up on the floor. Does that mean that every bill Democrats put across they really don't want to support? I am just not sure.

Now, we are about to vote on a resolution of the opposite. We want to support the law enforcement officers of

ICE and will renounce the activist campaign against them.

The danger these officers face is no joke. So for those in the back who would like to speak, Mr. Speaker, during this, I would ask that they get quiet for one moment, because six officers of ICE lost their lives defending those.

The danger to these officers is real, and it is not a joke. Six officers have died in the line of duty:

Special Agent Brian Beliso;
Special Agent Timothy Ensley;
Special Agent Lorenzo Gomez;
Special Agent Scott McGuire;
Special Agent David Wilhelm; and

Special Agent Jaime Zapata, who was killed by cartel hitmen in Mexico.

These agents gave their lives in the line of duty. Thousands more of these agents risk their lives every day on our behalf.

I want you to pause for one moment and I want you to think about those agents, think about those families, but think about those thousands of agents who are defending our border. What do they think about a bill that comes across the desk that says you want to abolish them? How much support do you want to give them? How much support do they feel when the leadership, Mr. Speaker, of the Democratic Party says: Vote “no,” vote “present,” just vote how you want?

Well, do you know what? When they risk their lives and they stop another human trafficker of modern-day slavery and they save another child, I will vote to support them. Or when they stop an amount of drugs coming across and they save American lives, I will support them. Or when they stop MS-13 gang members from coming into any of our communities, I will support them. If only for this reason, agents deserve our gratitude and support.

Mr. Speaker, I am confused. I understand there is this growing socialist movement in the Democratic Party, but when does this socialist new Democratic Party believe we should have no borders? I guess it is today.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what the Americans have asked for, and that is not what America supports. But then again, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I understand what the other side supports when they offer a bill and they ask people to cosponsor and then they won't even vote for it.

That is why I am happy to offer Congressman HIGGINS' resolution and stand with the women and men of ICE, because I want a safer America. And for those who gave their life for us, I will stand with them, even if it means standing up against a new socialist Democratic Party.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for personal reasons, I cannot be present for the vote on H. Res. 990. If present I would point out that if Republicans were really serious about assessing the efficiency of ICE, they would have heeded the multiple calls from me

and my Democratic colleagues to hold hearings on President Trump's dreadful family separation policy that has resulted in thousands of families being ripped apart, including the isolation of children and babies. As to the resolution's language that states “supports the efforts of all Federal agencies, State law enforcement, and military personnel who bring law and order . . .”, I strongly support that and the important agency missions including of money laundering, narcotics investigations, cyber crimes, terrorism prevention, and customs enforcement. If present, I would have inquired of my Republican colleagues if they could get the same statement of support of Federal law enforcement agencies from President Trump, given his behavior and statements in Helsinki and the same disdain he has expressed for Federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 990, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2, AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, with 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.

Mr. PETERSON. 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. Peterson moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2 (an Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes) be instructed to insist on section 11101 of the House bill (relating to animal disease preparedness and response) with an amendment to section 10417(d)(1)(B) of the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8316(d)(1)(B)), as proposed to be added to such Act by such section 11101, to strike “2023” and insert “thereafter”.

Mr. PETERSON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of anxiety out in the countryside because of trade, because of RFS, because of low prices, and because of weather in my area. What we are trying to do here is avoid another potential problem, and that is what can happen with an animal disease outbreak in this country.

In Minnesota, we suffered the biggest animal disease outbreak we have ever seen in this country when we got avian influenza in our turkey flock. It was devastating. The producers lost \$113 million. We lost \$3 billion in the country, and we saw the effect of not being prepared.

This isn't just a poultry problem. This also relates to foot-and-mouth disease, to PEDv, to cattle fever tick that Congressman VELA has informed me about, and to other diseases that present a serious threat for the viability of the livestock operations in the communities and supply chains across the country that depend on them.

In the House bill, we have a provision for \$450 million of permanent funding over 5 years for programs, including the National Animal Health Laboratory Network, the National Animal Disease Preparedness and Response Program, and the National Animal Vaccine Bank. The Senate provides an authorization for appropriations, but there is no permanent funding in the Senate bill.

While the appropriations committees deserve credit because they have put some funding into these programs over the years, the problem is that APHIS and the people who deal with this at the State level can't depend on it because you never know what it is going to be from year to year because the appropriators are the ones who have to decide. We want to make this permanent, and we are hoping that the Senate will accede to our ideas.

Animal disease programs are important investments in the health of our Nation's animals, our people, and the security of our food supply. As part of their work on the farm bill, conferees should insist on 10-year mandatory funding for animal disease preparedness and response programs to provide the certainty for both the farmers, for the consumers, and for the people who deal with this at the regulatory level.

Mr. Speaker, I include my full statement in the RECORD.

The mood in farm country is bad. It's bad because of the Administration's trade war; it's

bad because of declines in farm income; and it's bad because of volatile weather like the floods in the southern part of my district. Farmers and ranchers are staring a historically bad year in the face, and another hit would mean devastation for many of them.

And that's exactly what an animal disease outbreak would cause. Minnesota is the nation's largest producer of turkeys. Following an outbreak of avian influenza in 2013 and 2014, it is estimated that poultry producers in my state lost \$113 million in existing production, approximately \$3 billion nationally, and it cost taxpayers almost \$1 billion.

Hungry consumers are affected too. The price of a dozen eggs in 2015 was double what it was before the outbreak.

This isn't just a poultry problem. Foot and Mouth Disease, PEDv, Cattle Fever Tick and other diseases present a serious threat to the viability of livestock operations and the communities and supply chains across the country that depend on them. Outbreaks mean culling animals and suspending production, and because fewer animals come into processing facilities, layoffs in local communities.

Disease outbreaks also impact farmers who grow feed. One study estimates that a future outbreak of Foot and Mouth Disease could cost corn growers \$44 billion and soybean growers nearly \$25 billion. And there's a national security aspect to animal disease preparedness. The bipartisan Blue Ribbon Study Panel on Biodefense found that our current commitment to animal disease outbreaks leaves us vulnerable to attack on our food supply.

If we are serious about addressing these outbreaks, we must invest in preparation and response tools to tackle these diseases early. That level of effort is impossible without long-term funding certainty.

Currently, the House bill provides \$450 million in mandatory funding over five years for programs including the National Animal Health Laboratory Network, the National Animal Disease Preparedness and Response Program, and the National Animal Vaccine Bank. The Senate provides an authorization for appropriations, but no mandatory funding. While the Appropriations Committees deserve credit for providing some funding for these programs in their bills, animal health is not a short-term issue or an issue we should short change. APHIS, state officials, and producers need to know that adequate funding for these programs is going to be available for their work to pay off.

Animal disease programs are important investments in the health of our nation's animals, our people, and the security of our food supply. As part of their work on the farm bill, conferees should insist on ten-year, mandatory funding for Animal Disease Preparedness and Response Programs to provide the certainty that both farmers and consumers need. I am submitting for the RECORD a letter in support of these provisions from the Animal Agriculture Coalition, which represents livestock producers and animal health professionals nationwide.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the ranking member's motion is very much in the spirit of

the House position. I am really appreciative of that. Quite frankly, it makes our bill better.

H.R. 2 makes the historic commitment to protecting our Nation's livestock herd and, frankly, our national security by establishing and funding forward-looking animal health initiatives that address existing and emerging pest and disease threats.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing this discussion in conference, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's motion, and I ask Members to support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

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 ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Suspending the rules and adopting H. Res. 990;

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1037;

Ordering the previous question on H. Res. 1001; and

Adopting H. Res. 1001, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 20, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

YEAS—392

Abraham	Brown (MD)	Collins (NY)
Adams	Brownley (CA)	Comer
Aderholt	Buchanan	Comstock
Aguilar	Buck	Conaway
Allen	Bucshon	Connolly
Amodei	Budd	Cook
Arrington	Burgess	Cooper
Babin	Bustos	Correa
Bacon	Butterfield	Costa
Banks (IN)	Byrne	Costello (PA)
Barletta	Calvert	Courtney
Barr	Capuano	Cramer
Barragán	Carbajal	Crawford
Barton	Carson (IN)	Crist
Beatty	Carter (GA)	Crowley
Bera	Carter (TX)	Cuellar
Bergman	Cartwright	Culberson
Beyer	Castro (TX)	Cummings
Bilirakis	Chabot	Curbelo (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Cheney	Curtis
Bishop (MI)	Chu, Judy	Davidson
Bishop (UT)	Cicilline	Davis (CA)
Blum	Clark (MA)	Davis, Danny
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	Davis, Rodney
Blunt Rochester	Clay	DeFazio
Bonamici	Cleaver	DeGette
Bost	Cloud	Delaney
Boyle, Brendan	Clyburn	DeLauro
F.	Coffman	DelBene
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Demings
Brady (TX)	Cole	Denham
Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)	DeSaulnier

DesJarlais	Kustoff (TN)	Renacci
Deutch	LaHood	Rice (NY)
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Rice (SC)
Dingell	Lamb	Roe (TN)
Doggett	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)
Donovan	Lance	Rogers (KY)
Doyle, Michael	Langevin	Rohrabacher
F.	Larsen (WA)	Rooney, Francis
Duffy	Larson (CT)	Rooney, Thomas
Duncan (TN)	Latta	J.
Dunn	Lawrence	Ros-Lehtinen
Ellison	Lawson (FL)	Rosen
Emmer	Lee	Roskam
Engel	Lesko	Ross
Eshoo	Levin	Rothfus
Espallat	Lewis (GA)	Rouzer
Estes (KS)	Lewis (MN)	Royal-Allard
Esty (CT)	Lieu, Ted	Royce (CA)
Evans	Lipinski	Ruiz
Faso	LoBiondo	Ruppersberger
Ferguson	Loeb sack	Rush
Fitzpatrick	Lofgren	Russell
Fleischmann	Long	Rutherford
Flores	Loudermilk	Ryan (OH)
Fortenberry	Love	Sánchez
Foster	Lowenthal	Sarbanes
Fox	Lowe	Scalise
Frankel (FL)	Lucas	Schakowsky
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Schiff
Fudge	Lujan Grisham,	Schneider
Gabbard	M.	Schraider
Gallagher	Luján, Ben Ray	Schweikert
Gallego	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Garamendi	MacArthur	Scott, Austin
Gianforte	Maloney,	Scott, David
Gibbs	Carolyn B.	Sensenbrenner
Gomez	Maloney, Sean	Serrano
Gonzalez (TX)	Marchant	Sessions
Gottheimer	Marino	Sewell (AL)
Gowdy	Marshall	Shea-Porter
Granger	Mast	Sherman
Graves (GA)	Matsui	Shimkus
Graves (LA)	McCarthy	Simpson
Graves (MO)	McCaul	Sinema
Green, Al	McCollum	Sires
Green, Gene	McEachin	Smith (MO)
Grijalva	McGovern	Smith (NE)
Grothman	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Guthrie	McKinley	Smith (TX)
Gutiérrez	McMorris	Smith (WA)
Handel	Rodgers	Smucker
Harper	McNerney	Soto
Hartzler	McSally	Stefanik
Hastings	Meadows	Stewart
Heck	Meeks	Stivers
Hensarling	Meng	Suozi
Herrera Beutler	Messer	Swalwell (CA)
Higgins (LA)	Mitchell	Takano
Higgins (NY)	Moolenaar	Taylor
Hill	Mooney (WV)	Tenney
Himes	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Holding	Mullin	Thompson (MS)
Hollingsworth	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Hoyer	Nadler	Thornberry
Hudson	Napolitano	Tipton
Huffman	Neal	Titus
Huizenga	Newhouse	Tonko
Hultgren	Noem	Torres
Hunter	Nolan	Trott
Hurd	Norcross	Tsongas
Issa	Norman	Turner
Jackson Lee	Nunes	Upton
Jayapal	O'Halleran	Valadao
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Vargas
Jenkins (KS)	Olson	Veasey
Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo	Vela
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Velázquez
Johnson (LA)	Palmer	Visclosky
Johnson (OH)	Panetta	Wagner
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Walberg
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Walden
Joyce (OH)	Payne	Walker
Kaptur	Pearce	Walorski
Katko	Pelosi	Walters, Mimi
Keating	Perlmutter	Wasserman
Kelly (IL)	Peters	Schultz
Kelly (PA)	Peterson	Waters, Maxine
Kennedy	Pingree	Watson Coleman
Khanna	Pittenger	Weber (TX)
Kihuen	Pocan	Webster (FL)
Kildee	Poe (TX)	Welch
Kilmer	Poliquin	Wenstrup
Kind	Polis	Westerman
King (IA)	Price (NC)	Williams
King (NY)	Quigley	Wilson (FL)
Kinzinger	Raskin	Wilson (SC)
Knight	Ratcliffe	Wittman
Krishnamoorthi	Reed	Womack
Kuster (NH)	Reichert	Woodall

Yarmuth	Yoho	Young (IA)	Cheney	Jenkins (KS)	Reed	Doyle, Michael	Larson (CT)	Peters
Yoder	Young (AK)	Zeldin	Cloud	Jenkins (WV)	Reichert	F.	Lawrence	Pingree
NAYS—20								
Amash	Griffith	Massie	Coffman	Johnson (LA)	Renacci	Ellison	Lee	Pocan
Biggs	Harris	McClintock	Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)	Engel	Levin	Polis
Brat	Hice, Jody B.	Perry	Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)	Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Price (NC)
Brooks (AL)	Jones	Posey	Collins (NY)	Jones	Rogers (AL)	Esty (CT)	Lieu, Ted	Quigley
Garrett	Jordan	Rokita	Comer	Jordan	Rogers (KY)	Evans	Lipinski	Raskin
Gohmert	Kelly (MS)	Sanford	Comstock	Joyce (OH)	Rohrabacher	Foster	Loeb sack	Rice (NY)
Gosar	Labrador		Conaway	Katko	Rokita	Frankel (FL)	Lofgren	Royal-Allard
NOT VOTING—16								
Bass	Duncan (SC)	Roby	Cook	Kelly (MS)	Rooney, Francis	Fudge	Lowenthal	Ruiz
Black	Gaetz	Shuster	Costa	Kelly (PA)	Rooney, Thomas J.	Gabbard	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Blackburn	Goodlatte	Speier	Costello (PA)	Kind	Ros-Lehtinen	Gallego	Lujan Grisham, M.	Ryan (OH)
Cárdenas	Hanabusa	Walz	Cramer	King (IA)	Rosen	Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez
Castor (FL)	Moore		Crawford	King (NY)	Roskam	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney,	Sarbanes
DeSantis	Richmond		Crist	Kinzinger	Ross	Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean	Schneider
□ 1520								

Messrs. BIGGS, LABRADOR, MASSIE, JONES, JODY B. HICE of Georgia, ROKITA, JORDAN, BROOKS of Alabama, BRAT, GOSAR, GARRETT, and KELLY of Mississippi changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. DUNCAN of Tennessee, TIPPON, FERGUSON, Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. COOK, SMITH of Texas, and SAM JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct conferees was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 336.

SUPPORTING UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 990) supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 35, answered "present" 133, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]		
YEAS—244		
Abraham	Bergman	Buchanan
Aderholt	Biggs	Buck
Amodei	Bilirakis	Bucshon
Arrington	Bishop (MI)	Budd
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Bacon	Blum	Byrne
Banks (IN)	Bost	Calvert
Barletta	Brady (TX)	Carter (GA)
Barr	Brat	Carter (TX)
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Cartwright
Bera	Brooks (IN)	Chabot

Amash	Esparillat	Schakowsky
Brown (MD)	Gomez	Schiff
Castro (TX)	Green, Al	Serrano
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Soto
Clay	Gutiérrez	Swalwell (CA)
Cleaver	Huffman	Thompson (MS)
Correa	Jackson Lee	Tonko
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Vargas
Davis, Danny	Meeke	Veasey
Demings	O'Rourke	Vela
DeSaulnier	Panetta	Velázquez
Doggett	Rush	
NAYS—35		
Allen	Duncan (SC)	Roby
Bass	Gaetz	Shuster
Black	Hanabusa	Speier
Blackburn	Peterson	Walz
Cárdenas	Richmond	
Castor (FL)		
NOT VOTING—16		
Allen	DeSantis	Roby
Bass	Duncan (SC)	Shuster
Black	Gaetz	Speier
Blackburn	Hanabusa	Walz
Cárdenas	Peterson	
Castor (FL)	Richmond	
□ 1529		
Allen	Duncan (SC)	Roby
Bass	Gaetz	Shuster
Black	Hanabusa	Speier
Blackburn	Peterson	Walz
Cárdenas	Richmond	
Castor (FL)		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—133

Adams	Brownley (CA)	Cooper
Aguilar	Bustos	Courtney
Barragán	Butterfield	Cummings
Beatty	Capuano	Davis (CA)
Beyer	Carbajal	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	DeGette
Blumenauer	Chu, Judy	Delaney
Blunt Rochester	Cicilline	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	DelBene
Boyle, Brendan	Clyburn	Deutch
F.	Cohen	Dingell
Brady (PA)	Connolly	

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 337.

AUTHORIZING NATIONAL EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES MEMORIAL FOUNDATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1037) to authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]		
YEAS—414		
Abraham	Aguilar	Amodei
Adams	Allen	Arrington
Aderholt	Amash	Babin

Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Blumenauer
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
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cloud
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan

Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Crist
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)

Kinziger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Lesko
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Loftgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)

Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Sessions
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis J.
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky

Schiff
Schneider
Schradner
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Duncan (SC)
Gaetz
Hanabusa
Peterson
Richardson

Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Roby
Shuster
Speier
Walz

[Roll No. 339]
YEAS—226
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
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney

Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.

NOT VOTING—14

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

□ 1537

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 119, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1001) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 119) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 186, not voting 16, as follows:

NAYS—186

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

Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney

Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.

Ellison	Lawson (FL)	Raskin	Cole	Issa	Ratcliffe	Lawrence	Nolan	Scott, David
Engel	Lee	Rice (NY)	Collins (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Reed	Lawson (FL)	Norcross	Serrano
Eshoo	Levin	Rosen	Collins (NY)	Jenkins (WV)	Reichert	Lee	O'Halleran	Sewell (AL)
Espallat	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard	Comer	Johnson (LA)	Renacci	Levin	O'Rourke	Shea-Porter
Esty (CT)	Lieu, Ted	Ruiz	Comstock	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)	Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Sherman
Evans	Lipinski	Ruppersberger	Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)	Lieu, Ted	Panetta	Sinema
Foster	Loeb sack	Rush	Cook	Jones	Rogers (AL)	Lipinski	Pascrell	Sires
Frankel (FL)	Lofgren	Ryan (OH)	Costello (PA)	Jordan	Rogers (KY)	Loeb sack	Payne	Smith (WA)
Fudge	Lowenthal	Sánchez	Cramer	Joyce (OH)	Rohrabacher	Lofgren	Pelosi	Soto
Gabbard	Lowe y	Sarbanes	Crawford	Katko	Rokita	Lowenthal	Perlmutter	Suo zzi
Gallego	Lujan Grisham,	Schakowsky	Culberson	Kelly (MS)	Rooney, Francis	Lowe y	Peters	Swalwell (CA)
Garamendi	M.	Schiff	Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Rooney, Thomas	Lujan Grisham,	Pingree	Takano
Gomez	Luján, Ben Ray	Schneider	Curtis	King (IA)	J.	M.	Pocan	Takano
Gonzalez (TX)	Lynch	Schrader	Davidson	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Luján, Ben Ray	Polis	Thompson (CA)
Gottheimer	Maloney,	Scott (VA)	Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Roskam	Lynch	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Green, Al	Carolyn B.	Scott, David	Denham	Knigh t	Ross	Maloney,	Quigley	Titus
Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean	Serrano	DesJarlais	Kustoff (TN)	Rothfus	Carolyn B.	Raskin	Tonko
Grijalva	Matsui	Sewell (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Labrador	Rouzer	Maloney, Sean	Rice (NY)	Torres
Gutiérrez	McCollum	Shea-Porter	Donovan	LaHood	Royce (CA)	Matsui	Rosen	Tsongas
Hastings	McEachin	Sherman	Duffy	LaMalfa	Russell	McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Vargas
Heck	McGovern	Sinema	Duncan (TN)	Lamb	Rutherford	McEachin	Ruiz	Veasey
Higgins (NY)	McNerney	Sires	Dunn	Lance	Sanford	McGovern	Ruppersberger	Vela
Himes	Meeks	Smith (WA)	Emmer	Latta	Schweikert	McNerney	Rush	Velázquez
Hoyer	Meng	Soto	Estes (KS)	Lesko	Scott, Austin	Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky
Huffman	Moore	Suo zzi	Faso	Lewis (MN)	Sensenbrenner	Meng	Sánchez	Wasserman
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Swalwell (CA)	Ferguson	LoBiondo	Sessions	Moore	Sarbanes	Schultz
Jayapal	Murphy (FL)	Takano	Fitzpatrick	Long	Shimkus	Moulton	Schakowsky	Waters, Maxine
Jeffries	Nadler	Thompson (CA)	Fleischmann	Loudermilk	Simpson	Murphy (FL)	Schiff	Watson Coleman
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)	Love	Love	Flores	Nadler	Schneider	Welch
Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Titus	Fortenberry	Lucas	Smith (NE)	Napolitano	Schrader	Wilson (FL)
Kaptur	Nolan	Tonko	Fox	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)	Neal	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth
Keating	Norcross	Torres	Frelinghuysen	MacArthur	Smith (TX)			
Kelly (IL)	O'Halleran	Tsongas	Gallagher	Marchant	Smucker			
Kennedy	O'Rourke	Vargas	Garrett	Marino	Stefanik	Bass	Gaetz	Scalise
Khanna	Pallone	Veasey	Gianforte	Marshall	Stewart	Black	Hanabusa	Shuster
Kihuen	Panetta	Vela	Gibbs	Massie	Stivers	Blackburn	Lamborn	Speier
Kildee	Pascrell	Velázquez	Gohmert	Mast	Taylor	Cárdenas	Peterson	Walz
Kilmer	Payne	Visclosky	Gonzalez (TX)	McCarthy	Tenney	DeSantis	Richmond	
Kind	Pelosi	Wasserman	Goodlatte	McCaul	Thompson (PA)	Duncan (SC)	Roby	
Krishnamoorthi	Perlmutter	Walters, Mimi	Gosar	McClintock	Thornberry			
Kuster (NH)	Peters	Webster (FL)	Gowdy	McHenry	Trott			
Lamb	Pingree	Wenstrup	Granger	McKinley	Turner			
Langevin	Pocan	Westerman	Graves (GA)	McMorris	Upton			
Larsen (WA)	Polis	Williams	Graves (LA)	Rodgers	Valadao			
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Wilson (SC)	Graves (MO)	McSally	Wagner			
Lawrence	Quigley	Wittman	Green, Gene	Meadows	Walberg			
			Griffith	Messer	Walden			
			Grothman	Mitchell	Walker			
			Guthrie	Moolenaar	Walorski			
			Handel	Mooney (WV)	Walters, Mimi			
			Harper	Mullin	Weber (TX)			
			Harris	Newhouse	Webster (FL)			
			Hartzler	Noem	Wenstrup			
			Hensarling	Norman	Westerman			
			Herrera Beutler	Nunes	Williams			
			Hice, Jody B.	Olson	Wilson (SC)			
			Higgins (LA)	Palazzo	Wittman			
			Hill	Palmer	Womack			
			Holding	Paulsen	Woodall			
			Hollingsworth	Pearce	Yoder			
			Hudson	Perry	Yoho			
			Huizenga	Pittenger	Young (AK)			
			Hultgren	Poe (TX)	Young (IA)			
			Hunter	Poliquin	Zeldin			
			Hurd	Posey				

NOT VOTING—16

Bass
Black
Blackburn
Cárdenas
DeSantis
Duncan (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1543

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 183, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

AYES—229

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodi
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly

NOES—183

Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Demings
DeSaunier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)

NOT VOTING—16

Bass
Black
Blackburn
Cárdenas
DeSantis
Duncan (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1550

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 996 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. 6147.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1552

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. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies 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 Tuesday, July 17, 2018, amendment No. 41 printed in House Report 115-830 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) 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 House Report 115-830 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.

Amendment No. 25 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 27 by Mr. O'HALLERAN of Arizona.

Amendment No. 29 by Ms. ADAMS of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 39, as modified, by Mr. GROTHMAN of Wisconsin.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 237, answered “present” 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

AYES—172

Abraham Emmer Kustoff (TN)
Aderholt Estes (KS) Labrador
Allen Ferguson LaHood
Amash Fleischmann Lamborn
Amodel Flores Latta
Arrington Foxx Lesko
Babin Frelinghuysen Lewis (MN)
Bacon Gallagher Loudermilk
Banks (IN) Garrett Lucas
Barr Gibbs Luettkemeyer
Barton Gohmert Marchant
Biggs Goodlatte Massie
Bilirakis Gosar McCarthy
Bishop (MI) Gowdy Pearce
Bishop (UT) Granger McClintock
Bost Graves (GA) McMorris
Brady (TX) Graves (LA) Rodgers
Brat Graves (MO) McSally
Brooks (AL) Griffith Meadows
Buck Grothman Messer
Bucshon Guthrie Mitchell
Budd Handel Moolenaar
Burgess Harper Mooney (WV)
Byrne Harris Mullin
Calvert Hartzler Noem
Carter (GA) Hensarling Norman
Carter (TX) Herrera Beutler Nunes
Chabot Hice, Jody B. Olson
Cheney Higgins (LA) Palazzo
Cloud Hill Palmer
Coffman Hollingsworth Pearce
Cole Hudson Perry
Comer Huizenga Pittenger
Conaway Hultgren Poe (TX)
Cook Hunter Posey
Cramer Issa Ratcliffe
Crawford Jenkins (KS) Reed
Culberson Johnson (OH) Renacci
Curtis Johnson, Sam Rice (SC)
Davidson Jones Roe (TN)
Denham Jordan Rogers (AL)
DesJarlais Kelly (MS) Rogers (KY)
Duffy Kelly (PA) Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN) King (IA) Rokita
Dunn Kinzinger Rooney, Francis

Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)

Adams
Aguilar
Barietta
Barragan
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connelly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi

Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Trott
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)

Gianforte
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Holding
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

NOT VOTING—18

Bass Gaetz Roby
Black Hanabusa Scalise
Blackburn LaMalfa Schrader
Cárdenas Peterson Shuster
DeSantis Reichert Speier
Duncan (SC) Richmond Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1556

Mr. LAMB changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 223, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

AYES—190

Adams Demings Krishnamoorthi
Aguilar DeSaulnier Kuster (NH)
Barragan Deuch Lamb
Beatty Dingell Lance
Bera Doggett Langevin
Beyer Doyle, Michael Larsen (WA)
Bishop (GA) F. Larson (CT)
Blumenauer Ellison Lawrence
Blunt Rochester Engel Lawson (FL)
Bonamici Eshoo Lee
Boyle, Brendan Espallat Levin
F. Esty (CT) Lewis (GA)
Brady (PA) Evans Lieu, Ted
Brown (MD) Fitzpatrick Lipinski
Brownley (CA) Foster Loebsack
Bustos Frankel (FL) Lofgren
Butterfield Fudge Lowenthal
Capuano Gabbard Lowey
Carbajal Gallego Lujan Grisham, M.
Carson (IN) Garamendi M.
Cartwright Gomez Luján, Ben Ray
Castor (FL) Gonzalez (TX) Lynch
Castro (TX) Gottheimer Maloney, Carolyn B.
Chu, Judy Green, Al Maloney, Sean
Cicilline Green, Gene Maloney, Sean
Clark (MA) Grijalva Massie
Clarke (NY) Gutierrez Matsui
Clay Hastings McCollum
Cleaver Heck McEachin
Clyburn Higgins (NY) McGovern
Coffman Himes McNerney
Cohen Hoyer Meeks
Connolly Huffman Meng
Cooper Jackson Lee Moore
Correa Jayapal Moulton
Costa Jeffries Murphy (FL)
Courtney Johnson (GA) Nadler
Crist Johnson, E. B. Napolitano
Crowley Jones Neal
Cuellar Kaptur Nolan
Cummings Keating Norcross
Davis (CA) Kelly (IL) O'Halleran
Davis, Danny Kennedy O'Rourke
DeFazio Khanna Pallone
DeGette Kihuen Panetta
Delaney Kildee Pascarell
DeLauro Kilmer Payne
DelBene Kind Pelosi

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Blum

Perlmutter Schakowsky
 Peters Schiff
 Pingree Schneider
 Pocan Schrader
 Polis Scott (VA)
 Price (NC) Scott, David
 Quigley Serrano
 Raskin Sewell (AL)
 Rice (NY) Shea-Porter
 Rosen Sherman
 Roybal-Allard Sinema
 Ruiz Sires
 Ruppertsberger Smith (WA)
 Rush Soto
 Ryan (OH) Suozzi
 Sánchez Swalwell (CA)
 Sarbanes Takano

Thompson (CA) Richmond Scalise Speier
 Thompson (MS) Roby Shuster Walz
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Lynch
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Massie
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNerney
 McSally
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Mullin
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Rooney, Thomas
 J.
 Rosen
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Russell
 Rutherford
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Stefanik
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)

NOES—223

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Arrington
 Babin
 Bacon
 Banks (IN)
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bergman
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blum
 Bost
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Cloud
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Culberson
 Curbelo (FL)
 Curtis
 Davidson
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Donovan
 Duffy
 Duncan (TN)
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Estes (KS)
 Faso
 Ferguson
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallagher
 Garrett
 Gianforte
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.
 □ 1601
 Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed his
 vote from “no” to “aye.”
 So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

Stated for:
 Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr.
 Chair, during rollcall Vote No. 342 on the
 amendment (No. 25) to H.R. 6147 offered by
 Rep. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA of Arizona, I mistak-
 enly recorded my vote as “no” when I in-
 tended to vote “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR.
 O'HALLERAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Arizona (Mr.
 O'HALLERAN) on which further pro-
 ceedings were postponed and on which
 the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 217, noes 196,
 not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

AYES—217

Adams
 Agullar
 Amash
 Barragán
 Beatty
 Bera
 Bergman
 Beyer
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capuano
 Carballo
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Cole
 Connolly
 Cooper
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crist
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Demings
 Denham
 DeSaunier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Dunn
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Esty (CT)
 Evans
 Faso
 Fitzpatrick
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Gomez
 Gonzalez (TX)
 Gottheimer
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hastings
 Heck
 Herrera Beutler
 Higgins (NY)
 Himes
 Hollingsworth
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kihuen
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (NY)
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Lamb
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Loftgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham,
 M.
 Luján, Ben Ray

NOES—196

Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guthrie
 Handel
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hensarling
 Hice, Jody B.
 Higgins (LA)
 Hill
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 Kinzinger
 Knight
 Kustoff (TN)
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latta
 Lesko
 Lewis (MN)
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 Marshall
 Mast
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meadows
 Messer
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Norman
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Pittenger
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Posey
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Rice (SC)
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney, Francis
 Rooney, Thomas
 J.
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce (CA)
 Russell
 Rutherford
 Sanford
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smucker
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Tenney
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Waters, Maxine
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Bass
 Black
 Blackburn
 Cárdenas
 DeSantis
 Duncan (SC)
 Gaetz
 Hanabusa
 Peterson

Wittman Woodall Yoho
Womack Yoder Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Bass Duncan (SC) Roby
Black Gaetz Scalise
Blackburn Hanabusa Shuster
Cárdenas Peterson Speier
DeSantis Richmond Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1605

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. ADAMS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms.
ADAMS) 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 amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 194, noes 218,
not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—194

Adams Demings Kuster (NH)
Aguilar DeSaulnier Lamb
Barragán Deutch Lance
Beatty Dingell Langevin
Bera Doggett Larsen (WA)
Beyer Doyle, Michael Larson (CT)
Bishop (GA) F. Lawrence
Blumenauer Ellison Lawson (FL)
Blunt Rochester Engel Lee
Bonamici Eshoo Levin
Boyle, Brendan Espallat Lewis (GA)
F. Esty (CT) Lieu, Ted
Brady (PA) Evans Lipinski
Brown (MD) Fitzpatrick Loeb sack
Brownley (CA) Foster Lofgren
Bustos Frankel (FL) Lowenthal
Butterfield Fudge Lowey
Capuano Gabbard Lujan Grisham,
Carbajal Gallego M.
Carson (IN) Garamendi Luján, Ben Ray
Cartwright Gomez Lynch
Castor (FL) Gonzalez (TX) Maloney,
Castro (TX) Gottheimer Carolyn B.
Chu, Judy Green, Al Maloney, Sean
Cicilline Green, Gene Matsui
Clark (MA) Grijalva McCollum
Clarke (NY) Gutiérrez McEachin
Clay Hastings McGovern
Cleaver Heck Mc Nerney
Clyburn Higgins (NY) Meeks
Cohen Himes Meng
Connolly Hoyer Moore
Cooper Huffman Moulton
Correa Jackson Lee Murphy (FL)
Costa Jayapal Nadler
Costello (PA) Jeffries Napolitano
Courtney Johnson (GA) Neal
Crist Johnson, E. B. Nolan
Crowley Jones Norcross
Cueellar Kaptur O'Halleran
Cummins Keating O'Rourke
Curbelo (FL) Kelly (IL) Pallone
Davis (CA) Kennedy Panetta
Davis, Danny Khanna Pascrell
DeFazio Kihuen Payne
DeGette Kildee Pelosi
Delaney Kilmer Perlmutter
DeLauro Kind Peters
DeBene Krishnamoorthi Pingree

Pocan Schneider
Polis Schrader
Price (NC) Scott (VA)
Quigley Scott, David
Raskin Serrano
Rice (NY) Sewell (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen Shea-Porter
Rosen Sherman
Roskam Sinema
Roybal-Allard Sires
Ruiz Smith (WA)
Ruppersberger Soto
Rush Suozzi
Ryan (OH) Swalwell (CA)
Sánchez Takano
Sarbanes Thompson (CA)
Schakowsky Thompson (MS)
Schiff Titus

NOES—218

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

NOT VOTING—16

Bass Cárdenas
Black DeSantis
Blackburn Duncan (SC)

Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Richmond Shuster
Roby Speier
Scalise Wagner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1610

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 39, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment, as modified,
offered by the gentleman from Wis-
consin (Mr. GROTHMAN) on which fur-
ther proceedings were postponed and
on which the noes prevailed by voice
vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 114, noes 297,
not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

AYES—114

Abraham Graves (MO) Mooney (WV)
Allen Griffith Mullin
Amash Grothman Noem
Arrington Guthrie Norman
Babin Harris Nunes
Banks (IN) Hartzler Palmer
Barr Hensarling Perry
Biggs Hice, Jody B. Pittenger
Bishop (MI) Higgins (LA) Posey
Bishop (UT) Holding Rice (SC)
Brady (TX) Hudson Roe (TN)
Brat Huizenga Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL) Hunter Rohrabacher
Buck Issa Rokita
Budd Jenkins (KS) Rooney, Francis
Burgess Johnson (LA) Rooney, Thomas
Byrne Johnson, Sam J.
Carter (GA) Jones Rothfus
Chabot Jordan Rouzer
Cloud Kelly (MS) Royce (CA)
Comer King (IA) Russell
Curtis Kustoff (TN) Sanford
Davidson LaMalfa Schweikert
DesJarlais Lamborn Scott, Austin
Duncan (TN) Latta Sensenbrenner
Dunn Lesko Smith (MO)
Emmer Lewis (MN) Smith (NE)
Estes (KS) Loudermilk
Ferguson Luetkemeyer Smucker
Flores Marchant Walberg
Foxy Massie Walker
Gallagher McCarthy Walters, Mimi
Garrett McClintock Webster (FL)
Gibbs McHenry Wenstrup
Gonzalez (TX) McMorris Westerman
Goodlatte Rodgers Williams
Gosar McSally Wilson (SC)
Graves (GA) Meadows Wittman
Graves (LA) Messer Womack

NOES—297

Adams Beyer Brooks (IN)
Aderholt Bilirakis Brown (MD)
Aguilar Bishop (GA) Brownley (CA)
Amodei Blum Buchanan
Bacon Blumenauer Bucshon
Barletta Blunt Rochester Bustos
Barragán Bonamici Butterfield
Barton Bost Calvert
Beatty Boyle, Brendan Capuano
Bera F. Carbajal
Bergman Brady (PA) Carson (IN)

Carter (TX)	Huffman	Perlmutter
Cartwright	Hultgren	Peters
Castor (FL)	Hurd	Pingree
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Cheney	Jayapal	Poe (TX)
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Poliquin
Ciциlline	Jenkins (WV)	Polis
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Quigley
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Raskin
Cleaver	Joyce (OH)	Ratcliffe
Clyburn	Kaptur	Reed
Coffman	Katko	Reichert
Cohen	Keating	Renacci
Cole	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Collins (NY)	Kennedy	Ros-Lehtinen
Comstock	Khanna	Rosen
Conaway	Kihuen	Roskam
Connolly	Kildee	Ross
Cook	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kind	Ruiz
Correa	King (NY)	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kinzinger	Rush
Costello (PA)	Knight	Rutherford
Courtney	Krishnamoorthi	Ryan (OH)
Cramer	Kuster (NH)	Sánchez
Crawford	LaHood	Sarbanes
Crist	Lamb	Schakowsky
Crowley	Lance	Schiff
Cuellar	Langevin	Schneider
Culberson	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Curbelo (FL)	Lawrence	Scott, David
Davis (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Lee	Sessions
Davis, Rodney	Levin	Sewell (AL)
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Shea-Porter
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
Delaney	Lipinski	Shimkus
DeLauro	LoBiondo	Simpson
DelBene	Loebsack	Sinema
Demings	Lofgren	Sires
Denham	Long	Smith (NJ)
DeSaulnier	Love	Smith (TX)
Deutch	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
Diaz-Balart	Loweу	Soto
Dingell	Lucas	Stefanik
Doggett	Lujan Grisham,	Stewart
Donovan	M.	Stivers
Doyle, Michael	Luján, Ben Ray	Suozi
F.	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Duffy	MacArthur	Takano
Ellison	Maloney,	Takano
Engel	Carolyn B.	Taylor
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Tenney
Espallat	Marino	Thompson (CA)
Esty (CT)	Marshall	Thompson (MS)
Evans	Mast	Thompson (PA)
Faso	Matsui	Thornberry
Fitzpatrick	McCaul	Tipton
Fleischmann	McCollum	Titus
Fortenberry	McEachin	Tonko
Foster	McGovern	Torres
Frankel (FL)	McKinley	Trott
Frelinghuysen	McNerney	Tsongas
Fudge	Meeks	Turner
Gabbard	Meng	Upton
Gallego	Mitchell	Valadao
Garamendi	Moolenaar	Vargas
Gianforte	Moore	Veasey
Gohmert	Moulton	Vela
Gomez	Murphy (FL)	Velázquez
Gottheimer	Nadler	Visclosky
Gowdy	Napolitano	Walden
Granger	Neal	Walorski
Green, Al	Newhouse	Wasserman
Green, Gene	Nolan	Schultz
Grijalva	Norcross	Waters, Maxine
Gutiérrez	O'Halleran	Watson Coleman
Handel	O'Rourke	Weber (TX)
Harper	Olson	Welch
Hastings	Palazzo	Williams
Heck	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Herrera Beutler	Panetta	Womack
Higgins (NY)	Pascrell	Yarmuth
Hill	Pascarella	Yoder
Himes	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Hollingsworth	Payne	Young (IA)
Hoyer	Pearce	Young (IA)
	Pelosi	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—17

Bass	Gaetz	Scalise
Black	Hanabusa	Shuster
Blackburn	Labrador	Speier
Cárdenas	Peterson	Wagner
DeSantis	Richmond	Walz
Duncan (SC)	Roby	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1615

So the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 340, “yea” on rollcall No. 341, “nay” on rollcall No. 342, “nay” on rollcall Nos. 343 and 344, and “yea” on rollcall No. 345.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) 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. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WALDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–835) on the resolution (H. Res. 982) of inquiry requesting the President, and directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to transmit, respectively, certain information to the House of Representatives referring to the separation of children from their parents or guardians as a result of the President’s “zero tolerance” policy, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2, AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 2:

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CONAWAY, THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, GOODLATTE, LUCAS, ROGERS of Alabama, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, CRAWFORD, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, YOHO, ROUZER, MARSHALL, ARRINGTON, PETERSON, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, COSTA, WALZ, Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. MCGOVERN, VELA, Mses. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. O’HALLERAN.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 4204, 4205, and 9131 of the

House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. FOXX, Mr. ALLEN, and Ms. ADAMS.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of subtitles A and B of title VI, sections 6202, 6203, 6401, 6406, 6407, 6409, 6603, 7301, 7605, 8106, 8507, 9119, 9121, and 11101 of the House bill, and sections 6116, 6117, 6202, 6206–09, 6301, 6303, 7412, 9102, 9104, 9106, 9111–13, 12408, 12627, and 12628 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SHIMKUS, CRAMER, and TONKO.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of section 12609 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HENSARLING, DUFFY, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title III of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROYCE of California, CHABOT, and ENGEL.

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of sections 2802, 6408, 8104, 8107, 8109, subtitles B and C of title VIII, 8402, 8502, 8503, 8506, 8507, 8509, 8510, 9111, 11614, and 11615 of the House bill, and section 2425, subtitle D of title VIII, sections 8601, 8611, 8621–28, 8631, 8632, 12515, 12601, and 12602 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BISHOP of Utah, WESTERMAN, and GRIJALVA.

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of sections 1601, 4022, 4026, 8502, and 11609 of the House bill, and sections 3113, 7128, 8623, 8630, 8632, 12301, and 12407 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. WALKER, COMER, and Ms. PLASKETT.

From the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of section 7509 of the House bill, and section 7409 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ABRAHAM, DUNN, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of sections 2404, 6223, 6224, 6503, 9117, and 9118 of the House bill, and sections 2415, 2416, 6124, 6304, and 7412 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DENHAM, GIBBS, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALVERT. 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. 6147, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 996 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. 6147.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1623

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. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies 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, amendment No. 39 printed in House Report 115-830 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 42 printed in House Report 115-830.

Ms. MOORE. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to terminate or restructure the Great Lakes Advisory Board, a Federal advisory committee chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the committee for supporting me in my very important amendments last evening, and I have another very important amendment that is before the committee here today.

Mr. Chair, I urge support for my amendment that would prevent the administration from dismantling the EPA's Great Lakes Advisory Board. I am so pleased that this bill has again rejected the President's proposal to gut the GLRI, and this amendment would prevent them from dismantling the advisory board.

Mr. Chairman, this is a critical matter for anyone who drinks water. The Great Lakes provide drinking water to some 40 million people. Let me say that again. Forty million people depend on this resource for one of life's basic requirements, water, not to mention anglers and recreation.

As an old African proverb goes, water has no enemies. So, hopefully, the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative is something that we are going to recognize as having played a critical role in protecting and restoring one of America's greatest national treasures, a life-sustaining element, water.

Just to mention, not to bore people with a lot of statistics, but the Great Lakes contain about 21 percent of the world's surface freshwater and more than 80 percent, 85 percent, of the freshwater in North America. This is indispensable.

As critical as this funding is, it is also important that the EPA receive advice and input from local stakeholders regarding priorities under that program. The Great Lakes Advisory Board provides such advice.

EPA established the board in 2013 to provide independent advice to the EPA administration in its capacity as chair of the Federal Great Lakes Interagency Task Force. Some of the past activities of the advisory board have been providing the EPA with recommendations regarding what are the most significant stressors and needs for the Great Lakes ecosystem; providing the EPA with recommendations on ways to ensure effective public input into the Great Lakes action plan process; and providing advice on whether the GLRI should invest in efforts to understand long-term, future threats and communicate them to the Great Lakes community for action.

In light of reports of efforts to undermine the board, on a bipartisan basis, I joined colleagues in writing to the EPA earlier this year to make clear that we support the establishment and maintenance of the board. My amendment would put teeth behind this letter and make it clear to the administration what congressional intent is regarding this important advisory board.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, this bill is consistent with years past that provided robust funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. Therefore, this is an initiative I can support and we accept.

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from California. He is a very effective leader on this issue. I appreciate him.

An effective Great Lakes Advisory Board is vital to ensuring that the GLRI remains successful and impactful today and in the years to come.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. MULLIN. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the final rule entitled "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on June 3, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 35824).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds from enforcing the Obama administration EPA methane rule. This rule is currently facing litigation uncertainty, and Congress must act to block this job-killing regulation estimated to cost our economy \$530 million annually.

While oil and gas production has increased more than 25 percent since 2005, related methane emissions have actually decreased almost 40 percent during the same time period.

It is counterproductive for the Federal Government to enact harmful regulations that cause inefficiencies, recklessly spend taxpayer dollars, and force hardship upon job-creating industries.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, the gentleman's amendment would block the EPA from regulating methane emissions from sources in the oil and gas sector.

Methane is a primary component of natural gas and is a potent greenhouse gas with global warming potential more than 25 times greater than carbon dioxide.

□ 1630

In 2013, nearly one-third of the methane emissions in the United States came from oil and gas production, processing, transmission, and distribution. There is no doubt, no doubt at all that methane contributes to the increased levels of greenhouse gas concentrations, which will contribute to long-lasting changes in our climate such as rising global temperatures, sea level rising, changes in weather and precipitation patterns.

Public health risks include more heat waves and drought, worsening smog, increased intensity of extreme weather events, and increasing the range of ticks and mosquitoes, which can spread diseases such as Lyme disease, West Nile Virus, and Zika.

The disgraced former EPA administrator, Scott Pruitt, tried to delay this rule, but the courts blocked that effort and ruled that the EPA cannot delay implementation. When is the majority going to stop the assault on the environment?

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, the EPA has imposed these substantial competitive barriers, despite the industry's significant reduction in methane emissions through their own initiatives and innovation.

What is not known is that through the EPA's own analysis, it shows that methane emissions from hydraulically fractured gas wells have actually fallen dramatically. According to EPA data—not my data, but EPA data—methane emissions from oil and gas production declined by 38 percent from 2005 to 2012, and methane emissions from hydraulically fractured natural gas wells have plummeted 73 percent since 2011.

Total methane emissions from natural gas systems actually are down 11 percent since 2005, despite the significant production increases over this time period. This is a prime example of market forces at work.

American producers developed innovative means of capturing additional methane because doing so means they have more product to sell. Profitability, rather than a top-down Washington regulation, drove this unprecedented emissions reduction.

In fact, in 2012 alone, voluntary methane emission reductions activities by the U.S. oil and gas industry generated \$364 million in additional revenue.

Unfortunately, the methane rule represents the kind of one-size-fits-all policy that will actually stifle innovation and discourage further investment in emission reduction technology.

Actually, as a result, the EPA's methane rule, if allowed to stand, will not only lead to economic harm, but environmental harm as well.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the right to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, EPA was directed by the President to take a second look at the methane rule promulgated by the Obama administration. In conjunction with that review, EPA attempted to

provide the regulating community with some certainty by postponing some implementation dates. However, the courts have blocked that from happening.

In light of these challenges, the time is ripe for a temporary pause on the enforcement of these requirements, so I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

Well, simply put, I urge our colleagues on both sides to come together and kill this job-killing regulation and support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I oppose this amendment. Climate change threatens the health and welfare for current and future generations.

As the gentlemen have pointed out, Mr. Chairman, industry has moved—has moved, in part, because of pressure from the EPA, and, in part, because of just the financial loss of allowing this methane gas to escape into the atmosphere. It is dollars that are burning up.

These are precious resources that we are taking from the Earth, and we should make sure that we don't waste any of it, and that is why I think the EPA rule should not be delayed.

As has been pointed out, industry has the ability to capture this methane. It has the ability to make money from it, and I want to just make sure that we encourage everyone in the industry to move forward.

Mr. Chairman, let me give you an example. The Bakken Oil Field, which is in North Dakota—I am very familiar with it because I spent many a summer in that area—burns brighter than the entire metropolitan area of the Twin Cities at night because of the flares from the methane that are being burnt. That energy should be captured. It should be saved. We should be conservationists for future generations. We must take action, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. MULLIN. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prepare, propose, or promulgate any regulation or guidance that references or relies on the analysis contained in—

(1) "Technical Support Document: Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in February 2010;

(2) "Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013 and revised in November 2013;

(3) "Revised Draft Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in NEPA Reviews", published by the Council on Environmental Quality on December 24, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 77802);

(4) "Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in July 2015;

(5) "Addendum to the Technical Support Document on Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866: Application of the Methodology to Estimate the Social Cost of Methane and the Social Cost of Nitrous Oxide", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016; or

(6) "Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds from implementing the Obama administration's social cost of carbon rule. Congress and the American people have repeatedly rejected cap and trade proposals.

The Obama administration continuously used social cost of carbon models, which could be easily manipulated in order to attempt to justify new job-killing regulations.

The House has a clear, strong record of opposition to the social cost of carbon, voting at least 11 times to block, defund, or oppose the proposal, including H. Con. Res. 119, which we will be considering later this week.

A carbon tax would be passed along to consumers, undermining the success of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act we passed last year.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very harmful rider, and it would prohibit the EPA from considering the social cost of carbon as part of rulemaking. The social cost of carbon is an estimate of economic damages associated with small increases of carbon dioxide emissions in a given year.

It represents the best scientific information available, incorporating the impacts from carbon pollution into regulatory analyses. Weakening or eliminating use of social cost of carbon as a tool for Federal agencies that would ignore the sobering cost of health, environment, and economic impacts of extreme weather, rising temperatures, intensifying smog, and other impacts.

We cannot afford to abandon science while trying to tackle climate change, so I strongly oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It would prohibit funds from being used to advance guidance or make rules that rely on Obama-era social cost of carbon guidance.

I have heard from folks in Montana who cannot get a permit to expand a coal mine because they didn't account for the carbon released by the trains that would carry the coal. I have heard of the difficulties of building railroad bridges because they might allow more coal to be transported.

We must stop relying on metrics that were designed by the keep-it-in-the-ground crowd. Similar language passed, on a bipartisan vote, here in the House last September. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, garbage in equals garbage out. We have heard this on numerous occasions.

And in this instance, the international—or correction—the Interagency Working Group has chosen to disregard the policy decisions from OMB Circular A-4 regarding how they set the modeling. And as a result of that, they have—interestingly, the analysis generated by them would have been 80 percent lower than the mean SCC value if they had followed the guidance. And the result overstates the benefits by at least four times relative to what it would be if only the national benefits were considered as OMB directs.

This is a blatant pattern of disregard, Mr. Chairman, for the OMB guidance in order to inflate the SCC and beg the

question how many input decisions were responsible where responsible people could disagree were selected in order only to inflate the SCC value.

Let's restore the faith and vote for this amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for bringing this amendment. It is an important amendment to people that matter very much.

John Dingell is a man of integrity. I feel I know his heart. He has a huge heart, and we disagreed on many issues, but I know him as a man of integrity.

He was told he had to push through the cap and trade that would have gotten into costing people for this so-called cost of carbon, and he said it is not only a tax, it is a great big tax, and he lost his chairmanship.

But what John Dingell knows, what I know is when you start creating taxes on fuel, the people that get hammered the worst are the Nation's poorest among us. That is who it gets passed to. That is who gets crushed. Let's don't do this to the hardworking, poorest among us. Let's vote for the Mullin amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reiterate again: We should be using the best scientific information available, and we should be incorporating the impacts from carbon pollution into regulatory analysis.

When we see children being hospitalized because of intense smog, more people suffering respiratory and heart disease, and other impacts from that, we all pay for that. Whether we pay for it in emergency room visits, we pay for it in our insurance, there are many ways in which we are individually paying for the pollution that is created, let alone recognizing the effects it has on climate change.

So, simply, again, we cannot afford to abandon science while trying to tackle climate change, and I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in House Report 115-830.

Ms. MOORE. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. There is appropriated for grants for lead reduction projects under section 1459B of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-19b) \$10,000,000, to be derived from a reduction of \$10,000,000 in the amount provided in this Act under the heading "Environmental Protection Agency—Environmental Programs and Management".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise today to offer an amendment to increase resources available to help address a scourge that is occurring in so many of our communities: lead poisoning.

My district is facing its challenges like so many in our country, and the Federal Government must do its part by ensuring that we provide the resources to address this scourge.

Two of the most prominent vectors are old housing and old water infrastructure, lateral lead pipes. My amendment would attempt to address just one of the sources of lead, old lateral lead pipes, while recognizing the need to address housing when the appropriate funding bill comes to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, we know that children throughout America are at risk of a major public health crisis given aging drinking water infrastructure and housing stock. In my district alone, there are tens of thousands of lead service lines that pose a threat to the public health of children.

We have heard so much about Flint, Michigan, but I can tell you that lead poisoning in my district mirrors that of Flint, Michigan. I mean, Mr. Chairman, there just are no safe levels of lead for children.

□ 1645

As noted in a recent report by The Pew Charitable Trusts: "In the absence of lead, hundreds of thousands of children would be more likely to realize their full potential thanks to higher grade point averages, a better chance of earning high school diplomas, and graduating from college, and a reduced likelihood of becoming teen parents or becoming convicted of crimes." Yet lead exposure remains a serious threat for far too many kids and their families in our country.

The only way to remove lead pipes as a source of lead contamination is to completely remove them. That is the goal that I joined with my former and dearly loved colleague, the late great Louise Slaughter, in writing to urge the EPA in March of this year to update its lead and copper rule to require

the full replacement of lead service lines.

But both public utilities and private homeowners are hard pressed to finance this needed work. It is my understanding that the average cost can be somewhere between \$6,000 to \$8,000 to replace such lines, which is an unimaginable sum for many of the households that our constituents live in.

My amendment would provide funding for one of the newest tools that Congress created in the 2016 WRDA bill to help communities address lead pipes. This program provides grants for lead reduction projects that help reduce the concentration of lead in drinking water by, among other uses, providing assistance to low-income homeowners to replace lead service lines.

Recognizing the need, Congress authorized the program at \$60 million per year; yet it received only \$10 million in the fiscal year 2018 omnibus appropriations bill. While I would like to get closer to the authorized level, my amendment is modest and pragmatic and would simply continue funding for this program at the fiscal year 2018 level.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 2018 bill included \$10 million for EPA to establish a grant program to provide funds to States and communities for lead reduction projects as authorized in the 2016 WIIN Act.

I might also point out that we now have a WIFIA program that is in the bill, which will allow for communities throughout the country to leverage up to \$5 billion annually, and maybe more in the future, in their communities for such things as lead reduction within their towns and counties.

Mr. Chairman, therefore, this is an amendment we can accept, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his stewardship and for his recognition of the importance of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to implement, or to require the State of Washington to implement, the final rule entitled "Revision of Certain Federal Water Quality Criteria Applicable to Washington" published on November 28, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 85417).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to reverse the past administration's decision to implement unattainable water quality standards through the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA.

I want to be clear that this amendment is not about opposing clean water standards. This is an amendment to support the work that Washington State, which has an impeccable environmental record, undertook.

Washington developed their own standards for more than 190 pollutants after more than 3 years of research, outreach, and public feedback. These requirements would have already been some of the most rigorous nationwide, but EPA rejected them.

For example, Spokane, the largest city in my district, invested \$340 million in the first-of-its-kind water treatment facility. This facility was celebrated, and the Republican mayor was invited to the White House by President Obama to celebrate this investment as a model for cities to work with residents to meet new environmental standards.

The problem? Even this state-of-the-art facility would not be able to meet the immeasurable EPA standards.

Spokane Valley, another major city in my district, is facing an estimated \$1 billion for municipal and industrial compliance costs because of these rules. This will affect companies like Inland Empire Paper Company, which has been in business since 1911. Right now, the PCB standards that the previous administration imposed will force them to limit their cardboard recycling capabilities and force them to send these products to landfills.

We often hear the term "best available science." Well, these requirements cannot even be measured by the scientific community. They are unattainable.

It is not new for the EPA to abuse their power in the name of clean water. In Washington State, we saw this abuse of Federal authority with the What's Upstream? campaign and its efforts to misrepresent our farmers and ranchers.

When the Federal Government enacts a policy, it should not be pouring Federal dollars into lobbying for its support.

Requirements that can't even be measured are an abuse of trust, and it is vital that we fix this problem now,

which is why my amendment limits funds to implement EPA's water quality standards that preempt Washington State's.

This amendment will allow flexibility and reasonable guidelines for States to move forward with water quality standards that can be measured and met.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out, this amendment would prohibit the implementation of Washington State's revised water quality criteria. This standard protects communities from exposure to toxic contaminants, such as PCB, arsenic, and mercury in the fish that they eat.

Being from Minnesota, Mr. Chairman, I understand fish advisories very well. I often see signs that limit fish consumption for pregnant women, and for children in particular.

This action, however, would ignore court decisions and the voices of Native American Tribes, Asian-Pacific Islander communities, and fishing interests, all of which agree that seafood consumption standards are necessary in order to protect public health and water quality. In fact, the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission has asked that Congress reject this amendment because it puts the treaty rights that have been protected and the resources of Tribes in Washington at risk.

Many native families subsist on the fish that they catch. Passing this amendment lowering water quality standards puts these families at greater risk of poisoning from their traditional foods.

There is a lot of funding in this bill and some of the other bills that we have on the floor, Mr. Chairman, that work to prevent diabetes or to lower risk from diabetes with high blood sugar. Tribal nations are finding that returning to native foods, such as fish, is a great and excellent way of preventing or reducing the effects of diabetes.

But after years of failure by Washington State to propose a protective standard, EPA finally put forth a standard which is more protective and meets the Clean Water Act requirements.

Now, I understand that the regulated community has always been uneasy about what stricter standards might be. The revised water quality criteria take steps to address their concerns.

The standard approved the use of new implementation tools, including a longer compliance schedule and intake credits. An intake credit means that, if the water comes to you with a pollutant and you don't discharge it, you are not responsible for having to remove it. So if you didn't pollute it, you are not responsible for cleaning it up.

This amendment would circumvent all of the work that has been done to devise a standard that protects public health and water quality.

Furthermore, Washington State officials believe that, despite the Congresswoman's good intentions—and I do believe that these are good intentions—this amendment would hurt the State of Washington. It would not actually help the dischargers.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support her amendment.

Under the previous administration, EPA proposed this stringent water regulation standard in Washington State without utilizing sound scientific data or evidence. In doing so, EPA created regulatory uncertainty and imposed unachievable permit levels on the State, which are costly and nearly impossible for industries to comply with.

I encourage the State, the Tribes, and the EPA to continue to work together to find agreeable standards that improve water quality and human health while, simultaneously, providing clarity to the impacted communities and industries. In the meantime, though, I certainly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, when humans consume contaminated fish, it results in serious health impacts, such as cancer, organ damage and reproductive dysfunction, or impairment in brain development.

High fish-consuming communities—as I have mentioned, Native American Tribes and Asian-Pacific Islander communities—need the protections afforded by this revised water quality standard.

I would like to, for the RECORD, again state that this amendment is not supported by the State of Washington or the Tribal communities in the area.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Clearly, more work needs to be done. I look forward to having this amendment not pass and for people to get down to doing the serious work that needs to be done to address the gentleman's concerns.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. LOUDERMILK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the final rule entitled "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Engines and Vehicles—Phase 2" published in the Federal Register on October 25, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 73478 et seq.), with respect to trailers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, under the Clean Water Act, Congress gave the Environmental Protection Agency the authority to regulate any air pollutant from any class or classes of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines which may be reasonably anticipated to endanger public health or welfare.

To avoid any ambiguity, Congress further defined the term "motor vehicle" as a "self-propelled vehicle designed for transporting persons or property on a street or highway."

Until recently, regulators understood, as any reasonable person would, that the term "self-propelled vehicle" only applies to vehicles that can move on a roadway under their own power, such as cars, pickup trucks, semi trucks, SUVs, or vans. Never was a trailer, whether a utility trailer pulled by a pickup truck, a boat trailer pulled by a car, or a cargo trailer pulled by a semi considered a self-propelled vehicle, and, therefore, these were never under the regulatory authority of the EPA.

However, in 2016, without any authority of Congress, the EPA extended its regulatory authority and included cargo trailers in the rules for greenhouse gas emissions and fuel efficiency standards for on-road, heavy-duty vehicles and engines. This rule will require cargo trailers to add components that, in some cases, have shown to improve aerodynamics, resulting in some improvement in fuel efficiency. However, this blanket policy, which has resulted from regulatory overreach, is not only costly to consumers, but, in some cases, is counterproductive to the Agency's own mission of promoting clear, clean air policies and practices.

The additional weight of these aerodynamic components that are being mandated by the EPA will cause car-

riers to significantly limit the amount of cargo a single trailer can carry and still stay within DOT weight restrictions. Therefore, carriers have to put more trucks on the highway to carry the same amount of goods. Obviously, more trucks mean more carbon emissions without any measurable improved efficiency.

If the EPA is able to enforce this regulation, it will not only be counterproductive to the environment, but also very costly to American consumers.

□ 1700

The trucking industry has made significant strides in recent years to improve fuel efficiency and reduce air pollution, without the government mandates.

This amendment simply prevents the EPA from using any funds in this act to regulate trailers under the greenhouse gas rule. Congress never extended to the EPA the authority to regulate trailers under the Clean Air Act, because trailers are not and have never been considered self-propelled vehicles.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this commonsense amendment, so we can put an end to this blatant regulatory overreach.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment would prohibit the EPA from implementing or enforcing its greenhouse gas and fuel efficiency standards for medium-and heavy-duty engines.

Specifically, this amendment carves out an exemption for trailers. These fuel standards were jointly developed by the EPA and the Department of Transportation, and they will improve fuel efficiency and cut carbon pollution to reduce the impacts of climate change.

In fact, the EPA and DOT estimate that these standards will lower CO₂ emissions by approximately 1 billion metric tons and cut fuel costs by \$170 million. And cutting fuel costs is always a good thing to go do.

These standards will achieve greenhouse gas emission reductions that are nearly equal to those associated with all the energy used by U.S. residents in 1 year.

These efficiency fuel standards have been in place since 2016, and companies around the world have already made massive investments in the cleaner technology. Blocking the rule now would have negative consequences for human health and the environment, but also for the economy.

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to

the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), and I thank him for his hard work on this amendment.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much, and I appreciate my colleague for introducing this amendment.

He is absolutely right. The Clean Air Act never gave the EPA this authority. They just created it out of thin air.

Their rationale is kind of interesting, because they took the authority that said that they could regulate new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, and then the definition of new motor vehicle meaning any self-propelled vehicle designed for transporting persons or properties on a street or highway, and applied it to trailers. They are not self-propelled.

When I asked Janet McCabe, who was the Acting Director of the Air Division of the EPA, when she came in front of the Energy and Commerce Committee how in the world could they do this, and I presumed she wasn't a lawyer and she said: Well, yes, I am.

I was surprised, because the language is pretty clear. They don't have the ability to do that.

She said: Well, you can't haul any goods if the trailer is not attached to a truck.

That is not in the code. The code says that they only have authority over self-propelled vehicles. They created this out of whole cloth.

It doesn't make any sense to allow an agency to create law. That is our job, and I told her that that day.

I said: Look, you think this needs to be changed, bring in a bill, and we will discuss it.

They have never done that. They don't have authority. We shouldn't fund something that is clearly illegal based on the plain English reading of the terms.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to join the gentleman from Virginia and myself in support of what is a commonsense upholding of our constitutional authority as the legislative branch, and I encourage a "yea" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this rule promotes a generation of cleaner, more fuel efficient trucks. President Obama was right when he said: "We are the first generation to feel the impact of climate change and the last generation who can do something about it."

This amendment is harmful, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. LAMBORN. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the threatened species listing of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Preble's meadow jumping mouse is a tiny rodent with a body approximately 3 inches long, a 4- to 6-inch long tail, and large hind feet adapted for jumping. This largely nocturnal mouse lives primarily in streamside ecosystems in Wyoming and Colorado.

To evade predators, the Preble's meadow jumping mouse can jump up to 18 inches high, like a miniature kangaroo. But this little acrobat's most famous feat was its leap onto the endangered species list back in May 1998, a move that has since hindered development on the front range of Colorado, from Colorado Springs, Colorado, to the Wyoming border.

Among projects that have been affected are the Jeffco Parkway southeast of Rocky Flats, an expansion of the Chatfield Reservoir, and housing developments in El Paso County along tributaries of Monument Creek. Builders, landowners, and local governments in affected areas have incurred hundreds of millions of dollars in added costs because of this mouse. Protecting the Preble's mouse has even been placed ahead of protecting human life.

On September 11, 2013, Colorado experienced a major flood event that damaged or destroyed thousands of homes, important infrastructure, and public works projects. As a result of the Preble's mouse's listing as an endangered species, many restoration projects were delayed as Colorado sought a waiver.

Moreover, the scientific evidence simply does not justify these delays or the millions of taxpayer dollars that go toward protecting a rodent that is actually part of a larger group that roams throughout half of the North American Continent.

Several scientific studies have concluded that the Preble's mouse does not warrant protection because it isn't a subspecies at all and is actually related to one of the largest and most widespread genetic lineages of North American jumping mice. Even the scientist that originally classified this mouse as a subspecies has since recanted his work.

Moreover, the Preble's mouse has a low conservation priority score, meaning that the hundreds of millions of dollars already spent on protection efforts could have been better spent on other, more fragile species.

My amendment would correct the injustice that has been caused by the inaccurate listing of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse and would refocus the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's efforts on species that have been thoroughly scientifically vetted and that should be managed by the Endangered Species Act.

This amendment is supported by Citizens Against Government Waste and has previously passed the House of Representatives on three separate occasions, all by bipartisan votes. So I encourage my colleagues to, once again, support this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I would like to make the case that this is a rider, that this is authorizing on an appropriations amendment, and that the author of the amendment is in the majority.

The majority could have a hearing in the authorizing committee. It could come to the floor. It could pass on the floor. The Senate could move it. And it appears to me that President Trump is in a position to sign this into law, should he choose to do so.

So there is another alternative vehicle for moving the gentleman's amendment forward, and that is to do it legislatively and not put it on an appropriations bill. The Senate has chosen to put no riders on their appropriations bill.

But the amendment is before us. As pointed out, it would prohibit the Fish and Wildlife Service from implementing or enforcing the threatened species listing of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse under the Endangered Species Act, and it would restrict the Service from offering any of the critical protections to preserve the species.

Now, once a species is listed under the Endangered Species Act, it is the role of Fish and Wildlife, and it is primarily permissive, to help parties comply with the act as they carry out their activities.

I also want to make sure the RECORD is clear that Fish and Wildlife Service reviewed the information claiming an alleged taxonomic error in the listing of the species and found no evidence that the Preble's meadow jumping mouse is not a valid subspecies.

But under this amendment, the Service would not be able to continue to offer to recover this species, though the Endangered Species Act prohibitions would still apply. The Service

would not be able to work with agencies. The Service would not be able to work with developers. The Service would not be able to work with landowners and others to provide ESA compliance.

The Fish and Wildlife Service would be barred from issuing permits or exemptions. This means that landowners, industry, and other parties who might need to take the Preble's meadow jumping mouse incidental to their otherwise lawful activities, such as urban development, would become vulnerable to third-party lawsuits.

Additionally, this amendment would also limit the Service from undertaking the required status reviews of the subspecies or from any initial rulemaking to downlist or to delist the species, as appropriate.

Mr. Chair, I think it is pretty obvious that this amendment should go through a different way of coming to the floor, and that is through the authorizing committee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the House has spoken on this. In last year's conference report, we directed Fish and Wildlife Service to make this species among its highest priorities for consultation and permit processing. Obviously, the agency has not moved fast enough, and they need to get hopping.

So I am sure this amendment will squeak by with all of our support. I urge an "aye" vote.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I will just conclude by saying, if the Fish and Wildlife Service worked together with developers, local communities, and other groups, that would be one thing. But when they come in with a hammer and say, you have to do it this way, that is really not working together. That has, unfortunately, been the experience of many parties on the front range of Colorado.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge that, once again, we support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Service has a statutory requirement to implement the Endangered Species Act. Defunding the agency's ability to fulfill its legal requirements makes it more vulnerable to lawsuits, and I know that that is something that we are all trying to avoid here. When you have lawsuits, it is an unnecessary cost for the taxpayers.

Now, the gentleman's amendment would undermine the Service's ability to work collaboratively with States, local governments, communities, and landowners, to conserve this imperiled species. The amendment would create

uncertainty for landowners and also make them vulnerable to lawsuits.

So we should not pass this amendment. We should be supporting the Fish and Wildlife Service efforts and not blocking the agency from doing its job.

Mr. Chair, my commitment to the chairman and to my walking partner in the tunnels as we all come over for votes is to work with them to make the Fish and Wildlife Service more responsible to the gentleman's concerns. But at this time, I have to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. LAMBORN. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the threatened species or endangered species listing of any plant or wildlife that has not undergone a review as required by section 4(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(2)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

□ 1715

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is straightforward. It simply ensures that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is following current law, specifically section 4(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act, by conducting their review of all threatened and endangered plants and wildlife at least once every 5 years.

Time after time, the Federal Government refuses to follow the will of Congress when it enacted the Endangered Species Act. The government designates land as "critical habitat" despite not meeting the ESA definition, and the government consistently refuses to remove plants and animals from threatened or endangered status

even when those species are flourishing and no longer in need of ESA protections.

But you may ask yourself: How does the government know when a species should be removed from the endangered or threatened list? How does the government know if a species is recovering? The answer could be found in the ESA, and it is a requirement that the Federal Government review all plants or species that are currently listed as endangered or threatened every 5 years.

Under the Endangered Species Act, the purpose of a 5-year review is to ensure that threatened and endangered species have the appropriate level of protection. And because the ESA grants extensive protection to a species, including harsh penalties for landowners and other citizens, it makes sense to regularly verify if a plant or animal is being properly classified or if it should be delisted.

Despite this commonsense requirement, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service acknowledged earlier this year that it has neglected its responsibility to conduct the required reviews for nearly 1,000 species.

By enforcing the 5-year review, my amendment will ensure that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is using the best available scientific information in implementing its responsibilities under the ESA, including incorporating new information through public comment and assessing ongoing conservation efforts.

This amendment is supported by Citizens Against Government Waste, the National Mining Association, and the American Farm Bureau, and it has previously passed the House of Representatives on three separate occasions, all by bipartisan votes.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in ensuring that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service follows the law, the letter of the law, in the Endangered Species Act and that we do not allow the agency to spend money that would violate current law.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to once again support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, the Service attempts to comply with the statutory mandate to review the status of listed species every 5 years to determine whether their classification as threatened or endangered is still appropriate. However, the Service has a backlog of such reviews due to funding limitations, such as the 42 percent listing reduction contained in this bill.

In this bill, the work that the Service would need to do to comply with what you want in this bill alone is cut \$8 million, so that just puts them farther behind.

In recent years, the Service has only been able to complete 100 to 120 reviews per year, which is less than half of what is needed to keep up with the requirement to review all the species every 5 years. So that falls on Congress for us not giving them the funds that they need to do the job effectively and efficiently as you are requesting, and the way to fix that is to give them the proper funding.

But as the gentleman might be aware, the chairman was given level funding this year. He did the very best that he could with what he had to balance things out in the interests of the requests he had from Members of the House, but this particular \$8 million cut just makes your problem even worse.

This amendment would not remove species, without reviews, from the list of the species protected by the ESA. So the ESA prohibition against take would still remain, as would the ability of citizens to sue to force compliance.

If funding cannot be used to enforce the ESA for species with late reviews, that will leave the species unprotected.

While the proposed language would prohibit the Service from working with agencies, developers, landowners, and others to provide ESA compliance through section 7 consultations or section 10 permits for Federal or private projects that could potentially affect the species, it would not affect the ability of third parties to sue those agencies or landowners and potentially join their projects due to the lack of ESA compliance.

Mr. Chairman, as I said about the last amendment, we don't need another rider or extraneous provision in this bill. It is already overburdened with many, many riders.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to take this language to the appropriate committees of jurisdiction and work through and see if we can make positive changes and create win-wins.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. And I would urge my colleagues, if they want the backlog to change, to help the chairman and me get more money into the allocation of this bill so the chairman and I can work to achieve those goals together.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Two quick responses, then I am going to yield some time.

When it comes to funding for the Fish and Wildlife Service, they are just going to have to basically do what every other private or governmental entity, family, and individual has to do, which is prioritize their spending. They have to live within their means. We all have to live within our means. They have to have the priorities where they can do the job with the money that they are given.

Number two, I think that maybe my colleague would agree with me that

outside environmental groups are largely to blame for bringing massive lawsuits that tie up a lot of the resources of the Fish and Wildlife Service so they can't be doing their business of protecting the species that they are already supposed to be caring for. So I think they really get a lot of the blame here as well.

Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I support this amendment. The root of the frustration with the Endangered Species Act is that species rarely get delisted, and people who are directly affected by a listing are condemned to a life of an additional Federal rule indefinitely.

Congress tried to prevent this by requiring the Fish and Wildlife Service to review the status of every listed species every 5 years and to down-list or delist species accordingly.

Today, the Service has a backlog of 892 species without a current 5-year review.

Without these 5-year reviews, species could be recovered and we wouldn't even know it. I find this simply unacceptable.

Unless the Service focuses its personnel on inherently Federal responsibilities under the ESA and non-Federal partners take the lead on actual recovery, we will never break the contentious and litigious cycle that we have now.

And, by the way, we have actually increased the ESA recovery budget in this bill for 5-year reviews. So let's get ESA working again.

Mr. Chair, I urge an "aye" vote on this amendment.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Chair, I would urge my colleagues to once again support this commonsense amendment, which we have done in the past three different times on a bipartisan basis.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. GOODLATTE. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to take any of the actions described as a "backstop" in the December 29, 2009, letter from EPA's Regional Administrator to the States in the Watershed and the District of Columbia in response to the development or implementation of a State's watershed implementation and referred to in enclosure B of such letter.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to urge support for my amendment, which would reaffirm and preserve the rights of the States to write their own water quality plans.

My amendment simply prohibits the EPA from using its Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load and the so-called watershed implementation plans to hijack States' water quality strategies.

Over the last several years, the EPA has implemented a Total Maximum Daily Load blueprint for the six States in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, which strictly limits the amount of nutrients that can enter the Chesapeake Bay. Through its implementation, the EPA has basically given every State in the watershed an ultimatum: either the State does exactly what the EPA says or it faces the threat of an EPA takeover of its water quality programs.

Congress intended that the implementation of the Clean Water Act be a collaborative approach, through which the States and the Federal Government work together. This process was not meant to be subject to the whims of politics and bureaucrats in Washington. Therefore, my amendment instructs the EPA to respect the important role States play in implementing the Clean Water Act.

I want to make it perfectly clear that this amendment would not stop the EPA from working with the States to restore the Chesapeake Bay, nor would it undermine the cleanup efforts already underway. My language only removes the ability of the EPA to take over a State's plan or to take retaliatory actions against the State if it does not meet EPA-mandated goals. Again, it ensures States' rights remain intact and not usurped by the EPA.

It is important to point out that the correlation between the EPA's outrageous waters of the United States rule and the Bay TMDL, at the heart of both issues is the EPA's desire to control conservation and water quality improvement efforts throughout the country and to punish all those who dare to oppose them.

The bay is a national treasure, and I want to see it restored, but we know that in order to achieve this goal, the

States and the EPA must work together. The EPA cannot be allowed to railroad the States and micromanage the process.

This amendment has passed the House with bipartisan support several times, and I urge my colleagues to once again vote to ask the EPA to respect the important role States play in implementing the Clean Water Act and prevent another Federal power grab by the administration.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment would allow those who pollute the Chesapeake Bay to ignore the Environmental Protection Agency's water quality standards.

Restoring the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed continues to be a priority, and a priority for this committee to fund it. The EPA established the mandatory water quality standards and Congress has appropriated over \$1 billion for the Chesapeake Bay Program to help States, localities, and businesses meet those needs. This amendment would jeopardize that funding and have devastating effects on the health of the bay.

How long will the States and localities be able to meet their obligations that they agreed to in 2014 in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement if the Federal Government's financial assistance goes away?

This is a partnership. We should keep the partnership moving forward.

Furthermore, if this amendment were to become law, it would block the EPA's ability to enforce the court-ordered settlement requiring the farm community and agribusinesses to meet watershed specific pollution limits. It would not, however, relieve the farms and agribusinesses from the requirements in the settlement.

The State and local governments want to move forward. They want to keep the partnership moving. But the Farm Bureau and, in fact, some of the industrial operators they represent don't think that they should be responsible for controlling the pollution that they dump into our rivers and streams across the country.

The courts have sided with the EPA on this matter, and the Farm Bureau continues their pursuit to stop mandatory cleanups through judicial appeals and through this amendment.

There are enough special interest provisions for big business in this bill already. We don't need any more.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits the use of funds to take retaliatory actions against individual States. Importantly, this amendment would not prevent the EPA from working with States to restore the bay.

In 1985, the States in the Chesapeake Bay region recognized the need to address pollutants in the bay and, through their own initiative, came together to conduct cleanup efforts. These State-driven efforts were largely successful. As a matter of fact, water quality improved almost 50 percent from 1985 to 2010.

However, in 2010, the EPA seized the States' authority to determine their own continued compliance and threatened to dictate Federal requirements if the States were unable to comply. This 2010 power grab, known as the Chesapeake Bay TMDL, directly contradicts the intent of the Clean Water Act.

The Clean Water Act clearly acknowledges State authority in water quality and requires cooperation rather than coercion between the States and the Federal Government.

These coercive methods have been tried and imposed and have failed. Actually, water quality has not improved since the federalization of the bay cleanup efforts.

It is simply imperative that we return the constitutional rights of the States to make their own water quality improvement decisions and restore the State control that has been shown to actually improve water quality. The future of the Chesapeake Bay depends on it.

□ 1730

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I am happy to rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. This is another example of EPA overreach. It is my hope that my colleagues from Virginia and Pennsylvania can continue to work with the administration to find common ground on approaches that will improve water quality in a more flexible manner. I certainly support this amendment and I urge an "aye" vote.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me just say, this amendment does not in any way take any resources away from any of the six States in the Chesapeake Bay region to improve water quality. What it does take away is the ability of the EPA to dictate to those States one way, their way, to do it.

The Clean Water Act was written with it in mind that the Federal Gov-

ernment would set the standards and the States would figure out how to meet those standards. And that flexibility has been taken away starting in the Obama administration, and it is time for this Congress to stop them from doing that so that we can have the kind of collaborative effort just described by the subcommittee chairman, Mr. CALVERT, and get back to doing things the right way.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, for more than 35 years, there has been a regional partnership created through the Chesapeake Bay Program, and it sought to restore and protect the Nation's largest and most productive estuaries. That is a partnership with the Federal Government which includes funding that is working together to achieve those common goals.

Now, I have nothing before me saying that the State of Virginia, or any of the regional partners, want to withdraw from this moving forward to continue to clean up this estuary. This amendment would undermine decades of work and decades of Federal dollars that the Federal Government has put in in partnership, and it would have devastating effects to the health of the bay and the economy it supports.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose 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 Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEG0

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. GALLEG0. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. ____ No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to issue a grazing permit or lease in contravention of section 4110.1 or 4130.1-1(b) of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chairman, grazing on public lands is a privilege—not a right—and ranchers who use these

lands should abide by the law and pay their fair share.

On average, Federal rates for grazing are more than 90 percent lower than what the private sector charges. In fact, these rates are so low that the government actually loses money administering the grazing program. My amendment would simply reaffirm that grazing permits or leases should not be issued to anyone who refuses to comply with BLM regulations, including the payment of fees.

Mr. Chairman, this is a narrow amendment, but it speaks to a broader principle. We can't claim to support the rule of law and then look the other way when ranchers like Cliven Bundy ignore their obligations.

Bundy thumbed his nose at the executive and judicial branches of our government, running up over \$1 million in unpaid fees. He then put the lives of local and Federal officials in danger during a standoff at his Nevada ranch.

Later, when two Oregon ranchers named Dwight and Steven Hammond, who also have a history of disregarding grazing regulations, were sent to Federal prison for fires they potentially set near Federal lands, members of the Bundy family led an armed occupation of the national wildlife refuge.

Mr. Chairman, President Trump recently pardoned the Hammonds, validating these violent tactics and insulting the courageous law enforcement officers who risked their lives during the confrontation in Oregon. With these pardons, Trump has effectively given his blessing to groups who intimidated, threatened, and occupied local communities. He has legitimized Bundy's extreme right-wing movements.

Make no mistake, Donald Trump is sending a clear message to militant and antigovernment organizations: You can break the law, threaten Federal employees, and endanger public safety with complete impunity. That is unacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, freeloading on Federal land is unlawful and unfair. Let's pass my amendment and reaffirm that the ranchers need to play by the rules just like the rest of us.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, this amendment previously failed by recorded vote in July of 2016. The amendment taxed ranchers and attempts to relitigate the Bundy matter.

DOJ was found to have withheld evidence and to have violated these ranchers' rights. There is no reason to relitigate this matter at this juncture. The regulations are already in place.

This is an unnecessary political amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLEGU. Mr. Chair, let's face it: Ranchers who refuse to pay what

they owe the Federal Government are freeloaders, pure and simple. If you don't pay your taxes, you go to jail. If you don't pay your mortgage, you get your house taken away. Ranchers are not more special than any other Americans. They are freeloaders, and they should pay for their freeloading. Congress should not stand for it. Let's pass my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman brings up exactly the point I am trying to make. We are trying to relitigate a previously settled issue. It was actually found that these ranchers' rights were violated by the Department of Justice.

We started looking—the Hammonds were brought up. When we were actually looking at this case where they actually tried to look at the fire danger on their land, and it got beyond their lands and on to public land, they were fined exclusively and hardlined.

Where is the same type of justice given to the Forest Service or the BLM when their prescribed burn fires go out of hand and take private holdings? It is not the same. This isn't about freeloading. This is about a case where we need to look at how we take care of our public lands.

Mr. Chair, I ask everybody 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 gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGU).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GALLEGU. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. BYRNE. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to repeal section 105(a)(2) or section 105(b) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer a straightforward amendment to prohibit any effort to redirect funds allocated under the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, which is commonly known as GOMESA.

For those who don't know, GOMESA calls for a Federal revenue sharing agreement between the Federal Government and four Gulf States: Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama. The program is designed to split up revenue from selected oil and gas lease sales in the Outer Continental Shelf of the Gulf of Mexico.

The neat thing about GOMESA is it ensures appropriate funding for the coastal areas that provide the workforce, assume the environmental risk, build much of the infrastructure, and support the offshore oil and gas industry. It only makes sense that the coastal areas should receive an adequate share of the revenue.

Previously, there have been administrative efforts to direct the money away from the Gulf States, and, instead, devote the resources to national projects. While I appreciate the Trump administration not including any such proposal in this year's budget, I still believe it is important for Congress to send a clear, bipartisan message that we do not support moving GOMESA funds away from the Gulf Coast.

In fact, just this year, the Department of the Interior disbursed almost \$188 million to the four Gulf oil and gas producing States. Alabama received \$21 million this year, and the two coastal counties in Alabama received an additional combined amount of \$5 million.

I have seen these GOMESA funds put to good use back in my home State of Alabama, whether it was for environmental rehabilitation protection projects or programs that boost the coastal tourism economy. GOMESA is working by supporting and promoting our Gulf Coast communities. If you talk to our local mayors and county leaders, they will tell you how critically important GOMESA funding is for their region.

It would be detrimental to go against congressional intent and redirect these funds away from our respective coastal communities. By including this amendment, we can make clear that Congress does not support reallocating these resources and show our strong support for the Gulf Coast.

Mr. Chair, I ask for an "aye" vote on 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 Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. BURGESS. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to hire or pay the

salary of any officer or employee of the Environmental Protection Agency under subsection (f) or (g) of section 207 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 209) who is not already receiving pay under either such subsection on the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment on an issue I have worked on for several years on the Committee on Energy and Commerce as the authorizing committee.

In 2006, the Committee on Appropriations, without an authorization from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, included a provision in the annual Department of the Interior EPA Appropriations bill to allow the Environmental Protection Agency to begin using a special paid program that was explicitly and exclusively authorized for use by the Public Health Service Administration under the Department of Health and Human Services.

The special pay mechanism allows a government employee to leave the normal GS pay scale and receive nearly uncapped compensation. This provision was intended to be used only in unique circumstances for leaders in the healthcare industry who would never leave the private sector to work for the Federal Government except for those special, more competitive salaries.

Under current law, this justification can never be used at the Environmental Protection Agency. Indeed, some of the employees that the Environmental Protection Agency pays under title 42, the part of the U.S. Code that allows for this special pay, were previous government workers who were merely moved into the special pay scale because they desired more money.

The Environmental Protection Agency has claimed in the past that because the Environmental Protection Agency is a health organization, it may use this statute to pay special hires, and the Committee on Appropriations has agreed to let them, despite the authorizing committee's objection.

Originally, the Environmental Protection Agency was granted only a handful of slots to fill with title 42 hires. That number has now increased to over 50. The cost to the taxpayers for these employees is tens of millions of dollars.

This amendment would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from hiring any new employees under title 42, or transferring any current employees from the GS scale to title 42. It would not effect current employees being paid under this provision. This would give the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the authorizing committee, the time it needs to ad-

dress whether the EPA truly deserves the special pay consideration.

The Government Accountability Office looked into the Department of Health and Human Services' abuse of title 42 several years ago, and found problems with the implementation of this program. Within the Department of Health and Human Services where, arguably, this could be allowed, why would Congress ever allow the Environmental Protection Agency to implement the same problematic pay structure?

□ 1745

In multiple hearings in the Energy and Commerce Committee, both former Administrator Lisa Jackson and former Administrator Gina McCarthy refused to give specifics regarding the program. A Freedom of Information Act request by the EPA union, the American Federation of Government Employees, sent to my office showed that title 42 hires at EPA are, in fact, sowing dissent among workers, with the union asking the Congress to stop this abusive and unfair hiring technique.

A report by the Environmental Protection Agency's own inspector general in 2015 discovered that the EPA did not properly demonstrate a need to use the title 42 hiring authority, nor did it provide clear and convincing justification for its continued use. This is further proof that the Environmental Protection Agency's use of the title 42 hiring authority must come to an end.

I have introduced legislation further clarifying that the Public Health Services Act, written for HHS, does not permit the EPA to use this language to hire employees under a special pay structure.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, this amendment, like some of the other amendments that we have seen, could be handled in the authorizing committee, which the gentleman is a member of, if memory serves me correctly.

The gentleman is in the majority. Call up, have a hearing, pass legislation, and then do it in a way that doesn't add more burdensome amendments and riders to this bill. The Senate is also controlled by the same party in the majority, and the President is of that party. So I would encourage the gentleman to go through what I would call regular order.

This amendment would prohibit the EPA from hiring scientists using its title 42 authority, the flexible hiring mechanism that allows agencies to at-

tract and retain staff with outstanding scientific and technical skills.

This authority, as has been pointed out, is used by the EPA, the CDC, the NIH, and other agencies that require candidates who have specialized degrees in areas such as medicine, science, and engineering.

It is not always easy for the Federal Government to attract high-level professionals who have invested many years in school and could easily make more money in private practice or academia. In fact, we have heard that USGS and BLM quite often have problems keeping highly educated engineers in place because the private sector comes and offers them so much more money.

So the Federal Government has found it wise to allow these agencies to provide some additional funding to retain and recruit these employees. We should want to have the best and the brightest working for us and the American people—the best doctors, the best scientists, and the best engineers. So I am disappointed that the gentleman does not believe such highly specialized employees deserve the title 42 designation.

With our Nation facing crises like Lyme's disease, PFAS in our drinking water, and climate change, we should be investing in our scientists. We should be encouraging them to seek employment with the Federal Government.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is a reasonable amendment. It only affects employees who are new hires in title 42 in the Environmental Protection Agency, not in the CDC and not in NIH. It is an amendment that would allow the authorizing committee an opportunity to catch up with what the Appropriations Committee has done without an authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, this amendment could go through a different order and not be placed onto an appropriations bill.

This is a shortsighted amendment. I think it deserves to have a fair and open vetting with the House concentrated on just what this would mean to the EPA. So I don't think we should attack Federal employees who sometimes have chosen to not receive as much compensation and devote their lives to public service.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 54 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. EMMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 55 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. EMMER. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to withdraw National Forest System lands within the Rainy River Watershed on the Superior National Forest from disposition under United States mineral and geothermal leasing laws.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment, which I am pleased to say that I intend to withdraw, because after months of hard work in this Chamber and with the administration, it is no longer necessary.

Minnesota is the proud home to the Iron Range, which boasts an abundance of natural resources and critical minerals. When it comes to protecting the environment while developing our economic assets, nobody does it better than Minnesota.

Despite this history, on its very last day in office, the Obama administration proposed to withdraw more than 240,000 acres of land in our State from mineral exploration and development. This last-minute action was an assault on our way of life, threatening thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in State revenue and school trust funding. It handicaps our national security by increasing our reliance on foreign sources of minerals.

That is why I offered this amendment to stop this foolish action.

This amendment is identical to one that was unanimously adopted by this Chamber last year and echoes the good news delivered by the President to thousands of Minnesotans on June 20 when he announced his intent to rescind this arbitrary withdrawal, which is now in process.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the amendment is going to be withdrawn, but let me explain what this language would have done. To the best of my knowledge, the leases haven't been permanently withdrawn yet.

This language would have prevented the Forest Service and the Interior Department from acting to protect our Nation's most visited wilderness area.

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is located in northern Minnesota, and it is one of the last truly undisturbed wild places in America.

It is a national treasure, and it is under threat from sulfide-ore copper mining. The proposed mine is next to the wilderness. There is no buffer, and there is no barrier here. It is literally in the same water.

Sulfide-ore mining is the most toxic industry in America. It pollutes waterways with acid drainage that contains arsenic, mercury, and lead.

The Forest Service recognized how damaging this type of mining could be to the Boundary Waters, so they proposed a 20-year halt to Federal mine leases in the watershed. They were urged to study this withdrawal by our Governor from Minnesota, Tribal Governments, and people from all across America who were worried that sulfide mining could destroy the surrounding waters and lands.

They have a right to be worried. All these mines have failed. In 2014, a sulfide-ore mine in British Columbia failed, dumping billions of liters of toxic sludge, causing permanent environmental damage.

So the Forest Service wisely decided to conduct a science-based assessment to see if mineral withdrawal would make sense for the water-intensive ecosystem of our Boundary Waters.

Now, Mr. Chairman, despite what you might hear about what the gentleman said, the proposed mining withdrawal is not some overreach or some past or current administration being out of line. In 1976, Congress established this exact review process under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. Congress intentionally provided a way to protect our country's natural treasures and vulnerable places.

If the gentleman's amendment would have come to the floor for a vote and would have passed again, it would have stopped that review process. It would make the withdrawal study meaningless, because it dictates the outcome.

If this amendment had been on the floor and it would pass, the withdrawal of the Boundary Waters from sulfide-ore mining would have been off the table no matter what the study would have said is best for the wilderness.

In every conversation I have had, and I have had many, with Secretary Zinke and Secretary Perdue, they have told me the same thing: The study should be completed.

So I hope my colleagues and the President would reject having these leases go through without having a study.

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), who is my colleague from Minnesota and coauthor of this amendment.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. EMMER for yielding.

The lady, for whom I have enormous respect, has failed to mention the fact

that this or any other project anywhere in the country, let alone the State of Minnesota, would be, nevertheless, subject to endless reviews by the Environmental Protection Agency, some of which take up to 10 and 12 years. So it is not as though we are approving a mining project here. It is going to have to undergo rigorous review.

As my colleagues from Minnesota know, I was an original sponsor of the 1978 Boundary Waters Wilderness legislation. I am very proud of that fact.

I want everybody to know here that, at the time, we made a solid commitment to preserve and to protect some 1.1 million acres out of the Superior National Forest for the BWCA, to protect it from all manmade harm and damage to the environment. But we also made a commitment to reserve the remainder of the Superior National Forest for mixed-use purposes and specifically cited recreation and forestry.

The U.S. Forest Service described mining as a desirable-use purpose. In fact, that was the forestry service at that time.

Our word is our bond in this business. This amendment will uphold that hard-fought compromise. The simple truth is that we have been mining on the Iron Range for 130 years, yet we have the cleanest water in the State of Minnesota and perhaps the country. We are going to do everything we can to make sure that we keep it that way.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me first start off by saying that I have great respect for my colleagues, both Representative EMMER and Representative NOLAN, and the rest of our delegation, Representative MCCOLLUM included.

This has been an ongoing debate.

I just want to make sure folks understand, know, and can appreciate—and I know the gentleman is going to withdraw the amendment—that hundreds of thousands of people have been weighing in on this ongoing public process, and their comments should not be ignored. That is the bottom line. Nor should we be ignoring a science-based assessment of the best management practices that are important for one of Minnesota's and the country's national treasures.

We should be open to new types of mining in Minnesota, but only when those necessary environmental reviews are met.

I refer to the Boundary Waters as Minnesota's Yellowstone. There is a reason for that. It has a national perspective with hundreds of thousands of

Americans visiting it each and every year, whether it is canoeing or fishing. That is where some of my best memories in my life have taken place.

So I want to make sure—we owe it to ourselves and future generations—that we rely on science before undertaking any activity that would disrupt this fragile ecosystem.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time, and I want to thank my colleagues for their ongoing discussion on this issue.

Mr. Chair, once again my colleagues, Representatives EMMER and NOLAN, are offering this amendment. And while I appreciate my friendship with my Minnesota colleagues, I once again oppose this amendment and rise in opposition.

Minnesota has a rich history of taconite mining that dates back generations. However, this amendment is not about taconite mining, it's about copper-nickel mining, which has never been done before in Minnesota and is being proposed within the watershed of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, which is one of America's most visited wilderness areas.

An environmental review is currently underway to study the viability of mining this close to the Boundary Water Canoe Area and this amendment would defund that review less than a year before its scheduled completion in 2019.

Hundreds of thousands of people, on both sides of the issue, have weighed in on this ongoing public process. Their comments should not be ignored. Nor should we be ignoring the science-based assessment of best management practices for one of Minnesota's national treasures.

We should be open to new types of mining in Minnesota, but only when the necessary environmental reviews are met.

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area is Minnesota's Yellowstone. Hundreds of thousands of Americans visit it on fishing and canoe trips annually. Some of the best memories of my life have taken place in the Boundary Waters.

We owe it to ourselves and future generations to rely on science before undertaking any activity that could potentially disrupt this fragile ecosystem. I oppose defunding the ongoing environmental review and ask others to vote against the amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), who is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee's Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, now you know how it feels about California water. I got the drift of this thing.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's interest on this issue and appreciate the variety of opinions about it. I thank the gentleman, as well as the gentlewoman from Minnesota, who is the subcommittee's ranking member, for her willingness to work with the committee. As we work together to try to move forward with this bill, I hope a compromise will be found.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his work and continued support on this issue.

To make a few closing points, nothing about this amendment would allow for mining in the Boundary Waters, period.

□ 1800

In fact, to demonstrate the disconnect and level of misinformation on this issue, my colleagues who stand in opposition to this amendment worked to have report language accompany this bill which incorrectly calls attention to a "proposal" to withdraw lands within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, despite the fact there is no such proposal and it remains unlawful to mine within the Boundary Waters.

Nothing about this amendment eliminates any existing environmental protections. This amendment reinforces the commonsense reality that economic growth and environmental protection do not have to be mutually exclusive.

I am pleased to have the support of the House on this very important issue during this 115th Congress. I am pleased to have the pledged support and continued commitment from the administration to end this withdrawal. I am pleased that we will soon be able to get Washington out of the lives of thousands of hardworking Minnesotans.

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

Mr. Chair, I withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I reserved my time. The gentleman has withdrawn the amendment. Even though the amendment has been withdrawn, I don't have the right to close or I would have used my time.

Could the Parliamentarian instruct me as to if my time is actually gone.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's time has elapsed because the amendment was withdrawn.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, we do have a tradition of mining in Minnesota—taconite mining is the new mining—and I just want to reiterate the fact that these leases are for mining and the company that is looking to mine is sulfide-ore mining.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to close by sharing some words from the founding members of Kids for the Boundary Waters. I have their handwritten notes. To have handwritten notes from America's young adults these days is pretty special.

From Callie: "This unique place shaped my life. The Boundary Waters helped me to realize my potential."

From Henry: "I have watched year after year as families like my own have grown together in this wilderness."

From Julia: "The pristine, untainted waters of the Boundary Waters are essential to the quality and uniqueness of the journeys of visitors."

From Tommaso: "I am more committed than ever to help preserve and protect this beautiful and unique ecosystem for future generations."

From Elsa: "Once the watershed faces sulfide-ore copper mining, it will never be the same."

From Joseph, who started this organization during his fight with leukemia: "What cancer has taught me for sure is that sometimes life only gives you one chance to get things right, and this is our one chance to protect the Boundary Waters."

I urge my colleagues and others to join me in standing with these young, inspiring people and to oppose the lease renewal.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 56 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. GROTHMAN. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the rule entitled "National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on October 26, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 65292).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to deal with the new rule entitled, "National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone," which affects several Wisconsin counties that I represent along Lake Michigan.

Since the original CLEAR Act came into effect, the Environmental Protection Agency has had the authority to regulate air emissions from stationary and mobile sources. They have—and this is a good thing—over time, progressively come up with new rules, making the standards more and more stringent for the counties along Lake Michigan.

If you are ruled a nonattainment, it is a burden. It is a burden on industry that has to spend substantial amounts of additional money dealing with stricter and stricter standards, putting them at a competitive disadvantage compared to other parts of the country and other parts of the world. It is also

a difficult thing for individual motorists who find their cars have to be repaired. It is very expensive.

Some of it is easy for people who have a high salary to deal with. Maybe they don't have an older car. But I have always felt that some of this disproportionately affects the people who are just struggling to get a goal in life.

Therefore, when the EPA comes up with new standards, it is not without effect. They need to come up with new standards they proposed a couple of years ago.

The purpose of the amendment is to prevent them from spending money promulgating these new standards so that our industries may have a predictable situation and not be at a competitive disadvantage.

I should point out that, insofar as the counties along Lake Michigan are ruled a nonattainment, it may be through no fault of their own. In part, for historical reasons, they have monitored the ozone by placing the monitors real near Lake Michigan, where there are artificially high amounts of ozone.

Secondly, we have a situation where, insofar as there are pollutants in the area, almost all of them come from south of Wisconsin, out of Chicago or areas further south. As a practical matter, it can be almost impossible, or even impossible, for these Wisconsin counties to deal with these problems.

I have been working with the Environmental Protection Agency on this issue. After introducing the amendment, I have continued to work with the Environmental Protection Agency.

While I would like to deal with this problem statutorily, I realize it would be probably better for all concerned if the Environmental Protection Agency, as well as the business community in Wisconsin, and I could reach a conclusion.

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

Mr. Chair, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana). The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 67 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. CONNOLLY. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose or issue any modification to any regulation established in the final rule of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled "Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals From Electric Utilities" (80 Fed. Reg. 21301 (April 17, 2015)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, it is in the spirit of bipartisan, common-sense, and modest safeguards that I sought to offer this amendment that would protect the 2015 Federal coal ash rule.

Sadly, late last night, Acting EPA Administrator Wheeler helped cement the toxic legacy of former Administrator Pruitt's reign over the EPA by rolling back Federal coal ash standards, making this amendment moot.

I remind my colleagues that the Obama-era Federal coal ash rule was not rushed nor was it onerous. In fact, some think it didn't go far enough. After years of debate, input from community and industry stakeholders, and nearly half a million public comments, the Obama administration finalized stringent but pragmatic Federal coal ash regulations to deal with post-closure requirements, groundwater monitoring, and public reporting.

The Pruitt proposal, which was announced only 5 months ago, included very few hearings, very little outreach to the public, and last night was finalized. That is warp speed, even for the Trump administration's swamp-driven EPA antiregulation movement. So, no, the 2015 rule was not rushed; the Pruitt rule most certainly was.

I also remind my colleagues of the catastrophic 2008 Kingston, Tennessee, coal ash spill and why the Federal Government got in this business to begin with. The Kingston spill was a devastating event. The breach released 5 million cubic yards of coal ash, covering 300 acres in toxic sludge, damaging and destroying homes and property, resulting in \$1.2 billion in cleanup costs, mostly borne by the public.

The lasting health consequences of that spill, some of which are still unknown, are even worse. Residents still suffer from respiratory illnesses and other side effects. Arsenic levels where the coal ash runoff was disposed of were measured at 100 times, Mr. Chairman, higher than the amount allowed under the Safe Drinking Water Act. The EPA has already said such exposure significantly increases risk of cancers.

Earlier this year, lawyers filed suit in Federal court alleging that more than 180 members of this Superfund cleanup now face severe health effects, and 30 individuals have died from the cleanup of this toxic waste.

These coal ash spills continue to occur across the country, Mr. Chairman, including in my home State of Virginia, where a neighboring State, North Carolina, had a coal ash pond that spilled more than 39,000 tons of toxic ash and 24 million gallons of wastewater into the Dan River.

Though much of the public and media attention to this spill was focused on North Carolina's regulatory shortcomings, Virginia was exposed to the dangers of the coal ash spill. As a result, Virginia's Department of Environmental Quality secured a \$2.5 million settlement against Duke Energy Caro-

linas, a fraction of the cost of the cleanup.

What has happened in Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee can happen in any one of our communities that have or are near coal ash impoundment ponds, which is why we must protect the 2015 Federal coal ash rule. Unfortunately, that is not what happened last night.

What happened last night will weaken groundwater monitoring and cleanup requirements without considering the widespread evidence of significant groundwater contamination recently revealed by industry's own data. Already, under the 2015 rule's reporting requirements, coal ash waste sites across the country displayed evidence of contaminating groundwater. Under Pruitt's proposal, that data may not even see the light of day. We may not know. We are not going to monitor.

Surely, if there is anything we here in Congress can agree on, it is the right of all people to have access to safe drinking water. As a result of the 2015 Federal rules, States are working to close legacy coal ash impoundments and protect water. Under the new finalized agreement that modified that rule last night, that is now in jeopardy. Because of that action, we are going to have to address coal ash in a different way, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, because of that action, I will be forced to withdraw this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. Chair, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division A (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require changes to an existing placer mining plan of operations with regard to reclamation activities, including revegetation, or to modify the bond requirements for the mining operation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, Alaska has a long history of placer mining operations, beginning in the early 1800s and continuing through today. In fact, Alaska is one of the few places left, including California, that has placer mining operations.

Most placer mining operations are small, but it as a robust industry in Alaska, providing hundreds of jobs and contributing to the growth of rural Alaskan communities.

The Bureau of Land Management's Fortymile plan, finalized in the last days of the previous administration, upended decades of successful placer mining land management in the Fortymile Planning Area.

The Fortymile plan imposed an overly complex regulatory framework on small-scale placer mining operations as part of an ongoing effort to discourage mining activity in the area.

The Fortymile miners previously agreed to environmental remediation standards, and under the new plan proposed by the BLM, they are expected to reclaim land that they have not mined and mitigate in ways they did not agree to in their approved operation plans.

They are expected to remediate land that was impacted by placer mining over 100 years ago, which adds to their financial burden and makes it economically impractical for miners to continue their operations.

This language has been included in the appropriations report language by unanimous consent for the last 2 years. This is a necessary piece of legislation and amendment to this bill to make sure the BLM recognizes that miners do have obligations, they have met their obligations, and the agencies have gone against them.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alaska has been enlightening me more about placer mining, and I appreciate learning more; but I have some questions that remain unanswered, so that is why I have opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

□ 1815

I understand that between 400 and 600 miles of BLM-managed streams have historic or active placer mining impacts, and there is a legacy of historic claim with reduction of ecosystem function.

Now, BLM continues various outreach activities, including public meetings and interactions with individual miners, and is working with industry to incorporate best management practices and new reclamation techniques to accelerate stream recovery. I think that would be a good thing.

Of course, reclamation activities may be necessary, and what they are looking to do is to increase the cost to the miners, which the gentleman is objecting to, if I understand correctly, in order to get these streams and ecosystems back up to function.

This amendment would prohibit assessing the cost of the reclamation areas to placer miners who are profiting from mineral extraction on BLM-managed land.

I personally believe the American taxpayer should not shoulder the burden of the restoration costs, that responsible parties should.

So the gentleman will probably be enlightening me over the next couple of months on what he thinks might be able to be worked out so that both parties feel that the burden is not overburdensome, but there is adequate reclamation going forward.

Mr. Chair, at this time I have to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the Dean of the House's amendment and his dedication to the sound management of natural resources on behalf of constituents in his State.

Obviously, mining, and certainly placer mining, is unique to Alaska. Alaska certainly has a unique history when it comes to mineral extraction, probably more than any other State in the Union. It is certainly a big part of Alaska's economy and the economy of the United States. It is a mutually beneficial enterprise.

This amendment is similar to the ones adopted by voice vote in FY17 and FY18, so I certainly urge my colleagues to adopt it by a voice vote yet again.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the comments from the chairman, and especially the comments from the gentlewoman who understands and has opposition. I would like to remind everybody, again, the reclamation was taking place, the mitigation was taking place. They changed the rules after they agreed on it.

This is not a newly mined area. This has been mined before. In fact, I just came from there on the Fourth of July. Chicken, Alaska. This is where this mine is. Lots of mom-and-pop operations, retired people. Chicken, Alaska. You know why they call it "Chicken"? They couldn't spell "ptarmigan." That is why they call that small community that.

They are trying very hard, but very frankly, the BLM came in with this plan. It is not working. In fact, they are spending very large amounts of money trying to implement their reclamation concept when it doesn't work. And I will challenge anybody to show that these miners are not doing their best, but their proposal is trying to put them out of business. I just think that is wrong.

If I thought they were doing some harm, I would definitely not be for them. I have been there. I have seen it. I have watched what they are trying to do. An agency, I think, has forgotten their role, and they don't support mining. BLM is supposed to. And they have made it very nearly impossible for, very frankly, a mom-and-pop operation to do so.

So I hope the gentlewoman can see her way to allowing this amendment to this bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 59 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. PERRY. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to give formal notification under, or prepare, propose, implement, administer, or enforce any rule or recommendation pursuant to, section 115 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7415).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by thanking Chairman CALVERT for this opportunity.

Mr. Chair, this amendment prohibits the EPA from using funds for actions pursuant to section 115 of the Clean Air Act. Section 115 of the Clean Air Act allows the agency to mandate State emissions levels to whatever level the agency deems appropriate if, in collaboration with a foreign government, they determine endangerment and if the other government has a reciprocal agreement to prevent or control these emissions in their own nation.

Now, this is a backdoor provision that allows the agency to vastly expand its regulatory authority and encroach on the constitutional rights of the States to regulate their own energy sectors, based on the actions of a foreign nation and the whims of the executive branch.

It is irresponsible to allow unelected bureaucrats at the EPA to retain the ability to seize such an expansive authority. If the U.S. government wants to pursue such a policy, one that, in my opinion, is constitutionally suspect, it should be done through an explicit congressional delegation of authority on a case-by-case basis.

A similar amendment has passed the House during the interior and environmental appropriations packages for the

previous 2 fiscal years, Mr. Chairman. I urge my colleagues to take back our Article I authority and support this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, it has been pointed out that this amendment would block the EPA from regulating air pollution under section 115 of the Clean Air Act, which deals with international pollution and allows the United States to work with other countries on transboundary pollution issues.

Being a State that borders Canada, we enter into agreements with them many times to make sure that both of our countries are working together in the best interest of their citizens.

This gentleman has offered this amendment for a number of years. It used to be the amendment to torpedo the climate change agreement, but President Trump took care of that, so I am a little unclear as to why it is continuing to be offered.

Section 115 could be a tool in our toolbox for a path to achieve reduction targets for greenhouse gases. The gentleman's amendment would prohibit both the EPA and the Trump White House from even developing a well-considered recommendation as to whether or not to use this authority.

The President might, in some circumstances, want to work with another country to address something. This to me is just the latest in a long line of attacks on clean air and on the EPA's authority to respond to the urgent threat of climate change.

A vote for this amendment is another vote, in my opinion, for climate denial and to block action to curb carbon pollution that is driving our dangerous climate change.

We see the hurricanes getting stronger, the wildfires raging stronger, and now we are seeing the glaciers melt.

Mr. Chair, so I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and to leave this tool in the toolbox for the Republican administrator at EPA, as well as for the Republican person who is serving in the White House. Let's leave them one tool in the toolbox in case they want to take it out and use it.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, are we or are we not a sovereign Nation? I think that most people would agree that we are, and, as such, we don't take issue with the Congress, with the administration doing its job to keep our air clean and to make treaties and provisions with other nations.

But what we do take issue with is other nations working with, potentially, this administration, any admin-

istration, that comes up with an agreement not ratified by the American people, not ratified by this body or the body on the other side of the Capitol to encroach upon the constitutional rights of States to regulate their own environmental emissions, as provided.

So it is not a question of whether we think that the climate isn't changing, man has something to do with it, or whether it should be regulated or how it should be regulated. It is a question of the authority vested in the Constitution, in these bodies, and the ones that are not.

It is not the place of unelected bureaucrats or individuals to make an agreement with some other nation, then to impose itself on the States individually. That is all we are saying here. It has passed on numerous occasions because it is good.

The President got us out of the Paris climate agreement, but that doesn't mean that some other administration in the future might make another agreement that, yet again, the American people had no part in; neither did this body. So this just ensures that if that is the case, we have the protection that this body should provide.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 60 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division A (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to treat the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, in the West, water is the key to everything. One small family, the Gosses—I met them my first year in Congress in 2003—has been fighting a 30-year, protracted battle with the Forest Service over the water and access to the water.

They have been to two different courts, and the courts said, yes, the water is theirs. The Forest Service responded to the first court by fencing the water in. They said the 23 acres around it was their acreage and they couldn't walk their cows to get to the water.

The Gosses went back to court, and found that the court said, okay, they don't have a right to walk the cows on your 23 acres, but they do have a right to move the water to the cows through a pipe or a ditch. The Forest Service responded by electrifying the fence.

That is the kind of fight that we are in right now. A couple years ago, I stood out over that water for about 2½ or 3 hours with the Forest Service, the Gosses, and we all negotiated that the fences could be brought in, that accommodations could be met, that we could find habitat other places. And it was all agreed we would get to the water.

Then, subsequently, the Fish and Wildlife Service said, well, there is a jumping mouse. They admitted themselves that the science was not very good, that they had never seen one of the jumping mice there, but they thought it might be there. They admitted that the science was very terrible.

Despite the lack of any scientific evidence, despite everything, now that area has been shut back off.

There are many areas where the jumping mouse could have a critical habitat, but the agency just refuses to do it.

So my amendment is quite simple. It simply says that the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse cannot be listed as endangered or threatened until they do some better science. It is a very straightforward amendment where we are trying to find the balance between the Endangered Species Act and the need for jobs, the need for an economy in the West. And that revolves around open spaces, ranchland, water. It all comes together in this one single issue.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment clearly would prohibit Fish and Wildlife Service from implementing or enforcing the endangered species listing of the New Mexico jumping mouse under the Endangered Species Act. It would restrict the Service from offering critical protections to preserve the species.

This amendment is harmful. Once a species is listed under the Endangered Species Act, the role of Fish and Wildlife is primarily permissive, helping parties comply with the act as they carry out their activities.

Now, the majority of the habitat of the New Mexico jumping mouse is on Federal land, and Fish and Wildlife is working with the Forest Service to develop conservation measures that will protect the mouse while allowing livestock grazing on Forest Service lands and assuring adequate water for these cattle.

Since the endangered species listing, members of the livestock community

have voiced concern about their impacts to people who recreate and make their livelihood on Forest Service lands, which result from addressing the needs of the mouse.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has established three working groups to address these concerns, and they have come up with some creative solutions, like establishing cattle lanes to assure cattle can have access to water while protecting the vegetation necessary for the survival of the mouse.

We have been in contact, and we find that there is a lot of excitement and there is a lot of cooperation going on. So I would like to work with the Service to make sure that we give this a full chance of working.

□ 1830

Under this amendment, the Service would not be able to continue to recover this species, though all the Endangered Species Act prohibitions would still apply. So the Service wouldn't be able to continue to recover the species under this amendment, but all the other activities of the Endangered Species Act would still apply. So the Service wouldn't be able to work collaboratively any longer with stakeholders to provide ESA compliance.

The Service has a statutory requirement to implement the Endangered Species Act. Defunding the Agency's ability to fulfill these legal requirements just makes the Agency and the Federal Government more vulnerable to lawsuits, which is an unnecessary cost for American taxpayers.

Additionally, this amendment would limit the Service from undertaking a required status review of the subspecies or from initiating any rulemaking to downlist or even delist this species, when it became appropriate.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, with respect to the gentlewoman, if the science underlying the decision was sound, and even the Agency itself has admitted that the science was seriously flawed—if the stakes were not so high—the entire listing of species would demand sound science. So this is a serious problem throughout the West and throughout the United States.

If it weren't a matter of being able to provide jobs and have economies in these big rural areas of New Mexico, and there are no other tax bases in those areas, so as we crowd out the ranchers, then counties simply don't have the revenues to survive themselves.

If the stakes weren't these, then I would listen more closely to the gentlewoman's arguments. But as it is, I just don't think that we can sustain a decision like this. If the Fish and Wildlife Service had showed up at that meeting where we found other critical habitat within a couple of miles, it is just that critical habitat didn't block access to this source of water, the only source of water in that section of the

ranch, and these are ranches that are on mountain ranges.

So you have the inability for cows to cross the mountain ranges over to the next range. Also, it is miles in between some of the loading stations and the water stations.

So these are things that compel me to say that we have to find something different here. We want the Agency to reconsider it, to look for better science, to look for better critical habitat.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman wasn't here earlier, because he was attending to other work and now has come down to do his amendment, but I have been making the case that this type of authorizing language, these types of debates and discussions, should be taking place in the authorizing committee where we can bring in the Service, bring in the ranchers, find out what we need to do better to create win-wins.

When we just come and put things on the appropriations bill, it doesn't allow for that full vetting. It doesn't allow us that opportunity to work with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee after the authorizing committee is coming through and figuring out where we need to adjust the budget, or what we need to do, or how we need to do oversight to make sure that the Fish and Wildlife Service is doing things that the gentleman is talking about.

So, an interesting thing, we got some information from the Service, and the Service has been working with the research community to expand the survey of the jumping mouse outside its currently known occupied areas. The goal of this expansion effort is to document additional populations. If they document additional populations, we could possibly move toward downlisting or delisting the species, as appropriate. But your amendment, unfortunately, would block that.

I would like to see this type of amendment be brought up under the majority—the majority is the same in the Senate, and the majority is in control of the White House—and have an opportunity to do the right kind of oversight to make sure that, when we are doing legislation with the best of intentions—if this survey were to come back and say that we could downlist or delist the species, this amendment would prohibit us from doing it.

So, at this time, I will oppose the gentleman's amendment. But I thank him for bringing this attention to the floor, and I will look more into it.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, again, I respect the gentlewoman's opinions and observations.

I would point out that these are 1907 water rights, which, in New Mexico, water rights are given, and the earlier, the better. So they can't get access be-

cause of the listing of a species. The science is very flawed.

The Agency had the opportunity to go out to the forest with us. And that day, they simply turned down the opportunity to meet with us. We had the State forester, the head of the U.S. Forest Service of New Mexico there. We had the regional forester. Everyone was there except the people who really needed to be there. They refused our invitation.

I have been working on this single issue for 14 years myself, so it is not like we haven't been discussing the issue at length.

Again, with that, I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 New Mexico will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 61 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division A (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to draft, propose, finalize, implement, enforce, or carry out any rulemaking on the lesser prairie-chicken (*Tympanuchus pallidicinctus*) under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, this issue is very similar to the last one.

As we approached the year 2013-2014, discussions were going on with Fish and Wildlife Service about the potential listing either as endangered or threatened of the lesser prairie chicken. We began to ask for volunteers. We asked for farmers and ranchers, for oil and gas companies, to work together to really come up with a collaborative plan in order to avoid the listing for the lesser prairie chicken as either threatened or endangered, and the industries responded very well.

To date, partners in that effort have contributed more than \$64 million in enrollment and mitigation fees. They have agreed to conserve more than 150,000 acres of habitat.

It was at that point that the Fish and Wildlife Service said, okay, this is the best effort we have had in this collaboration nationwide. They were all ecstatic. Then they turned around about a month later and simply listed the lesser prairie chicken.

Again, the science was somewhat lacking in that. So, in 2015, a Federal district court looked at the issue, and they vacated the finding and said that the Fish and Wildlife Service took no account of the ongoing conservation.

Keep in mind that the conservation efforts actually have been working. Just this year, the number of birds is up from 30,000 to 39,000, so almost a 25 percent increase in the population. That is exactly what these collaborative efforts were intended to do.

The court found that the Fish and Wildlife Service didn't conduct a proper analysis and that the analysis they did was neither rigorous nor valid.

So we are simply asking, in this amendment, that the lesser prairie chicken not be listed, that it be delisted.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, in 2016, the Service officially removed the lesser prairie chicken from the Federal list of endangered and threatened wildlife in accordance with the September 2015 court order vacating the Service's 2014 delisting determination, as the gentleman pointed out.

Now, the administration action was taken in light of the decision not to appeal the court's ruling. So they decided they weren't going to appeal, but they were going to try to move forward.

So the Service is currently conducting a species status assessment to characterize the current and future conditions of the lesser prairie chicken. The assessment takes into account both the threats and conservation efforts.

When I was in Nevada—I wasn't in your State, sir, but I was in Nevada with one of our other colleagues—I saw amazing work that was being done in collaboration, in fact, with an energy company, amazing work being done.

The gentleman from Nevada was unable to produce one prairie chicken for me to see that morning when we were out, but I believe that they are there and that the conservation is working, in spite of the fact that I didn't get to see one lesser prairie chicken.

But going back, the draft report was shared with peer and partner reviews, and the Service is working with them to get feedback. If the Service deter-

mines the listing of the lesser prairie chicken as threatened or endangered is warranted, it is unlikely that any rule-making could be completed before 2018. So that would take 2 years, in which Congress could take action.

I would like the Service to be able to continue working closely with its partners, including State fish and wildlife agencies, the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agency, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, industry, private landowners, and other partners, in the interest of conserving the lesser prairie chicken.

So what the amendment does, and why I am objecting to it, it halts, it stops, that transparent process that is working properly, that I saw in the field working properly and providing ample opportunity for public comment in how we could move forward.

So this amendment would make the decision. It would make the decision final about the conservation of the species on the basis of what is not, in my opinion, good science. So, at this time, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I hope all partners continue to work together.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support amendment No. 62 to H.R. 6147. This amendment modernizes the Endangered Species Act and recognizes voluntary conservation efforts to protect the lesser prairie chicken.

In 2015, the species native to western Kansas was inaccurately listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act due to a multiyear drought. Since then, Kansas farmers and ranchers have devoted millions of dollars toward successful conservation through a range-wide plan. This along with increased rainfall has led to an increase in the lesser prairie chicken population.

However, recently, the push to list the species as endangered was restarted, disregarding these voluntary efforts. I am glad this amendment recognizes the private conservation efforts toward the lesser prairie chicken. I co-sponsored a similar measure in the farm bill, and I appreciate Representatives PEARCE and MARSHALL for offering this amendment. I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

In 2015, a Federal court ordered the Fish and Wildlife Service to remove the lesser prairie chicken from the list of threatened and endangered species. Environmental activists immediately petitioned the Agency to list the species again, and the Agency, having

been stung by the court, concluded that the petition had merit.

Now the Agency is on the verge of listing the species yet again, and it will end up in court again, where it will be delisted again. Rinse and repeat.

Folks, how many times must we repeat this cycle before people start working together? How much money must be wasted fighting each other before we realize that our money is better spent actually helping the species?

This amendment calls a timeout on the madness, at least for one species. That is why I am urging an "aye" vote.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, again, I would point out that the collaboration was unprecedented across the Nation. What is going to happen, if this collaboration fails, is that others are going to say, okay, that collaboration process simply doesn't work.

Though, again, the courts, we are simply agreeing with the court findings in the matter that the Fish and Wildlife Service failed to ask very important questions and needs to reaccomplish the evaluation.

All in all, the States and local areas can and will pitch in to help the species survive. But the heavy-handed approach coming from the Fish and Wildlife Service simply, again, is going to kill jobs and kill the potential of collaborative efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on 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 New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 New Mexico will be postponed.

□ 1845

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out Proclamation 7320 entitled "Establishment of the Ironwood Forest National Monument" issued by the President of the United States on June 9, 2000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that supports recreational shooting, K-12 education, and responsible energy development by prohibiting funds for the Ironwood Forest National Monument that was unilaterally designated under the Antiquities Act.

By looking at the map here, it is very clear that this monument was a political land grab meant to prevent responsible energy and mineral production, as well as multiple use on Federal lands. You couldn't construct something even worse than that.

As you can see, the monument boundary starts in the right corner here in the yellow and includes a large mineral deposit that includes molybdenum, manganese, gold, and peripheral lead-zinc-silver.

The boundary then works its way up and also encircles the purple, which is a significant copper deposit.

Continuing to move up to the green, the monument encompasses significant amounts of lead, zinc, and silver veins.

Moving further up the map to the next yellow, the monument encircles the entire Silver Bell Mine and operations, as well as other claims, and also encompasses massive mineral deposits that contain molybdenum, manganese, gold, and peripheral lead-zinc-silver.

Moving to the blue and to the top left of the monument, the boundary almost entirely encircles two large veins that contain barium, lead, and silver.

Essentially, all the colored areas on the map are off limits to new energy and mineral exploration and development as a result of the monument land grab.

Proponents claim the 188,619-acre monument is necessary to protect a stand of ironwood trees covering 640 acres. Let me repeat that. Proponents claim the 188,619-acre monument is necessary to protect a stand of ironwood trees covering 640 acres.

Wow. If this unilateral monument designation was not political, it would have had a significantly different boundary and been much smaller.

There is nothing glamorous about this monument, and it was an unconstitutional taking by then-Secretary Babbitt and the Clinton administration, pointblank.

The Arizona Mining Association, Arizona Rock Products Association, Arizona Mining Industry Gets Our Support, and the Southern Arizona Business Coalition recently asked for this monument to be modified significantly, stating: "One-third of the area encompassed in the Ironwood Monument is either State trust lands or privately owned. These lands have effectively lost all economic potential as a result of the national monument designation. . . . At the time of the designation, the State government estimated that it would lose \$100 million in mineral rights. This does not include financial losses to private companies or the lost employment potential for the mines."

Asarco and Liberty Star Uranium and Metals Corporation of Tucson have also asked for this monument to be significantly altered.

Further, the Ironwood Forest National Monument has caused harm to the common schools beneficiary, K-12 education, by locking up these lands, preventing multiple use, and stopping important revenues from flowing to the educational coffers.

The Ironwood Forest National Monument enacted a complete ban on recreational shooting. No utility corridors are allowed in the monument. One-quarter of the monument can be closed to human entry for over one-third of the year due to the presence of sheep, and nearly 10,000 acres of this monument are completely locked up at all times. Further, the monument constitutes an attack on ranchers by negatively impacting grazing.

This monument designation was an unconstitutional taking. Asarco invested \$72 million prior to the monument designation in hopes of expanding the mine. They will likely invest several hundred million more, create new jobs, and grow the economy if the mine is no longer within the monument boundary.

The Arizona Game and Fish Department has not been able to fully implement vital management activities within the monument boundaries, including fencing to protect wildlife, predator control, law enforcement wildlife investigations, and responses to illegal wildlife activities.

In November, 24 Members of Congress sent President Trump a letter recommending a recession of this monument amongst other monument recommendations. That letter was endorsed by the American Farm Bureau Federation, Americans for Responsible Recreation Access, the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, and the Public Lands Council.

This amendment is endorsed by the American Exploration and Mining Association, American Encore, AMIGOS, Asarco Mining, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, Free Market America, the Arizona Farm Bureau, Arizona Liberty, the Arizona Pork Council, Concerned Citizens for America, Eagle Motorcycles, Rim Country Custom Rods, the Southern Arizona Business Coalition, and Yavapai County Supervisor Jack R. Smith, amongst others.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their time and for their good work on this bill.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment that seeks to eliminate the Ironwood Forest

National Monument, which is in my district. The fact that it is in my district is secondary to the callous disregard to the public input, the wishes of the people of southern Arizona, the history of the area, and the biodiversity that this amendment attacks.

This amendment effectively repeals the monument, returning the lands back to multiple-use status, and opening them up for unfettered mining and other harmful activities.

The sponsor of the legislation says that it is necessary to restore access for recreational shooting and to generate revenue for local schools, which I understand is a nod to the potential revenue garnered from future mining operations that he envisions will pop up once the monument is eliminated. He speaks for the mining industry, not Arizonans, and certainly not my constituents.

A recent poll found that 73 percent of the people of Arizona oppose eliminating protections for national monuments. Arizonans don't want mining in their monuments, but that doesn't seem to matter to the sponsor of this amendment, who will seemingly do whatever it takes to roll back public lands protections.

I also take issue with the sponsor of the amendment's notion that this amendment is about protecting access for recreational shooting. When the monument was established, recreational shooting was allowed, as it is on a large percentage of public lands. Unfortunately, some bad actors forced local land managers to rethink access for the entire shooting community. People were shooting up endangered cacti, leaving bullet hole-ridden sofas and other trash throughout the desert. Those were used as targets.

One of the great things about living in Tucson and southern Arizona is that we are surrounded by public lands. Our protected desert landscapes support wildlife and an abundant biodiversity to a wide range of recreational activities.

Unfortunately, this amendment views these rare landscapes as commodities, only available for extraction of resources and nothing more. It is kind of a corporate radar approach and mentality to our shared public assets and lands: use them, abuse them, discard them, and see how much we can make out of them, in terms of money.

The spirit of conservation and preservation is very important to the people of southern Arizona, and this is one of our special places. This amendment is an attack on the people, its history, and our traditions in southern Arizona. This amendment is an attack on the Antiquities Act, and this amendment is an attack on our public lands.

This monument was created in the year 2000 by President Clinton after the Pima County Board of Supervisors, the elected officials for the county, petitioned for it; the Tohono O'odham Nation petitioned for it; the people of southern Arizona petitioned for it; and that monument was created.

The vice chairman of the Tohono O'odham Nation, Mr. Verlon Jose, said, today: "The Tohono O'odham have lived in this region since time immemorial, and the Ironwood Forest National Monument has tremendous cultural and historical importance. More than 200 important archeological sites with remains from our ancestors are within the monument, including two areas listed on the National Register of Historic Places. We must oppose misguided efforts to withhold funding from Ironwood, as it would have a devastating effect on efforts to protect this national treasure."

Mr. Chairman, the issue here today is about trying to relive and undo a decision that was made with public participation, public input, the support of local elected officials, the support of affected Tribes, and do it for the specific interests of a mining company that feels they have a right, even though it is a foreign-owned company, to come in on our public lands, withdraw minerals, pay no royalties, and exploit the area.

The Ironwood Forest National Monument is a landscape treasure. It is a rare treasure, and it needs to be maintained. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, look at how this monument is connected and concocted. I think every which way. You couldn't make a worse definition for a monument.

What it basically does is it goes to the far side to catch these two minerals over here. Down here in the middle, it goes to the far edge. This is called gerrymandering for minerals. This is a political bias based upon takings from the people of Arizona.

Remember, I responded by saying: Listen, one-third of this designation was private and State lands. These are part of the dedication to the citizens of Arizona.

So when you look at this, this is the worst concocted. This is the vanity of, actually, atrocities of monuments gone haywire.

Now, I am happy to work with the gentleman from southern Arizona to rightsize this monument. I would be happy to do that. But this concoction is a blatant exercise in overjurisdiction of the Federal Government and misutilizing the Antiquities Act.

Mr. Chairman, I ask everybody to vote for my amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. 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. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 64 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. POSEY. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Federal Acquisition Regulation 6.101(a) with respect to aviation helmets.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, this is really pretty simple.

A constituent came to me with a problem concerning procurement for aviation helmets. He has a manufacturing company here in the United States, but he is not able to sell his helmets to the Department of the Interior.

His helmets are not inferior. They are used by many industries. They are used in many countries. But he is not on the approved list for Federal agencies. Currently, the approved list includes only one manufacturer.

My amendment will change this by providing additional options through competition. The amendment requires compliance with the Federal acquisition regulation policy that ensures a full and open process in procuring aviation helmets.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this great amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 65 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. DENHAM. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this act may be used by the Secretary to modify operations of the New Melones reservoir authorized in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887, 901) for the purposes of executing any component of the

State Water Resources Control Board of California's Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prevents a huge water grab by the State of California from farmers and communities in California's Central Valley.

Under Sacramento's new plan, residents and farmers, alike, will suffer skyrocketing rates that will cripple our local economy, our farms, and our communities. Specifically, the State is mandating 40 percent of the water from Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers to be flushed out into the ocean.

□ 1900

Currently, we are losing about 25 percent of our current water being flushed out by these mandated flows. This will increase it to 40 percent. This water feeds the Central Valley Project and the farmers that rely on it. My community relies on this water for drinking, to operate our local businesses, and for green power. This powers our local communities.

The amendment prevents the State from robbing water from the Valley and protects the New Melones reservoir from depletion. The New Melones is a Federal facility that provides water for the Central Valley, and generates hydropower for Californians.

The Bay-Delta Plan will drain significantly more water from New Melones each year than it currently releases, leaving the reservoir completely dry some years. The reservoir will be unable to meet its water obligations to the federally-authorized Central Valley project, which is critical to moving water all across the Central Valley. Lower water levels will reduce the ability to generate power.

My amendment prevents Federal dollars from contributing to this misguided plan, and the State from robbing our water. We need more water in the valley, not less.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. This amendment seeks to block collaborative water management in California. Such management is aimed at benefiting all water users, cities, farmers, Tribes, the fishing industry, and recreation interests.

Specifically, this amendment blocks Federal compliance with the California Bay-Delta Plan, which is a plan being developed by the State of California to prevent the collapse of California's iconic salmon fisheries, and to preserve all beneficial use of the State's water.

After a decade of research and public outreach, the State government is close to finalizing the Bay-Delta Plan. It will increase water flows into the California Bay-Delta from the San Joaquin River. The increased flows will improve salmon survival and prevent an unfolding ecological crisis in the Bay-Delta, which is key for the environment for the Bay and the Pacific Northwest fisheries, one of the most valuable and unique ecosystems in the world.

While multiple factors have contributed to recent salmon declines, a key factor has been unsustainably large water diversions from the California rivers. The Bay-Delta seeks to address this by reducing diversions and increasing river flow.

Mr. Chair, this obviously is an amendment which the author is very passionate about. This also is something that the State of California has engaged in.

This amendment, in my opinion, once again, should be something that should be handled in an authorizing committee so the State of California can come in, the gentleman and his proponents of what the State is doing can have a discussion, and then the authorizers can work their will and let the appropriators know whether or not to move forward on this.

To do this amendment here shuts out a full, transparent discussion about what should or should not take place in the State of California, where the California citizens all across the State have had input with their elected officials on how to move forward.

So this amendment seeks to undermine what appears to be a successful implementation of the Bay-Delta Plan, which California has seen as a necessary step toward preventing precious fishery declines and the loss of thousands of jobs that rely on healthy fish and functioning ecosystems.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK). The reservoir resides in his district.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for bringing this amendment to the floor.

The gentlewoman from Minnesota misses an important fact, and that is that the current massive water diversions have done absolutely nothing to improve salmon populations.

By taking those diversions to 40 percent unimpaired flow to the ocean, in practical terms, this means that New Melones and Don Pedro reservoirs in my district will be drained to their dead-pool levels each fall.

It would destroy what's left of agriculture in California's Central Valley, destroy the tourism these reservoirs attract in my region, and create catastrophic water shortages in one of the most water-rich regions of the Nation.

We don't build these reservoirs to dump water into the ocean. We build them to store surplus water from wet years so that we have it in dry ones.

This is insanity. It is the result of years of greens-gone-wild radicalism in California. This amendment assures that the Federal Government will not participate in such nonsense.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, in rising to support my colleague, Mr. DENHAM, on this amendment, I note that the California State Water Board is contemplating their next water grab, and how disconnected from reality these regulators are.

In the latest plan, they want to take 40 percent of the flows from San Joaquin. Concurrently, they have a pending proposal to also increase the volume of flows from the Sacramento River, in my region, that washes out to the ocean, all under the guise, the failing guise of protecting fish. They are contemplating 45 to 65 percent of unimpeded flow.

We already know that when it comes to protecting people or fish, Sacramento always decides to choose the latter. This plan defies even basic common sense or fairness.

Instead, it relies on questionable science to impose arbitrary restrictions, with no solutions to address the loss of habitat for native species, or even the predators in the delta, which we already know to be a major threat to the fish population. Up to 90 percent of the affected species are devoured by these predator fish.

It offers no recourse for the devastating impact it will have on jobs and local economies.

I would like to remind the regulators, California voters overwhelmingly supported the effort to direct \$2.7 billion for water storage projects, recognizing the need to invest in infrastructure such as Sites Reservoir.

If that project already existed, the reservoir would be nearly full right now, providing enough water to serve 3.6 million Californians for an entire year, and relieve the stress on the Sacramento and Central Valley water systems.

Mr. Chair, we need some common sense. I urge my colleagues to support Mr. DENHAM's amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire as to how much time both sides have?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COMER). The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McNERNEY).

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chair, I understand my colleague's position on this. Water is a scarce commodity. You

want to have access to water. You want to plant your trees. You want to feed your stocks and all that.

But what you are not saying is what is going to happen if you continue to take more water from the delta. The delta is a finite water supply. The more you take water from the delta, the more saltwater from the ocean comes in and poisons our facilities, our docks, our fishing, it changes the whole environment. And we are going to cost jobs if you do that, so it is really a balance.

Now, I think it is okay to work together to find a proper amount of water to ship out and a proper amount of water to stay in the delta. When we have bigger rain events, the water pushes the saltwater back out toward the ocean. It clears out water a little bit.

So, I mean, it is not like we are just trying to save water to hurt you guys. That is not what is going on here. We have our own interests to take care of.

This is always a fight. What we need to do is sit down and compromise and find some way to get through this so that we don't end up hurting one another, which is what happens.

Again, I understand the position you are in. I understand the need for water. California is a dry State. We have years and years of drought. But continuing to demand access to water when there is only a finite supply, every year you want more, that is not going to work. It is just not going to work.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, our State Water Board is out of control. Our State Water Board is involved in a political operation to remove farming out of the State of California.

This amendment would attempt to put a stop to the reckless State plan and continue the current New Melones operations. This is something we need to act on and act on immediately. We are in crisis.

I am a strong advocate for Mr. DENHAM's position and, certainly, for his constituents, and I am glad to support this amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, at this time I will make my remarks to close.

This amendment is an attempt to get the Congress involved in undermining a State's rights and its prerogatives.

The Federal Government should be assisting California in ways to restore the State's rivers and recover needed fisheries, instead of trying to interfere with obstruction from Washington. I often hear my colleagues say that Washington should get out of the way. In this case, I totally agree.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, the gentleman talks about a compromise. I will not compromise and allow our people to go without water, people that

have no drinking water, only to have FEMA come in and bring bottled water. I will not shut down our farms. That is not a compromise.

This is a Federal project that has our water for our community that now they want to double the amount that goes out to the ocean. It is a waste. It is harmful to our community. It will shut down our agriculture, and it will leave people without potable drinking water.

This is insanity to try to say that you are saving the fish when there is no science. This will harm the fish. Without water, without green power, and without cold water, you will kill the very fish that you are trying to save.

I believe that our farms deserve this, our communities deserve this, and our people must have it to survive.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. ABRAHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 66 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. ABRAHAM. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO RESTRICT CERTAIN USE OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS IN NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce any prohibition or limitation of any kind in a cooperative agreement referred to in section 29.2 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, on the planting of genetically modified crops in a national wildlife refuge.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, the Fish and Wildlife Service regularly enters into cooperative agricultural agreement with farmers to plant and raise crops on farm fields on national wildlife refuge land. Those agreements require that the farmers leave a portion of that crop standing over the winter in order to provide cover and forage for wildlife. In the spring, those farmers plow up everything and start all over again.

In 2014, the Fish and Wildlife Service began to prevent farmers who entered into these agreements from planting GMO seed. This action was not based on facts, it was not on rules, and this action is harmful to both wildlife and to the farmers who are providing that food and cover.

GMO crops are proven safe. They use less water. They use less pesticides.

They use less fertilizer, and they feed much of the world, both humans and animals.

Wildlife groups like Ducks Unlimited support this amendment, and I ask for your support, too.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1915

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment clearly would prohibit Fish and Wildlife Service from enforcing limitations or prohibitions on the use of genetically modified seed in commercial agricultural operations conducted on national wildlife refuges.

As the gentleman pointed out, in 2014, a decision to curtail the use of genetically modified seeds or crops, GMOs, for use on National Wildlife Refuge System lands by 2016 grew out of several years of litigation successfully brought against U.S. Fish and Wildlife.

During the term of the litigation, the courts did not allow the use of GMOs. As a result of this restriction, the refuges found that they were able to meet their biological objectives and accomplish their wildlife management purposes without the use of GMOs and that GMO use could be curtailed nationwide.

This approach avoids costly litigation for the taxpayers and the need for additional site-specific compatibility determinations and NEPA analysis of GMO crops. It is a saver of the taxpayers' dollars.

Fish and Wildlife Service has proven over several years that they can accomplish their wildlife objectives without the use of GMOs. However, Fish and Wildlife policy on biological diversity, integrity, and environmental health does allow for the use of GMOs when it is essential to accomplish the refuge purposes and is approved by the Regional Refuge Chief.

This amendment jeopardizes the current FWS policy that is based on years of experience. We should be supporting Fish and Wildlife Service and its efforts, not blocking the agency from doing its job.

Mr. Chair, once again, this is the appropriations portion of Fish and Wildlife. This clearly is something that has gone through the court system, that has gone through authorization. It is a policy discussion and it should be done in the policy committee. It should be done where people can come in and testify and have their debate in full transparency. It should be done then and brought to the floor.

Mr. Chair, the majority controls the House, the Senate, and the White House. I would encourage the author of the amendment to not use the appropriation bills to put more riders on.

The gentleman may or may not be aware, Mr. Chair, that the Senate has

no riders on its bill at all. And I believe that this could really put the chairman and myself, as the ranking member, possibly at a disadvantage when we go to reallocate those precious dollars, with all the requests that we have had on the floor over the past 2 days, when we go into doing what our job is, the appropriations.

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

The National Academy of Sciences was established by Congress in 1863 in the midst of the Civil War to provide independent, objective advice to the Nation on matters related to science and technology.

The Academy, in 2016, released a comprehensive literature review on the science of genetically engineered crops, or GMOs as they are commonly referred to. The Academy found zero scientific evidence that GMOs are any more or any less safe for human consumption and the environment than organisms modified by more traditional genetic methods, like selective breeding.

This amendment blocks an outdated policy made during the last administration which pandered to extreme environmental groups by feeding into the unfounded fears of GMOs. This amendment is an opportunity to rise above fear-mongering and make sound policy based on science and rationality.

Mr. Chair, let's do the right thing and vote "aye."

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I just ask that my colleagues support this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 67 printed in House Report 115-830.

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:

At the end of division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to eliminate the Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is prohibiting the use of appropriated funds to eliminate the Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership, or

programs, that are for the reforestation of urban areas. In fact, I celebrate and support the increase in funding. This amendment is particularly helpful, I hope, to create the legislative history of the importance of the urban reforestation program.

Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member as well as the chairman of this committee for recognizing the importance of urban reforestation.

This amendment emphasizes the importance of the Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership in urban forests and preserves our ability to return urban areas to healthy and safe living environments for our children. I have offered similar amendments because I want an ongoing creation of legislative history to ensure that this program is kept.

In the past 30 years alone, we have lost 30 percent of all of our urban trees, a loss of over 600 million trees. Eighty percent of the American population lives in dense quarters of the city. Reforestation programs return a tool of nature to concrete areas that can help remove air pollution, filter out chemicals and agricultural waste in water, and save communities millions of dollars in stormwater management costs.

I have certainly seen the devastation of droughts right in large cities. In particular, Houston, a couple years ago, lost many, many trees in a severe drought that we experienced over the summer. It took many community investors—when I say that, nonprofits—and Federal dollars to restore green life to Houston.

We know that asthma is on the rise. In people below the Federal poverty threshold, we see asthma increasing. Asthma comes when children have to be subjected to polluted air.

Some of the reasons individuals at lower income may have increased risk of asthma are increased exposure to indoor and outdoor pollutants, cigarette smoking, secondhand smoke exposure, and nearby industrial pollutants and highway traffic.

The good news is that trees provide the source of oxygen that is so necessary, and it comes about through a scientific process that I will discuss a little bit later.

We have a headline here from Science Daily that says: “Cities and Communities in the U.S. Losing 36 Million Trees a Year.”

And then another headline: “Researchers Suggest Reforestation Around Urban Areas to Reduce Ozone Levels,” which enhances, creates, makes worse the asthma that many of our children suffer from.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of my amendment to Division A of H.R. 6147, the Interior and Environment Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2019 and to commend Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this bill through the legislative process.

Among other agencies, this legislation funds the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park

System, and the Smithsonian Institution, which operates our national museums including the National Zoo.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple but it sends a very important message from the Congress of the United States.

The Jackson Lee Amendment emphasizes the importance of Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnerships and urban forests, and preserves our ability to return urban areas to healthy and safe living environments for our children.

Similar amendments were offered and accepted in the Interior and Environment Appropriations Acts for Fiscal Year 2018 (H.R. 3354), Fiscal Year 2017 (H.R. 5538), Fiscal Year 2016 (H.R. 2822), Fiscal Year 2008 (H.R. 2643), and Fiscal Year 2007 (H.R. 5386), and were adopted by voice vote.

Mr. Chair, surveys indicate that some urban forests are in serious danger.

In the past 30 years alone, we have lost 30 percent of all our urban trees—a loss of over 600 million trees.

Eighty percent of the American population lives in the dense quarters of a city.

Reforestation programs return a tool of nature to a concrete area that can help to remove air pollution, filter out chemicals and agricultural waste in water, and save communities millions of dollars in storm water management costs.

I have certainly seen neighborhoods in Houston benefit from urban reforestation.

In addition, havens of green in the middle of a city can have beneficial effects on a community's health, both physical and psychological, as well as increase property value of surrounding real estate.

Reforestation of cities is an innovative way of combating urban sprawl and deterioration.

Mr. Chair, a real commitment to enhancing our environment involves both the protection of existing natural resources and active support for restoration and improvement projects.

Several years ago, American Forests, a leading conservation group, estimated that the tree cover lost in the greater Washington metropolitan area from 1973 to 1997 resulted in an additional 540 million cubic feet of storm water runoff annually, which would have taken more than \$1 billion in storm water control facilities to manage.

Trees breathe in carbon dioxide, and produce oxygen.

People breathe in oxygen and exhale carbon dioxide.

A typical person consumes about 38 pounds of oxygen per year.

A healthy tree, say a 32 ft tall ash tree, can produce about 260 lb of oxygen annually—two trees supply the oxygen needs of a person for a year.

Trees help reduce pollution by capturing particulates like dust and pollen with their leaves.

A mature tree absorbs from 120 to 240 pounds of the small particles and gases of air pollution.

Trees help combat the effects of “greenhouse” gases, the increased carbon dioxide produced from burning fossil fuels that is causing our atmosphere to “heat up.”

Trees help cool down the overall city environment by shading asphalt, concrete and metal surfaces.

Buildings and paving in city centers create a heat-island effect.

A mature tree canopy reduces air temperatures by about 5–10 degrees Fahrenheit.

A 25 foot tree reduces annual heating and cooling costs of a typical residence by 8 to 12 percent, producing an average annual savings of \$120 per American household.

Proper tree plantings around buildings can slow winter winds, and reduce annual energy use for home heating by 4–22 percent.

Mr. Chair, trees play a vital role in making our cities more sustainable and more livable.

The Jackson Lee Amendment simply provides for continued support to programs like Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnerships that reforest our urban areas.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the Jackson Lee Amendment and thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their courtesies, consideration, and very fine work in putting together this legislation.

[From Science Daily, Apr. 18, 2018]

CITIES AND COMMUNITIES IN THE US LOSING 36 MILLION TREES A YEAR

Source: USDA Forest Service—Northern Research Station

Summary: Nationally, urban/community tree cover declined from 42.9 percent to 42.2 percent between 2009–2014. This translates to losing an estimated 36 million trees or approximately 175,000 acres of tree cover annually.

Scientists with the USDA Forest Service estimate that between 2009 and 2014, tree cover in the Nation's urban/community areas declined by 0.7 percent, which translates to losing an estimated 36 million trees or approximately 175,000 acres of tree cover annually. Pavement and other impervious cover increased at a rate of about 167,000 acres a year during the same period, according to research by USDA Forest Service scientists.

Nationally, urban/community tree cover declined from 42.9 percent to 42.2 percent. Twenty-three states had a statistically significant decrease in tree cover, with a total of 45 states showing a net decline. Trees improve air and water quality, reduce summer energy costs by cooling homes, reduce noise, mitigate runoff and flooding, and enhance human health and well-being, making them important to human health and urban and community infrastructure. The annual benefits derived from U.S. urban forests due to air pollution removal, carbon sequestration, and lowered building energy use and consequent altered power plant emissions are estimated at \$18 billion.

The study by Dave Nowak and Eric Greenfield of the USDA Forest Service's Northern Research Station, “Declining urban and community tree cover in the United States,” was published in the journal *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*.

A table showing tree cover and impervious cover change by state is available at: <https://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/news/release/resources/cities-communities-losing-tree-cover/>

“Urban forests are a vital part of the nation's landscape,” said Tony Ferguson, Director of the Forest Service's Northern Research Station and the Forest Products Laboratory. “Forest Service research puts knowledge and tools into the hands of urban forest managers that supports stewardship and the wise allocation of resources.”

States or districts with the greatest annual net percent loss in urban/community tree cover were Rhode Island and the District of Columbia (minus 0.44 percent), Georgia (minus 0.40 percent), and Alabama and Nebraska (minus 0.32 percent each). States with the greatest annual net loss in tree cover were Georgia (minus 18,830 acre/year), Florida (minus 18,060 acre/year) and Alabama (minus 12,890 acre/year).

Three states—Mississippi, Montana and New Mexico—had slight, nonsignificant increases in urban/community tree cover. Nationally, Maine has the highest percent tree cover in urban/community areas with 68 percent tree cover. At 10 percent tree cover, North Dakota ranked as having the lowest percent urban/community tree cover.

“Urban forests are an important resource,” said Nowak. “Urban foresters, planners and decision-makers need to understand trends in urban forests so they can develop and maintain sufficient levels of tree cover—and the accompanying forest benefits—for current and future generations of citizens.”

As of 2010, urban land occupied 3 percent, or 68 million acres, of the United States, while urban/community land occupied just over 6 percent of the United States, or 141 million acres.

Overall, urban/community impervious cover had a statistically significant increase from 14.5 percent to 15.1 percent (an increase of 0.6 percent). States with the greatest annual net percent increase in impervious cover were Delaware (0.28 percent), Iowa (0.26 percent), and Colorado, Kansas and Ohio (0.24 percent each). States with the greatest annual net increase in impervious cover were Texas (17,590 acre/year), Florida (13,900 acre/year) and Ohio (8,670 acre/year).

[From Phys.org, Sept. 9, 2014]

RESEARCHERS SUGGEST REFORESTATION
AROUND URBAN AREAS TO REDUCE OZONE
LEVELS

(By Bob Yirka)

A team of research conservationists with members from several universities in the U.S. is suggesting in a paper they've had published in Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, that urban areas could benefit by investing in cost effective reforestation efforts around urban areas that currently suffer from high ozone levels. Planting trees, they suggest could help cities bring those levels down.

The researchers note that despite aggressive efforts by many metropolitan areas to lower ozone levels in ground level air, levels remain high, causing the populations that live in them to live with an increased risk of health problems—prior research has indicated that as many as 152,000 premature deaths each year can be attributed to the damage ozone inflicts on lungs. Current efforts to combat ozone levels are aimed at the source, factory emissions, etc. Laws limiting emissions have not kept up with growth however, leading to increases in ozone levels.

The researchers suggest a different approach—remove the ozone by planting trees. They suggest that land be purchased on the outskirts of cities with high ozone levels to be converted to forest—trees they note, remove both ozone, and one of its precursors.

To bolster their point, the researchers looked at the Houston metro area in Texas, a part of the country with consistently high ozone levels. Land that is currently used for agriculture on the outskirts, they claim, could be purchased and replanted with trees, creating a 1.5-square-mile forest. They estimate that over a 30 year period, the reforested area could reduce ozone and precursors in ground-level air by 310 tons. They also note that if fast growing trees were planted, timber harvests could help make up initial outlays and loss of local revenue from agricultural products.

The researchers also plotted potential targets on a map of the U.S., highlighting areas where reforestation would likely do the most good—along the 1-95 corridor in the north-east, for example, and around Chicago, Detroit and many parts of California. The team concludes by noting that if something isn't

done, the problem of ozone pollution is only likely to get worse in the face of both continued growth and as global warming exacerbates the problem.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, although the base bill already continues to support this program at the fiscal year 2018 level, I am happy to accept this amendment, as I have for the past 2 years.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from California.

As I indicated, I think that creating the additional legislative history of the importance of this particular program is what I hope will strengthen it.

May I ask, Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member, to discuss the urban reforestation program, and I thank her for her leadership.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for this opportunity. I also thank the chairman of our subcommittee for accepting the amendment.

Mr. Chair, many cities don't have urban wildlife refuges nearby, and to address that challenge, the Service has 21 Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnerships spanning the country. These partnerships have nourished an appreciation of wildlife conservation to new audiences, and I have seen them in action, empowering local community organizations to inspire conservation in local parks and other natural areas.

I just want to list a few of these urban partnerships that can be found: New Haven; Chicago; Houston; Providence; Seattle; Baltimore; Los Angeles; Albuquerque; Santa Barbara; Yonkers; New Orleans; Denver; Philadelphia; Atlanta; Springfield, Massachusetts; Anchorage; Cincinnati; the twin cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, St. Paul being my hometown; Elizabeth, New Jersey; West Palm Beach, Florida; San Juan; and Alamo, Texas.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to learn more about this program.

Once again, I thank the gentlewoman for the time, and I thank Chairman CALVERT for accepting this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, let me conclude my remarks by saying I have certainly seen neighborhoods in Houston benefit from urban reforestation. In addition, havens of green in the middle of a city

can have beneficial effects on a community's health, both physical and psychological, as well as increased property values of surrounding real estate. But when you have had a drought, you know how important this program is. Reforestation of cities is an innovative way of combating urban sprawl and deterioration.

Finally, let me say, photosynthesis, how many of us remember that in our classrooms? I love that process. That happens in plants, generally involves the green pigment chlorophyll, and generates oxygen as a byproduct, cleaning the air. That is what these programs do in urban America.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in House Report 115-830.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, 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, I thank the ranking member and the chairman of this committee for considering my amendment.

My amendment is prohibiting the use of appropriated funds to limit museum outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution. Again, for programs like this, this is to advocate and create the legislative history of the importance of these programs, and I am glad to have this amendment presented to the Congress at this time.

Mr. Chair, in order to fulfill the Smithsonian's mission—the increase and diffusion of knowledge—the Smithsonian seeks to serve an even greater audience, and this has come about over the years by bringing the Smithsonian to enclaves of communities who otherwise would be deprived of the vast amount of cultural history offered by the Smithsonian.

The Smithsonian's outreach program serves millions of Americans, thousands of communities, and hundreds of institutions in all 50 States through loans of objects, traveling exhibitions,

and sharing of educational resources via publications, lectures, presentations, training programs, and websites.

Let me say from personal experience, one of my predecessors, the Honorable Mickey Leland, that many people know died in an airplane going into an Ethiopian mountain trying to bring food to starving people in Eritrea and Ethiopia, had introduced the first bill for a museum dealing with slave history. He did not live to see that legislation go forward, but later, JOHN LEWIS introduced the legislation to create the Smithsonian Museum of African American History and Culture.

We have it today, and it is a museum that has seen more people attend it, and the outreach is crucial: the board members, who are so proud to be a part of it, and the Congressional Black Caucus, that was the anchor of passing this legislation. Now we have an outstanding exhibit on Oprah Winfrey, and all are there to see this historic figure and many others.

It is important that the Smithsonian Air and Space Museum and many others have the opportunity to reach out to Americans and let them know of these very special resources, these assets that are here.

So this is a very important emphasis to have, and I would like to make sure that we continue to do it robustly so that more Americans can know their history.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of my amendment to Division A of H.R. 6147, the "Interior and Environment Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2019."

Let me also thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this bill to the floor.

Among other agencies, this legislation funds the Smithsonian Institution, which operates our national museums, including the Air and Space Museum; the Museum of African Art; the Museum of the American Indian; and the National Portrait Gallery.

The Smithsonian also operates another national treasure: the National Zoo.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple but it sends a very important message from the Congress of the United States.

The Jackson Lee amendment simply provides that:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution.

This amendment is identical to amendments I offered to the Interior and Environment Appropriations Acts for FY2017 (H.R. 3354) and FY2016 (H.R. 2822) that were approved by voice vote.

Mr. Chair, the Smithsonian's outreach programs bring Smithsonian scholars in art, history and science out of "the nation's attic" and into their own backyard.

Each year, millions of Americans visit the Smithsonian in Washington, D.C.

But in order to fulfill the Smithsonian's mission, "the increase and diffusion of knowledge," the Smithsonian seeks to serve an

even greater audience by bringing the Smithsonian to enclaves of communities who otherwise would be deprived of the vast amount of cultural history offered by the Smithsonian.

The Smithsonian's outreach programs serve millions of Americans, thousands of communities, and hundreds of institutions in all 50 states, through loans of objects, traveling exhibitions, and sharing of educational resources via publications, lectures and presentations, training programs, and websites.

Smithsonian outreach programs work in close cooperation with Smithsonian museums and research centers, as well as with 144 affiliate institutions and others across the nation.

The Smithsonian's outreach activities support community-based cultural and educational organizations around the country.

They ensure a vital, recurring, and high-impact Smithsonian presence in all 50 states through the provision of traveling exhibitions and a network of affiliations.

Smithsonian outreach programs increase connections between the Institution and targeted audiences (African American, Asian American, Latino, Native American, and new American) and provide kindergarten through college-age museum education and outreach opportunities.

These outreach programs enhance K–12 science education programs, facilitate the Smithsonian's scholarly interactions with students and scholars at universities, museums, and other research institutions; and disseminate results related to the research and collections strengths of the Institution.

The programs that provide the critical mass of Smithsonian outreach activity are:

1. the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service (SITES);
2. the Smithsonian Affiliations, the Smithsonian Center for Education and Museum Studies (SCEMS);
3. National Science Resources Center (NSRC);
4. the Smithsonian Institution Press (SIP);
5. the Office of Fellowships (OF); and
6. the Smithsonian Associates (TSA), which receives no federal funding.

To achieve the goal of increasing public engagement, SITES directs some of its federal resources to develop Smithsonian Across America: A Celebration of National Pride.

This "mobile museum," which will feature Smithsonian artifacts from the most iconic (presidential portraits, historic American flags, Civil War records, astronaut uniforms, etc.) to the simplest items of everyday life (family quilts, prairie schoolhouse furnishings, historic lunch boxes, multilingual store front and street signs, etc.), has been a long-standing organizational priority of the Smithsonian.

SITES "mobile museum" is the only traveling exhibit format able to guarantee audience growth and expanded geographic distribution during sustained periods of economic retrenchment, but also because it is imperative for the many exhibitors nationwide who are struggling financially yet eager to participate in Smithsonian outreach.

For communities still struggling to fully recover from the economic downturn, the ability of museums to present temporary exhibitions, the "mobile museum" promises to answer an ever-growing demand for Smithsonian shows in the field.

A single, conventional SITES exhibit can reach a maximum of 12 locations over a two- to three-year period.

In contrast, a "mobile museum" exhibit can visit up to three venues per week in the course of only one year, at no cost to the host institution or community.

The net result is an increase by 150 in the number of outreach locations to which SITES shows can travel annually.

And in addition to its flexibility in making short-term stops in cities and towns from coast-to-coast, a "mobile museum" has the advantage of being able to frequent the very locations where people live, work, and take part in leisure time activities.

By establishing an exhibit presence in settings like these, SITES will not only increase its annual visitor participation by 1 million, but also advance a key Smithsonian performance objective: to develop exhibit approaches that address diverse audiences, including population groups not always affiliated with mainstream cultural institutions.

SITES also will be the public exhibitions' face of the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture, as that new Museum comes online.

Providing national access to projects that will introduce the American public to the Museum's mission, SITES in FY 2008 will tour such stirring exhibitions as NASA ART: 50 Years of Exploration; 381 Days: The Montgomery Bus Boycott Story; Beyond: Visions of Planetary Landscapes; The Way We Worked: Photographs from the National Archives; and More Than Words: Illustrated Letters from the Smithsonian's Archives of American Art.

To meet the growing demand among smaller community and ethnic museums for an exhibition celebrating the Latino experience, SITES provided a scaled-down version of the National Museum of American History's 4,000-square-foot exhibition about legendary entertainer Celia Cruz.

Two 1,500-square-foot exhibitions, one about Crow Indian history and the other on basket traditions, will give Smithsonian visitors beyond Washington a taste of the Institution's critically acclaimed National Museum of the American Indian.

Two more exhibits, "In Plane View" and "Earth from Space," provided visitors an opportunity to experience the Smithsonian's recently opened, expansive National Air and Space Museum Udvar-Hazy Center.

For almost 30 years, The Smithsonian Associates—the highly regarded educational arm of the Smithsonian Institution—has arranged Scholars in the Schools programs.

Through this tremendously successful and well-received educational outreach program, the Smithsonian shares its staff—hundreds of experts in art, history and science—with the national community at a local level.

The mission of Smithsonian Affiliations is to build a strong national network of museums and educational organizations in order to establish active and engaging relationships with communities throughout the country.

There are currently 138 affiliates located in the United States, Puerto Rico, and Panama.

By working with museums of diverse subject areas and scholarly disciplines, both emerging and well-established, Smithsonian Affiliations is building partnerships through which audiences and visitors everywhere will be able to share in the great wealth of the Smithsonian while building capacity and expertise in local communities.

The National Science Resources Center (NSRC) strives to increase the number of ethnically diverse students participating in effective science programs based on NSRC products and services.

The Center develops and implements a national outreach strategy that will increase the number of school districts (currently more than 800) that are implementing NSRC K–8 programs.

The NSRC is striving to further enhance its program activity with a newly developed scientific outreach program introducing communities and school districts to science through literacy initiatives.

In addition, through the building of the multicultural Alliance Initiative, the Smithsonian's outreach programs seek to develop new approaches to enable the public to gain access to Smithsonian collections, research, education, and public programs that reflect the diversity of the American people, including underserved audiences of ethnic populations and persons with disabilities.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the Jackson Lee Amendment and thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their courtesies, consideration, and very fine work in putting together this excellent legislation.

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

□ 1930

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise to approve the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I have no objection to the gentlewoman's amendment. It was accepted last year by voice vote, and I encourage adoption of the gentlewoman's amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member, and thank her again for her leadership.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for the time, and I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for accepting this amendment.

The chairman and I know the importance of museums and the wealth of knowledge that they share with the American public. And when we have the Smithsonian Day at our hearings, when the chairman puts the gavel down, everybody is in attendance to see what the Smithsonian is going to bring to the history lesson that it is going to share with the Members of our committee.

We are inspired, just as these museums inspire people of all ages, to better understand our world, and our place in it.

I am very pleased that the Smithsonian is going to be able to go forward

with its public outreach programs, including exhibitions, programs, and online resources, which anybody can access. It ensures that as many Americans as possible can benefit from their vast collections.

At the Science Museum of Minnesota, we call it "Museum in a Box," and I am glad the Smithsonian is going to continue with that.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, let me thank the gentlewoman for really letting us know what a joy the Smithsonian is, even in front of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chair, I want to emphasize that the Smithsonian outreach programs increase connections between the Institution and targeted audiences: African Americans, Asian Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, and new Americans, and provide kindergarten through college age music education and outreach opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, I failed to say that when we were putting this together, once the African American museum was established, the museum personnel leadership, Dr. Lonnie Bunch, went on the road across America collecting artifacts from African Americans and historic families to put in this museum, real items of slave history and the history from through the years, through the centuries, and it made the museum a living example of the history of our time here in the United States.

That has been done by the Smithsonian in many different groups. And so I would offer this article that says: "New National Data Reveals the Economic Impact of Museums Is More Than Double Previous Estimates."

The American Alliance of Museums released two groundbreaking reports revealing indisputable evidence that museums contribute more to the United States economy than previously thought and have widespread support.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I would like to include in the RECORD this American Alliance of Museums report dated February 13, 2018.

[From the American Alliance of Museums, Feb. 13, 2018]

NEW NATIONAL DATA REVEALS THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF MUSEUMS IS MORE THAN DOUBLE PREVIOUS ESTIMATES

(By Laura Lott)

ARLINGTON, VA.—The American Alliance of Museums (AAM), the only organization representing the entire scope of the museum community, today released two groundbreaking reports revealing indisputable evidence that museums contribute more to the United States economy than previously thought and have widespread public support that transcends political affiliations and geographic locations.

Armed with the two new reports and a wealth of data, on February 27 hundreds of museum professionals will visit with members of Congress and their staff to ask them to support funding for vital federal agencies and tax incentives for charitable donations. The Fiscal Year 2019 budget proposal announced by President Trump yesterday calls for the elimination of multiple agencies that support the arts and humanities.

"Never before in the 112-year history of the Alliance have we possessed such comprehensive and statistically robust studies to support what we've always known," said Alliance President and CEO Laura Lott. "Our legislators, policymakers, funders, and trustees can be confident in the fact that museums are important economic engines that support jobs and bring revenue to their local communities. In addition, our studies show that the American public is overwhelmingly supportive of museums in general, and specifically supports maintaining or increasing their federal funding."

TWO REPORTS REINFORCE THE VALUE OF MUSEUMS

The first study, Museums as Economic Engines, reveals that museums support 726,000 jobs in the United States, and directly employ 372,100 people, more than double that of the professional sports industry, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The study, conducted by Oxford Economics with the support of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, shows that for every \$100 of economic activity created by museums, an additional \$220 is created in other sectors of the US economy as a result of supply chain and employee expenditure impacts. These impacts mean that museums contribute approximately \$50 billion to the US economy each year, a number that's more than twice previous estimates.

The report is also the first to show that US museums generate more than \$12 billion per year in tax revenue to federal, state, and local governments. The museum field's largest economic impact is on the leisure and hospitality industry (approximately \$17 billion), but it also generates approximately \$12 billion in the financial activities sector and approximately \$3 billion each in the education/health services and manufacturing sectors.

Museums provide important economic impacts to every part of the nation. The top 10 states driving this impact are geographically diverse and account for 57 percent of the gross value added to the national economy. States with the highest economic impact from the museum sector included California (\$6.6 billion), New York (\$5.4 billion), and Texas (\$3.9 billion). However, those that rely most heavily on museums due to their relatively higher concentration include the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Wyoming, and Alaska.

The second report, Museums & Public Opinion, examines the opinions of Americans concerning museums, their educational and economic value, as well as their thoughts about federal funding and support for museums in their community. Conducted jointly by AAM and Wilkening Consulting, the study was fielded by the market research experts at Ipsos and polled more than 2,000 Americans. The survey results overwhelmingly demonstrate the high degree to which Americans believe in and support their museums, regardless of political affiliation, geographic location, and whether they visit museums or not:

97 percent believe that museums provide valuable educational experiences to their communities

89 percent recognize the important economic contributions and jobs that museums bring

96 percent would approve of elected officials who act to support museums including acting to maintain or increase federal funding.

"The data speaks clearly: whether urban or rural, conservative or liberal, or a museum-goer or not, Americans treasure the museums in their communities and want elected officials to support them," Lott said.

Findings from the two reports will be discussed by leaders from the Alliance and its research partners February 26 at Museums Advocacy Day in Washington, DC and May 7 at the Alliance's Annual Meeting & Museum Expo in Phoenix.

CONGRESSIONAL HONOREES

During Museums Advocacy Day, the Alliance will present awards to legislators who have demonstrated exemplary support for the nation's museums:

Senator Lisa Murkowski (R-AK) used her position on the Senate Appropriations Committee to advocate for funding for key federal agencies. She is also an original cosponsor of legislation that would reauthorize the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

Representative Suzanne Bonamici (D-OR) is a co-founder of the Congressional STEAM Caucus, and a leader in seeking funding that will help school districts provide a well-rounded education.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. JODY B. HICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 69 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Environmental Justice Small Grants Program of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the Office of Environmental Justice, also known as the OEJ, was established within the Environmental Protection Agency, the EPA, in 1992, in order to assess environmental concerns with the potential of affecting disadvantaged communities.

To bring about this goal, the OEJ set in motion the Environmental Justice Small Grants Program in 1994. While this grants program initially sought to overcome environmental issues that could hurt underprivileged communities, it has, unfortunately, devolved into a platform for political activism, in addition to offering services typically powered by State and local governments.

Furthermore, in recent years, the Environmental Justice Small Grants Program has been used for purposes entirely unrelated to the office's stated mission. Examples would be: funding

educational programs on urban gardening, creating healthy environments for nail salons, or the so-called negative consequences of automobile dependency.

While some of these projects may be commendable, the bulk are not within the scope of the constitutional responsibilities delegated to the Federal Government.

Our country currently shoulders \$21 trillion in debt and we should not be subsidizing what would otherwise be State initiatives and local projects. It is for these reasons that I have introduced my amendment to discontinue funding for the OEJ Small Grants Program. This will allow the EPA to refocus millions of taxpayer funds toward the Agency's core mission over the next decade, and I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I want my colleagues to listen closely to what this amendment does. It prohibits funds to support the EPA's Environmental Justice Small Grants Program, which, since its inception in 1994, has awarded funding to local and Tribal organizations working with communities facing environmental justice issues.

These grants support and empower low-income communities to understand and address exposure to environmental harms and risks.

If there is a problem, if there is a grant that hasn't been done properly, then it is Congress' responsibility to do oversight. So, in my opinion, there should be no Member of this body that supports cutting these critical funds. If there are problems, we should be re-requesting oversight.

This is a case of David versus Goliath. With this amendment, small communities would be left defenseless when confronted with corporations that come in and sometimes cause illness due to their underlying pursuit of profit over human health.

Examples of these programs supported by these grants are: a program to promote Baltimore residents' awareness of lead health risks and lead abatement services. It is important to provide education:

Working with the residents in Puerto Rico to clean up coastal areas and reduce solid waste and aquatic debris. I was just recently in Puerto Rico watching the EPA work and clean up the debris, the unimaginable debris of the hurricanes that went through last year.

Working in Lawrence, Massachusetts, in one of the poorest and most populated cities in New England to educate families about lead contamination in soil, and, yes, sometimes that means knowing what is in the garden, what is in the yard, what is in the play-

ground, as children touch soil contaminated by lead and then touch their faces and their mouths. The negative effect of growing vegetables in lead-contaminated soil can be life changing for children.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would, again, just reiterate the fact that this grant program is not doing the job that it was designed to do. It is not even doing things that are related to the stated mission. It is a waste of taxpayer dollars, and for that, it is not something that we should continue funding.

It has lost its purpose. It has lost its mission, and it just simply is not necessary to continue funding. When we talk about the issues happening in Puerto Rico or other parts of the world, we have FEMA and we have other avenues to deal with serious problems like what happened in Puerto Rico and other places in our country, and those means are working effectively.

But to simply waste funds on a grant program that directly is involved in activities unrelated to their own mission statement, is not something that we should be involved in. As a result, this amendment has been endorsed by a number of organizations, such as: the Competitive Enterprise Institute, Heritage Action, Citizens Against Government Waste, Club for Growth, FreedomWorks, Free Market America, and a host of organizations who are concerned about the direction our country is going financially and are supportive of stopping the waste here.

So I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I would gently remind the gentleman from Georgia that Puerto Rico is a territory of the United States. It is not a foreign entity.

I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), my dear friend and chairman of the committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman, and I must rise in reluctant opposition.

I wish I could have worked with the gentleman on this amendment, but this amendment reaches a little too far and is inconsistent even with the Trump administration's position.

This year the President requested \$2 million for the Environmental Justice Small Grants Program which would provide financial assistance to low income, minority, and Tribal populations, which we deal with quite often.

This amendment would prohibit EPA's ability to issue grants altogether, which means all of the Office of Environmental Justice funds would be allocated to the payroll and personnel and could result in the hiring of more EPA staff, and I am sure that is not your intention. And so there would be

no savings according to the CBO. Zero. No savings at all in this amendment. I don't believe that is your intent.

Because the amendment would have unintended consequences, I must oppose the amendment.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate these comments. What we are dealing with would simply do away with funding of the small grants part of this program where those funds are not being used according to the mission.

Mr. Chair, I continue to ask for support from my colleagues, keeping in mind the multiple organizations that are supportive of this amendment. I ask my colleagues to support this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman very much and I am glad that she emphasized the work that the Environmental Justice grants have done in Puerto Rico, and the fact that they are citizens of the United States.

But I have seen what the Environmental Justice grants have done because they are small. As Mr. CALVERT indicated, the administration recommended \$2 million. These grants are small, and they help communities clean up. They help communities deal with violators of environmental rules, both in the State and Federal, mostly State, and gives them the ability to clean and deal with neighborhood issues. That is how small these grants are.

It also has provided assistance to Environmental Justice clinics that can work with community organizations on how to petition for something that is both an eyesore and environmental damage, to rid it of it, or to get the entity, the corporation, the small business, whatever it is, to clean it up. It makes it better for all concerned.

Mr. Chair, I would just ask and recognize that this is part of civic participation, and these grants should be allowed.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I just have to ask the question. Tragedies like the water crisis in Flint, Michigan, demonstrate the issues surrounding environmental justice to continue to persist in our country. So the question is: When did it become partisan to ensure children drink clean water?

This amendment ignores the need to identify and address disproportionately high adverse human health and environmental effects on minority and low-income populations. I urge, I implore the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Chair, if he suspects that there is waste in this program, let's do the oversight together.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and to stand with communities and the disenfranchised over corporations.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

□ 1945

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay attorney's fees pursuant to a settlement in any case, in which the Federal Government is a party, that arises under—

(1) the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(2) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.); or

(3) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment, which seeks to crack down on the practice commonly known as sue and settle.

When Federal agencies settle lawsuits with outside advocacy groups behind closed doors, the outcome is pretty much what you would expect: costly new regulatory burdens with taxpayers picking up the tab.

That is exactly how sue and settle works. Federal agencies accept lawsuits from outside advocacy organizations and, rather than defend themselves, proceed to settle that lawsuit in a closed-door agreement, resulting in new and more costly regulations.

It is bad enough that the taxpayer ultimately pays for these regulations, but under current law, it is the taxpayer footing the bill for attorneys' fees for these outside organizations. That is absurd.

My amendment prevents American taxpayer dollars from being used to pay the legal fees of outside advocacy

groups for settlements under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act. Organizations can still sue whomever they want, but they cannot do it on the backs of taxpayers.

Fortunately, we are making progress to end this practice. In the House, we have passed this amendment several times before, and the Trump administration has taken notice of our efforts. The Trump administration sees this practice for what it is: an abuse of our regulator process that must be reined in.

The EPA announced last fall that it will no longer pay attorneys' fees as part of the settlement process and will ensure stakeholders have input and a more transparent settlement process. This amendment will help bolster the administration's efforts to stop this abusive practice.

The Trump administration realizes that nowhere is the cost of these settlements more painful than in the environmental regulatory context. The result of these lawsuits is hundreds of new regulations and tens of millions—even billions—of dollars in compliance costs.

If that isn't bad enough, as part of the agreements, agencies are often required to reprioritize their agendas, allocating limited resources to the priorities of these interest groups rather than priorities designated by Congress or ones that have received public and stakeholder input.

The American people are tired of our unaccountable Federal Government, and we have the opportunity to do something about it. This is a necessary step to rein in overregulation and bring transparency back to the regulatory process.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I am a little confused, because it would be only when the Trump administration would decide to be a party of a lawsuit that this judgment would ever be used. So I would assume that you would trust the Trump administration to be overly judicious before involving itself with any suit, would you not?

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I support the Trump administration, but I also support our duty under the Constitution to make sure we tell the executive what to do.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, that is why I am confused, because this would be the Trump administration. The gentleman said, if I heard him correctly, Mr. Chair, that he would expect the Trump administration to be very judicious in using this.

So I find this amendment is extraneous. It puts the same parameters on attorneys' fees under the ESA, the Clean Air Act, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act that are already in place for attorneys' fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act.

The Equal Access to Justice Act already caps the hourly rate of attorneys' fees, unless the court determines an increase in the cost of living or special factors such as limited availability of qualified attorneys for the proceedings justifies a higher fee. And it requires the party to be a prevailing party.

Mr. Chairman, we don't need to add an extraneous, redundant provision to a bill that is already overburdened with harmful legislative riders, especially when I trust that the Trump administration would be very limited and very judicious in ever using this.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment. I reserve the balance of my time and my right to close.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

This amendment would block funds used by the agencies to pay legal fees under any lawsuit settlement that arises under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

While the intent of these pieces of legislation was good, serial litigants and special interest groups have turned these laws into tools used to block access to our forests and our mineral resources.

In Montana, we have a litigation problem, as many of our forest management projects are locked up by environmental extremists filing frivolous lawsuits. Agencies spend more time behind a desk and more resources defending their actions than they do working on our lands.

These lawyers continue to get richer as Montana's landscape goes up in smoke and taxpayer funds are wasted.

This same amendment passed the House last September, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment again.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to close.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), who is the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. Suing the government and settling has become a lucrative business that is supported by taxpayer dollars. The Endangered Species Act, for example, has become wrapped around the axle of the judicial system by excessive litigation.

We are essentially paying people to sue the Federal Government. This needs to stop.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an "aye" vote on the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the sue-and-settle practice cuts stakeholders and the public out of the regulatory process. It undermines the Article I authority we hold here in Congress.

By restricting the payment of legal fees, we take away the incentive for these environmental advocacy groups to sue the Federal Government, and we protect public input in the rulemaking process.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment is unnecessary and duplicative. The Equal Access to Justice Act already provides a framework for legal fees related to cases in which the Federal Government is a party. I find myself standing here as a Democrat, a person who has been resisting almost everything that President Trump has been trying to do in the environmental arena and other arenas that affect healthcare and so much more, but I find myself defending the Trump administration's right in which they are a party to participate in the Equal Access to Justice Act, just as I did for President Obama's administration.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to stop, take a minute, think about what this amendment is really doing, and agree with me that we should oppose this amendment. We should not stop the Federal Government when it is involved in cases and is a party from participating in the Equal Access to Justice Act.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 71 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. LARSON 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 148, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000) (increased by \$100,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman

from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to require a Federal study on the financial impact of the disaster known as crumbling foundations that is plaguing parts of the Northeast, including my home State of Connecticut, Massachusetts, and with further study, we believe, it impacts much of the northeastern region of our country.

This amendment simply asks for the Treasury to lead a joint study with our Federal regulators to assess the financial impact of this disaster and provide recommendations to help mitigate Federal and local losses, and help these suffering homeowners who, through no fault of their own, have experienced a catastrophic disaster.

There is no one who has worked harder on this in our State of Connecticut than JOE COURTNEY. JOE has been a leader in this, organizing people in both the State and local arenas, as well as our two United States Senators BLUMENTHAL and MURPHY.

JOE has led the way, and I have had the fortune, along with State Senator Tim Larson, to travel to South Windsor, East Windsor, and Manchester, Connecticut, and witness the devastation and the heartache that these homeowners go through.

I know, looking out and seeing Mr. YOUNG, he will remember what happened in the South with the famous, or infamous, China drywall. It is similar to that experience, where homeowners and individuals, through no fault of their own, experienced catastrophic loss.

We have been working tirelessly on this effort and feel that this study, in fact, will reveal the impact that it will have on homeowners, many of whose loans and homes have been backed by GSEs Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and even as we project out into the future, having Federal bases there where this concrete may have been used that has impacted the people there in a dramatic fashion.

As I indicated, nobody knows more about this issue and has studied it more thoroughly than Congressman JOE COURTNEY from the Second Congressional District.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) to explain further the issue of crumbling foundations.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. LARSON for yielding and, again, for offering this amendment, which has been part of a number of initiatives that we have worked on jointly together to deal with this issue.

Again, for the record, just to clarify what is going on here, a concrete quarry up in north central Connecticut,

which had been mining aggregate for foundations in homes, it turned out there was a material called pyrrhotite, which is an iron sulfide material that, over time, when it is exposed to moisture, rusts and cracks in a sickening fashion and results in the total collapse of home foundations.

The estimate is as high as 19,000 homes have had foundations using material from this quarry. As the gentleman pointed out, this has also occurred in western Massachusetts. It goes as far north, actually, as Three Rivers, Quebec, because it is a strain of pyrrhotite that runs from Canada down through New England.

This picture shows vividly the damage caused to a home in Coventry, Connecticut, where the repairs require you to lift the house, clean out the old foundation, pour a new foundation, and, again, lower the house back. It costs roughly about \$200,000.

We were able to secure a tax ruling from the Treasury Department that allows individuals like this homeowner in the picture to basically deduct those losses, which, again, is some relief.

Frankly, there is more that we need to bring to the table. The gentleman's amendment would allow the Federal regulators that set up the rules for lending banks and institutions to get some flexibility for loan-to-value ratio rules that occur when there are natural disasters.

□ 2000

Again, in Federal natural disasters in places like Florida and Texas, there is some flexibility to allow homeowners to get a loan perhaps above the loan-to-value ratios so they can, again, basically conduct repairs to make their houses habitable again. This amendment will set up that process.

Secretary Mnuchin, as the gentleman and I know we have met with personally, would be the Department that would organize this task force that the amendment contemplates.

Again, it is something which the banking industry in Connecticut and Massachusetts has expressed a strong interest in basically allowing some relief for homeowners who, again, have poured their heart and soul into their homes to be able to recover their losses.

I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. We had a similar amendment last night that was adopted by Mr. CALVERT. Again, I want to thank the majority for their understanding on this issue.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, I would also like to thank Secretary Mnuchin again for his outstanding work, his understanding and empathy, and the prompt manner in which they have taken up what, as you can imagine for these homeowners, is just catastrophic in nature. We want to commend him and also the Tax Advocate as well for their testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on this very important issue.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 72 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 156, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 157, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 221, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 224, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment No. 72 to provide additional funding for the Native American CDFI Assistance Program.

This program supports critical economic development in Native communities, which face significant barriers to accessing basic financial services and capital. For example, almost all Alaska Native villages in my State do not have banks and are not connected to the road system.

The Native program provides financial assistance and technical assistance awards on a competitive basis to Native CDFIs, allowing them to effectively build wealth and further economic self-determines in Native communities.

These mission-driven Native organizations are working to finance businesses, create jobs, expand and improve affordable housing options, and much more.

The Native program accounts for a small portion of the fund's overall budget but has a significant positive impact, which includes empowering Alaska Natives to improve their economic well-being in my home State.

Without my amendment, a cut to the Native program in FY 2019 would be especially devastating to our Nation's impoverished and underserved Native communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this noncontroversial bipartisan amendment to restore funding for the Native program.

My amendment, when considered with Representative STEVEN PALAZZO's CDFI amendment, would restore the program to the current enacted level of \$16 million so the Native organizations may continue growing small busi-

nesses, create jobs, and promote vital economic development in Native communities.

I would like to thank the Native CDFI Network and the amendment's cosponsors, Representative GWEN MOORE, COLLEEN HANABUSA, and TULSI GABBARD.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for introducing this amendment of which I am a proud cosponsor.

This amendment provides additional funding for the Native American CDFI Assistance Program, also known as NACA, which supports critical economic development in Native communities like mine in Hawaii, those in Alaska, and communities all across the country which already face significant barriers to accessing financial mainstream services and capital.

NACA accounts for a small portion of the CDFIs, but it provides significant support to Native CDFIs, including Native Hawaii organizations in my home State of Hawaii.

Of the \$22.7 million in CDFI awards made to Hawaii since the fund was launched, 41 percent of total dollars awarded came from this NACA Program. It has funded organizations like the Council for Native Hawaiian Advancement, which supports Native Hawaiian communities with homeownership counseling and mortgage loans, small business access to capital, and loans to farmers and ranchers.

While the NACA Program is unable to meet the demand by qualified Native CDFIs at its current funding level, a cut to NACA in FY 2019 would be especially devastating to our Nation's impoverished and underserved Native communities.

I urge my colleagues to join my colleague from Hawaii, Representative COLLEEN HANABUSA, and me to support this noncontroversial, bipartisan amendment to restore funding to NACA.

The amendment, when considered with Representative PALAZZO's CDFI amendment, would restore NACA to the current enacted level of \$16 million so that Native CDFIs may continue growing small businesses, creating jobs, and promoting vital economic opportunity and development in Native communities.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. This is a good amendment to this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 73 printed in House Report 115-830.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. 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 156, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 221, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 224, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, my amendment increases funding for community development financial institutions, CDFIs.

CDFIs are critical to New Mexican communities because they provide financial products like loans, investments, and tax credits to underserved communities, including poor, rural, and Tribal areas.

This helps New Mexican entrepreneurs obtain capital to start and grow small businesses. It enables pueblos to build housing, and it provides access to economic development opportunities for rural communities throughout my State.

There are currently 19 CDFIs in New Mexico, which have received \$48 million in Federal grants since 1996. In total, CDFIs have provided 14,700 loans worth more than \$830 million for New Mexico communities, organizations, and individuals. On average, every dollar in CDFI funding can be leveraged for 12 times that amount.

It should come as no surprise just how critical this funding is for the economic development of my State, which is still struggling to recover from the recession.

For example, when no other lenders would give them a loan, the Clinica la Esperanza in the South Valley received a \$31,000 loan from the Accion CDFI to provide much-needed primary care to residents in the South Valley. A few years later, the clinic received an additional \$76,000 from Accion to move to a larger location in order to serve a larger client base of 3,800 patients.

Another example of CDFI lending is Tiwa Lending Services, which provides loans and financial education to the Pueblo of Isleta and other surrounding Native American communities.

And just last month, Clearinghouse CDFI received a \$3.2 million grant to build affordable housing in several States, including New Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, the evidence is clear. CDFIs have proven to be successful drivers of economic growth and development in underserved areas. They create jobs, provide American opportunity, and stimulate growth.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to increase funding for CDFIs to help spur economic development in communities throughout the country.

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 Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 74 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. PALAZZO. 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 156, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$17,000,000)”.

Page 157, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 158, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$4,000,000)”.

Page 158, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple.

During committee markup of this bill, we were successful in adding a restoration of \$25 million to the CDFI fund. Because of the way the amendment was drafted in committee, this secondary amendment is necessary to designate the individual funds within the CDFI account.

The CDFI banks that this amendment seeks to assist provide essential financial products to underserved populations, often the poorest of the poor. Additionally, financial literacy education provided by CDFI banks is an invaluable service to our most at-risk and disadvantaged communities across the Nation.

Again, this amendment is purely clerical in nature and ensures that the \$25 million added at committee markup is equitably distributed between the separate CDFI funds so it can do the most good for our most needy.

Mr. Chair, I ask the House to pass this amendment to ensure these reach their intended recipients, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I was disappointed that this bill originally cut CDFI by \$59 million and was very supportive of the full committee amendment that Mr. PALAZZO offered to add \$25 million to the program, which passed with bipartisan support. This amendment simply allocates that increase among the various worthy programs in CDFI.

I am particularly pleased to note that the Bank Enterprise Award Program and Healthy Food Financing Initiative received some of the funding, although I would like to point out that this increase alone does not bring any of the individual programs to their enacted levels and still leaves CDFI \$34 million, or 14 percent, below the current level.

I urge support of the amendment and hope that we will be able to work towards getting the CDFI the additional increases it needs in conference.

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Seeing no other speakers, I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member for their support in committee for restoring the funds.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an “aye” vote on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 75 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. SOTO. 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 160, line 3, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)” before “shall”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, my amendment would increase funding for the Tax Counseling for the Elderly Program by \$1 million.

For this amendment, we are not taking the \$1 million from any other account. Rather, there is a \$2.4 billion account for taxpayer services, and this simply adds to the carveout from that total for Tax Counseling for the Elderly.

□ 2015

This amendment is identical to an amendment I offered last year that passed this body by a voice vote, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment again this year.

The Tax Counseling for the Elderly program offers free tax help for individuals who are aged 60 or older. Cooperative grant agreements are entered into between the IRS and eligible organizations to provide tax assistance to elderly taxpayers. These funds provided by the IRS are used by organizations to reimburse volunteers for their out-of-pocket expenses, including transportation, meals, and other expenses incurred by them in providing tax counseling assistance at locations convenient to the taxpayer.

This amendment will restore funding to this program at the level that passed both the House last year and the Congress in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment; I thank the chairman for his support; and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 76 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. SOTO. 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 160, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, my amendment would increase funding for the IRS's identity theft and refund fraud casework by \$500,000. For this amendment, we are not taking the \$500,000 from any account. Rather, there is a \$2.4 billion account for Taxpayer Services, and this simply adds to the carveout from that total for the Taxpayer Advocate Services identity theft and refund fraud casework.

This amendment will restore funding to this program at the level that passed the Congress in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018.

Last year, there were 597,000 tax returns with confirmed identity theft, resulting in \$6 billion in taxpayer refunds being affected.

Identity theft can be frustrating and confusing to victims. While identity thieves steal information from sources outside the tax system, the IRS is often the first to inform a victim that their identity has been stolen. The IRS is working hard to resolve identity theft cases as quickly as possible and has made considerable progress at closing backlogs; however, more work remains.

Fighting identity theft is an ongoing battle, as identity thieves continue to create new ways of stealing personal information and using it for their gain. Identity theft cases are among the most complex handled by the IRS. The IRS is continually reviewing processes and policies to minimize instances of identity theft and to help those who find themselves victimized.

We, as a Congress, should be giving the IRS the resources necessary to close backlogs and help our constituents as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment; I thank the chairman for his support; and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 77 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. CARBAJAL. 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:

Strike section 125 of title I of division B.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, this week President Trump's Treasury Secretary, Steven Mnuchin, decided that the agency will no longer collect information on donations to political nonprofits.

This administration will no longer require 501(c)(4) organizations to disclose their donors, including groups like the National Rifle Association, the NRA, that operates as a nonprofit, but also spends millions of dollars each year on lobbying and advertising to influence our elections.

This announcement comes the same week that the Department of Justice arrested and charged a known Russian foreign agent who had infiltrated the NRA, an organization that has received thousands of dollars from Russian nationals since 2015. The Treasury Secretary's decision this week only thickens the swamp by unleashing a new opportunity for dark money and money from foreign powers to continue to flood our upcoming midterm elections.

I believe that we need more transparency in our elections, not less. While super PACs are currently required to disclose donors, now 501(c)(4)s are not. If you were a donor looking to influence elections and wanted to hide your identity, the underlying bill is currently making 501(c)(4) organizations an even more attractive way to conceal contributions.

There is a provision in today's appropriations package that prohibits the IRS—from issuing guidance on whether an organization is operating exclusively for the promotion of social welfare purposes, as written in the IRS code for 501(c)(4) nonprofits, to ensure that no one is abusing our Tax Code to influence our elections.

My amendment simply strikes out that provision so that the IRS may issue guidance differentiating which groups are truly social welfare organizations with a charitable mission from political organizations abusing our nonprofit tax laws to hide their political donors from the public.

More and more, our elections are being driven by organizations that are

receiving hundreds of millions of dollars in unreported, secret donations. Dark money is strangling our democracy and silencing the will of the American people.

In the 2012 presidential election, dark-money groups such as these spent over a quarter of a billion dollars on partisan political advertising and other campaign activities. In 2014, we saw the greatest wave of secret, special-interest money ever raised in a congressional election.

Moreover, in 2016, dark-money groups spent nearly 10 times what they did the previous cycle, totaling over \$1.1 billion, and that pattern of undisclosed political spending continues to grow this year. These political nonprofit organizations are receiving tax-exempt treatment and are being allowed to corrupt Federal tax law meant to help social welfare organizations like volunteer firefighters, rotary clubs, and other community service groups.

Our current election laws make it impossible to know where this money is coming from or if it is coming from foreign adversaries, like we saw recently with the NRA. This amendment is not partisan and will only continue to allow the IRS to identify nonprofits that are spending significant amounts of their money to influence our elections, regardless of their party affiliation.

Mr. Chairman, at this pivotal moment in our democracy, I urge my colleagues who are serious about draining the swamp to take this small step towards increased transparency in our political process.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from California. We have carried this provision the past 3 years in this very same bill. In fact, it has been signed into law, not only by President Trump, but also by President Barack Obama. It has been bipartisan in nature.

Retaining section 125 continues the current state of affairs as we know it today on this very, very sensitive issue. The IRS has limited resources at this time, but a lot of demands on them. Taking this section away and impacting this regulation that clearly everyone hates—we should have the IRS use their resources for the things that it should be intended for: resources to improve customer service, to implement tax reform law that we recently passed, reducing tax fraud, and moving ahead in this new tax season.

Mr. Chairman, reluctantly, I have to rise in opposition and ask that we continue the current law as it stands today.

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the feedback from my colleague.

Mr. Chair, this will not detour or take away from the efficiency of the focus of work and spending of resources by the IRS. This only does a fundamental thing, and that is provide for more disclosure and transparency to ensure that the American public has sunshine on who is spending what resources through which organizations. This amendment merely provides that transparency.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'll close with this. I appreciate the gentleman's sentiments towards how the IRS should use their resources.

Being a member of the Appropriations Committee and a member of this subcommittee my entire time on the full committee, I can assure you that the IRS is operating at a level that was not last seen since about 2011. Their resources are tremendously limited at this time, and we would prefer that they focus on customer service and implementing the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act that we recently passed.

Mr. Chair, I'll continue to oppose the gentleman's amendment, ask the House to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. KUSTOFF
OF TENNESSEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 78 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. 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 185, line 8, after the dollar amount insert "(increase by \$5,000,000)".

Page 221, line 13, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

Page 224, line 19, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to increase funding for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program by \$5 million.

I have had numerous conversations with law enforcement throughout my district, and it is crystal clear that the opioid epidemic continues to be one of their primary concerns. Our drug task forces in the Eighth Congressional District desperately need these resources, as we have seen a spike in narcotics trafficking along Interstate 40 in Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, I know that many of my colleagues are having similar discussions in their district, so they understand just how serious this issue is becoming for the safety and the security of the American people. It is no secret that the spread of illegal drugs throughout west Tennessee and across the Nation leads to higher crime rates, which ultimately increases the financial strain on our local, State, and Federal law enforcement.

We must do more to support law enforcement in this fight. This amendment will provide necessary funds for additional equipment and man-hours to conduct and carry out lengthy investigations to arrest these drug traffickers. The brave men and women in uniform are working tirelessly on the front lines to combat the opioid epidemic, and we can't afford to simply sit back and watch.

We also must think of the resources needed to battle the drug addiction epidemic, such as the opioid crisis. The extra funding will take major steps to target these high-risk areas in a front-end approach to preventing the spread of the opioid crisis in our communities. We must be proactive now, because prevention is the best long-term solution.

I am a former United States attorney, and I have seen firsthand how much these funds can make a huge difference in forward progress. I believe that funding the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area program is a good first step to supporting our law enforcement and combating rampant opioid epidemics.

Law enforcement at the local, State, and Federal level have expressed support for this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same today.

I also want to thank my colleagues, Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mr. MCKINLEY, for their hard work and support of this amendment.

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

□ 2030

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MRS. MURPHY
OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 79 printed in House Report 115-830.

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 246, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, 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.

I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment, which I am proud to colead with the Congressman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), the Congressman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), and the Congressman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

This amendment would provide additional support for two important and successful initiatives overseen by the U.S. Small Business Administration.

First, it would increase funding for SBA Women's Business Centers by \$600,000. This amendment builds on a successful floor amendment I offered to last year's bill, which boosted funding for WBCs by \$1 million.

If our amendment is adopted, the House would provide a total of \$19 million for WBCs, a substantial funding level that I will work to retain when the House and the Senate meet to reconcile their respective bills.

There are more than 100 Women's Business Centers located across the country, each operated by a local non-profit organization that receives financial support from SBA and others. These WBCs provide business training, counseling, and mentoring geared to women, especially those who are socially and economically disadvantaged.

Every WBC tailors its services to the specific needs of the community in which it is located, but all provide training in finance, management, and marketing. They also help clients utilize SBA's suite of capital, counseling, and contracting programs.

My central Florida district is home to many talented entrepreneurs, and, yet, it currently lacks a WBC. If this amendment is adopted, it will increase the number of WBCs that can be established nationwide and increase the chances that a WBC will be established in the Orlando area. This would help many of my constituents start or grow their small businesses and, in doing so, further strengthen our local economy.

In addition, our amendment would increase funding for SBA's Veterans Outreach programs by \$400,000, from \$12.3 million to \$12.7 million.

Each year, SBA uses these resources to serve more than 200,000 veterans and their families, including service-disabled veterans. SBA provides veterans with business training and mentorship, and helps them obtain loans, apply for Federal contracts, and cultivate connections with commercial supply chains.

My support for these investments in our veterans is rooted in the belief that servicemembers have fought for our Nation, and, we, as a Nation, must fight for them, both while they are in the military and once they transition to civilian life.

Our amendment does not increase the total amount of funding appropriated by Congress in the bill, and it enhances support for WBCs and veterans programs without reducing support for any other priorities.

I thank the Rules Committee for allowing the House to consider this bipartisan amendment. I respectfully ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support 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 Florida (Mrs. MURPHY). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 80 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. POLIS. 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 248, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment. Employee-owned businesses are uniquely structured where the employer and the shareholders and the executives benefit, as well as the workers.

There are different forms of making sure that employees can participate in the success and capital growth of a company. Those include co-ops, cooperatives; ESOPs, which stands for employee stock ownership plans; stock options; profit sharing. There are a number of ways to do it.

But some of the key findings are that, over time, employees at employee-owned businesses, whether they are partially or entirely owned by employees, have greater success. The companies do better and the workers do better: higher wages; more savings for retirement; more sustainability; and more profitability as an enterprise, because it improves retention rates and employee morale.

I think that employee-owned businesses are an important market-oriented mechanism to reduce the wage gap between executives, shareholders, and workers. But it can be difficult for a business to transition to an employee-ownership model or a business structure that allows for accessing financing and capital markets to make that transition happen.

That is why I am sponsoring this amendment today to encourage the Small Business Administration to provide technical assistance, as well as education and outreach about existing programs, one of which is called the loan guarantee program, which is available to employee-owned businesses.

SBA loans are a critical resource for many small businesses, and the employee-owned loan guarantee program

is underutilized because a lot of lenders don't understand the unique nature of employee-owned businesses, especially smaller banks.

ESOPs can be a very compelling model, as can the other models of employee ownership. There are a number of successful employee-owned companies in the district I am honored to represent in northern Colorado, including New Belgium Brewing.

SBA loans are actually a critical part of helping companies make that transition to employee ownership, especially for small and mid-sized enterprises.

I encourage the adoption of my amendment to help employee-owned businesses access financing options that will help small businesses grow, and help our communities retain community, local employee ownership of small businesses. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment to highlight the role that SBA can play in making employee ownership options a real-life occurrence for more companies and people across our country.

Mr. Chairman, of course, there are a number of pieces of legislation, many of them bipartisan, under the jurisdiction of different committees with regard to how we can remove barriers to employee ownership in our economy. But this simple one before us today would simply encourage the SBA to provide technical assistance under current authorized, funded programs, to help make sure that there is a greater awareness about the opportunities of employee ownership, both for economic productivity as well as for reducing the equity and wage gap in our country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 81 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee for the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO), 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 264, strike lines 13 through 18.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes section 628 of the underlying bill prohibiting the Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, from issuing rules on disclosures for corporations spending money to influence our elections, primarily through paid advertising.

The Supreme Court's 2010 Citizens United decision means that corporations, even foreign-controlled corporations, are now allowed to spend unlimited amounts of money to influence American elections.

Publicly traded corporations can buy millions of dollars' worth of TV, social media, and radio ads without disclosing their political expenditures to their shareholders. This outside spending in our elections has created a greater need for Members to raise more money for their campaigns and less time legislating.

This has eroded the public's faith in our institutions and is damaging to our democracy. Families in my district and across the country are concerned about paying their children's tuition or medical bills, not spending thousands of dollars to influence Federal elections. Their voices shouldn't be drowned out by millions of dollars of secret special-interest advertising from corporations.

A corporation's main goal is to make a profit, not to improve the quality of life for all Americans. They shouldn't have a say in our elections without their shareholders and the public knowing about it.

That is why we cannot muzzle the SEC's ability to issue rules regarding disclosures for publicly traded corporations on all their political expenditures. Stockholders and voters have been clear: They want to know the details of the political donations of the companies they own and give their business to. In fact, more than 1.2 million comments have been submitted to the SEC requesting that they require political disclosure by publicly traded companies. That is the largest number of comments on a rule in the history of the agency.

Congress should stop standing in the way of the SEC's mission, which is to provide transparency to the markets and the public. This amendment does not infringe on a corporation's right to spend money on political activity. It would just allow the SEC to disclose what money is being spent.

This is yet another opportunity for my Republican colleagues to prevent special interests from gaining even more pull in Washington and begin draining that swamp. This should not be a Democrat or a Republican issue, and it goes to the heart of our democracy and maintaining a government that is of, by, and for the American people.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, since the courts have weighed in, Democrats have been attempting to use the securities laws to mandate the disclosure of

companies' political spending activities in order to name and shame companies from engaging in such free speech activity.

Time and time again, when the issue of political disclosure has come up as a shareholder proposal at every company's annual proxy meeting where it has been proposed, it has been shot down. It has been defeated.

In fact, according to Proxy Monitor, the average percentage vote in favor of a political disclosure shareholder proposal in 2016 was just 23 percent support. Shareholders have repeatedly weighed in against requiring disclosure of this information and do not believe it is important in making their own investment decisions regarding that company.

Our securities laws and disclosure requirements have always centered on the concept of materiality, as determined by the Supreme Court, whether an omitted fact is material by looking at "whether there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable shareholder would consider it important in deciding how to vote."

In fact, under the Obama administration, former SEC Chair Mary Jo White declined to advance a political disclosure rule, stating it was "not one of the priorities we are advancing."

Additionally, former Chair White was vocal about ensuring that disclosures were not causing informational overload for investors. As a member of the Financial Services Committee, we heard repeated—repeated—testimony on that fact.

This provision to prevent the SEC from issuing a political disclosure rule has continually been part of appropriations packages that have been signed into law by Presidents of both parties and should continue to stay as part of this package.

□ 2045

Now, earlier you heard that the mission of the SEC is to provide transparency. Let me read exactly what the mission of the Securities and Exchange Commission is:

"The mission of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission is to protect investors; maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and facilitate capital formation."

This simply does not fit into that tripartite mission of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Now, with that being said, nothing—and let me repeat that, nothing—prevents companies from voluntarily reporting this information if they believe that it is important for them to make such disclosures or for their shareholders to also vote that way.

So all companies, private and public, should remain free to do just that: make that decision as they decide is the best course for that particular company.

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, this is not about shaming anyone. This does

not restrict free speech or the ability of corporations to engage in political activity. It only allows the SEC to require disclosure of corporate political spending, a little bit of transparency providing disclosure to the public, so that they clearly know the companies that they are investing their money in.

Moreover, more than 150 large companies, including more than half of the companies in the S&P 100, are disclosing their political spending already. Investors have filed over 300 shareholder proposals since 2011 asking companies to disclose political spending. This is all about transparency and protecting our democracy. We should not be scared of giving the public more information.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I will repeat a couple of things very briefly.

All of these proxy proposals have garnered 23 percent, average, support, so there is not widespread support among the investors.

And again, I will repeat that three-pronged mission that the Securities and Exchange Commission has: "protect investors; maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and facilitate capital formation." This particular effort does none of those things, advances none of those things, and that is why I oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 82 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. ZELDIN. 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 division B (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to enforce section 540 of Public Law 110-329 (122 Stat. 3688) or section 538 of Public Law 112-74 (125 Stat. 976; 6 U.S.C. 190 note).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my important bi-

partisan amendment to halt the sale and marketing of Plum Island, New York, by the General Services Administration.

Situated at the gateway of the Long Island Sound, Plum Island is a treasure for our local community in both New York and Connecticut. As a critical resource for research, approximately 90 percent of the land on Plum Island has been sheltered from development, protecting the diverse ecosystem of Long Island Sound and critical habitat for migratory birds, marine mammals, and rare plants. With recorded history dating back to the 1700s, Plum Island is also an essential cultural and historical resource.

Since World War II, Plum Island has been utilized as a resource laboratory. The facility, which has been under Federal jurisdiction since 1899, has since grown to become what is known today as the Plum Island Animal Disease Center.

In 2005, the Department of Homeland Security, which currently has jurisdiction over the island, announced that the Animal Disease Center would be moved to a new Federal facility in Kansas. To offset the cost of this relocation, a law was enacted in 2008 that called for the private sale of Plum Island to the highest bidder.

The traditional interagency consultation process regarding the disposal of Federal property was bypassed, fast-tracking the potential sale of this island without consulting the local community or other Federal agencies. This statutory mandate was also based on a false assumption that a sale could offset the cost of the new facility, when the true value of the island, including cleanup costs, still are not clear.

The town of Southold, New York, has local jurisdiction over the island and has passed ordinances preventing any private development. This factor, coupled with the significant cleanup and environmental mitigation costs associated with closing this facility, gives Plum Island little to no commercial value.

Furthermore, according to a DHS report issued in April of 2016, the new site in Manhattan, Kansas, is already fully paid for through a combination of Federal appropriations and State funding.

Allowing for continued research, public access, and permanent preservation of the island is a priority shared by elected officials, conservation groups, and local residents on both sides of the sound.

The GSA must stop advancing the sale of this island and stop wasting taxpayer money on retaining expensive real estate firms in violation of the will of the people and in spite of pending litigation over this proposed sale.

This amendment allows Congress to use the power of the purse to stop the GSA from marketing or selling the island while we continue the fight for a permanent solution that will preserve the island for conservation and education.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment passed the House on a bipartisan vote in 2016 as part of Financial Services and General Government Appropriations. My similar stand-alone bill, the Plum Island Preservation Act, has also passed with unanimous support in the House now in two consecutive Congresses.

Mr. Chairman, I once again urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I thank my partners from Connecticut, ROSA DELAURO and JOE COURTNEY, for once again introducing this amendment with me. I also thank my additional cosponsors from New York, KATHLEEN RICE, TOM SUOZZI, and JOHN FASO. The broad range of bipartisan support for this effort throughout our region shows what an important gem Plum Island is for our environment and for our history.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption 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 New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 83 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. PALMER. 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 division B (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available under title IV or title VIII of this Act may be used by the District of Columbia government to carry out the Health Insurance Requirement Amendment Act of 2018 (subtitle A of title V of the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Support Act of 2018; D.C. Bill 22-753).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds from being used to carry out the District of Columbia's Health Insurance Requirement Amendment Act of 2018. This is essentially the District's version of ObamaCare's individual mandate with a few important and troubling distinctions.

The mandate requires that all residents of the District of Columbia purchase government-sanctioned health insurance or pay what the District calls a "shared responsibility payment."

However, the mandate goes even further by allowing D.C. authorities to place liens on, seize, and sell the property of their residents if they are unwilling or unable to pay the tax penalty.

Let me repeat. If a D.C. resident chooses not to purchase the government-sanctioned health insurance plan or purchases health insurance that doesn't meet the District of Columbia's preferences, they will now have the authority to impose a tax penalty or seize and sell that person's assets.

But it gets worse.

Every plan available through the D.C. Health Link covers elective abortion, which means that the mandate forces individuals who don't wish to purchase this coverage to choose between violating their conscience and facing a tax penalty or, even worse, having their property seized.

I am sure you will hear objections to Congress meddling in District of Columbia affairs, but I will remind those objectors that Article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution vests Congress, not the D.C. City Council, with the authority to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever regarding the District.

When the District of Columbia makes it a priority to force the residents to buy insurance coverage they neither want nor need, it is incumbent upon Congress to exercise their constitutional authority and prohibit the use of funds to carry out this policy.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in strong opposition to this amendment interfering in the local affairs of the District of Columbia.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, you wouldn't know it from hearing the Member on the other side speak, but in 1973, Congress passed the bipartisan District of Columbia Home Rule Act, which created a locally elected government. According to the Home Rule Act, a central purpose of the act was to "relieve Congress of the burden of legislating upon essentially local District matters."

In his signing statement of the Home Rule Act, President Nixon wrote, "It will give the people of the District of Columbia the right . . . to govern themselves in local affairs. . . ."

Yet the bill before us would either repeal or block the District of Columbia from carrying out or enacting five local laws.

I filed amendments to strike all of these undemocratic riders, but the Rules Committee has blocked me from offering any of them on the floor, even though they all complied with House rules. I have gotten some of these amendments off in the past, and I intend to do so again, because this matter has to go to the Senate as well, Mr. Chairman.

Adding insult to injury, the Rules Committee allowed this and one other undemocratic amendment to be offered.

Republicans were not satisfied with sabotaging the Affordable Care Act by,

among other things, reducing the penalty for failure to comply with the individual responsibility requirement to \$0 in the recently enacted GOP tax scam. The ACA remains standing and popular, nevertheless, throughout the country.

Mr. PALMER has moved to sabotage, therefore, the District of Columbia's local health insurance market, too, and deny the 700,000 Federal taxpaying Americans who live in the District of Columbia access to quality, affordable health insurance coverage.

This antidemocratic healthcare amendment is offered by Mr. PALMER of Alabama, who doesn't live in and is not responsible to the people of the District of Columbia, but answers to another district. I doubt that Representative PALMER's constituents want him taking time from their business to meddle in the business of another Member's district.

This amendment would prohibit the District from spending its own local funds, consisting solely of local taxes and fees, to carry out a local District of Columbia bill that requires individuals to maintain health coverage or to pay a penalty for failure to do so.

I remind the House that three States have adopted this same approach.

In response to Republican efforts to sabotage the ACA, the District of Columbia, like States across the country, decided to do what they could and, in our case, convened a working group that consisted of businesses, providers, consumers, and insurers on how to preserve quality, affordable coverage locally.

In February, the working group unanimously recommended creating a local individual responsibility requirement—and I thought the other side was all about localism—and the District of Columbia Health Benefit Exchange Authority Executive Board unanimously supported the recommendation.

□ 2100

The District of Columbia Mayor then included an individual responsibility of requirement in her budget, and the D.C. Council debated and unanimously passed the Health Insurance Requirement Amendment Act of 2018, as required by Congress. Thus, D.C. will join three States in requiring residents to maintain health insurance coverage, and more States are considering doing the very same thing.

I urge Members to vote "no" on this undemocratic, offensive, and harmful amendment that would reduce enrollment in the D.C. individual insurance market by 15 percent, and increase premiums. I ask the gentleman to stay out of the business of my district.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chair, I want to applaud my good friend from Alabama, Mr. PALMER, and my colleague from North Carolina, Mr. WALKER, for their work on this particular amendment.

I couldn't disagree more with the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia. This is not about individual liberties. In fact, this amendment supports individual liberties. It keeps liens from being placed on property.

Quite frankly, Congress, overwhelmingly has supported repealing the individual mandate. And for some city to say that they are wanting to implement an individual mandate, it has nothing to do with healthcare. It has more to do with political statements.

And I can tell you that to have the particular initiative here in Washington, D.C., limit short-term health plans and, certainly, association health plans, it, again, is not about healthcare.

So I would encourage an adoption of the amendment and stand for liberty.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the other distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment.

In December, Congress passed historic tax reform that frees people from ObamaCare's erroneous individual mandate which punished lower and middle income families for not buying health insurance they don't want or cannot afford.

Well, how does D.C. respond? The City Council has now decreed that all residents must buy health insurance, no matter the cost or need. And listen, if you refuse, not only will you be financially penalized, but the D.C. government can seize your personal property. What?

The idea that a local government can force you to buy a private product just because of your zip code is unjust and un-American.

Congress, which has direct oversight of D.C., cannot allow the District to ignore Federal law and use politics to punish their residents.

I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CURTIS). The gentleman from Alabama has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen from North Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. WALKER, for their support of this amendment. And I would just like to point out, as Mr. MEADOWS was pointing out, this is really about defending rights.

This amendment prohibits the District of Columbia Council from imposing on individual property rights. It denies people the option to buy less expensive health insurance and insurance that they want and need.

I would like to also point out that in ObamaCare, even there, there was no force imposed on people to buy health

insurance. They could pay the penalty, or they could apply for a waiver with the IRS and, literally, millions did that. At no time did ObamaCare pose a threat to people's property rights, as this amendment does.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to stand up for the rights of the citizens of the District of Columbia to protect their property rights and support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. NORTON. 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 Alabama will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 84 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. MEADOWS. 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 division B (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 1334 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chair, before I get into my amendment, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the entire staff for not only a very thoughtful bill that really requires very few amendments, but really working with Members of all different ideological stripes in our conference. And I look forward to being able to support this when it comes up for a vote tomorrow.

My amendment prohibits funds from being used by the Office of Personnel Management, better known as OPM, to administer the ObamaCare's multistate program.

ObamaCare required OPM to contract with health insurers to make multistate plans available to consumers in all the States, and D.C., by 2017.

Now, there is only one problem with that. There is only one State participating. And yet, here we continue to fund it.

The multistate plan program has failed to meet its statutory requirements. It has failed to generate competition in the healthcare marketplace. And it has failed to lower health insurance premiums.

According to OPM, the government has spent \$53 million on administrative costs for this failed program. The evidence is clear: This program doesn't work and it is a waste of taxpayer dollars.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation said eliminating funding for this plan will not affect the levels of competition or premiums in the insurance markets, nor would it affect any ObamaCare subsidies.

So my amendment does not take funds away from OPM. It leaves more money for OPM to continue its other mission-critical programs without having to waste the time and resources on a poorly-functioning multistate plan program.

I have got letters from the OPM, Office of Personnel Management, who administers the plan, supporting the elimination of this program. I also have a letter from the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association, better known as NARFE, who represent the interests of more than 5 million Federal employees and retirees and their survivors, supporting the elimination of this program.

So finally, this program is widely viewed by analysts on the both the left and the right as either a de facto public option or a plausible foundation for a future public option.

The House should vote overwhelmingly to do away with this, and I urge my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, to do so.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. This amendment is another in a long line of attacks on the Affordable Care Act. It is, unfortunately, an example of Republicans turning to the appropriations process, instead of working through the appropriate channels via the authorization committees.

Weighing down bills with partisan riders does nothing but make it more difficult to enact these spending bills, especially in a timely manner.

Turning to the substance of the amendment, our constituents would be better served if we focused our efforts on extending quality, affordable coverage to more individuals, not eliminating plans.

Healthcare is an essential right, and a healthy America is a more productive, safer, and better place to call home. I suggest my colleagues vote "no" on the Meadows amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman opposite with his articulation of opposition; but I find it

interesting because the last time I checked, he is not from Arkansas, which is the only State that actually is benefiting from this. And yet, his State, my State, and every other State is paying for this for the benefit. And I would use that word very liberally, because it is not really benefiting them. They just keep it there. It is not lowering premiums in Arkansas.

So at what time do we look at a failed Federal program and say enough is enough? I think that that day is today, and I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership. I urge a vote in support of this particular amendment.

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. MEADOWS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. 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 North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 85 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. ROTHFUS. 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 division B (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under title IV or title VIII of this Act may be used by the District of Columbia government to carry out section 47-4471, D.C. Official Code, with respect to the liability of a taxpayer under section 47-5108, D.C. Official Code (as added by subtitle A of title V of the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Support Act of 2018; D.C. Bill 22-753).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment, a narrow amendment which simply prohibits any funds from going toward the District of Columbia from seizing property of citizens not in compliance with the District's individual healthcare mandate. It is a narrower amendment than the one we just debated.

My amendment does not take away the mandate. It simply says one of the remedies cannot be the seizure of property if an individual does not comply with the mandate to buy health insurance.

The individual mandate is, of course, controversial. Even Barack Obama opposed it when he was running in 2008.

In one of the debates in the 2008 primary, then Senator and Presidential candidate Obama said: "A mandate means that in some fashion, everybody will be forced to buy health insurance. . . . But I believe," then candidate Obama said, "the problem is not that folks are trying to avoid getting healthcare. The problem is they can't afford it."

He separately said:

If the mandate was the solution, we could try to solve homelessness by mandating that everyone buy a house. The reason why they don't have the house is they don't have the money. So our focus has been on reducing costs and making it available.

Regardless of what anyone on either side of the aisle thinks about a requirement to buy health insurance, it seems ill-advised and unjust to take away property from people that cannot even afford insurance.

I have to imagine that this was an oversight in writing the law, because surely no legislators could have intended such a harsh result.

I would note, Mr. Chairman, that in 2015, 6,902 residents of the District of Columbia were forced to pay the mandate penalty. Seventy-five percent of them made less than \$50,000.

I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting this commonsense measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in strong opposition to yet another amendment that interferes with another Member's district, indicating that there is more than one Member in this body that does not have enough to do at home.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 2115

Ms. NORTON. A few minutes ago, we debated an amendment offered by Representative GARY PALMER of Alabama that would prohibit the District from spending its own local funds, consisting solely of taxes and fees, to carry out a local D.C. bill, the Health Insurance Requirement Amendment Act of 2018, that requires individuals to maintain health insurance coverage or pay a tax penalty for failure to do so.

This amendment before us now offered by this Member, Mr. ROTHFUS of Pennsylvania, seeks to weaken the coverage requirement by prohibiting D.C. from spending its local funds to carry out a method of tax collection in existing D.C. law to enforce the penalty.

Mr. ROTHFUS has plenty to do representing his own district, but is now venturing far afield into a district represented by another Member of the House of Representatives.

In particular, D.C. would be prohibited from using its local funds to collect the tax penalty by distraint, or the seizure of property to obtain payment, for failure to pay.

The District is not unique in authorizing distraint, and it is seldom used. I

can't think of when it has been used. The seizure of property to settle tax debt is standard practice for the Federal Government, States, and cities across the country, including, would you believe, Representative ROTHFUS' State of Pennsylvania.

Under title 53 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, section 16031, Pennsylvania jurisdictions are allowed to collect taxes by distraint. I wonder if the sponsor has asked his own legislature to repeal that statute. Let him start at home before he tries to repeal something passed unanimously by the council of the District of Columbia.

It is true that the Affordable Care Act prohibited the Internal Revenue Service from seizing property to collect the individual responsibility requirement tax penalty, although it did authorize the IRS to withhold the penalty amount from future tax refunds, which amounts to the very same thing. However, each State and the District is free to authorize distraint to collect the local individual responsibility requirement tax penalty.

However, it is important to note, and I emphasize, that the District rarely seizes property to collect taxes owed. When it does, it does so only as a last resort. I can't think of when this has even happened. If a payment plan or settlement could not be established with a taxpayer, the District would first turn to remedies like withholding tax refunds or garnishing wages, not seizing a house or a car.

I am sure that is what happens in Mr. ROTHFUS' State of Pennsylvania as well.

I will not tolerate Republicans, this Member or any other, using the District of Columbia to score points with opponents of the ACA. They haven't been able to beat the ACA.

This amendment is one of several that constitute the most significant abuse of Federal power over the District of Columbia since Republicans took control in 2011.

So the ACA remains popular throughout the United States. They just can't bear that. So Mr. ROTHFUS moves on to the District, to see if he can do to the District what his side has not been able to do in the country for the ACA.

We found greater respect for democratic self-rule in the Senate in getting such riders removed. We intend to do so again.

Mr. Chair, I say to the gentleman, mind your own business.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this abuse of power, and I urge a "no" vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the gentlewoman would realize that this amendment scores points for the 75 percent of the people who were subject to the penalty who made less than \$50,000 a year. That is what happens when we have the mandate.

And it is Federal policy now, Federal policy, that holds that people should not be punished if they can't afford to purchase health insurance. They certainly shouldn't be punished by having their property seized.

And if it is only a few people, as the gentlewoman says, I would wonder why she is opposed to this amendment.

This is the Federal city. It is Federal policy that people should not be so punished.

President Obama, when he was running for President in 2008, was pretty clear. He knew what would happen. He observed what was going on with the Massachusetts mandate. He said:

Now, Massachusetts has a mandate right now. They have exempted 20 percent of the uninsured because they've concluded that that 20 percent can't afford it. In some cases, there are people who are paying fines and still can't afford it. So now they are worse off than they were. They don't have health insurance and they're paying a fine. And in order for you to force people to get health insurance, you have to have a very harsh, stiff penalty.

President Obama understood that. He understood, as a candidate, that it would be wrong to seize property.

Again, when you look at the people who were being levied the penalty in 2015, when the ACA had a penalty, 75 percent of the people who paid the penalty in the District of Columbia made less than \$50,000 a year.

Again, President Obama as a candidate:

I think it is important to recognize that, if you are going to mandate the purchase of insurance and it is not affordable, then there is going to have to be some enforcement mechanism that the government uses. It may charge people who don't already have healthcare fines or have to take it out of their paychecks.

And candidate Obama said:

And that, I don't think, is helping people without health insurance.

Again, he liked to keep on going and talking about Massachusetts. What is happening in Massachusetts, then-candidate Obama said:

There are articles being written about it which are that folks are paying fines that don't have healthcare. They would rather go ahead and take the fine, because they cannot afford coverage.

Mr. Chairman, this is for the folks who may not be able to afford it, people making less than \$50,000 a year. They shouldn't have their property seized.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to accept this commonsense, narrow amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 86 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. MCHENRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 87 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. MCHENRY. 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 division B (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the United States Postal Service to—

(1) implement any approach in the report of the Office of Inspector General of the Postal Service on May 21, 2015, entitled "The Road Ahead for Postal Financial Services"; or

(2) carry out any pilot project pursuant to the report.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It would bar the United States Postal Service from expanding on its current offerings of financial services and banking products.

I think it is important that the Postal Service focus on its core business of delivering the mail. While the idea of postal banking is nothing new, it is still a terrible idea.

In 2015, the inspector general for the Postal Service took the highly unusual step in proposing that the Postal Service should expand its banking services in areas like prepaid cards, savings products, and money orders. Since then, postal banking advocates have used the report to argue that the Postal Service has the authority to offer more banking products, all without congressional oversight or consent. Recent reports indicate that these efforts include using a pilot program to implement this awful idea. That is the reason why I am offering my amendment.

To make things even worse, rather than proposing the idea legislatively, the current strategy of those advocating for postal banking is to institute the program via behind-the-scenes negotiation between government bureaucrats and liberal special interest groups.

This amendment draws a clear, bright line that says that no taxpayer money shall be used to subsidize these quiet attempts at making postal banking a reality.

Proponents of postal banking argue that it would help the under-banked in this country, but the simple fact is that socialized banking is not the answer.

Instead, we have to focus on working together in a bipartisan way around fi-

nancial innovation as the pathway toward financial inclusion.

Postal banking is a giant step backward. The Postal Service, as I said, should focus on its core mission of delivering our mail.

Postal banking would simply create yet another government program that fails to solve the underlying problem.

Further, if Congress does not step in and stop this now, we endanger our small community banks and credit unions that are already in trouble, while at the same time putting an additional burden on the American taxpayer, who will be stuck footing the bill for this horrible idea.

This amendment protects the American taxpayers from being forced to finance a terrible idea called postal banking. Its passage would also maintain the role of Congress in determining the fate of the Postal Service and postal banking, not government bureaucrats and interest groups.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, sadly, the provisions contained in this amendment would block the Postal Service from running a pilot program designed to improve operations and save taxpayers money, like allowing travelers to submit passport applications at post offices across the country. It would severely limit the potential of one of our most essential, constitutionally mandated government agencies, and hurt our communities and our citizens in the process.

I represent not only countless letter carriers, but thousands of Ohioans who rely on the Postal Service for timely delivery of their Social Security checks, electric bills, and birthday cards from loved ones.

Expanding the services provided at our Nation's post offices would achieve two ends: supporting a great Federal job provider, and helping our communities and citizens at the same time.

At a time when banks and other institutions are abandoning inner cities and rural communities, in my district alone, post offices present a perfect medium to collocate, including with traditional banks or credit unions.

For example, in my home State, 18.6 percent of Cleveland households have no checking or savings account, and 24.1 percent of households are under-banked, forced to use costly payday and auto title firms or currency exchange stores to cash paychecks or make consumer loans. More than 35 percent of Cleveland's 389,000 residents live below the Federal poverty line.

Many post offices are located in bank deserts. Fifty-nine percent of post offices are in ZIP Codes with either zero banks or only one bank branch.

By giving the Postal Service the opportunity to serve our communities in

a more expansive capacity, we could also put the Postal Service back on the right track financially, bring back hundreds of American jobs, and, in so doing, restore faith in one of our most fundamental government services.

The Postal Service is already providing an impressive, expansive, and affordable service to all the American people—and by the American people, by the way. I am fighting in Congress to support the hardworking employees of the Postal Service and our citizens, especially in underserved communities across not just my district, but our country.

It is really horrendous to go into communities that have no financial services, where people are being ripped off every day.

Mr. Chair, I hope my colleagues will join me in this effort and oppose this misguided amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a very able and intelligent Congressman.

□ 2130

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time we have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which would limit the Postal Service's ability to offer products and services on a pilot basis that could help the Postal Service find its way to financial stability.

At a time when the Postal Service is bleeding red ink, this bill takes away existing revenue and potential revenue. In fiscal year 2017, the Postal Service reported a loss of \$2.7 billion, marking the 11th straight year in the red.

And just coincidentally, it got in the red because Congress, in 2006, restricted what the Postal Service could do. Well, it really worked well: 11 years of red ink, putting the Postal Service in insolvency, technically. To address the Postal Service's financial situation, the Postal Service needs financial relief, not further restrictions.

H.R. 6076, the Postal Reform Act of 2018, which I introduced with the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman MARK MEADOWS, on a bipartisan basis, passed the authorizing committee unanimously, and we are hoping to take it to the floor, and that is where it belongs, in an authorization bill, not as a rider on the appropriations bill.

This bill even addresses issues raised by the gentleman from North Carolina's amendment. Under the Postal Reform Act, the Postal Service would have to limit any new nonpostal products and services to only those provided to State, local, and Tribal governments and Federal agencies. The bill would preserve existing nonpostal products and services.

However, this amendment is much more restrictive than that. This

amendment includes a blanket prohibition that would prevent the Postal Service from implementing any other recommendations from a May 2015 Postal Service Inspector General Report, including improving its existing range of financial services, such as money orders.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Ranking Member LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, this amendment, as I said, includes blanket prohibitions that would prevent the Postal Service from implementing the reports and recommendations of the 2015 Postal Service Inspector General Report, including improving its existing range of financial services, such as money orders.

I might add, the assertions that have been made that there has been no congressional oversight, that is not true. My committee, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, has had numerous hearings on the Postal Service, numerous briefings with the Postmaster General and her predecessor and his predecessor.

We have marked up numerous bills. We finally got one we could agree on, and it is pending. That is how this should be done—not piecemeal, not in a way that further constrains and circumscribes the Postal Service that can only lead to more red ink.

We are trying to save the Postal Service, which is mandated in the Constitution. It has a requirement for universal service that private sector firms do not. And we have allowed some pilot programs to see if they can work. They are not a threat to financial institutions.

So we are fixing a problem here that does not really exist, and we are going to do real harm to a Postal Service we have already harmed with the 2006 legislation Congress passed in a lame-duck session in the name of reform, and it backfired. It blew up, and it has done incalculable damage which we are now trying to repair to the Postal Service.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this unwarranted intrusion into the prerogatives of the authorizing committee that is doing its job and has a bipartisan bill that passed our committee unanimously, which is a remarkable statement for the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

We ought not to be legislating on an appropriations bill in this way with respect to the Postal Service. It deserves better, our consumers deserve better, Postal Service customers deserve better, and we can do better.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Bankers Association, the

Credit Union National Association, the Independent Community Bankers of America, and the National Association of Federally Insured Credit Unions in support of this amendment.

JULY 18, 2018.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATRICK MCHENRY: On behalf of our organizations and the Americans we represent, we write to express support of your Amendment to Division B, within the Financial Services and General Government section of H.R. 6147. This amendment would prohibit the use of any taxpayer funds for postal banking and financial services and prohibit the creation of any new pilot program that would expand this business practice through collective bargaining.

While the USPS serves an important role in delivering mail and packages, we are concerned about expanding the Postal Service's primary role and allowing the government to compete with the private sector. This would include lower fees, subsidized services and even competing based on real estate and office location.

Consideration of expanding postal operations to engage in banking and financial services is not a new concept. It has been touted as a solution to help stabilize the US Postal Service's financial practices. The cost alone to hire additional workers and retrain existing employees to offer banking products would further undermine the Postal Service's budgetary issues.

Additionally, we have reservations about the ability of the Postal Service to safeguard customers' identities and information such as bank accounts and passwords. Regardless of the federal agency, the government has shown it can be slow to react to cyber threats, allowing bad actors to access citizens' private records.

It is clear the US Postal Service's financial health is troubling. Expanding USPS's operations to compete with private sector banks and credit unions is not the answer. We, the undersigned organizations, support your amendment to H.R. 6147 and encourage its inclusion in the final appropriations legislation.

Sincerely,

Grover G. Norquist, President, Americans for Tax Reform; Tim Chapman, Executive Director, Heritage Action; Tom Schatz, President, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste; Adam Brandon, President, FreedomWorks; Brandon Arnold, Executive Vice President, National Taxpayers Union; Kevin Kosar, Vice President of Policy, R Street Institute; Andrew F. Quinlan, President, Center for Freedom and Prosperity; Iain Murray, Vice President for Strategy and Sr. Fellow, Competitive Enterprise Institute.

WHO SUPPORTS THE AMENDMENT?

American Bankers Association, Americans for Tax Reform, Center for Freedom and Prosperity, Citizens Against Government Waste, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Credit Union National Association, Freedom Works, Heritage Action, Independent Community Bankers of America, National Association of Federally Insured Credit Unions, National Taxpayers Union, R Street Institute.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I also include in the RECORD a letter on behalf of Americans for Tax Reform, Heritage Action for America, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, FreedomWorks, National Taxpayer Union, R Street, and the Center for Freedom and Prosperity, along with the Competitive Enterprise Institute in support of this amendment.

JULY 17, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the members of the American Bankers Association, the Credit Union National Association, the Independent Community Bankers of America, and the National Association of Federally Insured Credit Unions, I write to urge the adoption of Congressman Patrick McHenry's amendment to the Financial Services and General Government (FSGG) appropriations bill to prohibit the U.S. Postal Service from providing banking services.

Financial institutions are strongly supportive of the Postal Service, as one of the largest mailers of any industry group in America. Physical mail remains an important communications channel for banks and credit unions. Financial institutions of all sizes use the mail to communicate with current and potential customers, to send statements and receive payments, and to market new products and services to their customers. Financial companies are also a vital revenue source for the Postal Service, generating billions of dollars of annual revenue that supports postal infrastructure. For these reasons, our members are committed to identifying long-term solutions to ensure an efficient, self-sustaining, and affordable U.S. postal system.

Postal banking is not one of those solutions. Although there have been a number of proposals over the past few years to turn the U.S. Postal Service into the world's largest shadow banking system, we are very concerned that allowing the U.S. Postal Service to provide banking services will be beyond the Postal Service's core competencies, will raise a number of serious regulatory and consumer protection questions, and will present significant competitive issues for private sector entities. Congress should encourage the Postal Service to focus on its core business of physical mail delivery, and not be distracted by expanding the mission to businesses outside of the Postal Service's area of expertise.

Most significantly, postal banking does not address the Postal Service's financial challenges, and may well make them worse. The U.S. Postal Service agrees. The Postal Service has strongly argued against authority to provide banking services, noting that providing these products would almost certainly cause it to lose money:

"The Postal Service's mission is to provide the American public with trusted, affordable, universal mail service. Our core function is delivery, not banking . . . Profit margins on these financial services businesses across the industry are very low . . . so even if we achieved \$1 billion in revenue and executed well, our cash position would only increase by an estimated \$100-200 million, which will not materially change our financial condition—we need to focus on the core delivery business."

The Postal Service went on to note that to the extent that more affordable pricing of financial services is a primary goal of postal banking efforts, "[m]ore affordable appears to mean at a lower price level than the free market provides today . . . Since established financial services firms make a slim margin on revenue . . . it seems unlikely that there is any significant room to lower prices without incurring a loss, and at a minimum, a lower profit margin."

No doubt, postal reform is a serious topic that Congress must confront. We encourage Congress to enact legislation that would re-

duce costs and increase efficiencies to put the U.S. Postal Service on a sound and sustainable financial path over the long run, but the provision of banking services is not an acceptable solution. We look forward to continuing to work with you on postal reform efforts in the coming months, but urge you to support Congressman McHenry's amendment to the FSGG appropriations bill to ban the Postal Service from providing banking services when it is on the House Floor this week.

Sincerely,

American Bankers Association, Credit Union National Association, Independent Community Bankers of America, National Association of Federally Insured Credit Unions.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that the Postal Service, as my colleagues across the aisle say, is a constitutional function. It is really important that the Postal Service do its mission of delivering the mail.

What we don't think we should do is give a government bureau, through a nonlegislative means, the right to expand into nonessential services for a part of the government that is bleeding money. An institution that cannot balance its own books should not be getting into the offering of credit or the movement of money and funds.

While I am in favor of postal reform, and while I support my letter carriers, I do not favor postal banking. I think it is important for this Congress to put a note down that we are in opposition to that, and that is why I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Ranking Member LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I would just like to respond to the gentleman. The offer of this amendment should never be on an appropriation bill. This is one of these extraneous riders that belongs in other bills, and it is very damaging to the future of communities across this country, thousands of which lack banking services and financial services of any kind.

What we are talking about here is something simple. It is something very simple: a pilot program. We are not saying this is going to happen all over the United States. This gentleman wants to deny the ability of communities to have any kind of normal financial service where they have been redlined by the very letters that the gentleman just asked to be placed in the RECORD. Those very institutions abandoned the communities that we are seeking to serve.

I am really disappointed that the gentleman would want people to be subjected to usurious interest rates or to a lack of any kind of financial service, even paying your electric bill, for heaven's sake.

So, for two reasons, I ask my colleagues to vote against the gentleman's amendment: number one, it doesn't belong in this bill; and number

two, it does a great disservice to the people of this country. They have a right to better service.

The Postal Service is coast to coast. It is audited, it is properly staffed, and it is universal. Whether you are poor or whether you are rich in this country, you have a right. You have a right to be treated fairly by the institutions that this Nation manages.

Mr. Chair, I want to congratulate those who work for our great Postal Service. I ask that the gentleman's amendment be defeated, and let us support what is in the Constitution of the United States, which is respect for the Postal Service, coast to coast to every citizen.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. 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 North Carolina will be postponed.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. For what purpose does the gentlewoman from Ohio seek recognition?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, you know, if they would operate these microphones for the Democrats as well as they operate them for the Republicans, maybe we could be heard on this floor, and especially for the women Democrats, I might add.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman's request for a recorded vote has been postponed.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, before we can conclude our debate, I wanted to thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member BETTY MCCOLLUM of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee for their work; and also the Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee Chairman TOM GRAVES and Ranking Member MIKE QUIGLEY for the great job they did; and for the men and women behind them that make up the professional and personal staff of the Appropriations Committee.

As of today, all 12 appropriations bills have been released. With the passage of this legislation, the full House will have halfway done all of our bills on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, we continue our momentum by passing H.R. 6147. I guess that will be tomorrow, and I urge support of the bill.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-830 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 43 by Mr. MULLIN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 44 by Mr. MULLIN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 46 by Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS of Washington.

Amendment No. 48 by Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 49 by Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 50 by Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia.

Amendment No. 51 by Mr. GALLEGO of Arizona.

Amendment No. 60 by Mr. PEARCE of New Mexico.

Amendment No. 62 by Mr. PEARCE of New Mexico.

Amendment No. 63 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 69 by Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 70 by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment No. 81 by Mr. CARBAJAL of California.

Amendment No. 83 by Mr. PALMER of Alabama.

Amendment No. 84 by Mr. MEADOWS of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 85 by Mr. ROTHFUS of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 87 by Mr. MCHENRY of North Carolina.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 194, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

AYES—215

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

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

NOES—194

Adams	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Barragán	Cummings	Hastings
Beatty	Curbelo (FL)	Heck
Bera	Davis (CA)	Higgins (NY)
Beyer	Davis, Danny	Himes
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Huffman
Blunt Rochester	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Bonamici	Delaney	Jayapal
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeLauro	Jeffries
Brady (PA)	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Brown (MD)	Demings	Johnson, E. B.
Brownley (CA)	DeSaunier	Kaptur
Bustos	Deutch	Katko
Butterfield	Dingell	Keating
Capuano	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Carbajal	Doyle, Michael F.	Kennedy
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Khanna
Cartwright	Engel	Kihuen
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Kildee
Castro (TX)	Espaillet	Kilmer
Chu, Judy	Esty (CT)	Kind
Cicilline	Evans	Krishnamoorthi
Clark (MA)	Faso	Kuster (NH)
Clarke (NY)	Fitzpatrick	Lamb
Clay	Foster	Lance
Cleaver	Frankel (FL)	Langevin
Clyburn	Fudge	Larsen (WA)
Coffman	Gabbard	Larson (CT)
Cohen	Gallego	Lawrence
Connolly	Garamendi	Lawson (FL)
Cooper	Gomez	Lee
Correa	Gonzalez (TX)	Levin
Costa	Gottheimer	Lewis (GA)
Costello (PA)	Green, Al	Lieu, Ted
Courtney	Green, Gene	Lipinski
Crist	Grijalva	Loebsock
		Lofgren

Lowenthal	Payne	Sherman
Lowe	Pelosi	Sires
Lujan Grisham,	Perlmutter	Smith (NJ)
M.	Pingree	Smith (WA)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Pocan	Soto
Lynch	Polis	Stefanik
Maloney,	Price (NC)	Suozi
Carolyn B.	Quigley	Swalwell (CA)
Maloney, Sean	Raskin	Takano
Mast	Reichert	Thompson (CA)
Matsui	Rooney, Francis	Thompson (MS)
McCullum	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus
McEachin	Rosen	Tonko
McGovern	Roskam	Torres
McNerney	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
Meeks	Ruiz	Upton
Meng	Ruppersberger	Vargas
Moore	Rush	Veasey
Moulton	Ryan (OH)	Vela
Murphy (FL)	Sánchez	Velázquez
Nadler	Sanford	Visclosky
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Neal	Schakowsky	Schultz
Nolan	Schiff	Waters, Maxine
Norcross	Schneider	Watson Coleman
O'Halleran	Schrader	Welch
O'Rourke	Scott (VA)	Wilson (FL)
Pallone	Scott, David	Yarmuth
Panetta	Serrano	
Pascroll	Sewell (AL)	

NOT VOTING—19

Aguilar	Hanabusa	Shea-Porter
Bass	Hoyer	Shuster
Black	Paulsen	Sinema
Blackburn	Peters	Speier
Cárdenas	Peterson	Walz
DeSantis	Rice (NY)	
Gaetz	Richmond	

□ 2203

Mr. COFFMAN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 346.

Stated against:

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 346.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 346.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 346.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 346.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 199, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

AYES—215

Abraham Granger
Aderholt Graves (GA)
Allen Graves (LA)
Amash Graves (MO)
Arrington Griffith
Babin Grothman
Bacon Guthrie
Banks (IN) Handel
Barletta Harper
Barr Harris
Barton Hartzler
Biggs Hensarling
Billirakis Herrera Beutler
Bishop (GA) Hice, Jody B.
Bishop (MI) Higgins (LA)
Bishop (UT) Hill
Blum Holding
Bost Hollingsworth
Brady (TX) Hudson
Brat Huizenga
Brooks (AL) Hultgren
Brooks (IN) Hunter
Buchanan Hurd
Buck Issa
Bucshon Jenkins (KS)
Budd Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (IN) Johnson (LA)
Burgess Johnson (OH)
Byrne Johnson (OH)
Calvert Johnson, Sam
Carter (GA) Jones
Carter (TX) Jordan
Chabot Kelly (MS)
Cheney Kelly (PA)
Cloud King (IA)
Coffman King (NY)
Cole Kinzinger
Collins (GA) Knight
Collins (NY) Kustoff (TN)
Comer Labrador
Comstock LaHood
Conaway LaMalfa
Cook Lamborn
Cramer Latta
Crawford Lesko
Cuellar Lewis (MN)
Culberson LoBiondo
Curtis Long
Davidson Loudermilk
Davis, Rodney Love
Denham Lucas
DesJarlais Luetkemeyer
Diaz-Balart MacArthur
Donovan Marchant
Duffy Marino
Duncan (SC) Marshall
Duncan (TN) Massie
Dunn Mast
Emmer McCarthy
Estes (KS) McCaul
Ferguson McClintock
Fleischmann McKinley
Flores McMorris
Fortenberry Rodgers
Foxy McSally
Frelinghuysen Meadows
Gallagher Messer
Garrett Mitchell
Gianforte Moolenaar
Gibbs Mooney (WV)
Gohmert Mullin
Goodlatte Newhouse
Gosar Noem
Gowdy Norman

NOES—199

Adams Cartwright
Aguilar Castor (FL)
Amodei Castor (TX)
Barragán Chu, Judy
Beatty Cicilline
Bera Clark (MA)
Bergman DelBene
Beyer Clarke (NY)
Blumenauer Clay
Blunt Rochester Cleaver
Bonamici Clyburn
Boyle, Brendan Cohen
F. Connolly
Brady (PA) Cooper
Brown (MD) Correa
Brownley (CA) Costa
Bustos Costello (PA)
Butterfield Courtney
Capuano Crist
Carbajal Crowley
Carson (IN) Cummings
Curbelo (FL) Faso

Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Robby
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted

NOT VOTING—14

Bass Gaetz
Black Hanabusa
Blackburn Hoyer
Cárdenas Joyce (OH)
DeSantis Peterson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2207

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MS. MCMORRIS
RODGERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Washington (Ms.
MCMORRIS RODGERS) on which further
proceedings were postponed and on
which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 227, noes 185,
not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

AYES—227

Abraham Allen
Aderholt Amodei
Arrington
Babin

Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Billirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cloud
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy

NOES—185

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright

Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
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
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
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
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Maloney
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer

Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Scalise
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo

NOT VOTING—16

Bass
Black
Blackburn
Cárdenas
DeSantis
Gaetz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2210

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAM-
BORN) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 213, noes 202,
not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]

AYES—213

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta

Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Bost

Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert

Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culbertson
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garrett
Mast
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
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

NOES—202

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen

Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Kinzinger
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
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
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey

Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Tayler
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Bass
Black
Blackburn
Cárdenas
DeSantis

Gaetz
Hanabusa
Hoyer
Peterson
Richmond

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2213

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California
changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAM-
BORN) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 213, noes 201,
not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

AYES—213

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman

Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess

Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock

Conaway Johnson (OH)
Cook Johnson, Sam
Costa Jones
Cramer Jordan
Crawford Joyce (OH)
Cuellar Kelly (MS)
Culberson Kelly (PA)
Curtis King (IA)
Davidson Kinzinger
Davis, Rodney Knight
Denham Kustoff (TN)
DesJarlais Labrador
Diaz-Balart LaHood
Duffy LaMalfa
Duncan (SC) Lamborn
Duncan (TN) Latta
Dunn Lesko
Emmer Lewis (MN)
Estes (KS) Long
Ferguson Loudermilk
Fleischmann Love
Flores Lucas
Foxx Luetkemeyer
Frelinghuysen MacArthur
Gallagher Marchant
Garrett Marino
Gianforte Marshall
Gibbs Massie
Gohmert McCarthy
Goodlatte McCaul
Gosar McClintock
Gowdy McHenry
Granger McKinley
Graves (GA) McMorris
Graves (LA) Rodgers
Graves (MO) McCaul
Griffith Meadows
Grothman Messer
Guthrie Mitchell
Handel Moolenaar
Harper Mooney (WV)
Harris Mullin
Hartzler Newhouse
Hensarling Noem
Herrera Beutler Norman
Hice, Jody B. Nunes
Higgins (LA) Olson
Hill Palmer
Holding Pearce
Hollingsworth Perry
Hudson Pittenger
Huizenga Poe (TX)
Hultgren Poliquin
Hunter Posey
Hurd Ratcliffe
Issa Reed
Jenkins (KS) Renacci
Jenkins (WV) Rice (SC)
Johnson (LA) Roby

NOES—201

Adams Crist
Aguilar Crowley
Barragán Cummings
Beatty Curbelo (FL)
Bera Davis (CA)
Beyer Davis, Danny
Bishop (GA) DeFazio
Blumenauer DeGette
Blunt Rochester Delaney
Bonamici DeLauro
Boyle, Brendan DelBene
F. Demings
Brady (PA) DeSaulnier
Brooks (AL) Deutch
Brown (MD) Dingell
Brownley (CA) Doggett
Buchanan Donovan
Bustos Doyle, Michael
Butterfield F.
Capuano Ellison
Carbajal Engel
Carson (IN) Eshoo
Cartwright Espaillat
Castor (FL) Esty (CT)
Castro (TX) Evans
Chu, Judy Faso
Ciilline Fitzpatrick
Clark (MA) Fortenberry
Clarke (NY) Foster
Clay Frankel (FL)
Cleave Fudge
Clyburn Gabbard
Cohen Gallego
Connolly Garamendi
Cooper Gomez
Correa Gonzalez (TX)
Costello (PA) Gottheimer
Courtney Green, Al

LoBiondo Panetta
Loebbeck Pascrell
Lofgren Paulsen
Lowenthal Payne
Lowey Pelosi
Lujan Grisham, Perlmutter
M. M.
Luján, Ben Ray Pingree
Lynch Pocan
Maloney, Polis
Carolyn B. Price (NC)
Maloney, Sean Quigley
Mast Raskin
Matsui Reichert
McCollum Rice (NY)
McEachin Ros-Lehtinen
McGovern Rosen
McNerney Roybal-Allard
Meeks Ruiz
Meng Ruppertsberger
Moore Rush
Moulton Ryan (OH)
Murphy (FL) Sánchez
Nadler Sarbanes
Napolitano Schakowsky
Neal Schiff
Nolan Schneider
Norcross Scott (VA)
O'Halleran Scott, David
O'Rourke Serrano
Pallone Sewell (AL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bass Gaetz
Black Hanabusa
Blackburn Hoyer
Cárdenas Palazzo
DeSantis Peterson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2216

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD-
LATTE) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 213, noes 202,
not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 351]

AYES—213

Abraham Brat
Aderholt Brooks (IN)
Allen Buchanan
Amash Buck
Amodei Buschon
Arrington Budd
Babin Burgess
Bacon Byrne
Banks (IN) Calvert
Barletta Carter (GA)
Barr Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Biggs Cloud
Bilirakis Cole
Bishop (MI) Collins (GA)
Bishop (UT) Collins (NY)
Blum Comer
Bost Conaway
Brady (TX) Cook

Shea-Porter Flores
Sherman Fortenberry
Sinema Foxx
Sires Frelinghuysen
Smith (NJ) Gallagher
Smith (WA) Garrett
Soto Gianforte
Stefanik Gibbs
Suozzi Gohmert
Swalwell (CA) Goodlatte
Takano Gosar
Thompson (CA) Gowdy
Thompson (MS) Granger
Titus Graves (GA)
Tonko Graves (LA)
Torres Graves (MO)
Tsongas Griffith
Upton Grothman
Vargas Guthrie
Veasey McHenry
Vela Handel
Velázquez Harper
Visclosky Hartzler
Wasserman Hensarling
Schultz Herrera Beutler
Waters, Maxine Hice, Jody B.
Watson Coleman Hill
Welch Holding
Wilson (FL) Hollingsworth
Yarmuth Hudson
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

NOES—202

Adams Kaptur
Aguilar DeGette
Barragán Delaney
Beatty DeLauro
Bera DelBene
Beyer Demings
Bishop (GA) DeSaulnier
Blumenauer Deutch
Blunt Rochester Dingell
Bonamici Doggett
Boyle, Brendan Doyle, Michael
F.
Brady (PA) Ellison
Brooks (AL) Engel
Brown (MD) Eshoo
Brownley (CA) Espaillat
Bustos Esty (CT)
Butterfield Evans
Capuano Faso
Carbajal Fitzpatrick
Carson (IN) Foster
Cartwright Frankel (FL)
Castor (FL) Fudge
Castro (TX) Gabbard
Chu, Judy Gallego
Ciilline Garamendi
Clark (MA) Gomez
Clarke (NY) Gonzalez (TX)
Clay Gottheimer
Cleave Green, Al
Clyburn Green, Gene
Coffman Grijalva
Cohen Gutiérrez
Comstock Harris
Connolly Hastings
Cooper Heck
Correa Higgins (NY)
Costa Himes
Courtney Huffman
Crist Jackson Lee
Crowley Jayapal
Cummins Jeffries
Curbelo (FL) Johnson (GA)
Davis (CA) Johnson, E. B.
Davis, Danny Joyce (OH)

Murphy (FL) Ros-Lehtinen Suozzi Heck
 Nadler Rosen Swalwell (CA) Higgins (NY)
 Napolitano Roybal-Allard Takano Himes
 Neal Ruiz Taylor Huffman
 Nolan Ruppertsberger Jackson Lee
 Norcross Rush Thompson (MS) Jayapal
 O'Halleran Ryan (OH) Titus Jeffries
 O'Rourke Sánchez Tonko Johnson (GA)
 Pallone Sarbanes Torres Johnson, E. B.
 Panetta Schakowsky Tsongas Jones
 Pascrell Schiff Upton Kaptur
 Paulsen Schneider Vargas Katko
 Payne Scott (VA) Veasey Keating
 Pelosi Scott, David Vela Kelly (IL)
 Perlmutter Serrano Velázquez Kennedy
 Peters Sewell (AL) Visclosky Khanna
 Pingree Shea-Porter Wasserman Kihuen
 Pocan Sherman Schultz Kildee
 Polis Sinema Waters, Maxine Kilmer
 Price (NC) Sires Watson Coleman Kind
 Quigley Smith (NJ) Welch Krishnamoorthi
 Raskin Smith (WA) Wilson (FL) Kuster (NH)
 Reed Soto Wittman Lamb
 Rice (NY) Stefanik Yarmuth Lance

NOT VOTING—13

Bass Gaetz Shuster
 Black Hanabusa Speier
 Blackburn Hoyer Walz
 Cárdenas Peterson
 DeSantis Richmond

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2219

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the noes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 203, noes 212,
 not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

AYES—203

Adams Dingell
 Aguilar Clay
 Amash Cleaver
 Beatty Clyburn
 Bera Coffman
 Beyer Cohen
 Bishop (GA) Connolly
 Blumener Cooper
 Blunt Rochester Correa
 Bonamici Costa
 Boyle, Brendan Costello (PA)
 F. Courtney
 Brady (PA) Crist
 Brooks (AL) Crowley
 Brown (MD) Cuellar
 Brownley (CA) Cummings
 Bustos Curbelo (FL)
 Butterfield Davis (CA)
 Capuano Davis, Danny
 Carbajal DeFazio
 Carson (IN) DeGette
 Cartwright Delaney
 Castor (FL) DeLauro
 Castro (TX) DelBene
 Chu, Judy Demings
 Cicilline DeSaulnier
 Clark (MA) Deutch

Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Correa Esty (CT)
 Evans
 Faso
 Fitzpatrick
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Davis (CA)
 Garamendi
 Gomez
 Gonzalez (TX)
 Gottheimer
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hastings

Heck
 Higgins (NY)
 Himes
 Huffman
 Ruppertsberger
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kihuen
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Lamb
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loebach
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham,
 M.
 Luján, Ben Ray
 Lynch

NOES—212

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amodei
 Arrington
 Babin
 Bacon
 Banks (IN)
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barraçan
 Barton
 Bergman
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blum
 Bost
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Cloud
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Culberson
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger
 Knight
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)

Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Rosen
 Roskam
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush

Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Soto

Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Smucker
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Tenney
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Rutherford
 Russell
 Rutherford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)

Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Webstrub
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker

NOT VOTING—13

Bass
 Black
 Blackburn
 Cárdenas
 DeSantis
 Gaetz
 Hanabusa
 Hoyer
 Peterson
 Richmond

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2222

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from New Mexico (Mr.
 PEARCE) on which further proceedings
 were postponed and on which the ayes
 prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 206, noes 209,
 not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

AYES—206

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amodei
 Arrington
 Babin
 Bacon
 Banks (IN)
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bergman
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blum
 Bost
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Brooks (IN)
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Cloud
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Culberson
 Curtis
 Davidson
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Estes (KS)
 Ferguson
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Foxx
 Gallagher
 Gianforte
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Grothman
 Guthrie
 Handel
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Higgins (LA)
 Hill
 Holding
 Hollingsworth
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)

King (IA) Norman
 Kinzinger Nunes
 Knight Olson
 Kustoff (TN) Palazzo
 Labrador Palmer
 LaHood Pearce
 LaMalfa Perry
 Lamborn Pittenger
 Latta Poe (TX)
 Lesko Poliquin
 Lewis (MN) Posey
 Long Ratcliffe
 Loudermilk Reed
 Love Renacci
 Lucas Rice (SC)
 Luetkemeyer Roby
 MacArthur Roe (TN)
 Marchant Rogers (AL)
 Marino Rogers (KY)
 Marshall Rohrabacher
 Massie Rokita
 McCarthy Rooney, Francis
 McCaul Rooney, Thomas
 McClintock J.
 McHenry Roskam
 McKinley Ross
 McMorris Rothfus
 Rodgers Rouzer
 McSally Royce (CA)
 Meadows Russell
 Messer Rutherford
 Mitchell Scalise
 Moolenaar Schweikert
 Mooney (WV) Scott, Austin
 Mullin Sensenbrenner
 Newhouse Sessions
 Noem Shimkus

NOES—209

Adams Ellison
 Aguilar Engel
 Amash Eshoo
 Barragán Espallat
 Beatty Esty (CT)
 Bera Evans
 Beyer Faso
 Bishop (GA) Fitzpatrick
 Blumenauer Fortenberry
 Blunt Rochester Foster
 Bonamici Frankel (FL)
 Boyle, Brendan Frelinghuysen
 F. Fudge
 Brady (PA) Gabbard
 Brooks (AL) Gallego
 Brown (MD) Garamendi
 Brownley (CA) Garrett
 Buchanan Gomez
 Bustos Gonzalez (TX)
 Butterfield Gottheimer
 Capuano Green, Al
 Carbajal Green, Gene
 Carson (IN) Griffith
 Cartwright Grijalva
 Castor (FL) Gutiérrez
 Castro (TX) Hastings
 Chu, Judy Heck
 Cicilline Higgins (NY)
 Clark (MA) Himes
 Clarke (NY) Huffman
 Clay Issa
 Cleaver Jackson Lee
 Clyburn Jayapal
 Cohen Jeffries
 Connolly Johnson (GA)
 Cooper Johnson, E. B.
 Correa Kaptur
 Costa Keating
 Costello (PA) Kelly (IL)
 Courtney Kennedy
 Crist Khanna
 Crowley Kihuen
 Cuellar Kildee
 Cummings Kilmer
 Curbelo (FL) Kind
 Davis (CA) King (NY)
 Davis, Danny Krishnamoorthi
 DeFazio Kuster (NH)
 DeGette Lamb
 Delaney Lance
 DeLauro Langevin
 DelBene Larsen (WA)
 Demings Larson (CT)
 DeSaulnier Lawrence
 Deutch Lawson (FL)
 Dingell Lee
 Doggett Levin
 Donovan Lewis (GA)
 Doyle, Michael Lieu, Ted
 F. Lipinski

Scott (VA) Suozzi
 Scott, David Swalwell (CA)
 Serrano Takano
 Sewell (AL) Thompson (CA)
 Shea-Porter Thompson (MS)
 Sherman Titus
 Sinema Tonko
 Sires Torres
 Smith (NJ) Tsongas
 Smith (WA) Upton
 Soto Vargas
 Stefanik Veasey

NOT VOTING—13

Bass Gaetz
 Black Hanabusa
 Blackburn Hoyer
 Cárdenas Peterson
 DeSantis Richmond

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2225

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from New Mexico (Mr.
 PEARCE) on which further proceedings
 were postponed and on which the ayes
 prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 216, noes 199,
 not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

AYES—216

Abraham Conaway
 Aderholt Cook
 Allen Costello (PA)
 Amash Cramer
 Amodei Crawford
 Arrington Cuellar
 Babin Culberson
 Bacon Curbelo (FL)
 Banks (IN) Curtis
 Barletta Davidson
 Barr Davis, Rodney
 Barton Denham
 Bergman DesJarlais
 Biggs Diaz-Balart
 Bilirakis Duffy
 Bishop (MI) Duncan (SC)
 Bishop (UT) Duncan (TN)
 Blum Dunn
 Bost Emmer
 Brady (TX) Estes (KS)
 Brat Ferguson
 Brooks (IN) Fleischmann
 Buck Flores
 Bucshon Fox
 Budd Frelinghuysen
 Burgess Gallagher
 Byrne Garrett
 Calvert Gianforte
 Carter (GA) Gibbs
 Carter (TX) Gohmert
 Chabot Goodlatte
 Cheney Gosar
 Cloud Gowdy
 Coffman Granger
 Cole Graves (GA)
 Collins (GA) Graves (LA)
 Collins (NY) Graves (MO)
 Comer Griffith
 Comstock Guthrie

Long Pittenger
 Loudermilk Poe (TX)
 Love Poliquin
 Lucas Posey
 Luetkemeyer Ratcliffe
 MacArthur Reed
 Marchant Reichert
 Marino Renacci
 Marshall Rice (SC)
 Massie Roby
 McCarthy Roe (TN)
 McCaul Rogers (AL)
 McClintock Rogers (KY)
 McHenry Rohrabacher
 McKinley Rokita
 McMorris Rooney, Francis
 Rodgers Rooney, Thomas
 McSally J.
 Meadows Ros-Lehtinen
 Messer Roskam
 Mitchell Ross
 Moolenaar Rothfus
 Mooney (WV) Rouzer
 Mullin Royce (CA)
 Newhouse Russell
 Noem Rutherford
 Norman Scalise
 Nunes Schweikert
 Olson Scott, Austin
 Palazzo Sensenbrenner
 Palmer Sessions
 Paulsen Shimkus
 Pearce Simpson
 Perry Smith (MO)

NOES—199

Adams Matsui
 Aguilar McCollum
 Barragán McEachin
 Beatty Foster
 Bera Frankel (FL)
 Beyer Fudge
 Bishop (GA) Gabbard
 Blumenauer Gallego
 Blunt Rochester Garamendi
 Bonamici Gomez
 Boyle, Brendan Gonzalez (TX)
 F. Gottheimer
 Brady (PA) Green, Al
 Brooks (AL) Green, Gene
 Brown (MD) Grijalva
 Brownley (CA) Grothman
 Buchanan Gutiérrez
 Bustos Hastings
 Butterfield Heck
 Capuano Herrera Beutler
 Carbajal Higgins (NY)
 Carson (IN) Himes
 Cartwright Huffman
 Castor (FL) Jackson Lee
 Castro (TX) Jayapal
 Chu, Judy Jeffries
 Cicilline Johnson (GA)
 Clark (MA) Johnson, E. B.
 Clarke (NY) Kaptur
 Clay Keating
 Cleaver Kelly (IL)
 Clyburn Kennedy
 Cohen Khanna
 Connolly Kihuen
 Cooper Kildee
 Correa Kilmer
 Costa Kind
 Costello (PA) King (NY)
 Courtney Krishnamoorthi
 Crist Kuster (NH)
 Crowley Lamb
 Cummings Lance
 Davis (CA) Langevin
 Davis, Danny Larsen (WA)
 DeFazio Larson (CT)
 DeGette Lawrence
 Delaney Lawson (FL)
 DeLauro Lee
 DelBene Levin
 Demings Lewis (GA)
 DeSaulnier Lieu, Ted
 Deutch Lipinski
 Dingell Loeb sack
 Doggett Lofgren
 Donovan Lowenthal
 Doyle, Michael Lowey
 F. Lujan Grisham,
 Ellison M.
 Engel Luján, Ben Ray
 Eshoo Lynch
 Espallat Maloney,
 Esty (CT) Carolyn B.
 Evans Maloney, Sean
 Faso Mast

Matsui
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pascrell
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Rosen
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Stefanik
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko

Torres Vela Waters, Maxine
Tsongas Velázquez Watson Coleman
Upton Visclosky Welch
Vargas Wasserman Wilson (FL)
Veasey Schultz Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bass Gaetz Shuster
Black Gaetz Speier
Blackburn Hanabusa
Cárdenas Hoyer Walz
DeSantis Peterson
Richmond

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2227

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 193, noes 220,
not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 355]

AYES—193

Abraham Diaz-Balart Jordan
Aderholt Duffy Kelly (MS)
Allen Duncan (SC) Kelly (PA)
Amash Duncan (TN) King (IA)
Amodel Dunn Kinzinger
Arrington Emmer Kustoff (TN)
Babin Estes (KS) Labrador
Bacon Ferguson LaHood
Banks (IN) Fleischmann LaMalfa
Barletta Flores Lamborn
Barr Fox Latta
Barton Gallagher Lesko
Bergman Garrett Lewis (MN)
Biggs Gianforte Long
Bishop (MI) Gibbs Loudermilk
Bishop (UT) Gohmert Love
Blum Goodlatte Lucas
Bost Gosar Luetkemeyer
Brady (TX) Gowdy MacArthur
Brat Granger Marchant
Brooks (AL) Graves (GA) Marino
Brooks (IN) Graves (LA) Marshall
Buck Graves (MO) Massie
Buchson Griffith Mast
Budd Grothman McCarthy
Burgess Guthrie McCaul
Byrne Handel McClintock
Calvert Harper McKinley
Carter (GA) Harris McMorris
Carter (TX) Hartzler Rodgers
Chabot Hensarling Meadows
Cheney Hice, Jody B. Messer
Cloud Higgins (LA) Mitchell
Cole Hill Moolenaar
Collins (GA) Holding Mooney (WV)
Collins (NY) Hollingsworth Mullin
Comer Hudson Newhouse
Conaway Huizenga Noem
Cook Hultgren Norman
Cramer Hunter Nunes
Culberson Issa Olson
Curtis Jenkins (KS) Palazzo
Davidson Jenkins (WV) Palmer
Davis, Rodney Johnson (LA) Pearce
Denham Johnson (OH) Perry
DesJarlais Johnson, Sam Pittenger

Poe (TX) Russell
Posey Rutherford
Ratcliffe Sanford
Reed Scalise
Renacci Schweikert
Rice (SC) Scott, Austin
Roby Sensenbrenner
Roe (TN) Sessions
Rogers (AL) Shimkus
Rogers (KY) Smith (MO)
Rohrabacher Smith (NE)
Rokita Smith (TX)
Rooney, Francis Smucker
Rooney, Thomas Stewart
J. Tenney
Ross Thompson (PA)
Rothfus Thornberry
Rouzer Valadao
Royce (CA) Wagner

NOES—220

Adams Gallego Neal
Aguilar Garamendi Nolan
Barragán Gomez Norcross
Beatty Gonzalez (TX) O'Halleran
Bera Gottheimer O'Rourke
Beyer Green, Al Pallone
Bilirakis Green, Gene Panetta
Bishop (GA) Grijalva Pascarell
Blumenauer Gutiérrez Paulsen
Blunt Rochester Hastings Payne
Bonamici Heck Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan Herrera Beutler Perlmutter
F. Higgins (NY)
Brady (PA) Himes Pingree
Brown (MD) Huffman Pocan
Brownley (CA) Hurd Poliquin
Buchanan Jackson Lee Polis
Bustos Jayapal Price (NC)
Butterfield Jeffries Quigley
Capuano Johnson (GA) Raskin
Carbajal Johnson, E. B. Reichert
Carson (IN) Jones Rice (NY)
Cartwright Joyce (OH) Ros-Lehtinen
Castor (FL) Kaptur Rosen
Castro (TX) Katko Roskam
Chu, Judy Keating Roybal-Allard
Cicilline Kelly (IL) Ruiz
Clark (MA) Kennedy Ruppertsberger
Clarke (NY) Khanna Rush
Clay Kihuen Ryan (OH)
Cleaver Kildee Sánchez
Clyburn Kilmer Sarbanes
Coffman Kind Schakowsky
Cohen King (NY) Schiff
Comstock Knight Schneider
Connolly Krishnamoorthi Schrader
Cooper Kuster (NH) Scott (VA)
Correa Lamb Scott, David
Costa Lance Serrano
Costello (PA) Langevin Sewell (AL)
Courtney Larsen (WA) Shea-Porter
Crist Larson (CT) Sherman
Crowley Lawrence Simpson
Cuellar Lawson (FL) Sinema
Cummings Lee Sires
Curbelo (FL) Levin Smith (NJ)
Davis (CA) Lewis (GA) Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny Lieu, Ted Soto
DeFazio Lipinski Stefanik
DeGette LoBiondo Stivers
Delaney Loeb sack Suozzi
DeLauro Lofgren Swalwell (CA)
DelBene Lowenthal Takano
Demings Lowey Taylor
DeSaulnier Lujan Grisham, Thompson (CA)
Deutch M. Thompson (MS)
Dingell Lujan, Ben Ray Titus
Doggett Lynch Tonko
Donovan Maloney, Torres
Doyle, Michael Carolyn B. Trott
F. Maloney, Sean Tsongas
Ellison Matsui Turner
Engel McCollum Upton
Eshoo McEachin Vargas
Españill McGovern Veasey
Esty (CT) McHenry Vela
Evans McNerney Velázquez
Faso McSally Visclosky
Fitzpatrick Meeks Wasserman
Fortenberry Meng Schultz
Foster Moore Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL) Moulton Watson Coleman
Frelinghuysen Murphy (FL) Welch
Nadler Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth Napolitano

NOT VOTING—15

Bass DeSantis Richmond
Black Gaetz Shuster
Blackburn Hanabusa Speier
Cárdenas Hoyer Tipton
Crawford Peterson Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2231

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. JODY B. HICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B.
HICE) 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 amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 174, noes 240,
not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]

AYES—174

Abraham Fortenberry Loudermilk
Aderholt Gallagher Love
Allen Garrett Luetkemeyer
Amash Gianforte Marchant
Arrington Gibbs Marino
Babin Gohmert Marshall
Banks (IN) Gonzalez (TX) Massie
Barletta Goodlatte Mast
Barr Gosar McCarthy
Barton Gowdy McCaul
Bergman Granger McClintock
Biggs Graves (GA) McHenry
Bilirakis Graves (LA) McMorris
Bishop (MI) Graves (MO) Rodgers
Bishop (UT) Griffith Meadows
Blum Grothman Messer
Bost Guthrie Mitchell
Brady (TX) Handel Mooney (WV)
Brat Harper Mullin
Brooks (AL) Harris Newhouse
Brooks (IN) Hartzler Noem
Buck Hensarling Norman
Budd Hice, Jody B. Olson
Burgess Higgins (LA) Palazzo
Byrne Hill Palmer
Carter (GA) Holding Pearce
Carter (TX) Hudson Perry
Chabot Huizenga Pittenger
Cheney Hultgren Poe (TX)
Cloud Hunter Poliquin
Collins (GA) Issa Posey
Comer Jenkins (KS) Ratcliffe
Comstock Johnson (LA) Renacci
Conaway Johnson (OH) Rice (SC)
Cook Johnson, Sam Roe (TN)
Cramer Jones Rogers (AL)
Crawford Jordan Rohrabacher
Culberson Kelly (MS) Rokita
Curtis Kelly (PA) Rooney, Francis
Davidson King (IA) Rooney, Thomas
DesJarlais Kinzinger J.
Duffy Kustoff (TN) Ross
Duncan (SC) Labrador Rothfus
Duncan (TN) LaHood Rouzer
Dunn LaMalfa Russell
Emmer Lamborn Sanford
Estes (KS) Latta Scalise
Ferguson Johnson (LA) Lesko Schweikert
Fleischmann Lewis (MN) Scott, Austin
Flores Long Sensenbrenner

Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Wagner

Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Nolan
Peterson

Richmond
Shuster

Speier
Walz

Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson

Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden

Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

NOES—240

Adams
Aguilar
Amodei
Bacon
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capuano
Carbal
Carbaljal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard

NOT VOTING—14

Bass
Black
Blackburn

Cárdenas
DeSantis
Gaetz

O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Kaptur
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Stefanik
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2233

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF
MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 215, noes 199,
not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 357]

AYES—215

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Bost
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer

Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
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)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador

LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

NOES—199

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbaljal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Schiff
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bass
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Cárdenas

DeSantis
Gaetz
Hanabusa
Hoyer
Peterson

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Stefanik
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zeldin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman

Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Zeldin

NOES—189

Adams
 Aguilar
 Barragán
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capuano
 Carbajal
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Cooper
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crist
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Esty (CT)
 Evans
 Faso
 Fitzpatrick
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Gomez
 Gonzalez (TX)
 Gottheimer
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hastings
 Heck
 Higgins (NY)
 Himes
 Huffman
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kihuen
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Lamb
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loebsock
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham, M.
 Lujan, Ben Ray
 Lynch
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McMorney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano

NOT VOTING—13

Bass
 Black
 Blackburn
 Cárdenas
 DeSantis
 Gaetz
 Hanabusa
 Hoyer
 Peterson
 Richmond
 Shuster
 Speier
 Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2243

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) on which further pro-

ceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 192, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]

AYES—223

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Arrington
 Babin
 Bacon
 Banks (IN)
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bergman
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blum
 Bost
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Cloud
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Culberson
 Curbelo (FL)
 Curtis
 Davidson
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Donovan
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Estes (KS)
 Ferguson
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallagher
 Garrett
 Gianforte
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guthrie
 Handel
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzer
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Higgins (LA)
 Holding
 Hollingsworth
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger
 Knight
 Kustoff (TN)
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Latta
 Lesko
 Lewis (MN)
 LoBiondo
 McClintock
 Marshall
 Massie
 Mast
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meadows
 Messer
 Mitchell
 Moelenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Norman
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Raskin
 Pearce
 Perry
 Pittenger
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Posey
 Ratcliffe
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Rice (SC)
 Roby
 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
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smucker
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Tenney
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Zeldin

NOES—192

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

NOT VOTING—13

Bass
 Black
 Blackburn
 Cárdenas
 DeSantis
 Gaetz
 Hanabusa
 Hoyer
 Peterson
 Richmond
 Shuster
 Speier
 Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2246

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

Evans	Lee	Rice (NY)
Faso	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen
Fitzpatrick	Lewis (GA)	Rosen
Fortenberry	Lieu, Ted	Roybal-Allard
Foster	Lipinski	Ruiz
Frankel (FL)	LoBiondo	Ruppersberger
Fudge	Loeb sack	Rush
Gabbard	Lofgren	Ryan (OH)
Gallego	Lowenthal	Sánchez
Garamendi	Lowey	Sarbanes
Gomez	Lujan Grisham,	Schakowsky
Gonzalez (TX)	M.	Schiff
Gottheimer	Luján, Ben Ray	Schneider
Green, Al	Lynch	Schrader
Green, Gene	Maloney,	Scott (VA)
Grijalva	Carolyn B.	Scott, David
Gutiérrez	Maloney, Sean	Serrano
Hastings	Mast	Sewell (AL)
Heck	Matsui	Shea-Porter
Higgins (NY)	McCollum	Sherman
Himes	McEachin	Sires
Huffman	McGovern	Smith (NJ)
Jackson Lee	McKinley	Smith (WA)
Jayapal	McNerney	Soto
Jeffries	Meadows	Stefanik
Johnson (GA)	Meeks	Suozi
Johnson (OH)	Meng	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson, E. B.	Moore	Takano
Jones	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Joyce (OH)	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Kaptur	Nadler	Titus
Katko	Napolitano	Tonko
Keating	Neal	Torres
Kelly (IL)	Nolan	Tsongas
Kennedy	Norcross	Turner
Khanna	O'Halleran	Valadao
Kihuen	O'Rourke	Vargas
Kildee	Pallone	Veasey
Kilmer	Panetta	Vela
Kind	Pascrell	Velázquez
King (NY)	Payne	Visclosky
Knight	Pelosi	Wasserman
Krishnamoorthi	Perlmutter	Schultz
Kuster (NH)	Perry	Waters, Maxine
Lamb	Peters	Watson Coleman
Lance	Pingree	Welch
Langevin	Pocan	Wilson (FL)
Larsen (WA)	Polis	Yarmuth
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Young (AK)
Lawrence	Quigley	
Lawson (FL)	Raskin	

NOT VOTING—15

Amodei	DeSantis	Richmond
Bass	Gaetz	Shuster
Black	Hanabusa	Sinema
Blackburn	Hoyer	Speier
Cárdenas	Peterson	Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2252

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably
detained. Had I been present, I would have
voted "nay" on rollcall No. 362.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no
further amendments, under the rule,
the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose;
and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUR-
TIS) having assumed the chair, Mr.
COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the
Committee of the Whole House on the
state of the Union, reported that that
Committee, having had under consider-
ation the bill (H.R. 6147) making appro-
priations for the Department of the In-
terior, environment, and related agen-
cies for the fiscal year ending Sep-
tember 30, 2019, and for other purposes,
and, pursuant to House Resolution 996,
he reported the bill, as amended by
that resolution, back to the House with
sundry further amendments adopted in
the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under
the rule, the previous question is or-
dered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any
further amendment reported from the
Committee of the Whole? If not, the
Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
question is on the engrossment and
third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed
and read a third time, and was read the
third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant
to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further
consideration of H.R. 6147 is postponed.

 HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MACARTHUR. 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 gen-
tleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

 TAX REFORM

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr.
Speaker, I am honored to rise today to
speak to the success in Louisiana's
Fourth Congressional District that we
have seen since the implementation of
the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Every skeptic, even the early skept-
ics of tax reform, saw near immediate
benefits when the IRS adjusted their
withholding tables and it resulted in
bigger paychecks for more than 90 per-
cent of Americans.

Now we are 7 months out, and after
the enactment of the Tax Cuts and
Jobs Act, the results are undeniable.
Nearly every economic indicator,
whether you are talking about the un-
employment rate or wages or job crea-
tion, is showing record growth; and
because of this tax reform, more than 1
million jobs have already been created
and more than 4 million Americans
have received increased wages or bo-
nuses.

The average tax cut in Louisiana for
a family of four was more than \$1,700.
That is not crumbs. That is real money
for the people in my district, and it
provides them with greater flexibility
to save for the future.

Real benefits for real people, that is
what tax reform delivered. I look for-
ward to many more success stories be-
cause of this historic legislation.

 HONORING COMMISSIONER ROY
CHARLES BROOKS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise
today to join my fellow Texans in hon-

oring Tarrant County Commissioner
Roy Charles Brooks for a tremendous
year of leadership as president of the
National Association of Counties.

For over 30 years, Commissioner
Brooks has fought for underserved
communities across Tarrant County.
As a community volunteer, a city
elected official, and county commis-
sioner, his integrity, innovation, and
fervor to help others has touched gen-
erations of Texans.

He has taken on issues such as
healthcare for the homeless, infant
mortality, obesity, criminal justice re-
form, mental health, and AIDS edu-
cation; and this past year, he worked
tirelessly to bring awareness to his
presidential initiative Serving the Un-
derserved: Counties Addressing Pov-
erty.

The project has pushed over 3,000
counties to look at the role they play
in alleviating poverty and to develop
best practices to address vital societal
needs, especially as pertain to early
childhood development.

Through his work, he has created a
community family that supports and
lifts each other up, building hope and
faith across Tarrant County. I honor
his lifetime of work and his dedication
to advocating for the toughest issues
that our communities face.

□ 2300

 CONGRATULATING THE NEVADA
COUNTY FARM BUREAU

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given
permission to address the House for 1
minute and to revise and extend his re-
marks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise
today to commend and note Nevada
County Farm Bureau in my district in
northern California that is celebrating
this weekend their 100th anniversary of
existence in Nevada County, helping
farmers and ranchers with the very di-
verse types of crops they have, not like
in the flatlands, but nestled in the
foothills and the mountains of Nevada
County.

They have different crops: hay crops,
tree crops, even a level of forestry that
they are all involved with there. The
Farm Bureau has been a leader a long
time in helping those folks to navigate
regulations, ideas for better propaga-
tion of their crops, and just a better
way to do things in the community.

We appreciate their leadership and
all of their memberships to help make
farming strong.

Congratulations to the Nevada Coun-
ty Farm Bureau on 100 years of helping
their members in Nevada County.

 PRESIDENT TRUMP'S COMMENTS
AT HELSINKI

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I
would like to share an editorial from

the Union Leader, New Hampshire's statewide newspaper.

People who thought a weak and dying Roosevelt gave away too much to the Russians at Yalta in World War II may want to reconsider. Compared to the pathetic, boot-licking performance of President Trump in Helsinki this week, FDR had his A-game going against Joseph Stalin.

Republicans who are now, finally, trying to distance themselves from Trump have no one to blame but themselves. They kept silent as Trump has disgraced and demeaned the office, damaged our relations with loyal allies, and repeatedly attempted to destroy a free press.

But when an American President openly sides with a Russian KGB thug against our own country, those politicians sense that the 'optics' don't look so good and might threaten their power and perks in midterm elections.

Trump, of course, is now trying to walk things back, but even his hard-core supporters must wince at how he tries to worm his way out of his nauseating Helsinki brownnosing of the dictator Putin.

But the Republican Party isn't Trump's hardcore faithful; and if the party doesn't clearly denounce this shameful and disgraceful performance, it is going to find itself with no credibility and no hope for years to come.

That is the end of the editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

GUN LEGISLATION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, last school year was a deadly year for so many of our children going to school in America. School shootings shocked the very core of Americans and communities across the country.

As we approach the beginning of school, this Congress has passed no gun safety legislation, no universal background check, no banning of assault weapons, no holding parents responsible for children getting guns.

Although I understand that there are many discussions about school security, the proliferation of guns is one of the issues that contributes to the dangers that our children face.

We know that the Second Amendment guarantees the right to bear arms, but there is nothing in the Second Amendment that does not allow us to have sensible gun safety legislation.

It is time for us to recognize that a Nation that has more guns than citizens can stand down in order to provide a safe educational climate for our children.

Are they not our most precious resource? It is time to act now.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6042. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to delay the reduction in Federal medical assistance percentage for Medicaid personal care services furnished without an electronic visit verification system, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 490. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam.

S. 931. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, as the "George Sakato Post Office".

S. 2692. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4558 Broadway in New York, New York, as the "Stanley Michels Post Office Building".

S. 2734. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the "George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 19, 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:

5665. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the July, 2018 monthly cumulative report on rescissions, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e); Public Law 93-344, Sec. 1014(e); (88 Stat. 335); to the Committee on Appropriations.

5666. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Colonel Christopher J. Niemi, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5667. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Gina M. Grosso, United States Air Force, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5668. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Involuntary Liquidation of Federal Credit Unions and Claims Procedures (RIN: 3133-AE82) received July 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5669. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for the Division of Regulatory Services, Office of the Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's significant guidance — Technical Assistance on Student Privacy for State and Local Educational Agencies When Administering College Admissions Examinations received July 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5670. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for the Division of Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Assistance to States for the Education of Children with Disabilities; Preschool Grants for Children with Disabilities [Docket ID: ED-2017-OSERS-0128] (RIN: 1820-AB77) received July 9, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5671. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Children's Products, Children's Toys, and Child Care Articles: Determinations Regarding Lead, ASTM F963 Elements, and Phthalates for Engineered Wood Products [Docket No.: CPSC-2017-0038] received July 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5672. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Safety Standard for Baby Changing Products [Docket No.: CPSC-2016-0023] received July 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5673. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting certification regarding the essential health benefit requirements under section 1302(b)(2) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5674. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyroxsulam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0227; FRL-9978-15] received July 9, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5675. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0104; FRL-9980-43-Region 9] received July 9, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5676. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Colorado; Attainment Demonstration for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard for the Denver Metro/North Front Range Nonattainment Area, and Approval of Related Revisions [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0567; FRL-9979-64-Region 8] received July 9, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5677. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Revised Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets for the Charleston, Huntington, Parkersburg, Weirton, and Wheeling 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Areas; Correction [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0511; FRL-9980-36-Region 3] received July 9, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5678. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0152; FRL-9980-62-Region 3] received July 9, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5679. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; AL; Section 128 Board Requirements for Infrastructure SIPs [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0642; FRL-9980-50-Region 4] received July 9, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5680. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5681. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the CY 2017 report on the Employment of United States Citizens in Certain International Organizations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C.276c-4; Public Law 102-138, Sec. 181 (as amended by Public Law 114-323, Sec. 308); (130 Stat. 1923); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5682. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 18-03, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5683. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 18-24, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5684. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 18-0A, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5685. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 18-0D, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5686. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-132, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5687. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-397, "Fiscal Year 2019 Local Budget Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5688. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a notification of a nomination and action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5689. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting three notifications of a nomination, action on nomination, change in previously submitted reported information, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5690. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 150121066-5717-02] (RIN: 0648-XF890) received July 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5691. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 151130999-6594-02] (RIN: 0648-XF807) received July 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5692. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report titled, "Debt Collection Recovery Activities of the Department of Justice for Civil Debts Referred for Collection Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2017", pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3718(c); Public Law 97-452, Sec. 1(16)(A) (as amended by Public Law 99-578, Sec. 1(4)); (100 Stat. 3305); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5693. A letter from the Regulations Officer, FHWA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition to the National Network [FHWA Docket No.: FHWA-2018-0016] (RIN: 2125-AF82) received July 3, 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.

5694. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress concerning emigration laws and policies of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(b); Public Law 93-618, Sec. 402(b); (88 Stat. 2056) and 19 U.S.C. 2439(b); Public Law 93-618, Sec. 409(b); (88 Stat. 2064); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5695. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Dahlonga Plateau Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2016-0012; T.D. TTB-151; Ref. Notice No. 166] (RIN: 1513-AC33) received July 11, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. House Resolution 982. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President, and directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to transmit, respectively, certain information to the House of Representatives referring to the separation of children from their parents or guardians as a result of the President's "zero tolerance" policy (Rept. 114-835). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2345. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-to-remember dialing code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system; with an amendment (Rept. 115-836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4881. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a task force for meeting the connectivity and technology needs of precision agriculture in the United States; with amendments (Rept. 114-837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3916. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to vest in the Secretary of the Interior functions under that Act with respect to species of fish that spawn in fresh or estuarine waters and migrate to ocean waters, and species of fish that spawn in ocean waters and migrate to fresh waters; with an amendment (Rept. 115-838). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 577. A bill to designate a peak in the State of Nevada as Maude Frazier Mountain (Rept. 115-839). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3045. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-840). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3994. A bill to establish the Office and for other purpose; with an amendment (Rept. 115-841). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4606. A bill to provide that applications under the Natural Gas Act for the importation or exportation of small volumes of natural gas shall be granted without modification or delay, with an amendment (Rept. 115-842). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5709. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for enhanced penalties for pirate radio, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-843). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 6414. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to extend the deadline for promulgation of regulations under the tribal transportation self-governance program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H.R. 6415. A bill to provide for border security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, Foreign Affairs, Agriculture, Armed Services, Natural Resources, the Budget, and 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. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 6416. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to direct the Federal Communications Commission, upon the request of a very high frequency commercial television broadcast station that has relocated to an underserved State, to provide that the virtual major channel number of such station shall be considered to be the same as the radio frequency channel number of such station; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr.

PETERSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BARR, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COLE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COMER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. DUNN, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. FASO, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JONES, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. NUNES, Mr. REED, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. YOHO, Mr. KATKO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 6417. A bill to create a nonimmigrant H-2C work visa program for agricultural workers, to make mandatory and permanent requirements relating to use of an electronic employment eligibility verification system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, 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 Ms. ESTY of Connecticut:

H.R. 6418. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study regarding the accessibility of websites of the Department of Veterans Affairs to individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut:

H.R. 6419. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend increased dependency and indemnity compensation paid to surviving spouses of veterans who die from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, regardless of how long the veterans had such disease prior to death; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAMB:

H.R. 6420. A bill to permit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a grant program to conduct cemetery research and

produce educational materials for the Veterans Legacy Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 6421. A bill to advance treatment and cures for blindness and other retinal conditions and to promote competitiveness in the United States through a pilot program to increase funding for translational research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LONG, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 6422. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to publish on the website of the Commission documents to be voted on by the Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 6423. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to certain Russian financial institutions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 6424. A bill to amend the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999, to clarify acceptable 9-1-1 obligations or expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 6425. A bill to provide grants to State-recognized or federally recognized apprenticeship programs to support the expansion, awareness, and prestige of such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 6426. A bill to provide for measures to strengthen dialogue with the Russian people and support Russian civil society, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. GABBARD (for herself and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 6427. A bill to improve oversight by the Federal Communications Commission of the wireless and broadcast emergency alert systems; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. GOTTHEIMER (for himself, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 6428. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 332 Ramapo Valley Road in Oakland, New Jersey, as the "Frank Leone Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 6429. A bill to amend the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 to authorize candidates in a presidential election campaign to request a security clearance; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CORREA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 6430. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to implement certain requirements for information relating to supply chain risk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 6431. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for certain reforms with respect to medicare supplemental health insurance policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McEACHIN (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. EVANS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BARRAGAN, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 6432. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the applicable percentage under the premium assistance tax credit for households with young adults; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 6433. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit Congressional candidates and Members of Congress from soliciting campaign funds on any day on which the House of Congress in which the candidate seeks election or the Member serves is in session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 6434. A bill to amend section 7 of Public Law 100-515 (16 U.S.C. 1244 note) to promote continued use of the James J. Howard Marine Sciences Laboratory at Gateway National Recreation Area by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 6435. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to prohibit States from entering into agreements with vendors for the provision, support, or maintenance of election systems if the vendors are owned or controlled by persons who are not citizens, nationals, or permanent residents of the United States or do not meet cybersecurity best practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 6436. A bill to direct the Director of National Intelligence to submit to State election officials and Congress annual reports on pre-election threats for general elections for Federal office; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H. Res. 1003. A resolution prohibiting Members of the House of Representatives from soliciting campaign funds on any day on which

the House is in session; to the Committee on Ethics.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 6414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H.R. 6415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval forces

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 6416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 6417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to clause 4 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States which gives Congress the authority to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut:

H.R. 6418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut:

H.R. 6419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LAMB:

H.R. 6420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 6421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3
Interstate Commerce

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 6422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;" and 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 Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 6423.

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. 6424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 6425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 6426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

or

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 6427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 6428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 6429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 6430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 6431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 6432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 6433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 6434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. RASKIN:

H.R. 6435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 6436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 395: Mr. CURTIS.
H.R. 490: Mr. CLOUD.
H.R. 508: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 559: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 671: Mr. KILMER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 750: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 754: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BOST, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BRAT, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 785: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 930: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1102: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1143: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1171: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1201: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1270: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1316: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. POSEY, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1439: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1511: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 1542: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1552: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 1565: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 1838: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1874: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1896: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1897: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1960: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2060: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2345: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2472: Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. BASS, and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 2598: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2633: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BARRAGAN, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2735: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2840: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2946: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 2953: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3138: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 3348: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 3709: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 3728: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 3790: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 3827: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 4099: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 4215: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 4338: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 4345: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 4473: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 4556: Ms. LOFGREN and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 4732: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 4765: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 4846: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 4886: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 4912: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 4915: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 5107: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 5121: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 5129: Mr. LONG and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 5145: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 5153: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 5158: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 5187: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 5241: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 5358: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 5383: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 5471: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 5476: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 5507: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 5508: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 5561: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5564: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 5573: Ms. PINGREE.

- H.R. 5632: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 5648: Mr. BIGGS.
 H.R. 5757: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 5855: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 5856: Mr. GIANFORTE.
 H.R. 5899: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, and Ms. TENNEY.
 H.R. 6014: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 6026: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 6068: Mr. ABRAHAM.
 H.R. 6086: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 6108: Mr. FASO.
 H.R. 6156: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 6179: Mr. WILLIAMS.
 H.R. 6193: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 6230: Mr. CICILLINE and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 6246: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 6287: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.R. 6330: Mr. COMER.
 H.R. 6336: Ms. ADAMS.
 H.R. 6351: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 6398: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 6400: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 6409: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.J. Res. 61: Mrs. LESKO.
 H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. JONES and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
 H. Res. 455: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. BASS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
 H. Res. 745: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CICILLINE.
 H. Res. 749: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H. Res. 776: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H. Res. 795: Mr. DUNN.
 H. Res. 864: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H. Res. 869: Mr. NORCROSS.
 H. Res. 930: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H. Res. 931: Mr. POE of Texas and Ms. TITUS.
 H. Res. 975: Ms. GABBARD.
 H. Res. 990: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. KINZINGER.
 H. Res. 993: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. MOORE.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 18, 2018

No. 121

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who has been the hope and joy of many generations, thank You for giving us the power to seek You. We praise You for Your promise that those who keep on seeking will find what they seek. Inspire our lawmakers to seek Your wisdom in order to be guided by Your loving providence.

Lord, give them a clearer vision of Your truth, a great faith in Your might, and a deeper assurance of Your love. Teach them to labor and not to ask for any reward except that of knowing they are doing Your will.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will pro-

ceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this week the Senate continues to confirm impressive nominees whom President Trump has asked to serve our country. We have confirmed two Assistant Secretaries to the Department of Education, Scott Stump and James Blew. We have confirmed a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, Randal Quarles. Now we will turn to the judiciary and consider nominees to the Fifth Circuit and Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

First is Andrew Oldham of Texas, the President's choice for the Fifth Circuit. Mr. Oldham has impressed the legal community in his years of public service, most recently as general counsel to the Governor of Texas.

Mr. Oldham has degrees from the University of Virginia, Cambridge, and Harvard Law. He clerked on both the DC Circuit Court and the Supreme Court. He carries the highest possible rating from the American Bar Association, "unanimously well-qualified."

He comes highly recommended by peers and colleagues from across the political spectrum. Judith Zaffirini is a Texas State senator. She is a Democrat. She wrote the Judiciary Committee to support Mr. Oldham's nomination "confidently, enthusiastically, and without reservation." She and the nominee have worked together on a number of important subjects. Through them all, she explains, "Mr. Oldham reflected the ideal qualities of a judge . . . open-minded, fair . . . thoughtful and analytical."

Lisa Blatt is a skilled litigator who argues frequently before the Supreme Court. She is also a Democrat. She wrote the committee too. Her letter describes Mr. Oldham as "a great listener" with "a brilliant legal mind, [and] a wonderful sense of humor and collegiality."

Her conclusion? He would "make a superb judge."

What about Mr. Oldham's own words? If confirmed, he explained to our colleagues during his hearing, he will "uphold the rights of all litigants—big or little—equally, and apply the law to all fairly."

He understands his responsibility, clearly. I look forward to confirming this nominee, and I urge each of our colleagues to join me.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. President, on another matter, it has been a year and a half since Republican majorities took their seats in Congress and a Republican President was sworn in. In 2016, the American people made it clear it was time to try something new. They were tired of a so-called recovery that focused overwhelmingly on big, wealthy metropolitan areas. They had seen enough of tax hikes and top-down regulations that held their communities back. They turned to Republicans to deliver a pro-growth, pro-opportunity agenda to create better conditions for working families, job creators, and entrepreneurs to rise together.

Eighteen months later, the results could not be clearer. Today, more people say it is a good time to find a job than at almost any point since the turn of the millennium. U.S. manufacturers are more confident than ever about the future of their businesses.

Here is a story from yesterday's Financial Times: "US retail sales rise for fifth straight month in June." This is a good sign for Americans all across the board. It shows our economy is healthy. It shows that families feel they have enough breathing room to

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S5027

make purchases, which of course then benefit the companies and workers who produce what they are buying. Of course, it is especially good for the 42 million Americans whose jobs are supported by the retail industry.

According to industry data, more than 6 in 10 Americans work in retail at some point in their career, so this continued prosperity is really significant. There is little question that tax reform is to thank for a significant portion of this progress.

For one thing, our middle-class tax cuts are directly boosting families' discretionary income. As the Wall Street Journal reported this week, "many households are experiencing less withholding from their paychecks thanks to the tax overhaul."

Analysts also point to the business side of tax reform, which is letting more U.S. employers expand and hire. That means more jobs for American workers, which means more income for American families, which means more money in the cash registers of American small businesses. The virtuous cycle goes on.

The American people and most fair observers are marveling at what our economy is delivering to workers and middle-class families, but I am starting to think our Democratic colleagues may have forgotten what a successful economic agenda looks like because even in the face of headline after headline and testimony after testimony from job creators we represent, they try to brush off this impressive growth as nothing serious, and they advocate for repealing or undoing the Republican policies that are helping to make it happen.

Fortunately, Republicans know full well how to cut taxes, trim back regulations, and get Washington out of the American people's way. It is just what we have done. It is just what we will continue to do.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRUMP-PUTIN SUMMIT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday, President Trump went through a walk back. President Trump's walk back performance was pathetic. It was weak, insincere, and thoroughly unconvincing. The President read a scripted clarification yesterday like he was in a hostage situation. All you had to do was look at his face. He couldn't even fully commit to it, adding off-the-cuff that other people could also be responsible for election interference in 2016. That is hardly a walk back, and it was concerning only one particular comment. The President did not address his lavish praise for Vladimir Putin in Helsinki. Is he going to walk that back? He blamed both countries—the United States and Russia—for the sour relations between us. Is he going to walk that back? He said U.S. stupidity and foolishness, not Russian aggression, was the reason our relationship with Russia was so bad. Is he going to

walk that back? He did not address his brazen attacks on the FBI while on foreign soil. Is he going to walk that back?

Now, late last night and this morning, the President is back to celebrating his meeting with Putin. He is walking back the walk back. That is what he did this morning. This is like Charlottesville redux. We all know what the President really thought. We know what he thought at Charlottesville. The walk back was unconvincing, and he went back to his old ways. We know what he thought at Helsinki. The walk back was unconvincing. And now, with his tweets this morning, he is back to his old ways.

The only reason there was a walk back is that the President was forced by pressure from many of my Republican friends here, from his allies in the media, and his own White House staff. They all pressured him to give that temporary walk back. But it is clear from today's tweets that he doesn't mean it, that he doesn't believe it, and, frankly, neither does anybody else. It is clear that he still believes President Putin over the consensus of the American intelligence community, and that puts Americans' security gravely at risk.

The President's reluctant, ham-handed, half-hearted "clarification" yesterday—almost entirely reversed this morning—is woefully inadequate. His behavior in Helsinki continues to demand a response from Congress, and there are many things we can do. But later this morning, if anything is true to form, the President will hold a Cabinet meeting, and his advisers will shower him with thanks and praise—this is what he craves—and will provide, perhaps, another version of what happened in Helsinki.

Given what happened in Helsinki and given that the President's walk back was so weak, there are several things we as a Congress can and should do. Talking the talk is not enough. Walking the walk is what is so important here. We need to act, not simply say "tsk, tsk; bad President" and then go back to business as usual, because the American polity, the American security, and the view of America in the eyes of the world have taken a severe setback. It is up to us in the Congress to try to undo that.

I mentioned a whole host of actions this body can take to counter Russia's malign activity, punish Putin for interfering in our elections, prevent him from doing it again, and ensure that the President is doing what is necessary to stand up for American interests. The Senate is not powerless to take action in the wake of President Trump's indefensible performance at his summit with Vladimir Putin. Let me reiterate and suggest some things we should do, and I believe we should do all of these.

First, our Republican colleagues need to join us in demanding immediate public testimony from the President's

national security team—those who were in Helsinki and those who would have knowledge of what happened in Helsinki.

We need to have immediate public testimony from Secretary Pompeo, from DNI Director Coats, and from Ambassador Huntsman.

Above all, we need the translator who was present at the one-on-one meeting with President Putin to testify openly before Congress. That is not usually done, but there are almost always other people in the room, so you don't need the translator. But for some reason—a reason that Americans and the world are wondering about—President Trump wanted no one else in the room. Having the translator come testify and tell us what happened there is an imperative. It is so important. It is rare for translators to come before Congress, but in this case, it is warranted—A, because no one else was in the room, by the President's direction, and B, because what happened there might have been so important, given what happened in public a few short hours afterward. The translator works for the Federal Government, works for the taxpayers, and may be the only person who can accurately report what President Trump said to President Putin behind closed doors, what concessions were made to Vladimir Putin. We want to know. Did the President make concessions that hurt our national security? What did he agree to?

Congress has a duty to conduct responsible oversight of the executive branch, particularly after what the President did in Helsinki. The President's summit calls for oversight. Having these people—particularly the translator—come testify is important. I understand Secretary Pompeo will appear before the Foreign Relations Committee next week, which is good, but we need to hear from others, including the translator. I urge Leader MCCONNELL and his leadership team to immediately request a hearing of the people I mentioned.

Second, the Republican leadership should soon place on the floor—ASAP—bipartisan legislation, led by Senators BOOKER, GRAHAM, COONS, and TILLIS, to protect the special counsel from political interference. This legislation passed out of the Judiciary Committee with bipartisan support. It has four sponsors—two Democrats, two Republicans. If Leader MCCONNELL is serious about the checks and balances and if what he said in the last day or two were not just meaningless words, he will put this legislation on the floor. It will pass.

Alongside demanding testimony from the President's national security team, passing legislation to protect the special counsel is probably the most important thing this body could do to ensure that President Trump's recklessness does not precipitate a constitutional crisis.

Third, we should ratchet up sanctions on Putin and his cronies, not

water them down. The sanctions this body passed by an overwhelming bipartisan margin of 98 to 2—and I salute Leader MCCONNELL; he helped to bring it to the floor even though the President didn't like it—have not yet been fully implemented by the Trump administration. On our side, Senators MENENDEZ and VAN HOLLEN have some very good ideas about sanctions, and we should act on them.

Fourth, our Republican colleagues can and should insist that the President finally release his tax returns. We all know that the President broke decades of practice when he didn't release those returns—so damaging because his economic interests outside of the government are so large, complicated, and varied and so important because he deals with international finance in these situations.

There was no good reason not to release his tax returns then. Yet President Trump's inexplicable behavior in Helsinki has many Americans asking: What does Putin have over him that he is behaving in a way that is, basically, inexplicable by any rational, logical line of thinking? That is why his tax returns will be so important. We should pass legislation that requires the President to release his tax returns. It was important before, but it is much more important now, after Helsinki.

Fifth, the Republicans should demand with us that the President insist the 12 Russians who have been indicted for our election interference and information warfare be handed over. Putin may not do it, but at least we ought to show how serious we are as a country. The President ought to show how alarmed he is that this happened, and the best way to do that is for our Republican colleagues to join with us. They will have more influence than we will have in asking him to do so.

Finally, we should have bipartisan legislation on election security. Together, in a bipartisan way, with the help of my friend from Tennessee—a senior member of Appropriations—in the last omnibus bill, we passed \$380 million for election security. As I understand it, that money is now being sent out to help the States, but we have to do more. There is bipartisan legislation. Senators KLOBUCHAR and LANKFORD and Senators VAN HOLLEN and RUBIO have good legislation that could help beef up our election security. We ought to move on it.

Our country—our cyber networks and our election systems—is under constant attack from adversaries like the Russians. There is bipartisan consensus that we must harden our election infrastructure. This has led to the legislation I mentioned by KLOBUCHAR, LANKFORD, VAN HOLLEN, and RUBIO. There is other legislation by Senators HARRIS and WYDEN. I urge the Republican leader to let us move on one or more of these bills.

We should do all of these things, not just one or two—all of them. I can't think of a logical reason not to do any

of them other than out of fear of offending the President. Times like these call for us to do more. We have already heard some of our Republican colleagues say “let's move on” after what the President said yesterday—as I mentioned, his so-called walk back was not a walk back at all—and that if we cared about our Nation's security, we would move forward.

The final thing I would say to my Republican colleagues is this: This is a moment that will be remembered in American history. It is not going away. This is a moment that will be remembered next week, next month, in November of 2018, in November of 2020, and way beyond. The Helsinki summit is now an unalterable fact in American history—a moment when, unfortunately, an American President humiliated his own country and himself before a foreign dictator. It was a terrible sign of weakness by this President, and it, unfortunately, weakens the office he holds.

Yet it can be remembered as a moment when a bipartisan majority in Congress—Democrats and Republicans in their dropping all trappings of party—links arms and stands up for our country after our President has refused to do so. Let's hope it is. Let's hope it is.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. President, I know my colleagues are waiting, and I appreciate their indulgence as I have one final point on the Supreme Court and Brett Kavanaugh.

I just read in a very recent interview that Judge Kavanaugh was asked, if granted the opportunity, whether he would overturn precedent in any one case. Judge Kavanaugh initially declined to answer. He then paused and said, on second thought, he would overturn the precedent in *Morrison v. Olson*. That is the case that upheld the constitutionality of the independent counsel law. I will make two brief points on the subject.

First, Judge Kavanaugh's response demonstrates he is willing to answer direct questions about precedent—which precedents he agrees with and which precedents he would overturn. I hope, during the hearings, we will not suffer the tried-and-true verbal gymnastics of nominees who have refused to answer questions on existing precedent. Judge Kavanaugh had no qualms about that in that interview.

Second and more immediately, considering everything we know about Judge Kavanaugh's expansive view of Executive power and accountability, the fact that *Morrison v. Olson*—of all of the cases in the history of the Supreme Court—is the first case he would think of overturning is deeply, deeply troubling.

We already know he believes a President shouldn't be investigated while in office, that a President can't be indicted while in office, that a President doesn't have to follow laws that the President “deems”—his word—uncon-

stitutional. Clearly, Judge Kavanaugh's judicial philosophy incorporates an almost monarchical view of Executive power and accountability, animated by a belief that our Chief Executive gets to play by a different set of rules.

Judge Kavanaugh, particularly after this interview, needs to recuse himself from anything having to do with the Mueller probe given his record and the fact that he was nominated by the subject of the investigation he could very well end up ruling on.

Once again, I thank my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

TARIFFS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I rise to discuss an issue that is of great importance to my constituents in Alabama and to many other people across the country. At issue is the health of our automotive industry.

Unfortunately, the health of my State's automobile industry is being threatened not by unfair competition or illegal practices but by significant tariffs proposed by the President. According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, more than a half a million Alabama jobs are supported by global trade, meaning more than one in every four Alabama jobs is tied to trade.

One of the key reasons Alabama has such a robust trade posture is due to our automotive manufacturing industry. I am old enough to remember what it was like before auto companies came to Alabama in the 1990s, starting with Mercedes. At the time that Mercedes came, many of Alabama's manufacturing facilities were closing down and moving to other countries. Yet, one by one—from Mercedes, to Honda, to Hyundai, and now to Toyota and Mazda, which are breaking ground on a new plant very soon—these automakers came to Alabama and breathed new life into our State's economy. They support, today, some 57,000 Alabama jobs, and our auto exports topped \$11 billion in 2017. That doesn't even include the new Toyota-Mazda plant in Huntsville, which is going to add another 4,000 jobs and \$1.6 billion in economic development.

After having no automobile industry 30 years ago, Alabama has become the third largest exporter of automobiles in this country. In only the past 15 months, every major automobile manufacturer in Alabama has announced an expansion to total 5,400 jobs and \$3.3 billion in investments. This industry has been a phenomenal success in Alabama and, more importantly, for the men and women who rely on these very good-paying jobs to support their families and to build better lives.

That is why it is a priority for me and colleagues like my friend, Senator ALEXANDER from Tennessee, to keep our States' automotive industry thriving. Yet, recently, this industry has come under attack. In May, President Trump threatened a 25-percent tariff

on imported cars, trucks, and auto parts under the pretext that these products somehow threaten our national security.

Let me be clear. While the United States faces any number of threats from adversaries on any number of fronts, foreign automobiles and auto parts are not threats to our national security. Do you know what is a threat? It is a 25-percent tax on the prices of these imported goods. The President's proposed auto tariffs have the potential to inflict serious damage on a booming industry in my State and in other leading auto-producing States, like Tennessee. We might call it a tariff, but we all know exactly what it is—a tax.

By definition, a tariff is a tax on a particular class of imports or exports. Any tariffs placed on products that come into the United States are taxes that increase the cost of those goods to American consumers. When other countries place additional tariffs, or new taxes, on American goods, it raises the purchase prices of American products overseas and hurts our ability to sustain competitive markets in those countries. So it is deeply troubling that the recent proposal from the President will threaten tens of thousands of jobs in Alabama and increase costs for American consumers.

Shortly after this tariff threat was issued, Senator ALEXANDER joined me in writing to Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross, and we urged him to reconsider the auto tariff tax proposal. Between our two States, the automotive sector contributes more than 200,000 jobs to our economies. Numbers of autoworkers from our States are in town this week to tell their stories, firsthand, to the Commerce Department, and I commend them for their efforts in doing so.

Senator ALEXANDER and I understand the devastating blow these tariffs will represent to an industry that has literally rebuilt our respective States' economies from the ground up. Automakers and their suppliers can be found in every corner and in nearly every county of each of our States. We have found common cause in fighting these tariffs and protecting our constituents from the devastating impacts they will have.

There are already a few legislative solutions out there, including Senator CORKER's solution regarding tariffs. I know Senator PORTMAN is also doing a lot of good work in this space. Senator ALEXANDER and I are working together to propose a solution of our own as a complementary measure to halt these tariffs. We hope to introduce that proposal as early as next week after consulting with our automotive manufacturers and working with our colleagues to grow bipartisan support for this legislation.

I realize that folks who have been affected by these proposed tariffs are looking for a silver bullet to stop them dead in their tracks. Right now, the

only silver bullet in this case is for the President to change his mind and recognize how many jobs are at risk because of these proposed tariffs. Until that happens, we are going to fight to protect what our States and our workers have earned.

I want to thank my colleague Senator ALEXANDER, who is here today, for his continued partnership in this effort. I look forward to working with more of our colleagues to stop the urgent threat to American jobs.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Alabama for his remarks.

I come to the floor to discuss bipartisan legislation that he and I, as he said, plan to introduce as soon as next week to encourage the Trump administration to reconsider the dangerous steps it is taking to impose tariffs on imported automobiles and automotive parts.

I use the word "dangerous" because nothing has done more during the last 40 years to raise family incomes in Tennessee than the arrival of the auto industry, and nothing could do more damage to those family incomes than the proposed tariffs on imported automobiles and automotive parts, combined with the tariffs on imported steel and aluminum that the administration has already imposed.

We have heard the Senator from Alabama talk about his State. In my view, Tennessee is more likely to be hurt than any other State by these tariffs. Let me tell a short story to explain why I would make such a dramatic statement.

Forty years ago, I walked 1,000 miles across Tennessee in my campaign for Governor. In Rutherford County, outside Nashville, I spent the night with the Knight family. Mrs. Knight told me that her twin boys were bright but that she was sad because, as she put it, there are no jobs around here. She said: They are smart boys, and they will never get a job here, and I will never see my grandchildren.

Forty years ago, there were no auto jobs in Tennessee. We were the third poorest State. Our family incomes were the third lowest. Our low-paying textile jobs were fleeing outside of our country. Unemployment and inflation were high, and prospects were bleak. Then in 1980—just 2 years after that walk, when I was the Governor of Tennessee—Nissan from Japan arrived and came to Rutherford. Then General Motors, with Saturn, came to Spring Hill. Then Volkswagen came to Chattanooga. All had large manufacturing plants.

As the American automobile industry moved to the Southeastern United States, more than 900 auto part suppliers spread across 88 of Tennessee's 95 counties. Today, 136,000 Tennesseans—or one-third of our manufacturing

workforce—work in those auto plants. Those auto jobs have become the main driver of family incomes, which have now risen to a little above the national average. Our economy is booming, and unemployment is at a record low.

Today, Tennessee produces 6.7 percent of all of the cars and trucks produced in the United States. Tennessee exported more than \$5.5 billion worth of automobiles and auto parts last year. Tennessee has been the top State in auto manufacturing strength for 5 out of the last 8 years, according to Business Facilities.

Let me get back to my little story. Last year, one of those bright twins from Rutherford County—the Knight family—where I spent the night 40 years ago, Randy Knight, retired as the general manager of the Nissan plant, which is the largest and most efficient auto plant in North America. His brother works there, too, and so does one of those grandchildren whom the grandmother thought she would never see.

You can see why Tennesseans become very worried when anything threatens the auto industry that has transformed our State. Here is why the proposed tariffs do that.

As the Senator from Alabama said, tariffs are taxes. Tariffs are taxes on us, pure and simple. They make what we buy and sell more expensive. The laws of economics usually say that when you make what you buy and sell more expensive, you buy and sell less of it. If we sell fewer automobiles and automotive parts, there will be lower revenues, lower profits, fewer wage increases, and fewer jobs.

Since almost every one of the 900 auto part suppliers use steel and aluminum, lower revenues and smaller profits mean fewer wage increases and fewer jobs for the 136,000 Tennesseans who work in the more than 900 auto plants in our State. More expensive cars means fewer people in the United States buy those cars and fewer people overseas buy those cars—the cars we make. Fewer people buying cars and trucks means that 136,000 Tennesseans in America's No. 1 auto State are going to have a lower standard of living than they otherwise would and lower family incomes.

Why in the world would our government raise our taxes and destroy our jobs in this way? Well, the government's answer is that tariffs protect jobs in the steel and aluminum industry.

It is true that some steel and aluminum jobs might be saved, but in 2003, when President George W. Bush proposed steel tariffs, there were about 10 times as many people working in the steel-using industries as there were in steel-producing industries. Let me say that again. There were more people working in the steel-using industry than there were in the steel-producing industry.

President Bush dropped the idea after a year because the tariffs destroyed, as

I said, more jobs in other industries, including the automotive industry, than they saved in the steel-producing industry.

I know something about the aluminum industry. My dad worked most of his life at Alcoa's Tennessee aluminum smelting plant, which closed a few years ago because electricity was so much cheaper in other parts of the world. You use electricity—lots of it—to smelt aluminum. That is why those plants came to East Tennessee more than a century ago. But electric prices in the United States gradually rose over that century, and are still cheaper in other parts of the world. So today there are only eight smelting plants left in the United States. Seven of them are still in operation. Alcoa operates four and makes 46 percent—nearly half—of all of the aluminum produced in the United States. Alcoa opposes the aluminum tariffs because it also operates smelting plants in Canada and other countries that export aluminum to the United States.

The bottom line is this: The largest U.S. producer of aluminum, Alcoa, doesn't want the aluminum tariffs. The thousands of auto plants and other plants that use aluminum don't want the aluminum tariffs. So who is asking for the aluminum tariffs?

A second reason justifying tariffs is that other countries may have been unfair to the United States. There may be examples of that, but when did it become a good idea to solve your own problem by shooting yourself in both feet at once? It is hard to see how raising our taxes and destroying our jobs is a smart solution to unfair trade practices.

Then there is the question of whether tariffs help autoworkers. Raising taxes and prices and selling fewer cars wouldn't seem to help the American autoworker.

Will it cause foreign companies to build more cars in the United States? Well, that is already happening.

The foreign manufacturers have been doing exactly what we asked them to do. They have moved here. They produce cars and trucks here. They export many of those cars and trucks and auto parts to other countries. Today, about half the cars being built in America are being built by the so-called foreign manufacturers. Nissan's plant in Rutherford County employs 8,000 Tennesseans and is the largest and most efficient auto plant in North America.

I was with President Trump last year when he spoke in Michigan about all the autoworker jobs leaving the Midwest. Since 1994, 3.6 million of those jobs have left the Midwest, but they didn't go overseas; they moved to Tennessee and Alabama and other parts of the Southeastern United States, which gained 3.6 million auto jobs during the same period. Those new auto plants are in Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Kentucky, and Texas. Those are all States where

the President is widely admired and States that he carried heavily in his election effort.

Those plants moved primarily to the Southeast because our part of the country offered right-to-work laws and an environment that allowed companies to make quality cars at a lower cost and sell them competitively here in the United States and around the world. In fact, my own view is that the movement of the American auto industry to the Southeast saved the American auto industry because where it was 25, 30, or 40 years ago was stuck in the Midwest in an oligopoly where the United Automobile Workers and three big companies were producing big, expensive cars, and the little foreign cars were coming in and eating their lunch in the marketplace. So now we have strong and effective American auto plants in the Midwestern United States and in the Southeastern United States, and half of them are made by so-called foreign manufacturers.

I agree with President Trump on many things—taxes, judges, regulations, the economy, Keystone Pipeline, and others. He has helped create today's booming economy and low unemployment. I give him credit for helping to do that, but these tariffs take us in exactly the opposite direction.

These tariffs are dangerous. These tariffs are going to cost us jobs. These tariffs are going to lower our family incomes. These tariffs are going to undo much of the good the President and this Congress have done during the last year and a half to create this booming economy.

I respectfully suggest that the President reconsider his trade policy, drop the tariffs as a tool for implementing his objectives, and find other, more effective means to persuade other countries to do for us what we do for them.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

OPENING OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL VA MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, this weekend, Colorado will be celebrating the opening of our new Rocky Mountain Regional VA Medical Center in Aurora. I am incredibly proud that we will be reaching this milestone this weekend after more than a decade of work and some significant hurdles, trials, and tribulations along the way. I commend my colleagues for the work they did funding this project.

The Rocky Mountain Regional VA Medical Center will be the crown jewel of the VA system. It wasn't easy to get here. A lot of people had to do a lot of work to make it happen, including the veterans, the leadership organizations in Colorado, our colleagues across the aisle, Congressman COFFMAN, Congressman PERLMUTTER, Senator BENNET—in fact, the entire congressional delegation for a number of years—Senator Salazar, Senator Udall, Senator Allard. They have all done incredible work to make this weekend a possibility.

Hundreds of millions of tax dollars were used for this facility. It did run over budget. It certainly ran over time. But we have learned a lot as a result of this facility, and the Army Corps of Engineers will now be taking over major construction projects like this. As a result of this facility, we have made changes on how designs are being made. It was a learning experience and unfortunately a costly one at that, but it doesn't change the fact that this will be a crown jewel in the VA system.

This is not the end of a project, it is the beginning of a promise to be fulfilled—a promise to our veterans on the care they will receive, a place where they will find healing, where they will find support, and where they will find a return to good health.

To our men and women in uniform who currently serve, know that you have a place in Colorado where you will find incredible care.

To those who have served our country, who live in Colorado, know that with great pride, we open this facility this weekend.

But we have more work to do. We have work to do to make sure that it is easier to hire doctors and fill the positions at the hospital that have remained open for months around the VA system. It takes too long to onboard medical professionals. We should cut down that time, figure out how to cut through the redtape and the bureaucracy. If you are qualified to practice medicine at Swedish Hospital in Denver, or any of our other great facilities, why can't you just go to work at the VA hospital as well? So these are things that we can do to do a better job.

On Monday, I met with the Secretary nominee, Robert Wilkie, President Trump's nominee to be the new VA Secretary, and I talked to him about the work we have to continue to do to make sure that veterans receive the best care possible. This Congress has passed legislation, such as the Choice Act. We have made great reforms over the last several months to reduce wait times and wait lists and to eliminate them and make sure that we can provide that promise of care.

This weekend in Colorado there will be a great celebration as we open this facility. So many people put in tireless years upon years of work, from the leadership of the State to the leadership of Congress. I am grateful that this weekend we celebrate as we open a facility that begins to fulfill the promise made a decade ago for veterans in the region.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to join my colleagues in making it clear just how

high the stakes are when it comes to our Nation's highest courts—for our families, for our communities, for our country, and for our future.

Since the day he took office, President Trump has made one move after another to turn the White House and the entire executive branch into a tool for those who have the most power, the most money, and the most influence to get even more power, more money, and more influence. From our public schools to our public lands and more, it is hard to find any Trump administration decision where the bottom line didn't come first.

But it is not just his administration. President Trump has systematically worked to roll back decades of progress through our courtrooms, from the Supreme Court on down, which will have long-lasting impacts stretching far beyond his time in the White House.

I know some of my colleagues were here last night to talk about the absolutely egregious circuit court nominees who would do everything they can to whittle away at our rights and freedoms as Americans. I want to talk about that for a bit as well, but I want to take some time first to talk about a nominee who would sit above those circuit court nominees in our Nation's Supreme Court and who, if confirmed, would overturn *Roe v. Wade*, eliminate protections for patients with preexisting conditions, reverse settled law and precedent, and give these extreme circuit court nominees even more room to do damage to our Constitution, our laws, our freedoms, and our way of life.

It is telling that President Trump and his Republican and special-interest allies are desperately trying to make the case that Judge Kavanaugh isn't well outside the mainstream, far outside the bounds of reasonable, and deeply opposed to what people across the country want when it comes to their rights and freedoms being protected. They may try, but they will not succeed because the record is clear and the facts are clear. Judge Kavanaugh is an extreme pick who would be devastating for our country if he is confirmed, and we need to do everything we can to stop it.

So I am standing here right now, on behalf of the families in my home State of Washington and across this country, to be very clear about what is at stake if President Trump and his enablers continue to try to turn our judicial system into one that works for massive corporations and special interests and against regular families.

Earlier today, a number of my colleagues stood in this spot to sound the alarm on what is at stake for our environment and our public health if the balance of this Court swings toward President Trump and his extreme special interests. I want to expand on those concerns, and I want to talk about just a few of the many issues that Judge Kavanaugh would impact should he be confirmed and how awful this would be for our families, commu-

nities, students, and workers and for our environment, our elections, our country, and more.

But before I get into some other issues—and, again, just a few of many—I want to start with two that I believe are most important and that every woman, every man, and every family should be thinking very hard about: protections for patients with preexisting conditions and *Roe v. Wade*.

First, President Trump has broken promise after promise he made to workers and families on the campaign trail, but he has never once wavered in keeping promises he made to extreme, ideological, rightwing special interests.

President Trump said he would make taking away patient protections—like those for preexisting conditions—and gutting policies that have made healthcare more affordable for millions a top priority. He failed to jam a bill through Congress here to make those things happen. So he has done everything he can to attack patients' healthcare from the Oval Office.

His biggest attack yet is Judge Kavanaugh—an extremely conservative nominee vetted by those same rightwing special interests who President Trump is so determined to keep happy, a judge who those special interests picked because they know he will help them undermine affordable healthcare from the Supreme Court Bench.

I believed President Trump when he said he was determined to undermine patients' healthcare in order to satisfy rightwing special interests. Healthcare coverage, especially for people with preexisting conditions, is on the line with this nomination, and we cannot afford not to take this threat seriously.

That is not the only healthcare issue under threat. President Trump said he would appoint Supreme Court Justices vetted by these groups for their willingness to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. He said women should be punished for having an abortion. In office, he and Vice President MIKE PENCE have done virtually everything they can to restrict women's access to healthcare and to chip away at women's constitutionally protected reproductive rights. Unless women and men across the country stand up to stop them, they will succeed in putting another Supreme Court Justice who has the ideological rightwing's stamp of approval when it comes to striking down *Roe*.

There is no sugarcoating this. We are on the precipice of five men voting to overturn a historic ruling that has made women healthier and made them more equal and more free in the United States. We cannot let that happen.

Those are two issues that so many of us are focused on, and they are so important, but they are far from the only ones. Another key issue I want to briefly mention today is the rights and freedoms of our LGBTQ friends, coworkers, neighbors, and fellow Americans. We have made progress, but there are many questions and cases in this area

that will come before the Supreme Court in the coming years—whether it is questions regarding equality under the adoption laws for all couples or the rights of a couple to buy a wedding cake, whether transgender troops can serve their country, whether someone can continue being fired simply for being LGBTQ, and more. So there is a whole lot at stake. Anyone who cares about this issue or anyone who simply believes that everyone in this country should have fundamental rights and freedoms—no matter who they are or who they love—should join us in rejecting Judge Kavanaugh.

That is not all. We have known from day one that President Trump would be hostile toward our bedrock environmental laws, that he was eager to do the bidding of the coal, oil, and gas industries, that his slogan of putting America first actually meant that the United States would be dead last in the fight against climate change, and that Trump's economic agenda has more to do with rolling back rules that help to keep our kids safe from toxic pollutants, protecting our drinking water, or preventing health problems in senior citizens—the ones those special interest groups try to call pesky regulations and what the rest of us moms, grandmothers, and ordinary people call commonsense protections.

But it is apparently not enough just to attack our environment for the administration. If you really want to shape our Nation's environmental laws for generations to come, you put someone on the Supreme Court for life who will consistently side with the massive corporations and special interests that put profits ahead of the health and well-being of families, and, boy, did those CEOs and special interests hit the jackpot with President Trump's nominee.

You don't have to spend long looking at Judge Kavanaugh's record to see that, should he be seated, nearly five decades of environmental protection are at risk, including the protections enshrined in the Clean Air Act, which has significantly cut the smog, soot, and chemicals that choked communities prior to 1970 and prevented hundreds of thousands of premature deaths and cases of heart disease in the years sense.

Also at risk is the Clean Water Act, which, if erased, would take us back to the bad old days before commonsense protections—like when the Cuyahoga River was so polluted that it caught fire; when shellfish beds were closed in Puget Sound, nearly decimated by pollutants; or when an estimated 20 million gallons of sewage effluent flowed into Lake Washington every single day.

I could go on and on about the strides our country has made to keep our families safe, but the bottom line is that because of our landmark environmental laws—like the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act—our rivers are cleaner, our air is easier to breathe,

and families are better protected than ever before.

Though we have a lot of work yet to do, it would be a grave mistake to go backward, and that is just what so many people fear would happen with Judge Kavanaugh on the Bench, given his past rulings and given the test that President Trump applied and his commitment to only nominate someone screened and approved by the extreme right, especially his stance that could take decisions away from our Nation's scientists and nonpartisan professionals and put those decisions into the hands of special interests.

That takes me to another issue I want to run through briefly: making sure our elections in this country are free and accessible and that corporations don't have a louder voice in our process than ordinary voters. These are issues where our courts have failed to serve us well in recent years, but by confirming Judge Kavanaugh, we would be cementing this awful pattern for a generation and making necessary reform so much more difficult.

Judge Kavanaugh will continue his habit of ruling to make it harder and harder for citizens to vote and have a voice in this democracy. We know this. We saw how he ruled in favor of stricter voter ID laws—ones where the intention to make it harder for Americans to vote was clear and absolutely the wrong way to go. We cannot have a Supreme Court that continues to allow voter suppression.

So I ask my colleagues: If you believe that voting in our country should be open to all and that people shouldn't have less access to the voting booth because of where they live or the color of their skin, join me in rejecting this nominee and demanding someone who will protect our elections and our democracy. If you believe that Citizens United was an awful decision that perverted the First Amendment and put shameful amounts of power into the hands of the mega rich and the biggest corporations, join me in rejecting this nominee and demanding someone who would put our ordinary voters first.

If we can't stem the flow of dark, unaccountable money in politics, and reverse the tide of the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations being allowed to have the loudest voices in our elections, we are going to keep running into massive challenges as a nation. Without a Supreme Court willing to do that, without rejecting Judge Kavanaugh and demanding someone else, we can't do that. Giving the most powerful among us an advantage in our elections is not the only way Judge Kavanaugh is working for those at the top, and I want to briefly discuss another.

Last month's Janus decision made it clear that workers and their unions need a fair voice on the Supreme Court. Unfortunately, Judge Kavanaugh has a long record of weakening worker protections, undermining union rights, and making it easier for corporations

and special interests to tilt the scales of justice in their favor.

I would urge my colleagues who claim to care about the rights and economic security of working families to join me in rejecting this nomination and put the power back into the hands of working families and the middle class.

This point is especially potent given the disgrace we witnessed in Helsinki. Every American should be deeply concerned about President Trump putting someone on the Supreme Court who is prepared to protect him from legal attack and do his bidding.

As we all watch, many of us in horror and dismay, as President Trump continues to do everything in his power to try and discredit the Mueller investigation, we cannot forget, for a moment, that his Supreme Court nominee suggested in a 2009 law review article that a sitting President should not be subjected to criminal investigation or civil or criminal litigation.

Does anyone think, for one second, this isn't something President Trump was looking for? Is there anyone who has seen how President Trump has acted, listened to what he said who thinks he is not thinking about what happens if something related to this investigation goes to the Supreme Court?

President Trump controls the White House. His Republicans control both Houses of Congress. The last thing we need, the last thing any American who truly cares about our country should want is to place the last remaining branch—the final branch intended to be independent, to put our Constitution first—into the hands of a Trump lackey. That would be awful. It would eliminate even the pretense of checks and balances. If Judge Kavanaugh is confirmed, with his record and given what we know about President Trump, that is exactly what would happen.

If you believe we should be taking the Russian election interference into U.S. elections seriously, join me in rejecting this nominee and demanding someone who would be truly independent and place an appropriate check on Executive power.

If you believe a President is not above the law, join me in rejecting this nominee and demanding someone who will take our Constitution and our judicial independence seriously.

If you believe Executive power is not unilateral and that real checks and balances are required, join me in rejecting this nominee and demanding someone who will clearly and unequivocally make sure that continues to be a reality.

Finally, I want to highlight Judge Kavanaugh's troubling record on commonsense gun safety. This is an issue that certainly hit close to home for far too many people in recent years. Churches, schools, concerts, it seems like no place is immune to the rampant gun violence happening in the country, which is why millions of Americans have taken to the streets in recent months to demand action.

Yet, at the same time, Judge Kavanaugh has taken a far more expansive interpretation of the Second Amendment and has vigorously argued that assault weapon bans are unconstitutional. His position is far more extreme than even the late Justice Scalia. It is no wonder the NRA immediately applauded Judge Kavanaugh's nomination and has pledged now to spend untold amounts to seal the deal on his confirmation.

Those are just a few issues weighing on so many people's minds right now. I could go on about what is at stake if President Trump turns his White House, and potentially now the judicial system, into one that favors the powerful few.

I would like to close by saying there are few things I take as seriously as a Senator than my duty to consider and vote on a Supreme Court nominee. In my time in the Senate, I have had the opportunity to consider nominees from Democrats and nominees from Republicans. I voted for some of them, I voted against some of them, each on their merits, and each based on how I think they would serve.

This time is different. We know exactly where President Trump's Supreme Court nominee will fall on the specific issues, no matter what vague answers Judge Kavanaugh chooses to deliver through this process.

Why do we know this? Because President Trump told us openly, publicly, and repeatedly. The President laid out specific tests and promised to only pick nominees from a prescreened list of people who would absolutely meet them.

Nobody should be fooled. Judge Kavanaugh is a rubberstamp. He will stand with special interests over families, and he will take our country in the wrong direction.

I urge my colleagues, stand with me in rejecting Judge Kavanaugh's nomination and join me in calling on President Trump to send us someone who would stand with women, with our workers, with our families, and who would truly commit to respecting settled law and the rights and freedoms we all hold dear and the longstanding protections that help keep our families safe and healthy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

NOMINATION OF RYAN BOUNDS

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I rise to speak out in opposition to the nomination of Ryan Bounds to sit on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

I will be voting against his confirmation, and I ask all of my colleagues to do the same. My reason for this is not just the fact that in expressing his disdain for multicultural values in a series of college writings, he compared efforts to build tolerance and promote diversity to Nazi book burning; it is not just the fact that he advocated against policies designed to make

LGBTQ students feel welcome and crack down on campus rapists; it is not just the fact that when a bipartisan judicial selection committee asked him to disclose past controversies, he deliberately misled the committee and said there was nothing to worry about.

Now that his controversial writings have come to light, he refuses to retract or show remorse for his statements. Instead, he brushes them off as overbroad and overheated.

Ryan Bounds' writings show he does not believe in a tolerant and diverse America, where women and people of color are treated with equal respect. In my eyes, that alone disqualifies him from sitting on the Federal bench, but Bounds has not received the blue-slip approval of either Senator from his home State of Oregon. No judge in modern history has ever been confirmed without a blue slip from either home State Senator.

So a vote to confirm him is a direct attack on the Senate's constitutional responsibility to advise and consent. The blue-slip process is a critical function of the legislative branch. It gives every Senator a chance to have a say in the Federal judges who serve in their home State.

The nominee to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit will have a lifetime tenure. If confirmed, Ryan Bounds will have influence over our legal system for the rest of his life. Don't the American people and their elected officials deserve a say in whether he should be allowed to fill that seat?

This debate is not just about one unqualified judge and his racist ideas. It is about the duty of the legislative branch to serve as a check and balance on the President. Over the course of the Trump administration so far, we have seen an unprecedented attempt to undermine the blue-slip process and pack the courts with judges favored by corporations and special interests.

I urge my colleagues to take a stand against President Trump's attacks on our legal system. Protect the integrity of the blue-slip process and vote against Ryan Bounds' nomination. The power and independence of the legislature is at stake.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

CALLING FOR THE RELEASE OF PASTOR ANDREW BRUNSON

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I think last week or the week before, you were presiding when I did a speech that I promised I am going to do every week we are in session until justice is served in Turkey.

It is a speech about this man. His name is Pastor Andrew Brunson. He was arrested in Turkey in October of 2016. If you want to sum up his crime, it is for being a missionary. He has been in Turkey for about 20 years, has served the community well, has provided aid and comfort to Syrian refugees, has provided a place for people in

Turkey who want to come into a Christian church to do just that. He has a small church in Izmir. You can only seat about 100 people in it, and he didn't even have that when he started his missionary work.

I should say he is from the Black Mountain area of North Carolina. He was part of the same church that Rev. Billy Graham was a part of. He went to Turkey to really pursue his passion and serve in Christ through missionary work.

In 2016, after the coup attempt, President Erdogan implemented emergency powers, and he swept up thousands of people and put them in prison. Pastor Brunson was in a Turkish prison for almost 19 months without charges—about 17 months in a cell that was designed for 8 prisoners that had 21 people in it.

I was in Turkey about 4 months ago—when I first met Pastor Brunson personally—to visit him in prison to let him know that as long as I am in the U.S. Senate, I am going to work hard for his ultimate release.

Then I went back about 6 weeks later, and I sat in a Turkish courtroom for about 12 hours, and I heard some of the most absurd charges that could ever be levied against someone to keep them in prison for what will now be going on 2 years. I told Pastor Brunson I would be back, and I will continue to be back, until justice is served.

I don't want to get into too many of the details so I will tell you he was in a courtroom today for another 5 hours. If it bore any resemblance to the time I was in the courtroom, it goes something like this: The defense gets to say nothing. They don't get to introduce witnesses to testify on his behalf. You have secret witnesses, many of them in a Turkish prison, testifying against him about things like a daughter posting a meal she had on a social media application that the Turkish authorities believe linked her to terror because they believe it is a meal certain terrorist organizations like. It also happens to be a meal that a lot of people in the Middle East like, but that was a charge that suggested he was involved in a coup attempt or conspiring with terrorists.

Having a light on in a church—by the way, in a room that doesn't have a window—that was supposedly observed by one of these secret witnesses who are in prison, saying: Well, clearly if there was a light on in this church, nothing good could have happened because it was in the middle of the night. Maybe somebody just left the light switch on, but I am still trying to figure out how they actually saw it because I have been in that room, and there is not a single window. There is no way you could have seen it from the outside.

Those are the types of charges that have been used to keep Pastor Brunson in prison since October of 2016.

Today, he was back, as I said earlier, in a hearing in a Turkish courtroom for 5 hours. At the end of the 5-hour

hearing he was told that he is going to continue to be in prison until they have another hearing in October, and that hearing is scheduled for about 4 days short of 2 years that he has spent time in a Turkish prison.

He has been in prison for 649 days. He is in good spirits—as good as you can imagine for somebody who is enduring the trauma of being imprisoned, I think, unlawfully and unfairly.

His wife Norine is in Turkey. She refuses to leave because she is afraid if she leaves Turkey, Turkey will not allow her to come back into the country.

They have been separated from their three children for 2 years because they are afraid to have them come into the country and not be able to leave.

I am asking the Members of Congress to join with me to apply pressure on Turkey to have justice done. Justice is releasing Pastor Brunson and letting him come back home.

We have provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act that send a very clear message to Turkey that we are serious about this.

I have my own concerns about Turkey because they seem to be drifting away as a NATO ally and partner and more toward a position I don't quite understand. I certainly don't understand it in terms of our mutual interests as NATO allies or as economic partners.

But for right now, I want to focus on a man who has been in prison for 649 days. I want to focus on other people who worked with the Embassy who have been in prison for about the same time. I want to focus on a NASA scientist who happened to be visiting his family in Turkey—he is a Turkish American—who has been in prison for 2½ years. We have to educate the American people on a Turkey that has no resemblance today of what it was just 5 or 6 years ago.

I want to have a positive working relationship with Turkey. I want increased economic ties and increased military ties. But when you illegally imprison American citizens, no matter how important that strategic relationship is, at some point we have to question whether or not we can go further.

In the meantime, if any of you are planning on going to Turkey, I would think twice. Make sure that you don't take a picture of somebody that maybe Turkish officials think is involved in a coup, because that can sweep you up in it. Make sure that you don't eat a meal that other segments of Turkish society like, because that may make you a coup conspirator.

I hope that we solve this problem, but I will tell you that there are very few things that would ever take me away from coming to this floor and going into committee meetings and doing everything I can to put pressure on Turkey until Pastor Andrew Brunson is back in this country safe and sound with his family. Then I will

continue to work on all the other people who are being unfairly and unjustly held in Turkish prisons.

We need to have justice for Pastor Brunson. We need Turkey to be the ally that we want them to be, and we need President Erdogan to show the leadership and the compassion to bring Pastor Brunson home.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

TARIFFS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about tariffs and their impact on Montana's family farmers and businesses. In Montana we have more than 27,000 family farms and ranches. Folks who farm and ranch these lands are descendants of homesteaders and pioneers, including myself. They are also young producers who may be preparing for their first harvest. Might I add that we don't have enough young producers in our State. The population of farmers is getting far too old.

These folks work 7 days a week, for long hours, to raise the food that feeds our families across this world, and they power our rural economies in this country. Farmers and ranchers are small business operators and owners who are always on tight margins and always are looking to make sure that they can make the books balance by being on the positive side of the ledger. Why? So they can keep their farms and ranches viable to be able to have the next generation take over their operation. Just like any other business—a local bar or a hardware store—you need to be able to make a profit to stay in business.

Producers need to make sure that they have predictability in input costs—we are talking about fertilizers, fuel, and seed—and predictability in markets, the places where we sell our grain, which has always been a challenge and which has become more of a challenge over the past 6 months. When farmers plant a crop, they need to know there is a market for that crop, because if there is not, it can put them in a world of hurt financially.

Unfortunately, in Montana, we are preparing to harvest winter wheat crops as we speak. Spring wheat crops will soon be coming, pulse crops will soon be coming, and oil seeds will soon be coming. The fact is that there is no certainty in any of those crops right now. Why? Because our farmers and our ranchers are being used as pawns in a trade war that I can guarantee not one of them asked for.

This trade war is eliminating access to foreign markets that have taken generations to develop and putting family farm and ranch operations in a financial pinch—such a severe financial pinch that we haven't seen anything like it since the 1980s, when we saw a mass exodus off the land due to bad ag prices.

The retaliatory tariffs against family farmers and ranchers is harming Mon-

tana's No. 1 industry, agriculture. Montana's grain producers produce about \$2 billion worth of wheat, barley, pulse crops, and oil seeds every year. Since the middle of June, the price of No. 1 Dark Northern Spring wheat in southeastern Montana has fallen more than 60 cents a bushel. That is more than 10 percent, and the same can be said throughout the State of Montana.

To put that in perspective, just think what would happen in your business if your prices were reduced by 10 percent right off the top. It would put you in a world of financial hurt, and that is where Montana's farms and ranches are today. If prices continue to plummet, some of these families who have been on the land for over 100 years will be forced to make some very difficult decisions in the next 6 to 8 months.

These tariffs are eliminating producers' access to foreign markets—markets that are in Asia and Europe and markets in Canada and Mexico. In Montana, we sell our grains and our beef to these countries and others: China, Japan, South Korea, Mexico, Pacific Rim countries, and European Union countries. These exports didn't just pop up overnight. They came to fruition after years of hard work, good faith and trust, and negotiations.

Negotiations and trust are being thrown out the window with these tariff fights. In some cases—Japan, for example—it has taken multiple generations to establish these export markets. If we lose them, it will take many generations to get them back. Countries such as Argentina and Russia are circling the markets like sharks, wanting to strike the minute we lose a grip on them to fill those voids.

Take, for instance, Mexico. Mexico is the largest importer of Montana barley in the world. For years, Mexico bought Montana's barley to be able to make beers, like Corona and others. These tariffs have put those markets at risk to the point that one Mexican barley buyer told one of the folks from the barley association of Montana: I don't know that we can depend on America to supply our barley anymore because these tariffs have put our markets at risk.

As a result, Mexico, which is a huge importer of American wheat, just this last spring turned toward Argentina for their wheat for the first time ever. They signed a contract for Argentine wheat to take the place of the wheat from this country, of which Montana is a part and will no longer be supplying.

The real question is, How long is this going to have to go on? We are faced with enough uncertainties in production and agriculture with weather, drought, hail, bugs, and disease. The list goes on. Unfortunately, this is a manmade problem.

I get it. I think the President is right when he talks about holding China accountable. They have stolen a lot of intellectual property. They manipulate their currency. But to put on tariffs where retaliation comes on ag products

is not the right direction to go. We can get their attention by other ways.

I would also say that these tariffs aren't just felt by farmers and ranchers. They are felt by other businesses too. For builders, for example, their costs are going up. In 2016, the voters of Missoula, MT, approved a \$30 million bond to build a new city library. They started the project, but tariffs on steel sent material costs soaring. Now the cost of rebar alone has increased the cost of the project by \$100,000. Library officials have told me that as a direct result of these tariffs, they are preparing with a need to go out and raise another \$500,000 to finish this project. The people of our State have to pay that price.

One of Montana's fastest growing industries is microbreweries. It is a real success story, employing a lot of folks and adding value to grains in our State. They are being hit hard by tariffs on aluminum. These emerging businesses have no other option but to pass that cost on to their patrons.

So we are paying both ways, folks. We are paying on the tariffs coming in, and we are paying on the tariffs being put on our products going out.

In agribusiness, for example, everything that is made of steel is going up and going up significantly. From I-beams to cattle guards, to posts for fencing, to metal for storage bins, anything made out of steel is going up significantly. Manufacturers who have been on the rebound since the 2008 financial crisis now have a hard time bidding contracts on materials. Less of their money is going into their pockets, if there is any left at all, because of these tariffs. Every sector of our economy is feeling the pinch of this escalating trade war.

Fair trade is really important. Getting manufacturing back to this country is really important, but it doesn't appear that we are doing those things. Instead, we are putting our existing businesses—whether it is in production or agriculture, construction or manufacturing—at risk with these trade wars.

We should have open markets. Those markets need to go in both directions, but we shouldn't be driving people into bankruptcy in the meantime. That is what is happening.

I ask: What is the end game? If this trade war continues, I had an ag banker tell me that family farms and ranchers have about 18 months before they have to start liquidating. That is the reality we are facing, and that is not very long.

That is the reason why this body needs to understand that we need to send strong messages to the administration that they can't use farms, ranches, and small businesses as bargaining chips. Their livelihoods are on the line.

Earlier this month, I hosted a roundtable discussion on tariffs at the Billings Chamber of Commerce. I was able to meet Montanans eyeball to eyeball,

and I heard their concerns. This is not a political issue. These tariffs aren't targeted toward Democrats or Republicans. They are targeted at everyone. Ag producers at this moment in time are probably carrying the majority of the load. It needs to stop before the damage is irreversible.

My grandparents homesteaded the land that we farm and lived through the 1930s. My folks, who took over the land, took the farm over in the early 1940s and lived through a lot of hard times themselves. My wife and I took the farm over in the late 1970s, and we saw what happened in the 1980s. We have seen what happens in agriculture, where so many of the folks can't make it on the farm anymore, and they have to have jobs off the farm to be able to make the books balance.

These tariffs are making things harder. We have been down difficult paths in this country before. I don't believe we can afford another punch to the gut in rural America. I will continue to fight for and defend the folks who put food on our table, but their bottom lines are being severely, severely impacted by this trade war.

Now look, the legislation we passed last week is a start. The Senate version of the farm bill provides a safety net, but I am here to state that if things continue to go south for our markets, we are going to be faced with a bill that dumps a bunch of money into production agriculture to keep these folks afloat. Why? Because of tariffs that are being put on ag products. It doesn't have to be this way.

We are an equal branch of government. I believe that both Republicans and Democrats can work on this issue in a commonsense way, especially in this body. The administration needs to understand that if they keep continuing down this war of who can put the most tariffs on products, we are going to have a hard time keeping our businesses afloat, particularly our family farms and ranches in this country. That will not help with food security for our country, and the long-term negative impacts of that are unacceptable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it has been a little more than a week since President Trump announced his nomination of Judge Brett Kavanaugh to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court left by the impending retirement of Justice Anthony Kennedy. In that short period of time, we have seen some of our friends across the aisle run through an almost impressive set of rhetorical calisthenics in an attempt to tank Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation before it even had a chance to begin.

"He will overturn this case or this law," they claim. "He will not be a check on the President," they have tried to say. They have even suggested that he charged too much for baseball

season tickets on his credit card—horror of horrors. Multiple fact-checkers have debunked each of these claims, so they have moved on.

More recently, we have heard from some of our Democratic colleagues that they want to review every single piece of paper—every email, every memo, every document that has passed across Brett Kavanaugh's desk at any point in his career.

Reviewing relevant and important documents is a perfectly normal part of confirming a judicial nominee, but using that as an excuse to delay, foot-drag, and obstruct is not acceptable. We know that the effort to get every memo from the Bush White House during the time he served as Staff Secretary there is really laughable and is only a fishing expedition designed to delay his confirmation until after the Supreme Court begins its work the first Monday in October.

For example, as Staff Secretary, he would have had the responsibility to basically manage the paper flow across the President's desk. These aren't just documents that he, himself, has generated. In fact, I suspect that with the overwhelming majority of them, he would have had nothing to do with creating them. He wouldn't be the author. He wouldn't be making policy recommendations. Basically, he would have navigated all of the documents that went across the President's desk to make sure that they had been reviewed by the appropriate person and that they would have been checked for accuracy. The ideas that every single piece of paper that went across President George W. Bush's desk should be somehow relevant and that we should delay confirmation until we have all had a chance to read it are ridiculous. Is what President Bush had for dinner 14 years ago relevant to Judge Kavanaugh's fitness to serve on the Supreme Court? Obviously not.

Just as, in 2010, the committee quickly processed Justice Kagan, who spent many years in the Clinton White House, I am confident we can expeditiously and efficiently review Judge Kavanaugh's relevant background materials to make sure the vote on his confirmation occurs before the Supreme Court reconvenes in October.

Under Chairman GRASSLEY's leadership, the Judiciary Committee will work to produce as many documents as are relevant and possible so that every Senator can do their due diligence. An important part of our constitutional responsibility is to provide advice and consent, as the Constitution itself says.

The most important thing to remember is that unlike the Kagan nomination, we have 12 years of service on the bench by Judge Kavanaugh. He served on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals in what has often been called the second most important court in the Nation because it is located in the District of Columbia. Most of the major cases involving huge policy disputes confronting

the Federal Government have made their way through his court, and he has written opinions—majority opinions and dissenting opinions—which have all been reviewed by the U.S. Supreme Court. I submit that would be the best evidence of what kind of Justice he would be on the Supreme Court. What kind of judge has he been on the DC Circuit? That is the best evidence.

We shouldn't indulge requests for these fishing expeditions and paper chases that will lead to nothing other than delay. It is important that the vetting process be deliberative and thorough, and it will be. But the volume of documents requested shouldn't be just a pretext to draw this out for political purposes.

Here is an important factoid: Nearly half of the Democratic caucus has already said that they will vote no on Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation to the Supreme Court. Are they going to be requesting documents? Are they going to be saying "Well, I want to look at everything that came across his desk" when they have already announced their public opposition?

Five of them announced their opposition before Judge Kavanaugh was even named. In other words, they would oppose anyone who is nominated by this President. We saw an attempt to filibuster the nomination of Neil Gorsuch to the Supreme Court, which resulted in the change of the precedent. We lowered the number of votes to close off debate from 60 votes to 51 votes because we realized that some across the aisle were so determined to vote against any nominee of this President—no matter how well qualified—there was no way we could confirm a well-qualified candidate. So we changed that.

Both Justices Sotomayor and Gorsuch were confirmed just 66 days after they were nominated. In the case of Judge Kavanaugh, if that same timetable held up, we would be voting on his confirmation about September 13—well in advance of the October deadline when the Court reconvenes. We will have plenty of time to thoroughly vet this nominee in a similar timeframe, which is consistent with the confirmation process for both Republican and Democratic Presidents.

I had the good fortune to sit down with Judge Kavanaugh last week and to renew my acquaintance with him, which first occurred in 2000. As I have recounted here on the floor, when I was attorney general of Texas, I had the privilege to argue a case in front of the U.S. Supreme Court. As one of the best qualified appellate lawyers in the country, having clerked on the Supreme Court, as well, he was one of the lawyers who helped me get ready for that oral argument.

I had a chance not only to get to know him in 2000 but to follow his career on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. He has consistently impressed me with his thoughtfulness, his deliberativeness, his outstanding legal and

academic credentials, and, of course, his experience on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. He was candid and open, professional and impressive.

I hope all of our colleagues will meet with Judge Kavanaugh to see for themselves. I have been told that he has been making calls to some Democratic Senators' offices, and they refuse to see him at all.

He is an accomplished jurist who will fairly and faithfully apply the law as written and adhere to the text of the Constitution, as judges are obligated to do, and leave the policymaking and the politics to the Congress and the executive branch. I look forward to continuing our vetting process and voting to confirm Judge Kavanaugh this fall—well in advance of the October term of the Supreme Court.

On a separate note, Mr. President, this afternoon, we will vote to confirm another accomplished legal mind, Andy Oldham, to the Federal Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, which includes Texas.

Andy will join two other judges whom we have already confirmed in the Fifth Circuit earlier this year: Don Willett, a former member of the Texas Supreme Court, and Jim Ho, my former chief counsel, someone with impeccable legal credentials. They are already on the Fifth Circuit. I am delighted that Andy Oldham will be joining them.

As we like to say in Texas, Andy wasn't born there, but he got there as fast as he could. He grew up in Richmond, VA, where his parents instilled within him a sense of hard work. His father put himself through college, and his mother was one of the first women to attend the University of Virginia.

Following their examples, Andy attended the University of Virginia and was awarded the prestigious title of Jefferson Scholar. While he was at UVA, he helped found an advocacy group to prevent sexual assault. His group was particularly focused on educating young men on their responsibilities when it comes to sexual violence.

From there, he attended the University of Cambridge as a Truman Scholar, graduated with first class honors, and then went to law school at Harvard—very impressive academic credentials.

During law school, he helped represent a death row inmate in a habeas corpus petition and won a temporary stay of execution in the U.S. Supreme Court. Based on Andy's hard work, the then-Governor of Virginia, who is now a Member of the Senate, commuted the defendant's sentence to life without parole based upon Andy's legal representation.

After law school, he went on to clerk for Judge Sentelle on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, which I spoke about in connection with Brett Kavanaugh. Then he served as an attorney to the Department of Justice's Office of Legal Counsel; that is, the lawyers for the lawyers at the Department of Justice's

Office of Legal Counsel, who issue authoritative guidance for the Department of Justice. And then, of course, he served as a law clerk for Justice Alito on the Supreme Court.

Following a period of private practice, the State of Texas came calling, and Andy became a deputy solicitor general in the office of the Texas attorney general; then it was Greg Abbott, whom he later followed to the Governor's office, where he now serves as Governor Abbott's general counsel.

On behalf of the State of Texas, Andy has argued two cases before the U.S. Supreme Court and filed countless briefs in support of the State. Because of his background and experience, Andy has earned bipartisan support, receiving recommendations from the general counsel to the Obama Foundation, as well as the Texas attorney general's office.

In his confirmation hearing before the Judiciary Committee, Andy spoke about his transition from a role as an advocate to that of a jurist. He explained how he views the role of a jurist as "fundamentally different," which it is.

He went on to say that "the oath of a jurist is simply to administer justice impartially, to do equal right by rich and poor, and to discharge justice in an equal and fair manner." This is exactly the type of judge we should want serving on our courts—someone who is impartial, not someone who will push for a particular ideology or political agenda on the bench. I believe Andy will follow this philosophy of impartially and fairly administering the law.

Andy spent all but 3 years of his career in public service, and he has advocated on behalf of Texans for many years. I am confident he will continue to serve them and the rest of the country well, and I look forward to supporting his nomination this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Utah.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the confirmation process for Brett Kavanaugh. By any honest measure, President Trump's nominee, Judge Kavanaugh, is exceptionally well qualified to serve on the Supreme Court. When he was nominated to the DC Circuit, he already had stellar credentials, a keen intellect, and an impressive knowledge of the law. He was confirmed to the DC Circuit Court in 2006, following years of Democratic obstruction. I have followed his work closely on that court for over a decade. His judicial record never ceases to impress.

A nominee with such a sterling reputation should receive wide bipartisan support. But over the years, I have seen firsthand the deterioration of the judicial confirmation process. When Justice Kennedy announced his retirement, I knew the Democrats would, again, play politics with the Supreme Court. It is what they have done for more than three decades. It is a matter

of grave concern to me, especially with an eminently qualified nominee. They are casting about looking for something—really, anything—to stop Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation.

Because Democrats want political judges, they politicize the confirmation process. This is what they did to oppose Justice Neil Gorsuch when he was nominated. They took a few cases out of the thousands he had decided and distorted what he had said. They attacked him as being unfit to serve. They said he was unqualified to be a Justice, but Justice Gorsuch had an unassailable record as a principled jurist on the Federal bench.

We fought back against the misrepresentations, the caricatures, and the exaggerations, and the American people saw through the Democrats' ruse. They saw the kind of Justice Neil Gorsuch would be—a Justice who says what the law is, not what he wants it to be, a Justice who respects the separation of powers, a Justice who will stand up to the executive and legislative branches when they overreach. I believe the American people will see the same thing when they look at Judge Kavanaugh.

The debate over Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation should be a debate over his qualifications. Does he understand the proper role of a judge under our Constitution? Does he have the experience needed? Will he respect our Constitution and the rule of law?

With hundreds of opinions, Judge Kavanaugh has built a reputation as being one of the most respected and influential judges in the entire country. His incisive reasoning has led the Supreme Court to adopt his positions in at least 12 cases.

Fidelity to the Constitution and to the rule of law are hallmarks of his opinions. Importantly, his vast body of work shows a deep commitment to the separation of powers. His opinions demonstrate his commitment to the principle that judges should interpret the law, not make it.

Judge Kavanaugh should be asked questions about his rulings and his approach to the law. As a judge, he has developed a reputation for his preparation in court. I have no doubt that he can stand up under the most rigorous questioning.

Yet what we have seen so far is a mix of hyperbole, mudslinging, and distortion. Attacks aimed at Judge Kavanaugh have not focused on whether he is qualified to serve. They have not focused on whether he understands the role of a judge. They have not focused on how he will interpret the Constitution and the laws passed by Congress. When it comes to what we should be asking about a nominee, what we have seen so far is not even in the ballpark.

After scouring Judge Kavanaugh's financial disclosure, progressives thought they had struck gold with a shocking revelation that would, surely, turn public opinion against him. So

what salacious scandal did they uncover? What damning evidence did they find that would dash all hopes of confirmation?

The Presiding Officer is not going to believe this, but they discovered that Judge Kavanaugh enjoys America's pastime. That is right. Judge Kavanaugh loves baseball—horrors. Honestly, I couldn't believe it either. But wait. It gets worse.

Not only does Judge Kavanaugh love baseball, but he was once a season ticket holder at Nationals Park. OK, but here is the real kicker. Judge Kavanaugh bought those season tickets with a credit card—with a credit card of all things. As was the Presiding Officer, I was speechless too. I have been racking my brain all week trying to figure out how a credit card-using baseball fan could slip through the cracks of the White House's vetting process.

Now, I am being facetious to prove a point. We are only 9 days into the confirmation process, and progressive opposition is already beyond parody.

Of course, this is nothing new. Everything we have seen so far comes directly from the Democrats' playbook. Throw every rumor, half-truth, and exaggeration at the nominee, and just see what sticks. When nothing sticks, double down on partisan attacks, take past statements out of context, mischaracterize his positions, and lob a hyperbolic Hail Mary if you have to. Do everything you can to denigrate, disparage, and dehumanize the nominee no matter his qualifications or character.

If Democrats continue down this path, we are going to lose all ability to debate matters of public importance. We cannot expect that all debate will be well reasoned, but opposition should, at the very least, be rational. It should never be hysterical. The rhetoric used to oppose Judge Kavanaugh crosses that line.

Just last week, when speaking about Judge Kavanaugh's impressive resume, I said you could not knock Yale, Harvard, or Georgetown. Maybe I spoke too soon. Shortly after the announcement that Judge Kavanaugh would be the nominee, Yale Law School released a statement with praise of Judge Kavanaugh from professors and administrators.

One professor even noted that "politics have deeply harmed our Supreme Court nomination process," but she lauded Judge Kavanaugh as being a "true intellectual," an "incomparable mentor," and a "fair-minded jurist who believes in the rule of law." She went on to say that "he is humble, collegial, and cares deeply about the federal courts."

The response from some Yale Law School students, staff, and alumni was swift, forceful, uncompromising, and completely ridiculous: "People will die if he is confirmed." As these Yale alumni were feverishly opposing the nomination, Judge Kavanaugh was spotted volunteering his time with a

local charity to distribute food to the poor. His decision to keep his commitment to volunteer the week he was nominated to the Supreme Court says more about Judge Kavanaugh than any letter could.

This overwrought reaction, sadly, comes as no surprise. Crying wolf is the left's trademark strategy in attempts to sabotage Republican nominees. Back in 1990, a group that opposed then-nominee David Souter warned that he was a threat to the "lives, health and livelihoods of millions of women and their families." It wasn't true then, and it isn't true now.

I hope that the Senate can raise the level of debate as we consider the nomination. In doing so, we should focus on whether Judge Kavanaugh is qualified.

I hope my Democratic colleagues can resist the temptation to politicize this nomination as they have with others in the past. Some of what we are seeing now has me worried.

We have also heard a lot from Democrats about how important transparency is to the confirmation process. Because of Judge Kavanaugh's long record of public service to our Nation, the executive branch has been asked to produce a large number of documents. Democrats have been demanding that they be given access to these documents as quickly as possible.

Some of my colleagues have expressed shock that Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein requested that assistant U.S. attorneys help to review these documents. The truth is that the Office of Legal Policy at the Justice Department always assists with nominations, and that Office is composed mostly of career attorneys. It is not uncommon for attorneys from other offices in the Justice Department to help with the review of nominations.

The government attorneys at the Department of Justice who work on nominations are extraordinarily thorough. Given the reportedly large number of documents, it makes sense that to facilitate this process, the DOJ would seek extra help.

When we spoke last week, Judge Kavanaugh said he was proud of his opinions, and he hoped people would actually read them rather than just read about them. I think those who do that will be just as impressed by Judge Kavanaugh's work as I am. I hope Senators will take the time to sit down with him.

Judge Kavanaugh has spent more than 23 years in public service. As a good man, a decent man, and an honest man, Judge Kavanaugh is the type of person we should all hope is nominated to a seat on the U.S. Supreme Court. That is why I am so pleased that President Trump nominated Judge Kavanaugh. I intend to do everything I can to support his nomination, and I hope that all other Senators will do the same.

We have to quit this mudslinging and mischaracterizing of people's characters. Judge Kavanaugh is one of the

finest people I know. He is also one of the smartest. He is conservative—no question about that—but he is honest. To me, these are some of the most important keys to these judgeship positions. I hope we get rid of the unjust representations against the judge. I hope we will start treating the Senate like the great deliberative body it really is.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. BARRASSO pertaining to the introduction of S. 3229 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, last week, President Trump nominated Judge Brett Kavanaugh to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court. People have begun looking over his extensive record, and he has been getting rave reviews around the country. Just look at a few of the headlines we have seen across the country.

The New York Times, July 10: "A conservative stalwart wins praise for his intellect and civility." The New York Times—it is astonishing.

The Wall Street Journal said: "Trump's nominee will be an intellectual leader on the bench."

The Detroit News said his record suggests that "he will maintain a commitment to interpreting the law as it is written, and not how he may wish it had been crafted." That is exactly what Americans should be looking for in a Supreme Court Justice because a judge's job is to apply the law, not to rewrite it.

People looking at Judge Kavanaugh's record and reaching the conclusion that he knows the right way to approach this very important job.

It is not just newspapers that are saying wonderful things and singing the praise of Judge Kavanaugh; legal scholars are lining up to commend his independence and his wisdom as a judge. Some of them are extremely liberal people he has worked with over the years. They just respect him that much as a judge who they find has been devoted to the law and the Constitution. Imagine that. That is what we

should expect in anybody who serves as a Justice on the Supreme Court.

A law professor from Yale wrote an op-ed for the New York Times last week titled “A liberal’s case for Brett Kavanaugh.” The professor called Judge Kavanaugh “a superb nominee” and said that “it is hard to name anyone with judicial credentials as strong as those of Judge Kavanaugh.”

Another liberal law professor called him a “highly qualified mainstream conservative judge.” He cited Judge Kavanaugh’s reasoning as “an example of the judging ideal, setting aside ideology and party politics, and just trying to get the law right.” That is a liberal former law professor. He said Judge Kavanaugh gives “an independent judiciary the job it is supposed to do: Interpret the law.”

There are lawyers who have appeared before Judge Kavanaugh who said the same things. I am not a lawyer, I haven’t done these sorts of things, but I understand there are surveys of lawyers who appear before judges in court, people who have won cases and people who have lost cases. They put up their ideas about what they thought about the judge afterward.

Across the board, they called him “an excellent judge.” They said that he “has a history of excellent legal argument and analysis,” someone who can think intellectually, think clearly, and come up with a legal argument and analysis to make the assessment, to apply the law as written. One lawyer actually said: “It is daunting and humbling to be in front of that brainpower.” This was an anonymous survey of lawyers who appear before Judge Kavanaugh. I don’t know if they won or lost, but people get to put in their opinions, winners and losers, after cases in anonymous surveys. “It is daunting and humbling to be in front of that brainpower.” This wasn’t people just trying to kiss up to the judge to win favor in a case; these are results from people after the case who were just telling it like it is. “Excellent legal judgment,” they say.

If you look beyond the courtroom, people are just as willing to talk about Judge Kavanaugh’s character as a person, not just a judge. That is part of it—to look at somebody’s legal philosophy, their intellect, and their character—when trying to assess a judge who has been nominated, to say: Is this person the right person to be a Justice on the Supreme Court?

The Washington Post even ran a piece by a woman who knows Judge Kavanaugh because he coaches her daughter’s basketball team. She wrote that she was impressed by “his traits of personal kindness, leadership, and willingness to help when called on.”

There are three things I look for in a nominee for the Supreme Court: judicial philosophy, a strong intellect, and a solid character. What we are hearing is overwhelming evidence from people who know him that Judge Kavanaugh has all of these qualities. He is some-

one who takes the law and the Constitution at face value.

The Constitution is a legal document, not a living document, and it was built for certainty. He knows that a judge’s job is to “interpret the law,” not to legislate from the bench, “not to make the law or make policy.” That is what he actually said in a speech last year.

He has an extremely strong intellect, and I can’t imagine there is anyone out there who can deny that. “It is daunting and humbling to be in front of that brainpower”—this is what one of the lawyers who appeared before him said. And he is a person of solid character. That is what we are hearing from people who have known him over the years from being extremely active in the community. The New York Times summarized it: “A conservative stalwart wins praise for his intellect and civility.”

So what is there for Democrats to come to the floor and object to? Why are they objecting to all of this? Why are some Democrats already saying they oppose a judge known for his intellect and civility? They were actually saying it before he was even named by President Trump. Whomever President Trump names, they are going to vote no. It is astonishing to see Democrats making that decision. Then they are asking for reams and reams of documents after they have already said they are against Judge Kavanaugh. What are they looking for? It is amazing.

That is what I believe the big difference is between Republicans and Democrats in Washington: Republican Presidents choose judges and justices to follow the law; Democratic Presidents seem to pick judges and justices who are guaranteed to push liberal policies and liberal agendas, preconceived notions of how they should rule on a case before they hear the facts. They know the way they are going to go, maybe using things like emotion, sympathy, and empathy. The Constitution is a legal document.

Even though you have legal experts from around the political world and around the spectrum of all sides of the aisle who praise his intellect and civility, it is not good enough for the liberal activists in this country. They don’t even want to consider Judge Kavanaugh’s qualifications, and they have said it here on the floor of the Senate and on television, if you listen. They are already making opposition to his nomination a liberal litmus test for Democrats in this Senate, and I am sorry to say that more than a few Democrats seem to be playing along. We have seen Democrats in the Senate who have already said that they don’t care about Judge Kavanaugh’s intellect; they don’t care that he is “just trying to get the law right”; they don’t care that, as one lawyer said, “it is hard to name anyone with judicial credentials as strong as those of Judge Kavanaugh.”

When you have someone with these qualifications, Senators ought to be looking at his record. They should look at the 300 decisions he has written in 12 years on the bench. It is absolutely the right thing to look at. They should meet him and talk with him.

We have just begun this confirmation hearing process. I hope that more Democrats in the Senate will have an open mind about this nominee. I hope they will consider the kind of person we should have on the Supreme Court and then make their decisions about whether Judge Kavanaugh has those qualities. From what I have seen, he absolutely does.

I plan to continue to look into his record and listen to people who know him best. I plan to sit down and talk with him. Everything I have seen so far tells me that this is someone who is exactly the kind of Justice we need on the Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, to my colleagues, let me just say that we must speak out and act.

President Trump’s appearance with Russia’s President Putin—a U.S. President capitulating to a strongman dictator, unprecedented in American history—compromised America’s national security and brings into question whether America can be relied upon as the leader of the free world.

With Mr. Trump standing with Mr. Putin while he discredited America’s investigation into Russian meddling—this is an American President, with a dictator, challenging the investigation being done against Russia—the President questioned the conclusions of U.S. intelligence agencies. He left unchallenged Mr. Putin’s lies and illegal military invasions.

In short, Mr. Trump did Mr. Putin’s bidding. In Russia, they are smiling; at the White House, they are scrambling.

Congress must speak out and act. Congress must repudiate the President’s actions to make clear to the American people and the world that Russia, directed by Mr. Putin, attacked our free election system in 2016 and tried to tip the scales in favor of Mr. Trump.

Russia illegally invaded the sovereign state of Ukraine and illegally annexed Crimea, which the United States must make clear we will never recognize. Russia, under Mr. Putin, murders its political opponents and journalists. Russia has interfered in the politics of several European democratic states.

Six months ago, I authored, on behalf of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Democrats, a report entitled “Putin’s Asymmetrical Assault on Democracy in Russia and Europe: Implications for U.S. National Security.”

I sent a copy of that report to President Trump and hoped that he would absorb it and use it in his meeting with

Mr. Putin. Unfortunately, he either didn't read it or didn't heed the advice in that report.

That report spells out in detail the asymmetrical arsenal that Mr. Putin uses. Yes, he uses his military, propaganda, and cyber; he supports organized crime and corruption, weaponizes energy, and supports fringe political groups, all to attack our democratic system of government.

The report spells out numerous recommendations for steps we should take to protect our national security against what Russia is trying to do to us. The report spells out several recommendations I just want to underscore today. We urge the President to assert Presidential leadership and launch a national response, an inter-agency response, so we make it clear that we will not tolerate this.

Mr. Trump has done just the opposite. He has downplayed any significance to what Russia has done, has not allowed us to have a coordinated effort with the executive branch, and has fought what Congress has tried to do in giving him additional resources in order to prepare us against what Mr. Putin is doing.

The report goes on to further recommend that we expose and freeze Kremlin-linked dirty money. The administration has not done that.

It goes on to say that we should subject state hybrid threat actors to an escalating sanctions regime. Here Congress did act. We passed the CAATSA statute, which requires—these are mandatory sanctions against Russia because of what they did to us in 2016 and what they did in regard to the Ukraine and their other activities. This administration has not fully utilized those sanctions that are available under the legislation we passed.

The report calls for publicizing the Kremlin's global malign influence efforts and building an international coalition to counter hybrid threats. Mr. Trump did just the opposite in his most recent foreign trip. In his performance in Brussels with NATO and then later in London, he not only took the opportunity to criticize two of our closest allies, Mrs. Merkel in Germany and Ms. May in London, England—the U.K.—but he also challenged the unity of Europe, weighing in with regard to Brexit and the politics of Brexit. That is not how the President brings unity among our allies in order to stand tall against the threats of Russia.

The report goes on to say that we need to build global cyber defenses and norms. Congress has appropriated funds; the administration has not fully utilized those funds.

We need to hold social media companies accountable. We see the infiltration of Russia into our social media platforms. Europe has already taken action to make sure that it identifies and is protected against infiltration of foreign entities getting involved in trying to influence policy in their country. The United States, under Mr. Trump, has not taken similar action.

First and foremost, we need to recognize Russia for what it is today—not the Russian people, but under the leadership of Mr. Putin, Russia is an adversary. They are against our system of government, and they are trying to bring down our system of government.

I saw the President's tweet this morning, and I just want to acknowledge that we want to have relations with all countries in the world. I want the relationship between the United States and Russia to be on a better plateau, but it has to be under our terms, not Mr. Putin's terms. That is the problem with what the President did in Helsinki. He allowed Mr. Putin to control the dialogue and allowed Mr. Putin to look as though everything he is doing is reasonable when it is not. If you give Mr. Putin space, he will push to fill it, and then he will go even further.

Ten years ago, Mr. Putin saw an opportunity. He saw an opportunity to put a wedge in regard to the NATO expansion and the growth of a unified Western Front. He saw that opportunity in the independent state of Georgia, and he took advantage of that. Russian troops invaded. They are still there today, and Georgia is still not part of NATO.

Mr. Putin's strategy paid off. The Western World gave him that open space; he took advantage of it.

In 2014, Mr. Putin, based upon his experience in Georgia—and also, by the way, based upon his experience in Moldova—said “Well, we can do the same in Ukraine,” and they invaded Ukraine. They took over Crimea; they illegally annexed Crimea, and guess what. Ukraine, today, is nowhere closer to being a NATO ally as a result of Mr. Putin's strategies.

It worked for him, not for us. That is not in our national security interest. The President gives him a pass.

They tried it in Montenegro. Russia financed operations of a coup to try to prevent the parliamentary elections from having a government that would ratify NATO. The people of Montenegro stood up and said no. They fought it, and they won. Now Montenegro is a NATO ally. We can't give this space to Mr. Putin.

Mr. Putin, not just in the United States, but in Europe, interfered in elections. But what happened in 2016 in America? This is a fact; this is not subject to debate. We know that Russia, directed by Mr. Putin, interfered in our elections. That has been confirmed by our intelligence community. It has been confirmed by our own Intelligence Committee here in the U.S. Senate. This is not something that you debate. We know that is a fact. We understand the President has tried to convince the public here in America that may not be true, but those are the facts. We know the facts. We are privy to the facts.

We know that Russia interfered in our elections, but the message from Helsinki, President Trump's message to President Putin, is: OK. Let's move

on. That gives space to Mr. Putin. His calculation: 2018 is fair game. I can do whatever I want in the U.S. elections. After all, I know the President will be on my side and will not hold me, Russia, accountable for interference in the U.S. elections.

That is certainly not in our interest. Congress must speak out and act. We have to protect this country. It is our responsibility. We are an independent branch of government. We need to speak out on behalf of our Nation.

Let me just lay out issues that I hope we will work on not only in response to the President's summit with Mr. Putin but also because it is our responsibility as an independent branch of government to speak out for America.

First, we need to protect the integrity of the Mueller investigation. I am not going to prejudge what the Mueller investigation will come in with. I have confidence that Mr. Mueller will do his work.

Mr. Trump has been openly critical over and over and over and over again about this investigation. It is outrageous that the head of the executive branch of government is trying to compromise the checks and balances in our own system, but we have to make sure that the checks and balances remain. We have to make sure that we protect the integrity of the Mueller investigation.

Congress needs to pass legislation, and there is legislation that has been recommended by our Judiciary Committee that would protect the integrity of the Mueller campaign. We should take up that legislation and pass it immediately.

I said that I will not prejudge what Mr. Mueller will come in with. We know there are people who have been indicted. We know that Russia has been engaged in the election. We know that some Americans were involved.

Was there collusion with the Trump campaign? It will be up to the Mueller investigation to give us those findings. But we do know from Helsinki that Mr. Trump openly colluded with Mr. Putin in regard to an orchestrated message coming out of Helsinki.

Secondly, Congress needs to exercise its oversight capacity with hearings. That is our responsibility.

I was pleased to see that Senator CORKER announced that Mike Pompeo, the Secretary of State, will be before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Wednesday of next week. This meeting is long overdue.

Let me just remind my colleagues that this meeting is being set up to get our very first briefing on what happened in Singapore in the President's meeting with Kim Jong Un in North Korea. We haven't had a single briefing in Congress on the North Korean summit.

Now we have Mr. Pompeo coming up here for North Korea. I urge Mr. Pompeo and Senator CORKER to make sure that Mr. Pompeo is prepared and has the time not only to address North

Korea but also to address what happened in Helsinki. We have a right, an obligation, to find out.

While we are able to question representatives from the executive branch in regard to Helsinki, let's make sure that we have a chance to talk to Jon Huntsman, our Ambassador to Russia, to get his take, his assessment of what happened. We need to talk to our Director of National Intelligence as to his assessments. We need to have oversight hearings here in Congress.

Most importantly, we need to understand what happened in the room—where it happened—where Mr. Putin and Mr. Trump spent over 2 hours. We have no information about what happened in that room. We have a responsibility as Members of Congress to understand what discussions took place, what commitments in regard to our elections, in regard to Ukraine, in regard to Syria, in regard to North Korea, in regard to Iran. We have a lot of interest in knowing what took place, and we should get that information now. That is our constitutional responsibility. We need to speak out and act to carry out our responsibility.

This is not a partisan issue. This is a constitutional issue of what we do. We are a check and balance in the system. The public expects us to act that way and to get that information.

We should also strengthen the sanctions regime against Russia. I say that mindful that the bill we passed last year, the CAASTA bill—I worked very closely with my colleagues in drafting that bill—provides a whole array of options to President Trump to impose new sanctions against Russia for their activities. Many of these sanctions, by the way, are mandatory. The President has no discretion. I say that with some disbelief because these sanctions have not been imposed yet, even though they are mandatory sanctions.

So Congress needs to speak out and act. We need to speak out to make sure these sanctions are indeed imposed, and we have to make sure we strengthen the sanctions regime, if the President needs more of a reminder or needs additional tools in order to act against Russia. One thing we want to make crystal clear is, we don't want to see the weakening of any of these sanctions. I think many of us know about conversations that took place in the past about Mr. Trump's thoughts about easing up some of these sanctions. We have to make sure that, in fact, they are not.

It was interesting that during the summit, there was a conversation against Mr. Browder about the Magnitsky sanctions that have been imposed by Congress. Browder worked with Senator MCCAIN on that legislation. We have to make sure those sanctions remain in place and are strengthened, not weakened. That is our responsibility to make sure that takes place.

We must also make sure that we protect the integrity of our election sys-

tem. We have appropriated funds for this. There is legislation that is pending by Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. We now know we are even more vulnerable. We have seen some indictments of late that point out what Russia could be doing in the 2018 elections, which are only less than 4 months away.

One of the fundamental principles of our democracy is our free and fair elections. We have a responsibility to make sure they are free from international tampering and the influence Russia may try to play in this election cycle. We need to take concrete steps to make sure that is done.

Lastly, I suggest that the Senate go on record repudiating President Trump's actions in Helsinki. The Republican leadership should bring to the floor of the U.S. Senate such a resolution. It is our responsibility to consider such a resolution.

By passing such a resolution, we can restore confidence to the American people and to the world that the United States, indeed, is the leader of the free world.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I oppose the nomination of Andrew Oldham to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. Oldham is only 39 years old. He checks the Federalist Society box, having been a member since law school of that rightwing legal group that vets all of President Trump's nominees. Mr. Oldham has spent much of his career litigating on behalf of Republican elected officials in Texas State government, where he worked on challenges to the Affordable Care Act, the DACA and DAPA programs, the Voting Rights Act, Fair Housing Act regulations, "Ban the Box" regulations on job applications, and Clean Air Act regulations, among many others.

Mr. Oldham's extreme ideology is apparent from statements he has made in his personal capacity. At his nomination hearing, he refused to say that the landmark Supreme Court case *Brown v. Board of Education* was correctly decided. That was an astonishing moment. Every Supreme Court nominee who has been asked this question has said he or she believed *Brown v. Board* was correctly decided. In recent hearings before the Judiciary Committee, nominees have answered yes to this question without hesitation; yet Mr. Oldham wouldn't answer.

If a nominee refuses to say that *Brown v. Board* was correctly decided, it certainly raises questions in my mind about the nominee's judgment, but that is not all Mr. Oldham has said.

At his hearing, he refused to say whether he agreed that voter discrimination still exists in the United States.

He gave an interview in 2016 where he described the Supreme Court as "the most dangerous branch" and said "they often fail to enforce our sacred rights that are in the Constitution, while creating rights that are not." Keep in mind, this is a Supreme Court where the majority of justices were appointed by Republican Presidents.

He gave a speech to the Federalist Society in 2016 where he said, "I have particular things that I think are illegitimate in the way that we conduct modern American law." He went on to say, "It's not that I disagree with a particular Department of Labor regulation or a particular IRS regulation; it is the entire existence of this edifice of administrative law that is constitutionally suspect."

He also wrote in a law review article that "the Sherman Act, as it is currently understood, is unconstitutional." The Sherman Act is one of our foundational antitrust laws; it prohibits monopolies and restraints of trade.

Mr. Oldham's views are clearly outside the judicial mainstream. His own words and writings show an extreme ideological agenda.

Of course, like all of President Trump's nominees, he has promised he would cast all his views aside if confirmed and simply follow the law. But time after time, we have seen these nominees get confirmed to the bench and then start interpreting the law to produce outcomes that align with their preexisting, Federalist Society-approved views and side with corporations and wealthy elites over working Americans.

Mr. Oldham is ideologically extreme, he has shown instances of terrible judgment, and he has said things that would make litigants question whether he could be a fair and impartial judge. I oppose his nomination.

Mr. CARDIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise to speak to the integrity of the character and the career of Andy Oldham, the President's nominee to be a circuit judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Andy represents the best of what Texas's legal community has to offer to our Federal courts. Andy Oldham was born to high school sweethearts. His parents, like his grandparents before them, knew struggles and knew hard work.

Andy's father was raised in a trailer with four other siblings, and Andy's grandfather spent years away from his family, first fighting in World War II and then in Korea. His mother was raised by her divorced mother, and Andy's mother helped manage the household starting at age 8.

Growing up in these humble beginnings taught both of Andy's parents the value of hard work. His father drove a cement truck and cleaned deep fryers in restaurants to pay his way through college. His mother was one of

the first women to attend the University of Virginia. Together, both enrolled in the Medical College of Virginia, where his father became a doctor and his mother became a dentist.

Andy's parents had enormous student debts to pay, and so Andy learned what it was like to grow up with little as well, but he likewise learned the value of an education from his parents.

Andy went to the University of Virginia on a full academic scholarship, graduating with a perfect 4.0 GPA and at the top of his class. He then became a Truman Scholar and went on to attend Harvard Law School.

Andy graduated from Harvard Law magna cum laude and clerked for Judge David Sentelle on the DC Circuit, one of the most respected Federal appellate judges in the country, and then clerked for Justice Samuel Alito on the Supreme Court of the United States.

He then worked as an attorney advisor for 2 years in the Office of Legal Counsel in the U.S. Department of Justice under the George W. Bush administration.

Andy then went into private practice at Kellogg Hansen here in Washington, DC. From there, Andy went to the Texas solicitor general's office to serve as the deputy solicitor general of Texas. I can state that office is usually a pretty tight ship.

After that, he joined Governor Abbott to serve as his legal counsel. He is now the general counsel for the Governor and has spent all but 3 years of his career in public service.

If I may say, it shows a depth of character and a devotion to his country that Andy would stay in public service for so long, so dutifully, while forgoing the great rewards that come with private practice. He is devoted to the practice of law, and over the years, Andy has displayed a keen understanding of the Constitution and how it applies and guides us to this very day.

I am confident Andy will not substitute his own policy preferences, his own opinions for the rule of law, but he will instead serve the people of Texas and the American people by respecting the law as written—as written in the Constitution and as written in Federal law—passed by this Congress and signed by the President. Our courts and our country are well-served by judges with this dedication, wisdom, and forbearance.

In his career, Andy has argued across the country in State and Federal courts. He has appeared and argued numerous times before the Fifth Circuit, and he has argued twice before the U.S. Supreme Court.

He has earned widespread praise from both Democrats and Republicans, and he was recommended to the Judiciary Committee by esteemed legal voices from both the left and right. Andy is respected across the political spectrum. I know my colleagues in the Senate will return the same respect when they vote today to confirm Andy

Oldham as a circuit judge of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Andy will be the fifth judge we have confirmed for the Fifth Circuit, one of the finest courts in the country—a court I have been privileged to argue before many times. Andy will be the third Texan and fifth circuit judge in the last year and a half, and that, I think, is one of the greatest legacies of President Trump and this Republican Senate; namely, the confirmation of principled constitutionalists to the Federal court; judges who will be faithful to the Constitution and Bill of Rights, who will stand steadfastly to protect our fundamental liberties, to protect free speech and religious liberty, to protect the Second Amendment, the right to keep and bear arms, to protect the Tenth Amendment, the fundamental liberties of the people against ever-expanding Federal power.

This is a legacy that was front and center as to why the American people elected this majority, and it is a legacy that will benefit Texans and Americans for generations to come.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRUMP-PUTIN SUMMIT

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, as we all know, in this country, in 2016, the Russian Government weighed a covert, multifaceted criminal campaign to interfere in our elections. We now know it was intended to help then-Candidate Donald Trump win the Presidency. We don't know the full impact of Russia's interference, but it is beyond debate that it happened.

Russia, as we now found out, used inflammatory propaganda—it actually was fake news—attempting to suppress Democratic turnout and boost support for Donald Trump. They also stole communications belonging to the Democratic National Committee and the Clinton campaign, which were then strategically released to maximize their impact. They were released at times when they could counter negative news stories about Donald Trump.

Just last week, 12 Russian intelligence officers were charged with hacking campaign officials' emails and State election boards. In just over a year—in what may rank as the most productive special counsel investigation in our Nation's history—32 people and 3 companies have been charged or pled guilty as part of the Russian investigation. We likely will not know the full extent of Russia's interference until the special counsel's investigation is complete.

But what is clear—and this is what should concern Republicans and Demo-

crats alike—is that our democracy, our great country, was attacked by a foreign adversary. And two days ago, on an international stage, standing shoulder to shoulder with Vladimir Putin, our President sided with that attacker.

Instead of forcefully condemning Russia's attack on our democracy, its role in annexing Crimea, poisoning individuals with chemical weapons on the soil of one of our closest allies, Russia's downing of a passenger airline with nearly 300 innocent civilians onboard, or undermining democracies around the world, our President offered only praise for the authoritarian President Putin. He then repeated his conspiracy theories about the FBI and called the Russia investigation a "witch-hunt"—denigrating our law enforcement institutions, while standing beside the foe they work so hard to protect all Americans from—Republicans and Democrats alike.

In my 44 years as a Senator, I have never seen anything like it. I can think of no Republican President and no Democratic President who would ever do this. I never thought it would be possible in our country before President Trump took office.

Yesterday, the President attempted to walk back his decision to side with Russia over our own intelligence agencies. He attempted to do it because of the criticism he got from both Republicans and Democrats, but as many of my colleagues told me would happen, President Trump walked back his walk back. He reiterated that the interference "could have been other people. There are a lot of people out there."

This morning on Twitter—where apparently he does his deepest thinking—he claimed that people at the higher ends of intelligence loved his press conference in Helsinki. I do not think anyone here doubts that the President meant what he said and said what he meant in Helsinki. And, after their two-hour private meeting in Helsinki, I do not think President Putin has any doubt either.

We have to know that Russia shares neither our values nor our interests. Russia is not our friend. Of course, we want to see improved relations with Russia on Syria, on nuclear proliferation, and on many critical issues, but for that to happen, Russia needs to respect our democracy and values. We must not slouch down to theirs.

The United States is the leader of the free world. The free world is under threat, as it has so often been. But these threats are not supposed to come from within.

Just moments ago, when asked if Russia is still targeting the United States, the President inexplicably said "no."

That is not the truth.

Russia is still targeting the United States. This is despite his Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, confirming just last week that Russia is, indeed, still targeting our digital infrastructure and interfering in our democracy. Director Coats compared it to the

warning signs that emerged prior to the 9/11 attacks, but the President denies it is happening.

I know Director Coats. I served with him when he was a Republican Senator in this body. I know he would not say this if it were not so. Notwithstanding the President's saying that Russia is not targeting us, his own Director of National Intelligence says they are. We can't trust this President's judgment when it comes to Russia.

Remember, the President takes an oath to protect and defend our Nation. When it comes to Russia, it appears he does not intend to abide by his oath to defend and protect our Nation. This Congress is going to be derelict in its duty if it takes no action.

All of us have to speak with a single voice in this moment—Republicans and Democrats alike. We should all condemn the President's actions, which were as dangerous as they were shameful.

These condemnations are important, but words are not enough. Remember, Congress is a coequal branch of government. Remember that the Senate is supposed to be the conscience of the Nation. Let's act like it.

The President, obviously, can't be trusted to keep his hands off of the Russia investigation. By denigrating it at every opportunity and by dismissing its lead investigator last year, he has repeatedly failed the test.

The Senate Judiciary Committee recently passed legislation with a strong bipartisan vote. Republicans and Democrats alike voted to protect the special counsel's investigation. That legislation is before the Senate. Let's enact it into law. Let's take what Republicans and Democrats together said in the Judiciary Committee—that we will protect the special counsel's investigation. Let's vote up or down. Let's do it and enact it into law.

It is often said that the only thing President Putin responds to is strength. Let's show him that here in the Congress, we stand united in opposition to his ongoing attempts to attack our democracy. Believe me, they are ongoing right at this moment. Let's pass stronger sanctions targeting him and the oligarchs who enable him, who continue to help him because they become billionaires by doing it. Let's pass a resolution making it clear that if President Trump chooses to stand with President Putin, then he stands alone. The European Union is not our foe. And President Putin is not our friend. Our allies around the world, especially those that have stood with us since World War II, are looking at us at this moment. They are questioning whether the United States will be a reliable partner in the face of creeping authoritarianism, both at home and abroad. Let's show them where we stand.

This is not about politics. It is not about Republicans or Democrats. This is about who we are as a country and what we stand for as Americans—

whether we stand for democracy; whether we stand for freedom, including the freedom of the press; whether we stand for the rule of law; whether we stand for truth; and whether we stand for America. As a Vermonter and a Senator, I know where I stand. It is time we stand together.

BLUE-SLIP TRADITION

Madam President, I believe I have colleagues on the floor who are going to make a unanimous consent request, but before they do, I feel obliged to speak up about the steady erosion of the norms and traditions that protect the Senate's unique constitutional role with respect to lifetime appointments to our Federal courts.

We should all be alarmed by the Judiciary Committee's abrupt change in course when it comes to respect for blue slips, which allow home-State Senators to have a word in what happens. This should concern us all. For much of this body's history, blue slips have given meaning to the constitutional requirement of "advice and consent." They have protected the prerogatives of home-State Senators, and they have ensured fairness and comity in the Senate.

When I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, under both the Bush and Obama administrations, not a single judicial nominee received a hearing without first receiving both home-State Senators' positive blue slips. Regardless of who was in the Oval Office, I steadfastly defended blue slips because I firmly believed in both their constitutional and institutional importance. I also firmly believed in the prerogatives of home-State Senators and the need to ensure that the White House works in good faith with those Senators.

My decision to defend blue slips was not without some controversy. I faced significant pressure from my own party's leadership to hold hearings for President Obama's nominees who had not received positive blue slips from Republican Senators. I was criticized by liberal advocacy groups and major news outlets like the New York Times, but I resisted such pressure because I believed then—and I still believe now—that certain principles matter more than party.

All of us, whether Democrat or Republican, should care about good-faith consultation when it comes to nominees from our own States. The reasons for this are both principled and pragmatic. We know our States. We know who is qualified to fill lifetime judicial seats that will have a tremendous impact on our neighbors and communities.

This week, the Senate will vote whether to confirm a nominee to the Ninth Circuit, Ryan Bounds, opposed by not one but both of his home-State Senators. Senators WYDEN and MERKLEY were cut out of the nomination process entirely. The White House interviewed Bounds and fast-tracked his nomination without consulting ei-

ther senator. If Mr. Bounds is confirmed, it will mark the first time in the history of the Senate that a judicial nominee is confirmed despite opposition from both home-State Senators.

My concern is not about a mere piece of paper. My concern is that we are failing to protect the fundamental rights of home-State Senators, and we are failing in our constitutional duty to provide our advice and consent on a President's nominees. That should concern all of us. The Senate should never function as a mere rubberstamp for nominees seeking lifetime appointments to our Federal judiciary.

Without blue slips, nothing prevents a California nominee from being appointed to a Texas court. Nothing prevents our State selection committees from being completely ignored by the White House. That is what we are seeing today. The Oregon bipartisan judicial selection commission overwhelmingly voted that Mr. Bounds—who misled the commission about his controversial writings—did not deserve its recommendation.

Some may dismiss these warnings, but I have served in the Senate long enough to know that winds tend to change direction. Inevitably, the majority becomes the minority. The White House changes hands. I suspect Republicans will rekindle their love of blue slips if they find themselves in the minority under a Democratic President, as they did under President Obama and during my chairmanship. That is precisely why maintaining a single, consistent policy with respect to blue slips is so critical.

That is why I will vote against Mr. Bounds. If we abandon our longstanding traditions to change partisan expediency, that provides only fleeting advantage and inflicts lasting harm in this body. We are better off when we follow the tradition we always have. We foolishly hurt ourselves and our individual States when we allow ourselves to step away from it. I would urge all Senators to ensure that home-State Senators are provided the same courtesies during the Trump administration that they received from both Republican and Democratic Judiciary chairmen during the Obama administration. I ask my fellow Senators to oppose Mr. Bound's nomination.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I am about to engage in a brief colloquy about a unanimous consent request with my colleague, the Senator from California.

I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the previous order, I be able to have 5 minutes to do that prior to the vote.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 118

Mr. LEE. Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No.

297, S. 118; that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I rise today to express concern with S. 118, the Reinforcing American-Made Products Act, because it would preempt California's strong "Made in America" labeling standards.

California requires that at least 90 percent of a final product be composed of American-made parts to use the label—the strongest standard in the Nation.

This bill would undo California's tough standard, setting instead a watered-down national standard. Companies could then confuse consumers by flooding the market with products sold under the "Made in America" label that were built using more foreign-made components. That is why the California attorney general and the Consumer Federation of California support keeping California's strong standards in place.

The "Made in America" label should promote U.S. manufacturing and give consumers confidence that they are supporting American jobs. Consumers want to know that products bearing the "Made in America" label are truly made in America. Because this would undermine that confidence and preempt California's strong standards, I believe this bill should not move by unanimous consent. Regretfully, for those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments made by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from California.

When Americans see a "Made in USA" label on a product, it is a source of great pride. It represents the American virtues of innovation and industriousness. It is a symbol of support for American manufacturing jobs and high-quality products across the board, and it often spurs American consumers to buy those very products.

The Federal Trade Commission currently enforces a difficult standard for products to claim the "Made in USA" label. It requires that all or virtually all of a product must be made in the United States, and it has issued lengthy guidance documents establishing the rules. However, one State holds a different standard—one that is nearly impossible for businesses to meet. Under California's law, if more than 5 percent of the components of a product are manufactured outside the United States, even if that means just a few bolts or a few screws, then that product cannot be labeled "Made in USA."

While companies could legally boast this claim in 49 of the 50 States under the Federal standards set by the Federal Trade Commission, they are often unable to do so because of the flow of interstate commerce. Most manufacturers sell wholesale to national and international distributors who then disperse products throughout the country. As a result, companies must label products according to the most rigid definition in order to protect themselves from costly litigation. In short, one State—one single State—is effectively governing how interstate commerce is conducted with regard to "Made in USA" labeling throughout the country.

The Reinforcing American-Made Products Act would solve this problem by ensuring that the current Federal definition is the supreme labeling law in interstate commerce without weakening the strong "Made in USA" national standard. In addition to upholding the Constitution, which empowers Congress—this body—to regulate interstate commerce, this legislation would provide clarity and consistency, which would help American companies avoid unnecessary hardships and frivolous lawsuits.

In the global marketplace, it is increasingly difficult for small American companies to stay afloat, let alone to compete. This reform would ultimately encourage manufacturing in America and use American tools and resources. It would also help so many of the small businesses and ordinary American workers who are currently being left behind, and helping them ought to be our goal.

This bill passed unanimously out of committee, and it has broad bipartisan support. I am disappointed that it is being blocked by the few people who do not support it when it could benefit all 50 of our States. We should exercise this authority, and we should open the flow of interstate commerce.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Oldham nomination?

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 160 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Blunt	Burr
Barrasso	Boozman	Capito

Cassidy	Hatch	Portman
Collins	Heller	Risch
Corker	Hoeben	Roberts
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cotton	Inhofe	Rubio
Crapo	Isakson	Sasse
Cruz	Johnson	Scott
Daines	Kennedy	Shelby
Enzi	Lankford	Sullivan
Ernst	Lee	Thune
Fischer	McConnell	Tillis
Flake	Moran	Toomey
Gardner	Murkowski	Wicker
Graham	Paul	Young
Grassley	Perdue	

NAYS—49

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Udall
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Duckworth	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Harris	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, Bob Corker, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Orrin G. Hatch, John Cornyn, David Perdue, John Barrasso, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 161 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Corker	Inhofe	Scott
Cornyn	Isakson	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Sullivan
Crapo	Kennedy	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—49

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Udall
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Duckworth	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Harris	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 49. The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 572

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 572; that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3227

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this moment hardly seems the time for the Senate to engage in debating rhetorical phrases of praise for the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency when that agency—better known as ICE—is deeply mired in the scandal of separating children from their parents. It is ICE that partnered with Border Patrol and Health and Human Services in this

diabolical situation. It is ICE that holds the parents in detention camps. It is ICE that has failed to arrange for the knowledge within the system of which parents go with which children. It is ICE that often has prevented individuals from having access to counsel, from being able to even phone their children, and charged them for using the phone.

In this situation, some 2,500-plus kids have been torn out of the arms of their parents, and this particular resolution would engage in nice phrases of praise instead of addressing itself to solving the problem.

We should right now be considering Senator HARRIS's act, the REUNITE Act, which would accelerate the reunification of the children, would ensure that family separation never happens again, would coordinate actions between ICE and the Border Patrol and Health and Human Services, and would set up a family case management system that worked, according to the IG of Homeland Security, to deliver 100 percent of the time when individuals had a date for a hearing—100 percent of the time.

That is why I ask my colleague to modify his request so that the Committee on the Judiciary, instead, be discharged from further consideration of S. 3227, the REUNITE Act, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Montana so modify his request?

Mr. DAINES. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. I strongly object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I live in a State—the State of Montana—that has a northern border. ICE agents keep our border secure, and I want to thank them for the very important work they are doing.

Far too many people are coming into our country illegally and putting the safety and security of American citizens at risk. In fact, in Montana, the effects of unsecured borders are very personal. All across our State, communities at this moment are torn apart by the meth and opioids that are trafficked through the southern border. In fact, just last year, ICE seized nearly 50 tons of narcotics, nearly a million pounds of heroin, fentanyl, and other deadly drugs that criminals and cartels are smuggling into our country.

At a time when America is suffering from a drug epidemic, how many more lives would be lost if ICE agents were not protecting our borders? How many

more innocent Americans would be harmed or murdered if we did not have ICE agents to arrest illegal immigrants with criminal convictions? These are the questions that those who call for the abolishment of ICE should be asking.

It is outrageous. It is irresponsible to call for abolishing one of our country's most critical security measures. Abolishing ICE would give terrorists, gang members, drug dealers, and other criminals a field day.

I stand for protecting American security. I stand for upholding the rule of law. That is why I stand with ICE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, this resolution being offered by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is a partisan political stunt to distract the American people from the crisis created by Donald Trump's zero tolerance policy.

Almost 3,000 children were ripped from the arms of their parents and traumatized by the President's cruelty.

Yesterday, the Senate Judiciary Committee had a closed-door briefing with officials from the Department of Justice, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Homeland Security. The American people deserve to hear from these officials in public and under oath. All these officials provided at this briefing—not under oath—was more obstruction and obfuscation. The witness from Immigration and Customs Enforcement even claimed that they “did not mess up here.”

Separating almost 3,000 children from their parents, not meeting judicially set deadlines for reunifying these children—the trauma continues. Is there anybody in America paying attention to this issue who actually believes there was no mess-up?

We need a public hearing to hear from these officials under oath.

Donald Trump is weaponizing fear to pursue his anti-immigration agenda, and we are not going to be party to that. We should be focused like laser beams on reuniting the children with their parents.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Ms. HIRONO. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Hawaii for joining in this statement about the agency of ICE, which is in the Department of Homeland Security.

There are certain things that I think Democrats and Republicans can come together to agree on. Let me tell you what I think they are. Border security—the United States needs security at its borders. There is no question about that, whoever the President may be.

The second thing we agree on is, nobody who is dangerous should be allowed to come to this country. Anyone

here who is undocumented and dangerous should leave, should be removed. We all agree on that, do we not?

The third thing, which 68 Senators agreed on, is comprehensive immigration reform. Our immigration laws are a mess—an absolute mess. That is why we continue to debate the topic, and 68 of us came to vote on a bipartisan measure 5 years ago to fix the whole system. It passed the Senate and died in the House.

Where are we today? We are here today debating on the floor the future of ICE. There are parts of the function and responsibility of this agency of ICE that all of us would agree on. ICE has important responsibilities combating serious criminal activities, like smuggling, bulk cash, drugs, weapons, human trafficking, violent criminals and others who would do us harm, and enforcing immigration laws against terrorists. There is no argument about that. But what has become controversial is the Trump administration's new immigration policy.

You see, we don't have the resources to deport 11 million undocumented people nor do we have the resources to arrest all who present themselves at the border. What this administration has done, though, is say that they are going to criminalize—charge as criminals—everyone who shows up at the border. By doing that, they take limited resources and focus them on a mass of people, most of whom are no threat at all to the United States, instead of focusing their resources on the drug smugglers, the traffickers, the would-be terrorists. Those are our priorities for the safety of our homes, our families, and our communities, are they not?

Here we have this resolution that was brought to the floor to commend ICE in all its functions. I can just tell you, I don't join in that resolution. I specifically don't join in it when it comes to the President's zero tolerance policy.

It became the policy of the Trump administration and the U.S. Government to forcibly remove 3,000 children from their parents. That is bad enough, is it not? The notion that you take a baby out of the arms of a mother—a toddler, an infant—separate a young child—we did it under President Trump's zero tolerance policy.

Now let me state what added insult to that injury. At that point, there was no effort made to make certain we could reunite the parents with the children. Time and again, we would meet downstairs for a briefing from ICE and other agencies, and they would tell us: We don't know where the parents are. We really don't know where the kids are. We are going to have to go looking.

Imagine separating up to 3,000 children from their parents, and the U.S. Government did not keep a record of what happened to those kids. Ship something by UPS—they give you a tracking number. Go online, and you

can track that package wherever it may be. Order a pizza from Domino's. Call them after 15 minutes and ask: Where is the pizza? They will tell you. Check your coat at a restaurant before you go to the table. When you come back and hand them that little piece of paper, they give you your coat. It is pretty simple, is it not? But when it came to children and families, this agency, ICE, along with other agencies of this government, lost them. In one agency in Chicago, they told me that the search for the parents of the little kids they had was like a scavenger hunt. They just started calling right and left to try to figure out where the parent might be.

Yesterday, we had a briefing, and finally these agencies came up with some numbers. There are 2,550 children still in our custody who are not reunited with their families; 1,800 parents we haven't linked up with their children. And we want to put a resolution on the floor to commend this activity—to praise them for their great work? Not me.

They do good work in a lot of important areas, and I will be happy to join in that chorus. But we stand here and ignore the obvious—that this zero tolerance policy has given our Nation a black eye, has raised questions about our values as Americans, has created situations we cannot morally defend, such as separating children from their mothers.

Do you know what the American Academy of Pediatrics tells us? The doctors tell us it is an institutional form of child abuse to remove these children.

I have seen them, these poor kids, 5 and 6 years old in these settings. The place I visited in Chicago was doing its best to help the children, but two little girls walked into the room where I was sitting. They were holding hands—cute little kids. It was my opportunity to meet about 10 or 12 kids who were separated from their parents under the zero tolerance policy.

These two little girls were holding hands, and I thought they were sisters. We asked in Spanish. “No, amigas,” she said. They had become friends to one another.

It turns out that the one who was 5 years old was from Guatemala and the one who was 6 years old was from Chiapas, Mexico. They were holding on to one another. All they had was one another because our government had separated them from their mothers.

Now this agency is struggling to find these mothers. In some circumstances, they cannot even link up the children with their parents.

No, I am not going to join in a resolution of congratulations for the work they have done. Many of the things they have done have been courageous and important for the security of this country, but when it comes to the zero tolerance policy, it is not.

I do want to make one last point. Listen to what the top agents at ICE's

Homeland Security Investigations agency, which focuses on serious transnational criminal activity, had to say. Last month, a majority of the agents focusing on transnational criminal activity wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Kirstjen Nielsen, asking that Homeland Security Investigations be removed from ICE because of “the political nature of civil immigration enforcement.”

These are men and women who are focusing on serious crimes, and they asked to be removed from ICE. They are tired of the politics. I am weary of it as well.

We need to start solving these problems—border security, dangerous people kept out of this country and removed, comprehensive immigration reform. And for goodness' sake, reunite these children with their parents.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise in support of the brave men and women of our Immigration Customs Enforcement agency. These are law enforcement officers who risk their lives every day to keep this country safe.

Rising in support of law enforcement used to be a bipartisan issue. It used to be an issue that brought us together, that unified us. Sadly, as we have seen in the preceding minutes, that is no longer the case.

I rise today to urge my Democratic colleagues to say no to the reckless and radical voices within their party that are pulling their party so far out of the mainstream and so far out of touch with the American people that it is barely recognizable. For a long time, when Democrats were debating immigration issues, they used to say “Well, of course, we support enforcing the laws,” almost as an obligatory throwaway. Instead, we are here today, debating the abolishing of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, the exact antithesis of where most congressional Democrats claimed they were. All of this started because a few weeks ago, a longtime Democratic incumbent, a Member of the House, found himself beaten in a primary in New York State by an avowed socialist. As a result, many of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle are suddenly terrified of their left flank. Because her campaign focused on abolishing ICE—abolishing the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, more incumbent Democrats have said that they, too, are open to abolishing ICE.

I call on this body to pull back from the abyss. On immigration there are areas of good-faith disagreement that this body has debated and will continue to debate. I have long characterized my views on immigration as being able to be summed up in four words: legal, good; illegal, bad. I think the vast majority of Texans and the vast majority of Americans agree with that. There

are a host of immigration policies that ought to be commonsense bipartisan policies.

The Presiding Officer has shown great leadership in fighting against sanctuary cities, fighting against jurisdictions that defy Federal immigration law and that release violent criminals without being willing to turn them over to immigration officials. Those violent criminals, in turn, go on far too often to commit even more violent crimes.

I am the author of Kate's Law, a commonsense proposal which says that aggravated felons who repeatedly enter the country illegally should face a mandatory minimum prison sentence. It was named for Kate Steinle, a beautiful young woman, 28 years old, murdered on a California pier by an illegal immigrant who had been deported over and over and over again and had been in and out of jail over and over and over again and had multiple felony convictions. Yet, because San Francisco is a sanctuary city, they released him yet again, and he committed murder.

Kate Steinle would be alive if we could come together on Kate's Law, if we could come together on ending sanctuary cities. Yet it turns out that in today's hyperpolarized world, even that is not extreme enough for the modern Democratic Party. Multiple leaders of their party are advocating abolishing the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency.

What does ICE do? ICE men and women—I have met with a great many of them in my home State of Texas. I have met with a great many Border Patrol agents. I have joined them on their midnight muster. I have gone out on patrol with them as they risk their lives securing our border and risk their lives keeping us safe in the interior.

Criminal aliens arrested by ICE in fiscal year 2017 were responsible for more than 76,000 dangerous drug offenses; yet many Democrats are saying: Abolish their role. They were responsible for over 48,000 assault offenses. They were responsible for over 11,000 weapons offenses. They were responsible for over 5,000 sexual assault offenses. They were responsible for over 2,000 kidnapping offenses, and they were responsible for over 1,800 homicide offenses.

Yet the approach of the modern Democratic Party is not to find a reasonable, commonsense common ground. It is, instead, to say: Abolish the agency that has arrested criminals responsible for over 1,800 murders.

When it comes to drugs—the volume they are dealing with in fighting the narcotics traffickers—ICE in fiscal year 2017 seized more than 980,000 pounds of narcotics. ICE seized approximately 2,370 pounds of fentanyl, approximately 6,967 pounds of heroin. Yet, today, too many elected Democrats are afraid that they, too, might face a socialist primary and that their far left is so angry, hates President

Trump so much, that their position is not that we should enforce the immigration laws; their position is not that they will stand with law enforcement. Their position has become to abolish the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, the agency charged with enforcing our immigration laws.

This is not a reasonable position and a public policy debate upon which reasonable minds might differ. There are many of those in the immigration world. This is not one of them. This is a radical and reckless position.

Yet, this resolution—by the way, this resolution says not a word about the issue of family separation. We have heard some of the speeches from my Democratic colleagues focused on family separation. I can state that every Member of this body, Democrat and Republican, agrees that families should not be separated.

Indeed, I have introduced legislation to prohibit family separation, to ensure that children stay with their parents—the best place for a kid is with his or her mom or dad—but to do so in a way that also respects the rule of law, that doesn't return to the failed policy of catch-and-release that only encourages more and more illegal immigration, that only puts more and more children—little boys and girls—in a position of being physically and sexually assaulted by human traffickers.

No one who cares about humanity, no one who cares about compassion should want to incentivize putting little children in the control of global, transnational drug cartels and human traffickers.

For the past several weeks, I have been negotiating with Democratic Members of this body, trying to see if we could reach common ground to unite and say that we will not separate families, but at the same time, we will respect the rule of law and not return to catch-and-release in a way that incentivizes illegal immigration.

We will find out if any Democrats are willing to find common ground. All 100 could join together on ending family release and ending it today, but too many on the Democratic side want to condition ending family release on essentially mandating the release of every illegal alien in custody—those apprehended with children, mandating their release. That is not a reasonable position. That is not a position the American people support, and, critically, this resolution before the Senate says not a word about it.

This resolution does not address that question. Instead, this resolution says that those ICE agents—the ICE agents who right now may be kicking down the door on a meth house and facing violent drug lords, firing weapons at them, risking their lives to keep us safe—we stand with those law enforcement agencies, even if we may disagree on the parameters of illegal immigration.

I am one who believes we should welcome and embrace legal immigrants—

those who follow the rules and wait in line like my father in 1957, when he came as an immigrant from Cuba seeking freedom. Those are debates we can have.

We ought to be coming together in the spirit of bipartisan agreement to stand with law enforcement. I call upon the responsible members of the Democratic Party—and, surely, there must be some left. Surely, in the Democratic Party, there are some voices that are willing to stand up to the reckless and radical left and say: No, we should not abolish the agency charged with enforcing our immigration laws, charged with protecting us from vicious and violent criminals.

The fact that Senate Democrats are today objecting to this resolution shows just how captive they are to the fury that rages against President Trump.

Everyone in this Chamber has, at one time or another, had something the President has said or done that we all disagreed with. That is part of the political process, but the rage and fury on the far left is a qualitatively different matter. It is a rage that is demanding Democrats to go after, to undercut, to attack law enforcement agents who keep us safe. That is a mistake. It is a disservice to this institution. It is a disservice to the legacy of many distinguished Senators and a disservice to the American people and the Constitution that we are sworn to protect.

I urge this body to pass this commonsense resolution, standing with law enforcement, enforcing our borders, and stopping violent criminals, murderers, kidnapers, and rapists that ICE arrests every year. Abolishing law enforcement puts all of us at peril. I call upon my Democratic colleagues to reject that radical and reckless position.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this Senator came to talk about trade, and I am going to do that, but I think what we have is an example of extremes in politics that is on display before us.

I think, on the one hand, political points are trying to be scored about the abolition of certain law enforcement organizations. On the other hand, there are the political points that a government, especially our government, should not have a policy of separating children from their parents, unless the parents have committed a crime and need to be incarcerated for the purpose of that crime.

Here we have the extremes again going to either side, when, in fact, if there were good will, if there were not such a highly polarized, highly charged, partisan atmosphere, in part, as we say in the South, egged on by various Members of the leadership in the Congress as well as the Executive—if we didn't have all of that, we could get a lot more done.

The genius of American politics is for us to be able to come together, to respect each other, to understand the

other fellow's point of view, and then work out our differences.

It is the same thing on the international stage. That is why we see it is so difficult to reach international agreements when people have gotten hardened into positions because of race or religion or political balance.

So if you note a tone of sadness in this Senator's voice, then you are correct because, again, we are seeing the polarization of American politics.

Why can't we have a law enforcement organization that also doesn't have to operate under a policy of separating children from their parents? That is the commonsense point of view, but, no, we devolve into these extremes.

TARIFFS

Mr. President, I came to talk about trade.

Is the United States taken advantage of by other countries? You bet and especially China. We have been letting them get away with it for years, but you don't try to correct that situation by suddenly saying, I am going to impose a tariff, as the President has, on imported steel and aluminum: 25 percent on steel and 10 percent on aluminum.

What happens then is, for the people who use those products in manufacturing, whatever their business is, that is going to cause the cost of those goods to go up. The consumers are going to be the ones who get hurt. By the way, what that is going to do, again, is the extreme. If you do this, the person who is offended is going to do this and do it more.

That is exactly what is happening in this trade war that is suddenly starting to hurt all of us. In reaction to steel and aluminum tariffs that the United States has imposed, good friends of ours, major trading partners of ours—I am keeping China in a different category. I am talking about the European Union; I am talking about Canada, one of our closest friends; and I am talking about Mexico. In retaliation for what we are doing to them, they are now retaliating and putting tariffs on other goods. They are putting tariffs on everything, not only for steel and aluminum but from washing machines to lobster, whiskey, and cheese.

We are starting to see the consequences of these moves. People are starting to hurt. This Senator has heard from many businesses in his State that are starting to get hurt. In Florida, we are seeing the harmful effects of these tariffs. Mind you, it is not just the Budweiser Brewery that I visited several months ago in Jacksonville that produces 3.3 billion aluminum cans a year. Of course, the cost of those cans are going to go up, and it is going to be the consumer who pays, but it is going to affect others in the restaurant industry, the medical device industry, the marine manufacturing industry, and the auto parts industry.

Let me tell you about the cost of these auto parts that we have to im-

port and those made here domestically. Because of the increased costs of steel or aluminum, the cost of those parts are going up. Maybe the dealer that services your car and replaces parts is one thing, but what about the individual entrepreneur, like the auto mechanic shop that has to buy its parts that all of a sudden has to charge more? The big guys that deal in many more automobile repairs can spread that cost over a lot of people, but that poor individual auto mechanic shop is getting hurt. It is happening right now, and they are losing business.

Take, for example, the marine manufacturing industry. Manufacturing boats is a big industry in Florida. It is worth \$121 billion a year in Florida, which is 650,000 jobs in Florida and tens of thousands of downstream jobs in Florida and nationwide. The industry in our State alone provides over \$10 billion in annual economic activity. All of those businesses are really getting hurt because the European Union, Canada, and Mexico—three big export markets for the boat manufacturers—are getting orders cut because of the retaliatory tariffs of 25 percent from the European Union. They are not going to sell any more boats to European customers if they have to pay an extra 25 percent. They will go elsewhere where they can get it cheap, and that means 10 percent extra costs in Canada; 15 percent in Mexico.

What is that going to do? There are jobs in that boat manufacturing industry that will go away. They are brands that you might recognize like Nautique, Bryant, and Bass Cat. They are all brands of one company, Correct Craft, that I visited in Orlando this week. They manufacture boats and engines in factories across the country, with their headquarters in Orlando.

The President's tariffs have increased the production costs considerably because of the cost of aluminum and steel that goes into those boats. To add insult to the already existing injury, they are being hit with these retaliatory tariffs from other countries where they sell their goods.

There is no sugarcoating it. We are in the midst of a full-blown trade war. If this thing gets out of control, it can take us into an economic recession like the Smoot-Hawley tariffs did in the recession that led to what is known as the Great Depression. If we continue down this path without an exit strategy, we are going to regret it.

Already, our boat manufacturers in Florida have lost tens of millions of dollars in canceled orders. Regal Marine Industries had \$4 million worth of orders fall through. The company estimates it will lose \$13 million this year because of these tariffs, and that will wind up costing people their jobs. It is no small thing.

This is what happens when you get excessively extreme, when you get partisan, when you act like you know it all, when you improvise your way through a complicated world and don't

have a well-thought-out plan of how to get out of this mess. Again, with bipartisan consensus, it is the nature of the politics that we have to rein in.

There is also the story of Micro Stamping, which is the sole supplier of high-grade surgical equipment. That equipment is used in the treatment of breast cancer. Micro Stamping is contemplating shutting down because the President's trade moves are stopping it from getting the specific type of steel it needs to manufacture the equipment.

What about Hale Products? It is up in Ocala. It is also being crushed by the tariffs. It makes fire suppression equipment. Since the cost of the tariffs is passed down to the end consumer, it says the tariffs will make it harder for municipal fire departments—that are already facing stiff budget constraints—to buy the new, lighter weight lifesaving firefighting equipment. This will have repercussions beyond the company's immediate business needs.

It is worth noting that what is going on is doing lasting damage to our strategic alliances. The U.S. Government—this executive branch—is treating our friends like enemies and is giving comfort to our adversaries. This is no way to run a country. We should be working with our allies to address our global challenges. We ought to be advancing our shared interests, not just in trade but in national security and a range of things.

Before we escalate these things and they get out of hand, we need to think a little bit more about what we are doing, why we are doing it, and if we are doing it the right way. This Senator is saying we are not doing it the right way. What we are doing is sending a message that America is closed for business. I don't think that is what we want to do.

I urge my colleagues to join this Senator in shining the light of day on the hard truth of what happens when you go along and make things up without having a clear plan for success, which is exactly what this trade war right now is a product of. That kind of approach doesn't work for the USA; it doesn't work for Florida; and it doesn't work for the vast majority of hard-working everyday Americans. I think it is time to come to our senses.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Missouri. COMMEMORATING THE NEGRO NATIONAL LEAGUE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, last night, the Major League Baseball All-Star Game was hosted in Washington. In conjunction with that game, the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum hosted an event to honor the Homestead Grays, which was one of the teams from that league. There were great teams in that league. The Homestead Grays had won the Negro League World Series in 1943, which was 75 years ago. They had a great exhibit here in town about that team and about the history of that league.

The museum, which was founded in 1990, is located in Kansas City, MO. It is dedicated to highlighting and preserving that important part of our sports history—the history of African-American baseball. Bob Kendrick runs that museum, and it is a museum I would encourage all of my colleagues to visit as the All-Star Game was in Kansas City a few years ago, and it was one of the venues for Major League Baseball.

When people are in Kansas City, playing the Royals, managers and coaches often take their players there—players who haven't been there before and players who want to go back—just for them to have a sense of what it was like when there was the segregation of baseball and also some of the great players who played there. The chairman of the board, Stewart Myers, was here yesterday, and the vice chairman, Adam Sachs, was here yesterday.

The museum is actually expanding and building the Buck O'Neil Research and Education Center on the Paseo in Kansas City. Buck O'Neil was a great Kansas Citian, but he had also been a great part of Negro Leagues Baseball. In June of this year, vandals broke into the YMCA, on which a lot of money had already been spent. It was where that part of the museum, the research center, was going to be housed. The vandals did more damage than they should have been able to do, and, unfortunately, there was some water damage in the building. Yet that effort continues.

The Negro National League was created there in 1920 at that Paseo YMCA. There was an owners meeting, and the owners decided, It is time we really put more of a structure into this league. So they established a league. Before 1920, these African-American teams barnstormed around the country and played whomever they could play. After 1920, they could still barnstorm, but there was a league, there was a league championship, and there was a structure they had not had before.

In 1947, as every baseball fan knows, the Brooklyn Dodgers decided to integrate baseball, and Jackie Robinson, who had played for the Kansas City Monarchs, was the first player to step into that challenge of integrated baseball. The league lasted another 13 years or so. I think the last team finally folded in the early 1960s.

Some of the greatest baseball and the most exciting baseball ever played was played in this particular league—names like Satchel Paige, who said about himself that he was so fast he could turn off the light in the bedroom and be in bed before it got dark. He was a great pitcher, and he was a great runner. Buck O'Neil, Satchel Paige, Cool Papa Bell, Jackie Robinson, and 100 other names in that last 3 years of the 1940s who joined the Major Leagues are all part of that story.

Missouri teams were an important part of that story. The Monarchs

played for 37 seasons, and I already mentioned that Jackie Robinson played briefly for the Monarchs before he went to the Dodgers. They won a dozen league championships. They sent more players than any other team to the Major Leagues. The St. Louis Stars, who were on the other side of our State—originally the St. Louis Giants—played 12 seasons. They won the league championship in 1928, in 1930, and in 1931.

The real focus of the exhibit here this week was on the Homestead Grays. Now, where did the Homestead Grays come from? I think I already mentioned they were celebrating the 75th anniversary of winning the Negro League World Series in 1943. The Homestead Grays were originally based in Homestead, PA, just outside of Pittsburgh.

In 1940, in 1941, and in 1942, they played at least half of their games here in Washington. When the Washington Senators were traveling, the ballpark would be available, and the Homestead Grays would play games there. By 1943, they were playing about two-thirds of their games in Washington and generally had more people at their games than the Washington Senators had at their games. They won nine consecutive league pennants from 1937 through 1945.

There was even an effort, when the Nationals team was brought here, to call the Nationals the Washington Grays because of that tremendous team that had played here. The team owners chose the Nationals because it was one of the Washington Senators' official nicknames. That is an important part of our history right there, and we are going to be celebrating the 100th anniversary of that league in 2020.

I and Congressman CLEAVER, who is on the other side of this building, are looking at ways to draw more attention to this great part of our story. It is sad because of the segregated elements of it, but it is a great story because of the entrepreneurship and the sportsmanship and the competitive nature of that league.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I can tell the Senator is interested. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. NELSON. Indeed, this Senator is interested. Would you believe that a lot of those retired players who are still living happen to live in Florida?

Mr. BLUNT. Right.

Mr. NELSON. Further, as the Senator correctly pointed out, once Jackie Robinson was able to break into the majors in 1947, it would be another 11 years—1958—before the last team in the Major Leagues integrated. Would you believe, for all of that period of time, these great baseball players who have contributed so much had no pensions?

Further, it was years later in this Senate—in the last decade—that, finally, the Commissioner of Baseball was brought in front of the Commerce Committee in order to face the music

about the fact that the retired players who had not played in Major League Baseball but in the old Negro leagues in America—because they couldn't get into Major League Baseball, even while the rest of the teams were being integrated, which took 11 years—had no pensions. Would you believe that Major League Baseball, through Bud Selig, finally agreed to give them onetime pension payments?

This Senator is so grateful because that has helped so many of the residents in my State who are these great players. Senator BLUNT has so accurately described their considerable talents on the baseball field.

Mr. BLUNT. I think that is an important part of the history.

There were a couple of players there last night who had played in the league, and of course there are fewer of those players all the time. I have had a chance, as you have had, to meet and talk to them over the years—to talk about the excitement of that kind of baseball and their ability to entertain both with their sportsmanship as well as just with their talent as sportsmen.

I think it was a great league, and it is a great story. I don't know if the Senator has had a chance to go to the museum in Kansas City, but as a guy who knew those players and appreciates what that league was all about, I would certainly love to go there with the Senator sometime.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will yield, as a matter of fact, I am looking forward to seeing that museum.

It was one of the Senator's players on the Kansas City Monarchs—"Peach-Head" Bob Mitchell, retired, who was living in my State—who brought to the attention of his Senator the inequity that had occurred in their never getting pensions, even though they were certainly capable of getting into Major League Baseball but, because of segregation, could not.

Mr. BLUNT. I am looking forward, along with others, to celebrating that century of history. It is an important part of the story to be told, and I am glad the Senator has helped add to it here today.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. President, I also want to talk for a few minutes about the importance of getting the appropriations bills to the Senate floor, and I want to do that by talking about the opioid epidemic.

Our annual opportunity to look at that is legislative—legislative in terms of deciding how to spend money as we try to deal with this epidemic that claims more lives than any other single accidental cause of death. For a long time, car accidents predominated that list, but in virtually every State in the country, more people die now from drug overdoses than die from car accidents.

There are people of every age, such as the high school cheerleader in my hometown of Springfield, MO, who hurt her leg and got medicine for that leg injury. I think it was after 3 years of

struggling with addiction that her mother found her dead in the bedroom from an overdose.

Every age, every race—there are stories of incredibly successful people who received from the doctor or the dentist more pain medicine than they needed. It is not because that is what the doctor or the dentist intended to do. Doctors and dentists in the 1970s and 1980s were told: This is nonaddictive. There is no reason for people to have pain.

People could take these opioid-based painkillers and not have pain. That part was true. The part that wasn't true was the nonaddictive part. And the part that wasn't true was what you would do when the doctor was no longer giving you that medicine or you could no longer act like you were getting the medicine because of pain when, by then, you were getting it for some other reason.

The appropriations bill that our committee has voted out and that we are eager to get to the floor includes \$3.7 billion targeting the opioid epidemic. It is a 1,300-percent increase over where we were 4 years ago. Congress has become more aware of not only how widespread the epidemic is but also the incredible human cost of the epidemic.

The bill includes almost half of that money, \$1.5 billion, for State opioid response grants. One reason we are doing this with grants is we really don't know all of the options yet, and we haven't been able to evaluate the best ways to deal with this. We do feel in our committee and in Congress that it is unlikely that the best way to deal with this in one place is necessarily the best way to deal with it in other places.

My State of Missouri received \$10 million last year. We will receive \$28 million this year if this grant funding is approved, and other States will go up proportionately, exactly as we did.

What did we do with that money in our State of Missouri to see how we could deal with this epidemic? More than 1,700 people have received evidence-based medical treatment for opioid-use disorder; 1,700 people in the last 12 months or so have received that. More than 4,300 kits of naloxone, which is what you take when you overdose, have been distributed. That is less effective sometimes than it used to be because of fentanyl, and people don't have any idea, when they are trying to help you with what you put into your system—and you don't either—so, occasionally, you will get that shot to relieve you from the overdose and think that has helped, and then suddenly what you have put into your system overwhelms even that normal cure if you get it on time. "Cure" might be the wrong word because all it does is save you that one time.

Around 4,000 people have received training on what to do in the event of an overdose. About 10,000 people have received training in our State on topics from treatment to prevention to recovery.

For a State like ours, the rate of opioid deaths has increased; opioid overdose deaths have more than quadrupled in the past 15 years. That would not be an unusual number for States to see.

Senator CAPITO from West Virginia and I were here on the floor talking about this earlier this year. This is not necessarily an urban problem. In fact, in most cases, it is more of a rural problem per capita than an urban problem per capita. We have set aside money targeted for those rural communities. There is \$135 million set aside for rural communities based on different things that appear to be needed more in rural communities than in any other communities.

A couple of hundred million dollars goes into community health centers to support people who have behavioral health concerns and mental health concerns. If you don't have a mental health problem before you get addicted to opioids, you have one once you have gotten addicted to opioids. So those funds go there to try to deal with that.

Senator STABENOW and I introduced a bill a few years ago, the Excellence in Mental Health Act, and eight of our States now have a situation where they are treating, in that eight-State pilot, behavioral health problems like all other health problems. That particularly steps up if someone with an opioid addiction problem has a behavioral health problem they wouldn't have had otherwise. And there is no limit. Just as there would be no limit if you had kidney dialysis, there is also no limit in those eight States for your behavioral health problems. There is no limit where, if you haven't whipped this in 28 days, you are going to have to deal with this as a unique problem. Dealing with mental health and behavioral health in the same way matters in all cases, but it particularly seems to apply as people try to beat addiction.

The Department of Labor and Health and Human Services bill includes \$60 million for child abuse prevention and treatment programs to support what happens in families when someone in that family gets into a situation of abuse.

The number of people who become addicted needs to change, but also how we deal with pain needs to change. So there is some unique money available to the National Institutes of Health to try to develop a pain medicine that is nonaddictive; \$500 million went toward that effort.

In all of these cases, we feel as though we have produced a good bill out of our committee. It has about one-third of the money in it after defense is taken off the table. It is a big bill that covers a large jurisdiction.

Everyone in the Senate deserves a chance to be part of this debate. Everyone in the Senate deserves to look at how the appropriators—I think it was 33 to 1 that they voted for this bill—have decided to spend the money. It

may be the way everyone decides to spend the money, but everyone ought to have a chance on this floor to say "No, I think this money would be better spent here and here, better spent this way and that way." Every single Senator ought to be able to be part of that discussion.

If we continue this process that we have been in for a few years—one big bill that nobody ever gets to vote on—that means the Senators who aren't on the Appropriations Committee will not have a say in establishing our national priorities. It is time to do that.

These bills are all out of committee and have been for almost a month now. We have had three of them on the floor already. I think we plan to have four of them on the floor next week, and maybe Defense, Labor, and HHS not too long after that.

These are big issues that every Senator should have a say in, and the only way that will happen is if these issues are decided right here on the floor. Hopefully we will set some records, at least, of having these bills on the floor and debated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I want to reflect on some of the data that has been coming in on our economy in response to our tax reform and deregulatory push.

Before I do, I want to commend my colleague from Missouri and thank him for his leadership and work on the incredible crisis of opioids we are dealing with. It is not a uniformly national crisis; it is more concentrated regionally, and my State of Pennsylvania is affected as badly as any place in the country.

I am pleased we have been able to take a number of constructive measures, but we have a lot of work yet to do as we try to deal with this scourge. I want to thank him for that.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, on tax reform, before I get into some of the macro and statistics that are really, really incredibly encouraging, I just want to touch on a couple of constituent companies and their employees and how our tax reform is affecting them.

One is a company called Glass & Sons Collision Repair. They are located in Reading, PA, which is in the eastern part of our State. They recently announced that they will be paying \$1,000 tax reform bonuses to all of their employees—\$1,000. This is a small business. It is a father-and-son business. The owners, Charles and Trevor Glass, made the decision to pay the bonuses right after they met with their accountants and learned how much they are going to save as a result of tax reform. The first thing they did is say: We are going to share this with our employees. It is a terrific development for everyone involved.

There is another company on the other side of the State, in Somerset,

the southwestern part of the State. It is a company called Guy Chemical. They recently announced that not only are they increasing wages and bonuses, but they are also making all new investments, including buying a new forklift, updated computer equipment, new software, and they are building a new lab for research and development that will be five times the size of their old lab. They are doing this because of tax reform and the confidence they have in the economic growth that is occurring in this reformed environment.

It is not only individuals who work for companies that have been able to pay higher wages and bonuses who benefit from tax reform; it is just about everyone. About 93 percent of all of the folks I represent and all of the folks we all represent—when they file their tax return for this year's income, they are going to pay less in Federal income taxes.

According to the Tax Foundation, the direct savings for a Pennsylvania family with an income in the \$50,000 to \$70,000 range—it will be about \$1,400 in savings.

In addition to the direct savings from a lower Federal tax bill, because of the savings that Pennsylvania utilities have on their Federal tax bill, they are required to pass that on to their customers, and that is exactly what they are doing. So far it is a combined \$320 million in annual savings to Pennsylvania consumers in the form of lower utility bills as a result of our tax reform.

There is no question that there are tremendous, direct personal and individual benefits across the board. Related to that is the fact that the economy is just taking off. The economy has been on fire. This year it has been tremendous.

Nothing reflects the strong economic data better than the employment picture. It is fair to say that the employment picture in America may never have been this good. I know that is making a very bold statement, but stay with me here as we go through some of this data.

In the month of May, we had the lowest unemployment rate since 2000—the lowest unemployment rate in 18 years. The African-American unemployment rate hit an all-time record low. It has never been measured as low as it was in May, at 5.9 percent. Likewise, the Hispanic unemployment rate hit an all-time record low, at 4.6 percent in June. Small business optimism was at the second highest level on record ever, this past month of May.

Dividends paid from overseas subsidiaries of U.S. multinationals, dividends paid back home—money that is sitting overseas and invested back in America—reached an all-time record high in the first quarter because we changed the rules to diminish the penalties we used to have when an American company brought income that was earned overseas back home.

Well, one of the things we wanted to have happen as a result of our tax reform was that we wanted to see more capital expenditures—more companies putting money to work buying plants, plant equipment, technology, and tools. Guess what. For the first quarter of this year, there was tremendous growth in capital expenditures by American businesses. It is up over 7 percent, well above even the ambitious estimate that came out from the Congressional Budget Office late last year.

I think one of the most amazing statistics about this whole employment picture is what happened in March. We saw that in the month of March—again, the first time ever that I am aware of—the number of job openings in America, meaning the number of available jobs that need to be filled, was greater than the number of people looking for jobs. Think about that. There are more jobs available in America than there are people looking for jobs in America. That is terrific for people who need work. The jobs are out there.

The National Federation of Independent Business, which is America's largest network of small businesses, were surveyed in June. Sixty-three percent—almost two-thirds—of these small business owners reported that they were hiring or trying to hire. That is the highest level we have seen since 1999. And 87 percent of those who are trying to hire, or are actually hiring people, are concerned that there are just too few people out there available to be hired.

So, in a way, the economy is growing so robustly and the job opportunities are expanding so quickly that we have a shortage of workers. We have too few people available to meet the demand for all of these jobs. It is the right problem to have.

So what happens as a result of that? It is exactly what we predicted. People who have decided to leave the workforce, to give up on work—people who are of working age and are healthy but decided, for whatever reason, not to work—are coming back into the workforce. They are coming back in big numbers. In the month of June, over 600,000 Americans who had worked in the past but then had stepped out of the workforce for whatever reason came back into the workforce. The biggest proportion of these folks are people who have never gone to college, but they have a renewed confidence and optimism about the economy. They have confidence in opportunities available to them, despite the fact that they don't have a college income. They have decided that they are going to reenter the workforce and, in the process, start to improve their standard of living.

By the way, the labor force participation rate rose really across, I think, all ethnic groups, including women, men, African Americans, and Hispanics. It is up across the board.

So far this year, over 1 million workers who had left the workforce are back

in it. That compares to about half a million workers in the first half of last year and about 600,000 in 2016. So there was a big surge in the number of workers coming back into the workforce, and they are finding jobs. It has improved our overall population, our overall percentage of working-age people who are, in fact, working. As I say, it is across all demographic groups and contributing enormously, first and foremost, to improving the quality of their lives and their family's lives but also our overall economic growth.

What else did we get from the June jobs report? In June—in the month of June alone—there were 213,000 jobs added. That is a very, very rapid pace. Oh, by the way, these numbers are always provided subsequently. So in June we got the revision for April and May, months that had good job growth. It turns out that it was even better than we thought. All together, there were 37,000 more jobs when we revised the April and May numbers than we had originally figured.

There was a modest uptick in the unemployment rate, but don't be fooled by that. That is because with so many additional people entering the workforce, we are counting far more people now in how we determine that.

One of the truly exciting things about this is that for many, many years, we have had stagnant wages. Wages just weren't rising very rapidly. It is because productivity wasn't growing. That, I think, was being driven by the fact that there wasn't considerable growth in capital expenditures. Now that we have changed that dynamic and capital expenditure is growing, productivity is growing and wages are starting to grow. I am not satisfied with the growth yet, but it is very encouraging that the direction is positive.

Based on the employment cost index, wages grew about 2.9 percent in the first quarter. That is the fastest pace in a decade—the fastest pace in 10 years. Average hourly earnings for nonmanagers rose at their fastest pace in 9 years.

In June, interestingly, pay for workers who switched jobs rose at 3.8 percent, which is a clear indication that employers are forced to bid up wages because they need to hire workers, and they are having trouble finding the workers.

This whole dynamic is very, very encouraging. It means wages are growing and are likely to grow more.

I should also point out that there is a feature in the arithmetic that suggests that it could mask the extent to which wages are growing. What I am referring to is when I say that average wages are growing by 2.7 percent. That is true, but let's keep in mind that when we get a surge of new people into the workforce, most of those people are coming in at the lower end of the wage spectrum. Maybe it is their first job or maybe they have been out of work for a long time, or maybe, as I pointed out,

they don't have the same level of education and skills of people already in the workforce. So they are starting at a lower-than-average wage. So all else being equal, that would tend to bring the average down. So despite that, when you have growth, that tells us that people who have been continuously employed are getting an even bigger growth in their wages.

So this is very, very encouraging. I think it is likely to continue. It is exactly what we were hoping would happen as a result of our tax reform.

But there is another whole development that is not directly about wages, but when you think about it, it makes a lot of sense. With all of these people finding work, with all of these opportunities for work and people coming back into the workforce, guess what. There is a reduction in dependency on government programs because people are able to earn the income to support their families.

So, for instance, in the 4-week average of unemployment benefits claims, one of the things we monitor closely, the number of people who are collecting unemployment hit a 45-year low of 213,000 in May—45 years. You have to go back 45 years to find so few people who required unemployment for an extended period of time. It is really amazing, when we consider how much bigger a country we are today, that we have gotten down to a number that was matched only 45 years ago—amazing.

We can look at the disability benefits. According to the Social Security Administration, fewer Americans applied for disability benefits last year than at any time since 2002, 16 years since we have had a number this low.

We can also look at the food stamp program. Two million people have come off of food stamps because they are working and they are earning enough that they either don't need it or they don't qualify anymore.

So these are very, very encouraging trends. As I say, because the driver is a new set of incentives that is encouraging capital expenditure and, therefore, productivity growth, I think this is really likely to continue.

The macro GDP numbers reflect this as well. The Congressional Budget Office last year estimated that growth for 2018 would be about 2 percent. As a result of tax reform, they revised that up to 3.3 percent.

As for estimates for the second quarter—the quarter that just ended—we don't have the numbers yet. It is still a couple of weeks away, but the estimates are that growth was probably equal, maybe even more than 4 percent.

So we have had tremendous growth. We already had a great first quarter relative to other first quarters, and the second quarter is probably very, very big.

All of this, of course, means that if this growth is sustained, which I think it is likely to be, not only will we continue to have good employment numbers like we have had, but we are also going to have good budget numbers.

The Federal Government budget is driven more than anything else by how strong our economy is and how many people are working. Everybody working is paying taxes. Every company that is making money is paying taxes. So revenue coming into the Federal Government is likely to be very strong.

So I am very optimistic. I think it is very clear that the combination of pushing back on excessive regulation and a tremendously pro-growth tax reform has led to this growth.

I should warn that I think there is a bit of a cloud on the horizon. I hope it doesn't develop into a big storm. Right now it is just a cloud, but that cloud is trade policy that could really start to hinder economic growth.

It is interesting. We had testimony at the Banking Committee just yesterday from Fed Chairman Powell. I pointed out that the minutes for the June meeting of the Federal Reserve's Open Market Committee had a disturbing reference. I will quote briefly: The FOMC minutes for June stated: "Some Districts indicated"—they refer to the various districts around the country—"that plans for capital spending had been scaled back or postponed as a result of uncertainty over trade policy."

That is a warning. That is a warning to us. If we spiral down into a full-blown trade war—and we certainly have a lot of skirmishes going on—and if this spirals out of control, business will start to pull back. They will lose the confidence they have had, and that could lead to diminished capital expenditures, which will start to really diminish the tremendous growth that we have seen.

So far for this year the economic picture has been extremely encouraging. Benefits are very broad-based. Economic growth is broad and strong. There are employment numbers that we haven't seen in decades. I believe this can continue. It is much more likely to continue if we avoid a damaging trade war.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am grateful today to be joined by Senator KING, from the great State of Maine, to speak about the troubling changes that we are seeing in the oceans and how climate change is reshaping our States' fisheries.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations recognizes that "climate change imperils the structure and function of already stressed coastal aquatic ecosystems." For the record, Maine and Rhode Island are indeed aquatic.

The oceans have absorbed approximately 30 percent of the excess carbon dioxide that we have pumped into the atmosphere since the Industrial Revolution began. That is changing the ocean's chemistry. The oceans have also absorbed roughly 90 percent of the

excess heat trapped in the atmosphere by those greenhouse gases. As a result of that excess carbon dioxide and that excess heat, our oceans are warming, and they are rising. They are losing oxygen, and they are growing more acidic. This puts marine life, coastal communities, and the global ocean economy all in jeopardy.

Commercial fishing is an important economy in the United States, and both Maine and Rhode Island celebrate our longstanding fishing traditions. According to the National Marine Fisheries Service, over 9.6 billion pounds of wild seafood, valued at \$5.3 billion, was commercially landed in the United States in 2016.

Across New England, American lobster was our most valuable fishery. We had lobstermen bringing around \$663 million—two-thirds of \$1 billion—worth of lobster to shore. Sadly, Rhode Island's lobster fishery is badly knocked down by warming ocean waters. NOAA notes: "The lobster industry in New York and southern New England has nearly collapsed." Maine dominated the catch, bringing in nearly 85 percent of the lobster landed in the region.

According to NOAA, from "1994 to 2014, Maine's landings surged 219 percent to more than 124 million pounds." The lobster population is shifting north, away from Rhode Island, New York, and Connecticut, as waters warm, leaving Rhode Island and other southern New England lobster traps empty. But Mainers are taking notice, too, as warming waters are driving lobster even farther north along their rocky coast. A recent study of 700 North American marine species predicted that lobster populations could move 200 miles northward by the end of the century as waters continue to warm. Senator KING can report what 200 miles does to the coast of Maine.

Lobster is not the only fishery feeling the heat in New England. A 2017 study of global warming found that the greater Northeast region is anticipated to warm faster than other regions of the world. According to the "Climate Science Special Report," a Federal report that will form the scientific basis of the Fourth National Climate Assessment, "the Northeast has warmed faster than 99% of the global ocean since 2004." We have a global ocean hotspot off our coast. The Northeast is also expected to see higher than global average sea level rise, putting our ports, fishing docks, and coastal infrastructure all at risk.

Fishermen have noticed. They are keenly aware of the myriad ways climate change is altering the waters that generations of their families have fished, and they see the difference. Fishermen in Rhode Island have told me: "Sheldon, things are getting weird out there."

"Sheldon, it's not my grandfather's ocean."

They share anecdotes of catching increasing numbers of tropical fish early in the summer season and seeing fish

that rarely frequented Rhode Island waters until recent years. As new fish move in and traditional fish move out, fishermen are left with more questions than answers.

In Southern New England, black sea bass has become the poster fish for shifting stocks. As we can see in this graphic, the 1970s had a hub of black sea bass here, with this as the center and then a slight reach upward but basically off the mid-Atlantic coast. This is 2014. The center of activity has moved up closer to Rhode Island. We are right here. Of course, black sea bass populations in our region have increased concomitantly.

This commercially valuable fish, the black sea bass, can help Rhode Island fishermen replace traditional species that are growing more scarce, like winter flounder—the fish my wife studied for her graduate work—which has crashed as winters warm.

The current fisheries' management structure, however, forces Rhode Island fishermen to toss the increasingly abundant and valuable black sea bass overboard. NOAA scientists saw this northward transit of the sea bass coming years ago, but regulatory catch limits did not keep up. They are generally based on historical catches. And States are hesitant to give up quota even after the fish have moved northward and left their shores, so State-specific quotas badly lag the changing distribution of the fish.

A former Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council scientist acknowledged that fish like summer flounder are moving north and told NPR that "some of the Southern states are having trouble catching their quota, and states to the north have more availability of fish."

Dave Monti is a friend who is a charter boat captain out of Wickford Harbor in North Kingstown, RI. Dave said:

There's no doubt the waters have warmed and black sea bass have moved in. The quotas haven't done a good enough job at figuring in climate change yet.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Providence Journal describing the changes that Captain Monti sees and our local efforts to deal with these changes.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Journal]

FRONT LINE OF CLIMATE CHANGE: BLACK SEA BASS SURGE OFF R.I.

(By Alex Kuffner)

PROVIDENCE, RI.—Scientists tell us that some fish will be winners and others losers as oceans warm.

In Rhode Island, count lobster, silver hake and winter flounder among the losers, their numbers plummeting as climate change drives water temperatures higher. On the list of winners so far are squid, summer flounder, butterfish.

And black sea bass. The population of the dusky-colored fish with striking blue accents has historically been strongest off the mid-Atlantic Coast, but over the past decade or

so its numbers have spiked off New England and it is becoming a more important catch for the region's fishermen.

In a telling sign of black sea bass's surge in Rhode Island, the state Department of Environmental Management last month loosened regulations governing the recreational fishery for the species, extending the season by 31 days and increasing the fall possession limit to seven fish per person per day, from five.

It may appear to be a small development, but the rules change resulted from a heated debate among state and federal regulators about how best to manage a species whose distribution and abundance has gone through a striking shift that few would have imagined a generation ago.

The back-and-forth over the fish also signals more difficulties to come as regulators struggle to respond to the impacts of climate change on the marine environment. Similar issues are already playing out with summer flounder, another warm-water fish that is becoming more common off the north Atlantic coast.

How they are managed will have important implications not only for those fish but for lobsters and other key species in the ocean ecosystem.

"We're in an adaptive mode right now," said Bob Ballou, assistant to the director of the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management and chairman of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's black sea bass and summer flounder boards. "It's occupying all our time to think through all the approaches to better manage these resources."

One of the key assumptions that the nation's fishery management system is built upon is that species don't move between general geographic regions.

That traditional regulatory framework held up for a long time, but rising water temperatures and the resulting shifts in species distribution and abundance are forcing the beginnings of change.

In the case of black sea bass, it's not that the population of the fish is simply relocating north. Numbers are still decent in the southern portion of the fish's range, but they are much stronger now off the coasts of New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts—places where the waters used to be too cold to support large populations.

In Rhode Island, water temperatures in Narragansett Bay have risen about 3½-degrees Fahrenheit since 1959, according to weekly monitoring done by the Graduate School of Oceanography at the University of Rhode Island. Warmer winters, in particular, have allowed black sea bass to thrive this far north.

In the 1980s and 1990s, a fish trawl survey conducted by the DEM rarely caught a single black sea bass in Rhode Island waters, but incidence of the species has risen steadily, especially over the past decade, and now each trawl nets about two black sea bass on average.

Because black sea bass move between federal and state waters, the fish is managed jointly by the federal government, through the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and states, including Rhode Island, through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

Although scientists have long known that concentrations of the fish have been shifting north toward the Gulf of Maine, it wasn't until 2016 that regulators started to factor in the change.

That year, a new stock assessment for black sea bass formally recognized for the first time two distinct populations of the fish, a northern group around New England and a southern group from New Jersey to the Carolinas.

The growth in the northern group more than made up for the southern group's mediocre numbers, and the assessment determined the total population of the fish to be nearly two and a half times higher than the minimum stock threshold set by regulators.

"That was a really big step forward," said Jason McNamee, chief of marine resource management for the DEM. "The science is now catching up to what's going on with the environment."

But despite the robust overall picture for the fish, the ASFMC's proposed quotas for this year called for a 12-percent reduction in the northern region's catch to allow the southern region, the historic center of the black sea bass fishery, to increase its share.

Rhode Island, New York, Massachusetts and Connecticut filed an appeal, and on May 3, the fisheries commission relented, allowing what amounts to a four-percent increase for the northern region.

The stakes are high for Rhode Island, which is experiencing deep changes to the composition of its marine species because of its location, at the junction of what ocean scientists call the Boreal Province—cold waters that include the Gulf of Maine to the north—and the Virginian Province—warmer waters of the mid-Atlantic to the south.

"We're right at the front lines of these changes," McNamee said. "These mid-Atlantic species are our most important species now."

Dave Monti reeled in another black sea bass.

Like the five others caught in Narragansett Bay on a recent morning, at less than 15 inches long, it was too small to keep. So Monti started working the hook out of its mouth.

"You've got to be careful of the dorsal fin," he warned. "It'll stick right into you."

As regulators have tightened catch limits for striped bass and other saltwater game fish that were historically abundant in Rhode Island waters, black sea bass has filled the void, said Monti, a charter boat captain who docks his boat in Wickford Harbor.

"They've saved my charters over the past couple years when other fish aren't around," he said.

Seas were too rough to visit his favorite place to fish for black sea bass, a patch of waters in the open ocean near Brenton Reef off Newport, so he steered his 44-foot boat the Virginia Joan to a few spots in the Bay between Jamestown and Narragansett.

Black sea bass is a reef fish that likes rocky bottoms and patrols the waters around jetties and pilings for prey. It's a hermaphrodite—some fish switch sexes as adults. The species can be found off Rhode Island year-round, typically coming inshore to the Bay in the spring to spawn and wintering farther off the coast.

Just south of the Jamestown Verrazzano Bridge, Monti reached for a rod from a holder overhead. He called it his "sea bass slayer." It was fitted with a shiny, red-tinted lure and he baited the hook with a slice of squid and a little fish called a silverside. A few minutes later, the first black sea bass was caught.

It doesn't take much work to find the fish these days, said Rick Bellavance, president of the Rhode Island Party and Charter Boat Association.

"Black sea bass are a charter boat operator's dream," he said. "They're pretty prevalent, they're easy to catch, and they taste great."

On a recent charter to Block Island, the six clients on Bellavance's boat caught only two striped bass and one bluefish between them, so he started setting lines for black sea bass. They promptly snagged 20 of the fish that were big enough to take home.

Although he applauded the new regulations, he said the changes have been slow to come and haven't gone far enough. He'd like to have the current six-month season extended year-round and the per-person daily limit raised to 10 fish.

"We need to recognize that the stock has shifted to the north and to the east," he said. "Rhode Island is closer to that epicenter than it used to be."

Monti, who is vice president of the Rhode Island Marine Fisheries Council, which advises the DEM on state fishing policy, agreed.

"There's no doubt the waters have warmed and black sea bass have moved in," he said. "The quotas haven't done a good enough job at figuring in climate change yet."

About half the morning's catch on Monti's boat were black sea bass. Among the rest were other warm-water fish that are becoming more common in Rhode Island: scup and summer flounder.

After Monti freed the little black sea bass from the hook, he held it in his hand. As the fish age, their scales become more blue. This one had yet to develop the bright coloring, but it was still striking.

"Pretty, isn't it?" Monti said as he dropped it back into the Bay.

Not everyone loves the fish.

Black sea bass have voracious appetites, hunting on the ocean bottom for crabs, clams and shrimp. The fish don't have teeth but will swallow crustaceans whole.

Lobstermen complain of pulling up their traps and finding black sea bass inside that have gobbled up their lobsters.

"I see it everyday," said Lanny Dellinger, a Newport lobsterman and board member of the Rhode Island Lobstermen's Association. "Everyday, every trawl. It doesn't matter if it's mud bottom, hard bottom, deep water, shallow water. There are so many black sea bass, it's unbelievable."

The rise of black sea bass is coming at the same time that the lobster catch is on a steep decline in Rhode Island, falling from 8.2 million pounds in 1998 to 2.3 million pounds in 2016, according to the National Marine Fisheries Service.

Lobster is a cold-water species that is moving north as Rhode Island's waters warm. The higher water temperatures have made the lobsters that remain more susceptible to shell disease. Dellinger and others believe that predation by black sea bass is also pushing down the lobster numbers.

Black sea bass could be contributing to the decline, but the fish is probably not the primary cause, said Jon Hare, science and research director at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Northeast Fisheries Science Center in Woods Hole. Crabs and other crustaceans that the fish eat aren't feeling similar impacts, he said.

McNamee agreed, saying that the fish generally prey on smaller juvenile lobsters, leaving the bigger ones alone.

As part of a larger study of black sea bass, the Rhode Island-based Commercial Fisheries Research Foundation is analyzing the gut contents of fish caught by nine participating commercial and recreational boats.

"We know that black sea bass do eat lobster, but we just don't know if the rate of consumption is having an impact on the size of the lobster population," said Anna Malek Mercer, executive director of the foundation.

One lobsterman sent her photos of a 2½-inch long lobster found inside a black sea bass in a trap.

"When they end up in lobster traps, there usually aren't any lobsters inside," she said.

Dellinger wants loosened regulations on both the recreational and commercial sides to allow fishermen to catch more black sea bass. He likened the fish to coyotes that

need to be culled or to rodents afflicting farmers.

"It's like owning a corn bin full of rats and nobody's allowed to get rid of them," he said.

Despite the recent changes, scientists and fishermen in Rhode Island say that the management system for black sea bass is still outdated.

Tellingly, none of the New England states has a seat on the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council—one of the two key decision-making bodies for the species—even though much of the fish's population is located off the region's coast.

That has meant that allocations remain high for fishing boats in states like Virginia and North Carolina that must sometimes travel half a day north to find the fish, while Rhode Island boats are forced to discard their catch because, local fishermen say, their quotas aren't high enough.

The southern states don't want to give up their share because black sea bass fetches a good price—more than \$3 a pound on average—and the commercial fishery is growing in value—tripling since 2009 to more than \$12 million.

The black sea bass study being done by the CFRF is using different gear types—from gill nets to trawls to lobster traps—to gather more data on the species and strengthen stock assessments that may be missing some fish.

Malek Mercer said that scientists are getting a better understanding of the fish's changing population, but managing the species is the problem.

"For better or worse, science is not going to fix that," she said. "But if we get our management there, I do think we can have a really strong black sea bass fishery here."

McNamee described the management system as "deliberative and slow by design." He acknowledged the frustration felt by Rhode Island fishermen who have seen the state's traditional groundfish stocks drop off while black sea bass proliferate.

"There's still way more fish to catch than fishermen can get access to," he said.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, we have to fix this. To use the black sea bass example, the species is comanaged by the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Rhode Island only has a seat on the Atlantic States Commission; it does not have a vote on the Mid-Atlantic Council. That means that my State is not fully represented in the decision-making process, and perfectly good black sea bass keeps being thrown into the sea by fishermen who ought to be able to bring that catch home.

In 2016, NOAA scientists assessed the vulnerability to the effects of climate change of over 80 commercially valuable species in the Northeast. So this is not just a story about black sea bass or about lobsters; this Northeast climate vulnerability assessment ranked species based on climate risk and sensitivities to changing ocean conditions.

Here is the climate risk factor graph. As we see, all 80 species scored in the high or very high risk of climate exposure categories. All 80 commercially valuable species they studied faced high or very high risk. This is a red flag for our fisheries.

Maine is the place for lobster. In Rhode Island, squid is king. In 2016, 56

percent of the longfin squid caught on the east coast was landed in Rhode Island. According to NOAA, this catch was valued at over \$28 million, accounting for nearly 30 percent of our landings value in 2016. But climate change is putting our calamari at risk. Warm waters may actually open more habitat for the species, but its carbon cousin, ocean acidification, is the hazard. Like its shellfish brethren, squid require calcium carbonate—for squid, it is to grow the hard beaks they use to feed. Acidic waters decrease the availability of this necessary compound in the seawater and can even dissolve calcium carbonate organisms' shells under extremely acidic conditions.

On the west coast, shellfish farmers have been dealing with ocean acidification since the mid-2000s. Dr. Richard Feely is the researcher who first identified ocean acidification as the cause for oyster spat failures in the Northwest back in 2005. He noted in a recent NPR article that the acidification problem is only going to get worse. "The acidification water welling up from the ocean floor now contains carbon dioxide gas emitted 50 years ago." Carbon emissions are worse since then. Some hatcheries in the Northwest are already moving operations to less acidic waters off Hawaii, and others are looking to buffer the water with seagrasses to absorb carbon and lower acidity. Shellfish farmers in Rhode Island are facing the challenge of acidifying waters as well.

At the same time, marine species are also facing deoxygenation, increased harmful algae, and other consequences of a warming and acidifying ocean. The symptoms of climate change in the ocean are everywhere.

A recent study in Global Change Biology warned that reduced oxygen availability could limit the growth of fish and other species. Fishermen can't make a living off sick and tiny fish.

California's lucrative Dungeness and rock crab season was cut short in 2015 to 2016 due to a harmful algae bloom.

Our Great Lakes have been hit too. I went out on Lake Erie after the horrible algae event there, and the fishermen who took me out sounded like Rhode Islanders. One of them said: "Everything I've learned from fishing a lifetime on this lake is worth nothing now, because it's all changing so fast."

If we have an opportunity to have an open, bipartisan debate on a strong Magnuson-Stevens Act reauthorization, I urge my colleagues not to overlook the toll climate change is taking on our fishing industry. The changes that are happening in our oceans do not care whether you believe they exist. The physics, chemistry, and biology driving these changes will happen anyway, and our fishermen are depending on us to give the scientists and the managers the tools and resources they need to meet the challenges climate change is bringing to our shores.

I now yield to my friend from Maine to give the perspective from his rocky shores.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I first want to thank Professor—I mean Senator WHITEHOUSE for the information he shared. It was compelling, important, and very worthy of our deep consideration.

To talk about renewing the Magnuson-Stevens Act without talking about the effects of climate change and the effects on the water itself would be an enormous missed opportunity.

First, I commend Senator WHITEHOUSE, the Senator from Rhode Island, for his longstanding commitment to the issue of climate change, the well-worn “Time to Wake Up” poster, and the work he has done over the years to force us to pay attention to this issue.

I am, as he indicated, going to talk about what is going on in the Gulf of Maine, but I want to broaden the discussion just for a few moments to talk about the issue of climate change as a broader question before us.

This isn’t some environmental dream. It is not something that was invented by someone. It was discovered by scientists, and it is dollars and cents. It is the most practical problem that we have to deal with.

I am on the Armed Services Committee. We are talking about military bases all over the world—some as close as right down in this region and then down toward Norfolk, VA—that are under a severe threat from rising sea levels and that are going to cost us billions, if not trillions, of dollars to upgrade and maintain because of rising sea levels. This isn’t something abstract. This is something that is happening today, and it is something that we are going to have to deal with that is going to have an enormous cost. The longer we put off preventing and dealing with this issue, the higher that cost is going to be.

There is a second reason this is a national security issue, and that is the aggravation of conflict and the initiation of migration. The number of refugees from Syria—which has disrupted the politics of Europe and disrupted many of the European countries and, indeed, has had a reflection here in this country—is roughly 3 to 4 million people. The estimate for refugees from climate change—from extreme temperature, from drought, from famine—is in the hundreds of millions as opposed to 3 to 4 million from Syria. Imagine the disruption to all of the countries of the world that are destinations for these refugees who are fleeing places that have become uninhabitable.

This is a question we are going to have to address, and, as our military characterizes it, it is a threat multiplier because when you have people moving from one region to another, you have conflict. From time immemorial, conflict has largely been based on things like access to water and access to arable land, and we are talking about an enormous accelerator of that across the world.

Now let me talk about the effects in my home State. First the good news. Lobster landings in Maine are up. We have ridden a lobster boom over the past 30 years. Since the 1980s, the poundage of lobsters harvested in Maine has grown 500 percent. When I was Governor, a good harvest of lobsters was 50 to 60 million pounds; 2 years ago, it was 127 million pounds—more than double. That is the good news.

The bad news is that it is starting to change, and we may have seen the turning point in this boom. We don’t know that, but the last 2 years have been down substantially from the peak in 2016. We will see what happens this year. Hopefully, it is a blip and not a trend.

By the way, one of the reasons the lobster industry has survived and flourished in Maine is not only the favorable impact of gradual increases in temperature but because of the conservation ethic of the lobstermen themselves, who voluntarily throw back egg-bearing females. They cut a V-notch in their tails so they won’t be caught again. If they are too small or too large, they throw them back. An amazing ethic of conservation has been imbued in the culture of lobstering and also in our laws for many years. So the fact that we still have a lobster fishery and that it is as vigorous and as productive as it is, is due in large measure to the creativity and conservation ethic of our lobstermen.

Here is the bad news. The bad news is, when water temperature gets to about 68 degrees, it is like turning a switch. It stresses the lobster population to the point where they can’t survive. The good news is, it gets warmer, and they multiply. The bad news is, once it reaches a certain critical point, the species could collapse. Indeed, that is what has happened, as the Senator from Rhode Island has indicated, to the once-plentiful lobster population of New York, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island.

The problem is, over recent years—and I have talked to a lobsterman friend today, just this afternoon—the center of gravity of lobstering along the Maine coast is steadily moving north and east. He told me it has moved about 50 miles in the last 10 years.

The other problem that is occurring is that the lobsters are going further offshore to seek cooler water, which means the lobstermen have to go further. They have to have bigger boats. They have to make more of an investment in order to make a living.

Right now, we are in good shape, but the trend is not good. We are seeing other changes that have magnified both the boom, and what we are worried about is the bust. We have seen changes decline in some fish species like the cod that fed on baby lobsters. Now, as Senator WHITEHOUSE mentioned, we are seeing a growth of a fish that was never seen in Maine in the recent past, the black sea bass.

My friend tells me, today they are catching triggerfish in the Gulf of Maine, which is a North Carolina species. They have even caught seahorses in lobster traps. This is a dramatic change as the waters warm.

As I mentioned, if they get close to the 68-degree level, the lobster population is in trouble. It is not only lobsters. By the way, lobstering is a serious business in Maine—half a billion dollars just in land value, a billion and a half dollars in the overall economic impact of this species to our State.

By the way, before I leave the question of lobsters, I have to acknowledge the comments made by the Senator from Pennsylvania earlier when he was talking about the economy, and he flashed a warning light at the end of his remarks about trade and tariffs. We are already seeing the negative impact of what I consider ill-considered tariffs on China. The first place they retaliated was against lobsters. Twenty percent of the entire lobster catch in Maine is sold and exported to China. It is our fastest growing market. If the Chinese tariffs they have already announced are imposed and fully implemented, it could cut that to zero.

Canada doesn’t have those tariffs. Canada is not engaging in a trade war with China. Canada and other countries are moving into the vacuum we have created. The idea that we can impose tariffs on other countries without any ill effects here just isn’t true.

Right now, it looks like the lobster industry, soybeans in the Midwest, maple syrup in Vermont, other agricultural products across the country are going to be collateral damage in an incipient trade war that I don’t understand where it is going.

I would like to know what the strategy is. What is the end game? Where does this go? So far, I haven’t seen any indication of that. What I have seen an indication of is severely dangerous impacts on our economy industry.

Another part of our ocean ecosystem is clams. There is a massive decrease in harvest because of two reasons: One, acidification. As the Senator from Rhode Island indicated, 30 percent of all the carbon dioxide that has been emitted during the Industrial Revolution has ended up in acidification in the ocean and, two, nonnative green crabs, which are exploding because they like the warmer water. They have been around for 100 years, but that population is growing enormously. They are just devastating the clams. Green crabs can consume 40 half-inch clams a day. Those crabs have decimated blue mussels and scallops along the shore. They are going for clams, and we are concerned that maybe lobsters could be next.

Warming water and shifting predators are not the only challenges we face: more carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, absorbed into the ocean, and one-quarter of what is emitted goes into the ocean. The ocean then becomes more acidic. Any kind of shelled

animals—lobsters, clams, oysters—expend evermore energy maintaining the pH balance in their bodies, and that means they can't grow and reproduce. The world's oceans have become 30 percent more acidic since the Industrial Revolution.

Oysters have become a great new product for Maine. We are growing them in oyster farms along the Damariscotta River and other places. You can go to fancy restaurants and see Damariscotta oysters. They are wonderful.

My friend Bill Mook, who is one of the pioneers of the oyster industry in Maine, has had to move the incubation of his oysters out of the ocean, out of the natural river, onshore, and into tanks so he can buffer the water to minimize the acidification and then put them back in the water to grow out. That is a pure result of climate change and acidification of the ocean.

Freshwater runoff is another issue that increases the acidification. We have had an enormous increase in the amount of freshwater rainfall in this country, and in Maine that has increased the acidification in the oceans. What do we do? The first thing we do is admit there is a problem. You can't solve a problem if you act like there is nothing wrong. The first thing we have to do is admit there is a problem. I think more and more people are coming to that conclusion.

When this administration was nominating people, the refrain I heard in all of the hearings was climate is changing, man has an impact on it, but we don't know how much.

That is progress. At least it is an admission that something is happening. What do we do? We admit there is a problem. I think we are close to reaching that point.

The second thing we have to do is more research. We have to continue to fund the science to do the research to understand what is happening, to understand what we can do to mitigate these risks. Research and scientific data is crucial. For some of our great agencies that have the people who have been researching this for years, to be suppressing the research or not supporting it or burying it is not a service to our country. Research is crucial. We need the facts. We need the data. We need mitigation strategies. We also need to pay attention to the underlying cause of climate change, which is a combustion of fossil fuels and the enormous amount of carbon dioxide that is being added to the atmosphere.

This is a long-term challenge. It is not something we can solve in the next 1 or 2 years. Some people ask: Well, it is such a long-term challenge, why are we doing it? Because it may not be solved for 50 years.

In my office is Edmund Muskie's desk. I sit behind Edmund Muskie's desk—one of the greatest Senators of the 20th century and one of the greatest citizens Maine has ever produced. Fifty years ago—2 years from now,

1970—Edmond Muskie led the passage of the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act, which are two of the greatest and most important pieces of legislation passed in this body in the last 100 years; the first real recognition that we had a responsibility to the environment, that we had a responsibility to our children and our grandchildren. By the way, astoundingly, the Clean Water Act passed the U.S. Senate unanimously. Can you imagine? We can't agree on the time of day unanimously in this body. In 1970, under Ed Muskie's leadership, the Clean Water Act was passed unanimously.

The point I want to make is, the steps they took almost 50 years ago have cleaned up our rivers, have cleaned up our atmosphere, have made parts of our country blossom again.

In Maine, we are working on our rivers. The towns that turned their backs on the rivers are now turning back toward the rivers because people can fish, swim, and enjoy the rivers. When Ed Muskie started his lonely crusade in the late 1960s, the rivers were essentially open sewers.

Fifty years ago, Ed Muskie started that work. We see the benefit of it today. We should be doing the same thing. The fact that it may not come to fruition for 20, 30, 40, or 50 years is no reason to not start now. We have to start. This isn't pie in the sky. This isn't somebody trying to impose new regulations. This isn't something that is made up by environmentalists or people who just don't want to see any development. No. This is lives and livelihood. These are families, communities. It is responsible stewardship and just plain common sense.

There is a lot of science, and there is a lot of complexity to this issue. It seems to me we can take inspiration from Ed Muskie, Howard Baker, and all those a generation ago who built the edifice upon which we have a cleaner, healthier, stronger economy and stronger society.

I remember those days. The great debate was payrolls versus pickerel. You couldn't have payrolls if you preserved the pickerel. It turned out to not be true. We have developed the strongest economy in the history of the world. Yet we paid attention to the environment. We have paid attention to our responsibilities, to our children and our grandchildren, and we created the economy at the same time we were able to clean up the environment.

I remember those debates. They were bitter. You can't do it. If you do this, you are going to put everything out of business. There will be no economy. That was the argument. It hasn't happened.

Finally, you can talk about the science. You can get caught up in all the data. To me, there is a really easy rule that makes this easy to understand what our responsibilities are. I call it the "Maine rototiller rule." Many people in Maine have gardens, but it is a small garden. It is in your

backyard, so it doesn't make sense for everybody to buy a rototiller—the machine you use once or twice a year to clean your garden and till over the ground and begin to plant. We borrow them. I used to borrow one from my neighbor Peter Cox. The "Maine rototiller rule" goes like this. When you borrow your neighbor's rototiller, you return it to them in as good a shape as you got it, with a full tank of gas.

That is all you need to know about environmental stewardship. Do you know what? We have the planet on loan. We don't own it. We own a little piece of land for a generation, but we don't own it. We have it on loan from our children and our grandchildren and their children and their grandchildren. Therefore, we have a sacred responsibility to turn over the planet to them in the same or better shape than we found it. That is our responsibility. It is very simple. When you borrow something from your neighbor, you return it in as good a shape as you found it. That is what we should be doing today.

We can do this. There will be costs, but the costs of not doing it will dwarf the costs we can undertake today to protect the Gulf of Maine, the coast of the United States, the fields of Africa, the forests of North America, and the land and water and air that our children and grandchildren deserve to have passed on to them in better shape than we found it.

We can do this. We can start today. We may not live to see the results, but we will know we have done something important, something meaningful, something that will make a difference in the lives of generations we don't know. They will know what we do or what we don't do. I myself choose the side of action—recognizing the problem, analyzing it, understanding it, and acting to mitigate the harms that otherwise will befall our children.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Senator KING and I yield the floor.

First, let me thank him for joining us. Second, with Senators present here from landlocked States, let me make the requests to both of you that, when we come before this body with concerns about what is happening to our ocean economies, which I think are shared by every coastal Senator who is seeing these changes, that you view our pleas with the same courtesy and respect that we show you when wildfires burn through Utah and we come to make sure that there is adequate emergency response or when Oklahoma faces hurricanes or cyclones and tornadoes and the Federal Government and the Senate rally to the response of those who are experiencing the pain of that in your States. Our fishing communities and our coastal communities have a very different distress, but I hope you will see it as an equal distress and pay us the courtesy of your due consideration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE).
The Senator from Oklahoma.

SECURING OUR ELECTIONS

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, there has been a lot of conversation again, of late, about election security. It seems to be a frequent conversation in the hallways the last couple of days, and it is an ongoing issue that I think some people have lost track of, but we have not.

AMY KLOBUCHAR and I and several others have worked very hard for months on this issue of election security, quietly trying to get the language right and to work through the process of what it takes to secure our elections for 2018, 2020, and beyond, learning the lesson from 2016.

I do want to remind this body that the elections are not something that happens this November. It is already ongoing. Many States' primaries have already been conducted. Last night there was a runoff primary that happened in Alabama. Georgia holds their runoff primaries next week, and Tennessee is the week after that. Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, and Washington will be on Tuesday, August 7. It is already ongoing.

While we watch the indictments that just came down from the Mueller investigation on GRU officers from Russia who were trying to interfere in our elections in 2016, as we have seen the sanctions and the indictments that have come down on some of the oligarchs from Russia and from the Internet Research Agency for what they were doing in social media, trying to be able to interfere with our election in 2016, I think it may be important for us to do a quick lookback at what has happened and what is still going on and what we are trying to accomplish in the next few weeks.

Let me just give a quick look at what is happening in my State of Oklahoma. In Oklahoma, in the 2016 cycle, the FBI and others began to discover that there were issues with the elections and some interference from what they, at that time, called "bad actors" in June of 2016. Later that summer, in August of 2016, the FBI issued what they call a nationwide "flash alert" to every State dealing with a threat from a "bad actor."

The Oklahoma State Cyber Command director received that warning, as did everyone else, but at that time the FBI didn't share any details because no one in my State was given security clearance to be able to have that kind of classified conversation with the FBI.

It wasn't until September 22 of 2017, a year and a little bit later, that DHS actually notified my State and our State election authorities that we hadn't just been targeted by a bad actor but that we had been targeted by the Russians—a year later—because no one had clearance and there was no one engaged.

DHS told Oklahoma State Election Board secretary Paul Ziriaux, who is doing a great job, that there was evidence that the Russians conducted a

surveillance scan looking into vulnerabilities in the State computer network, but they didn't get into the election board computer network, and they didn't get into any of our equipment.

They basically came and checked to see if the door was locked, and they found out that in Oklahoma the door was locked, and the Russians could not get in. They didn't penetrate into our system, though they tried.

But it was a year after the elections before we were even notified that the Russians were trying to penetrate our system. A subtle flash warning is all that we received in the summer of 2016.

Oklahoma has a great system for elections. Our system is consistent across every single county. We have optical scanners with a paper ballot backup so that we can verify the computer count with a hand count if needed. We have had a very good system. That system was tested by the Russians when they evaluated the computer networks of our State, and they were also not able to get in, thanks to the leadership of some of the cyber and the technology folks who are in Oklahoma.

Not all States have the same practices. In some States, from county to county their election systems are different. From township to township they may have different systems with different companies and different backgrounds. They may not have the same kind of system where they get a chance to protect their cyber systems.

We saw that in 2016, when the Russians were able to penetrate some of the States and actually were able to harvest some of their voter register rolls. They weren't able to change any votes. They weren't able to affect the voting that day, but they did a tremendous amount of scanning through systems to be able to see where there were vulnerabilities, what they could learn on our election systems, and how they could engage for a future time.

I think we should learn a lesson from that and be aware that the Russians are trying to penetrate that system and learning as much as they could.

At the same time that they were hacking into different systems and testing them out to see if they could get in, a different set of folks from the Russian group the Internet Research Agency were trying to put out social media disinformation.

Some 200,000 Oklahomans saw Facebook and Twitter posts that Russians put out as false information. They weren't all on one candidate. There were multiple candidates and multiple issues. Sometimes it was on Hillary Clinton, sometimes on Donald Trump, sometimes on BERNIE SANDERS, sometimes on Jill Stein, and sometimes just on ideological issues. Over 200,000 Oklahomans saw those posts from different Russians, not knowing they were Russian posts at all. They were Russians pretending to be Americans, and they were pushing that information out.

What can we learn from this? One is the most simple of those things: You shouldn't believe everything you see on the internet. It is not always an American. It is not always who they post to be, and it is not always true. It should be the most basic information that we should learn about what is happening on the internet and what is online, including Facebook and Twitter.

The other lesson that we need to learn is a little more complicated. We have to be able to have better communication between the Federal Government and States, better cybersecurity systems, and the ability to audit that.

That is why Senator KLOBUCHAR and I have worked for months on a piece of legislation called the Secure Elections Act. That piece has worked its way through every State looking at it and their election authorities. We have worked it through multiple committee hearings. In fact, recently, just in the last month, there were two different hearings in the Rules Committee. It is now ready to be marked up and finalized to try to bring it to this body.

It is a very simple piece. It affirms that States run elections. The Federal Government should not take over elections nationwide. In fact, that would make a bad situation worse. States need to be able to run elections and be able to manage those.

But it qualifies several things. One is that it gives a security clearance to a person in every single State. If there is a threat from a hostile actor, there is not some vague warning that comes out. There is an immediate address about what is happening and a communication within the intelligence community here on the Federal level to individuals with a clearance on the State level.

Right now, the DHS, in absence of this legislation, has started implementing it anyway. Every single State has at least one person with a security clearance now, including my own. They are working to have at least three in every State to do a backup system.

We also need to be able to affirm that every State can audit their elections, that they would do what is called risk-limiting audits after the election just to check and to make sure that the results are correct, but also that they have the ability to audit it as the election is going on so that it is not just counting on a machine but that there is also some way to back it up. States have a variety of ways they can actually do that.

If elections are trusting that the electronics are going to work and not be hacked into and not be affected, we should have learned the lesson from 2016 that there are outside entities trying to attack these systems and to find vulnerabilities, and they will.

Some way to be able to back it up, to be able to audit the election while it is happening, risk-limiting audits after the fact, security clearances for individuals within States, and rapid communication State to State and State to

Federal Government all help to maintain the integrity of our elections.

That is what we do in the Secure Elections Act. I think it is so important that we try to resolve this as quickly as possible.

I encourage this body to finish the markup in the Rules Committee to be able to bring it to the floor and to have a consistent bipartisan vote to be able to support the work that we need to continue to do to protect our elections in the days ahead.

Our Republic is one that maintains its stability based on the integrity of our elections. I have zero doubt that the Russians tried to destabilize our Nation in 2016 by attacking the core of our democracy. Anyone who believes they will not do it again has missed the basic information that is out day after day in our intelligence briefings.

The Russians have done it the first time. They showed the rest of the world the lesson and what could be done. It could be the North Koreans the next time. It could be the Iranians the next time. It could be a domestic activist group the next time. We should learn that lesson, close that vulnerability, and make sure that we protect our systems in the days ahead.

There is more that can be done, but the States seem to take a lead on this. This is something that the Federal Government should do, and we are very close to getting it done. I wanted to be able to tell this body that we are close. Let us work together to get this done in the days ahead.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATO

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, thank you.

Last week at the NATO summit in Brussels, the leaders of all 29 member states, including the United States with President Trump, signed a declaration reaffirming the purpose of the alliance—collective defense and the importance of article 5, which regards being attacked against one ally as an attack against all others.

There may be a growing sense here in the United States that NATO is no longer useful to our interests and that it is a burden that is not worth the cost.

I recently traveled to Moscow, Oslo, and Helsinki with members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, many of us on the Subcommittee on Defense. We had meetings with U.S. Embassy officials, our Ambassadors, and foreign government officials—people within the ministries of foreign affairs, ministries of defense, and with legislative leaders in that region.

At my meetings in Moscow, we worked to begin a dialogue with Russian counterparts. Everything I heard in those meetings reinforces my belief that Russia remains a threat to European stability and that a united NATO is essential to countering the threat and preserving American peace and prosperity.

Two wars in Europe last century resulted in the loss of hundreds of thousands of American lives who fought the forces of tyranny. To prevent a third war against this Communist menace, Western European powers, still weakened by World War II, formed an alliance with America and Canada to deter the Soviet Union's massive conventional forces from invading beyond what became the eastern bloc.

Not only did NATO successfully deter the Soviet Union until its collapse in 1991—and in my view, NATO contributed to the Soviet Union collapse in a significant way—but in that process, America's commitment to European security allowed these allies to recover from the war economically, strengthened democratic governance, and enabled them to stop fearing one another.

We would be naive to believe that threats critical to North Atlantic security have faded along with the Soviet Union. Indeed, my recent interactions in Europe confirmed that Russia remains a revisionist power intent on continuing Russia's disruptive activities in Europe, the Middle East, and here at home in the United States.

In every meeting I attended, I made clear that the Russians must end their election-meddling here in the United States and Europe in order to open doors to rebuilding our relations. I brought up Russia's destabilizing support for separatists in Ukraine and its illegal seizure of Crimea after Ukraine democratically chose a President who sought closer ties with the West.

Supporting and admitting that they share intelligence with the Taliban undermines the democratic government in Afghanistan and undermines our Nation's military as we continue to fight the Taliban alongside the Afghan National Security Forces.

In each circumstance of those conversations, Russian officials, including Foreign Minister Lavrov, continued to obfuscate or outright deny any responsibility. However, those meetings left me unconvinced that Russia is prepared to change its behavior.

In subsequent talks in Norway, a NATO member, and Finland, a NATO partner, the concerns relayed to me by these European leaders underscore the fear our European friends have about Russian activities. During our meetings, my colleagues and I reassured them of America's commitment to our joint security, and that commitment from the entire U.S. Government must not waver.

The first Supreme Allied Commander in Europe overseeing all NATO military operations was Kansas's own Dwight D. Eisenhower. As President in

1957, he declared before our NATO allies that we must "re-dedicate ourselves to the task of dispelling the shadows that are being cast upon the free world."

In addition to ongoing Russian subterfuge, terrorist groups remain intent on striking the West, threats to data information require strong cyber security measures, and the scourge of human and drug trafficking degrades social structures. On these and other issues, NATO allies have coordinated and contributed to the security of our own country, the United States of America.

In particular, let's recall that only once has NATO invoked article 5—in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks on our country. The only time the NATO alliance has been asked to respond, they declared a willingness to respond—that an attack on one is an attack on all—when the United States of America was attacked on 9/11.

When we went to war against al-Qaida and its Taliban hosts in Afghanistan, we were not alone. The United States has nearly 15,000 troops serving in Afghanistan, and they are serving with NATO coalition forces as part of counterterrorism efforts to support Afghanistan's fight against the Taliban and ISIS, which has seized strategic territories in recent years.

We are approaching 17 years of support from our NATO allies in Afghanistan—support that has come even at the expense of the blood of those who serve. Just last week, I am saddened to say, two U.S. Army soldiers paid the ultimate sacrifice and were killed while serving in Afghanistan, and at least two more soldiers have been wounded from insurgent attacks.

Finally, there is an economic threat that a destabilized Europe poses to our Nation's well-being. The EU—distinct from NATO but certainly a beneficiary of the security provided—is America's largest trading partner.

Questioning why we should come to the defense of the smallest NATO member damages the alliance, and it hurts our alliances elsewhere. If we won't honor a treaty in Europe, friends might wonder why we would honor a treaty in Asia. Predators can take advantage of our perceived indifference. That is, in part, what led to the Korean war.

The United States contributes 22 percent of NATO's total budget. In addition to our NATO contributions, the United States continues to increase defense spending on our military presence supporting our partners, with more than \$6 billion in fiscal year 2019 appropriated for the European Deterrence Initiative and another \$792 million invested in military construction across the continent.

President Trump is absolutely right to urge fellow allies to increase their defense spending, and I echoed that message on our trip to Norway when we visited with those allies in Oslo. To the credit of our allies, they have increased spending by more than \$40 billion in the past year.

Fighting alongside us in Afghanistan, where they continue to serve beside us today, unfortunately, more than 1,000 Europeans have died.

NATO is strong, and it is getting stronger. I believe the strength of NATO relies on remaining unified. Words matter, and what Americans say can bolster or shake confidence in the United States.

I will conclude on this personal note. I thought of the force for good our country has provided the world as I stood in our Embassy in Moscow on July 4th, our Independence Day, watching the Marine Corps Honor Guard's presentation of the colors as our national anthem was sung. It is difficult for me to sing the national anthem without choking up wherever I am, but it was especially difficult that day as I reflected upon the course of events in my life—when kids practiced getting under their desks for missile drills, to the fall of the Berlin Wall, to the aftermath of 9/11, to a father who served in World War II. I honor him and all those who served.

Over the past 70 years, it is America that has safeguarded freedom for our people and for those who live elsewhere in the world. Along the way, our vision of a freer, more prosperous world attracted allies who shared our dream.

Our foremost responsibility is to protect Americans all the time and to promote our values around the world. We can do this better. We can do this with our allies. With them, we will have a better future.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEMBERS OF THE SENATE NATO OBSERVER GROUP

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in April, the Democratic leader and I announced the reestablishment of the Senate NATO Observer Group. Senators TILLIS and SHAHEEN, both Members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, were named cochairs. We have asked for the following Senators

to participate: BARRASSO, RUBIO, GARDNER, ERNST, ROUNDS, MERKLEY, COONS, KING, BOOKER and VAN HOLLEN.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for July 2018. The report compares current-law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2018, H. Con. Res. 71, and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (BBA18). This information is necessary for the Senate Budget Committee to determine whether budgetary points of order lie against pending legislation. The Republican staff of the Senate Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, prepared this report pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act (CBA).

This is the fifth scorekeeping report this year and the second since I filed new enforceable levels on May 7, pursuant to BBA18 requirements. My last filing can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 6, 2018. The information included in this report is current through July 16, 2018.

Republican Budget Committee staff prepared Tables 1–6.

Table 1 gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee exceeds or is below its allocation for budget authority and outlays under the most recently adopted budget resolution and the fiscal year 2019 enforceable levels filing. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the CBA. For this reporting period, 10 of the 16 authorizing committees are in compliance with their allocations.

During this reporting period, Congress cleared two pieces of legislation with significant budgetary effects scored to authorizing committees. The first bill was H.R. 770, the American Innovation \$1 Coin Act. This measure requires the Secretary of the Treasury to mint, beginning in 2019, new \$1 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.” CBO estimates that H.R. 770 would increase direct spending in the near term by \$3 million but would be deficit-neutral over the entire budget window. This bill was charged to the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee. The second bill was H.R. 5956, the Northern Mariana Islands U.S. Workforce Act of 2018. This bill modifies U.S. immigration policy regarding the Northern Mariana Islands, thereby reducing the number of people able to claim asylum and receive means-tested benefits. CBO estimates that this bill would save \$3 million over the budget window. H.R. 5956 was charged to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

Tables 2–6 remain unchanged from my last filing.

In addition to the tables provided by Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting CBO tables, which I will use to enforce budget totals approved by Congress.

Because legislation can still be enacted that would have an effect on fiscal year 2018, CBO has provided a report both for fiscal year 2018 and fiscal year 2019. This information is used to enforce aggregate spending and revenue levels in the budget resolution under section 311 of the CBA. CBO's estimates show that current-law levels of spending for fiscal year 2018 exceed the amounts in H. Con. Res. 71 by \$157.4 billion in budget authority and \$106.3 billion in outlays. Revenues are \$3.2 billion above the revenue floor for fiscal year 2018 set by the budget resolution. Social Security outlays are at the levels assumed by the resolution, while Social Security revenues are \$446 million below the levels in the budget.

For fiscal year 2019, CBO estimates that current-law levels are below the fiscal year 2019 enforceable aggregates by \$1,142.2 billion in budget authority and \$646.1 billion in outlays. The allowable spending room will be reduced as appropriations bills are enacted. Revenues are \$5 million below the level assumed for fiscal year 2019. Finally, Social Security outlays and revenues are at the levels assumed in the fiscal year 2019 enforcement filing.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate pay-as-you-go, PAYGO, rule. After accounting for enacted legislation during this reporting period, the PAYGO scorecard shows deficit increases in fiscal year 2019 of \$25 million—\$5 million revenue loss, \$20 million outlay increase—over the fiscal year 2019–2023 period of \$332 million—\$47 million revenue loss, \$285 million outlay increase—and over the fiscal year 2019–2028 period of \$487 million—\$108 million revenue loss, \$379 million outlay increase. The Senate's PAYGO rule is enforced by section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71.

Included in this submission is a table tracking the Senate's budget enforcement activity on the floor since the May 7 enforcement filing. On June 18, 2018, Senator BERNARD SANDERS raised a Senate PAYGO point of order against H.R. 5515, the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019. That point of order was waived by a vote of 81–14. H.R. 5515 has yet to be enacted and is currently in conference.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (–) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS
[In millions of dollars]

	2018	2019	2019–2023	2019–2028
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry				
Budget Authority	47	0	0	0
Outlays	47	0	0	0
Armed Services				
Budget Authority	–33	0	0	0
Outlays	–24	0	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	21	285	382
Outlays	0	20	285	382
Commerce, Science, and Transportation				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Energy and Natural Resources				
Budget Authority	220	0	0	–3
Outlays	198	0	0	–3
Environment and Public Works				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Finance				
Budget Authority	21,971	0	0	0
Outlays	5,211	0	0	0
Foreign Relations				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Judiciary				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions				
Budget Authority	705	0	0	0
Outlays	205	0	0	0
Rules and Administration				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Intelligence				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs				
Budget Authority	7,300	0	0	–729
Outlays	1,850	4,400	4,400	3,671
Indian Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Small Business				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Total				
Budget Authority	30,210	21	285	–350
Outlays	7,487	4,420	4,685	4,050

TABLE 2.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS ¹
[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2018	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Statutory Discretionary Limits	629,000	579,000
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	23,259
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	5,400	54,200
Defense	589,320	132
Energy and Water Development	21,800	21,400
Financial Services and General Government	31	23,392
Homeland Security	2,058	45,665
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	35,252
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	177,100
Legislative Branch	0	4,700
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	10,091	81,900
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	42,000
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	300	70,000
Current Level Total	629,000	579,000
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (–) Statutory Limits	0	0

¹ This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

² Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS ¹
[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2019	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Statutory Discretionary Limits	647,000	597,000
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	9
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0	0
Defense	44	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0
Homeland Security	0	9
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	24,684

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS ¹—Continued
[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2019	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Legislative Branch	0	1
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0	67,109
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0	4,400
Current Level Total	44	96,212

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS ¹—Continued
[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2019	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (–) Statutory Limits	–646,956	–500,788

¹ This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

² Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 4.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)	
	2018
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2018	17,000
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	10,228
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	6,772
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	17,000
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	0

TABLE 5.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)	
	2019
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2019	15,000
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0

TABLE 5.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)—Continued

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)	
	2019
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	0
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	–15,000

TABLE 6.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAM (CHIMP) TO THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)	
	2018
Crime Victims Fund (CVF) CHIMP Limit for Fiscal Year 2018	11,224
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	10,228
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0

TABLE 6.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAM (CHIMP) TO THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND—Continued

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)	
	2018
Current Level Total	10,228
Total CVF CHIMP Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	–996

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2018.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2018 budget and is current through July 16, 2018. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 71, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2018.

Since our last letter dated June 6, 2018, the Congress has not cleared any legislation for the President's signature that affects budget authority, outlays, or revenues in fiscal year 2018.

Sincerely,
MARK P. HADLEY
(For Keith Hall, Director).

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AS OF JULY 16, 2018

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (–) Resolution
On-Budget			
Budget Authority	3,399.8	3,557.2	157.4
Outlays	3,221.3	3,327.6	106.3
Revenues	2,497.1	2,500.3	3.2
Off-Budget			
Social Security Outlays ^a	849.6	849.6	0.0
Social Security Revenues	873.3	872.9	–0.4

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

^a Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AS OF JULY 16, 2018

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted^{a b}			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,658,139
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,105,225	2,003,386	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	513,307	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	–866,685	–866,685	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,238,540	1,650,008	2,658,139
Enacted Legislation			
Authorizing Legislation			
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (P.L. 115–91)	–33	–24	0
CHIP and Public Health Funding Extension Act (P.L. 115–96, Division C)	705	205	0
An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 . . . and for other purposes (P.L. 115–96, Division D)	2,100	1,050	0
An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 (P.L. 115–97)	–8,600	–8,600	–143,800
An act making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes (P.L. 115–120, Divisions C and D)	14,509	1,203	–1,263
Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Divisions A and C–G) ^{b c d}	7,504	4,050	–12,424
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018, Divisions M–V (P.L. 115–141) ^e	225	203	–348
VA MISSION Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–182)	5,200	800	0
Total, Authorizing Legislation	21,610	–1,113	–157,835
Appropriation Legislation			
Department of Defense Missile Defeat and Defense Enhancements Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–96, Division B)	4,686	803	0
Further Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision I)	84,436	11,185	0
Further Extension of Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018, (P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision 3)	–315	–315	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018, Divisions A–L (P.L. 115–141) ^{e f g}	2,259,985	1,663,110	0
Total, Appropriation Legislation	2,348,792	1,674,783	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	2,370,402	1,673,670	–157,835
Entitlements and Mandatories			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	–51,440	4,205	0
Total Current Level ^{b h}	3,557,239	3,327,620	2,500,304
Total Senate Resolution ⁱ	3,399,841	3,221,349	2,497,139
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	157,398	106,271	3,165
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^aIncludes the budgetary effects of the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues and were cleared by the Congress during the 1st session of the 115th Congress, but before the adoption of H. Con. Res. 71, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018, the VA Choice and Quality Employment Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–46); the Harry W. Colmer Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–48); a joint resolution compact relating to the establishment of the Washington Metrorail Safety Commission (P.L. 115–54); the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 and Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–56); the Emergency Aid to American Survivors of Hurricanes Irma and Jose Overseas Act (P.L. 115–57); the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–62); the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–63); the Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria Education Relief Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–64); and the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–72).

^bEmergency funding that was not designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2) (A) of the Deficit Control Act does not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. These amounts, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–63)	263	263	0
Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123)	2,217	1,469	–509
Total	2,480	1,732	–509

^cThe Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123) contains seven divisions: Division A, Subdivision 2 of Division B, and Divisions C–F contain authorizing legislation, of which the budgetary effects of Subdivision 2 of Division B were designated as being for emergency requirements. Subdivisions 1 and 3 of Division B contain appropriation legislation: Subdivision 1 provided supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for disaster relief and designated those amounts as being for emergency requirements, and section 158 of Subdivision 3 provided authority for the duration of fiscal year 2018, for the Secretary of Energy to draw down and sell crude oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Division G of P.L. 115–123 provided for the budgetary treatment of Divisions A–F.

^dPursuant to section 232(b) of H. C. Res. 290 (106th Congress), the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001, the budgetary effects related to the Federal Reserve's surplus funds are excluded. As a result, the amounts shown do not include estimated increases in revenues of \$2,450 million in fiscal year 2018, \$2,180 million over the 2018–2022 period, and \$1,750 million over the 2018–2027 period.

^eSections 540–543 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2017 (Division F of P.L. 115–31), extended several immigration programs through the end of fiscal year 2017. Several continuing resolutions continued those authorities through March 23, 2018, and sections 202–205 of title II of Division M of P.L. 115–141 further extended those programs through 2018. CBO estimates that extending those authorities for the entirety of fiscal year 2018 will increase on-budget direct spending by \$5 million in fiscal year 2018, \$27 million over the 2018–2022 period, and \$53 million over the 2018–2027 period. In addition, CBO estimates that extending those authorities will decrease off-budget direct spending by \$1 million over the 2018–2022 period and by \$7 million over the 2022–2027 period. Further, CBO estimates that continuing those authorities will increase revenues by \$2 million over the 2018–2022 period and by \$7 million over the 2018–2027 period. Consistent with the budgetary treatment of Divisions K–V of P.L. 115–141, the budgetary effects of extending the immigration programs through March 23, 2018, are charged to the Appropriations Committee, the effects of extending the programs for the remainder of fiscal year 2018 are charged to the relevant authorizing committees.

^fPursuant to sections 1001–1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114–255), certain funding provided to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)—in particular the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in 2017 through 2026 shall not count for the purposes of complying with provisions of the Deficit Control Act or the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974. As a result, the amounts shown do not include \$1,056 million in budget authority or \$770 million in associated outlays in fiscal year 2018, specifically, \$60 million in budget authority and \$22 million in outlays for the FDA; and \$996 million in budget authority and \$748 million in outlays for HHS, which includes \$500 million in budget authority for state responses to the opioid abuse crisis and \$496 million for NIH.

^gSection 255 of the Departments of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018 (Division H of P.L. 115–141), delayed implementation of the recommendations of the United States Preventive Services Task Force with respect to breast cancer screening, mammography, and prevention. CBO estimates that the delay will increase direct spending (budget authority and outlays) by \$14 million in fiscal year 2019 and by \$6 million in fiscal year 2020. In addition, CBO estimates that section 225 will decrease revenues by \$23 million in fiscal year 2019 (of which \$6 million will be off-budget) and will decrease revenues by \$9 million in fiscal year 2020 (of which \$2 million will be off-budget).

^hFor purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

ⁱPeriodically, the Senate Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels in H. Con. Res. 71, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution. The total for the Initial Senate Resolution shown below excludes \$47,660 million in budget authority, \$22,467 million in outlays, and \$150,003 million in revenues assumed in H. Con. Res. 71 for discretionary spending not constrained by the budgetary caps established by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (P.L. 112–25) and subsequently amended, including spending that qualifies for adjustments pursuant to section 4205 of H. Con. Res. 71.

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Initial Senate Resolution	3,089,061	3,109,221	2,640,939
Revisions:			
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 3003 of H. Con. Res. 71	–8,600	–8,600	–143,800
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	4,686	803	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	84,436	11,185	0
Pursuant to section 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 4108 of H. Con. Res. 71	230,553	108,997	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	–295	–257	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,399,841	3,221,349	2,497,139

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2018.
Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2019 budget and is current through July 16, 2018. This report is sub-

mitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018, pursuant to section 30103 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–123).

Since our last letter dated June 6, 2018, the Congress has cleared the American Innovation \$1 Coin Act (H.R. 770), which awaits the President's signature. That act has significant effects on budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2019.

Sincerely,
MARK P. HADLEY
(For Keith Hall, Director).

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF JULY 16, 2018

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (–) Resolution
On-Budget			
Budget Authority	3,547.1	2,404.9	–1,142.2
Outlays	3,508.1	2,861.9	–646.1
Revenues	2,590.5	2,590.5	0.0
Off-Budget			
Social Security Outlays ^a	908.8	908.8	0.0
Social Security Revenues	899.2	899.2	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

^aExcludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF JULY 16, 2018

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,590,496
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,337,789	2,232,677	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	573,950	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	–890,012	–890,015	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,447,777	1,916,612	2,590,496
Enacted Legislation			
Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protections Act (P.L. 115–174) ^a	18	17	–5
VA MISSION Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–182)	18	17	–5
	0	4,400	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	36	34	–10
Legislation Cleared Congress and Pending Signature			
American Innovation \$1 Coin Act (H.R. 770)	3	3	0
Entitlements and Mandatories			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	957,064	940,899	0
Total Current Level^b	2,404,862	2,861,931	2,590,491

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF JULY 16, 2018—Continued
(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Total Senate Resolution	3,547,094	3,508,052	2,590,496
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	1,142,232	646,121	5
Memorandum			
Revenues, 2019–2028			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	33,273,105
Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	33,273,213
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	108

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
 Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.
^a Pursuant to section 232(b) of H.C. Res. 290 (106th Congress), the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001, the budgetary effects related to the Federal Reserve's surplus funds are excluded. As a result, the amounts shown do not include estimated increases in revenues of \$655 million in fiscal year 2019, \$570 million over the 2019–2023 period, and \$454 million over the 2019–2028 period.
^b For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS, AS OF JULY 16, 2018
(In millions of dollars)

	2018	2019	2018–2023	2018–2028
Beginning Balance ^a	0	0	0	0
Enacted Legislation: ^{b, c}				
A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Incident Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act". (S.J. Res. 57, P.L. 115–172)	*	*	*	*
Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protections Act (S. 2155, P.L. 115–174) ^d	*	22	329	490
Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act of 2017 (S. 204, P.L. 115–176)	*	*	*	*
An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish assistance for adaptations of residences of veterans in rehabilitation programs under chapter 31 of such title, and for other purposes (H.R. 3562, P.L. 115–177)	*	*	*	*
VA MISSION Act of 2018 (S. 2372, P.L. 115–182) ^e	*	*	*	*
Whistleblower Protection Coordination Act (S. 1869, P.L. 115–192)	*	*	*	*
All Circuit Review Act (H.R. 2229, P.L. 115–195)	*	*	*	*
American Innovation \$1 Coin Act (H.R. 770)	0	3	3	0
Small Business 7(a) Lending Oversight Reform Act of 2018 (H.R. 4743, P.L. 115–189)	*	*	*	*
Northern Mariana Islands U.S. Workforce Act of 2018 (H.R. 5956)	0	0	0	–3
Current Balance	*	25	332	487
Changes to Revenues	*	–5	–47	–108
Changes to Outlays	*	20	285	379

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
 Notes: P.L. = Public Law, * = between –\$500,000 and \$500,000.
^a On May 7, 2018, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget reset the Senate's Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.
^b The amounts shown represent the estimated effect of the public laws on the deficit.
^c Excludes off-budget amounts.
^d Pursuant to section 232(b) of H.C. Res. 290 (106th Congress), the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001, the budgetary effects related to the Federal Reserve's surplus funds are excluded. As a result, the amounts shown do not include estimated increases in revenues of \$655 million in fiscal year 2019, \$570 million over the 2019–2023 period, and \$454 million over the 2019–2028 period.
^e The budgetary effects of this Act are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to section 512 of the Act.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF POINTS OF ORDER RAISED SINCE THE FY 2019 ENFORCEMENT FILING

Vote	Date	Measure	Violation	Motion to Waive	Result
127	June 18, 2018	H.R. 5515—John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.	4106(a)—Senate-Pay-As-You-Go Violation ¹	Sen. McConnell (R-KY) ²	81–14, waived

¹ Senator Sanders raised a section 4106(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress) point of order against the bill because the bill would increase the on-budget deficit.
² By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to a roll call vote to waive the point of order.

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise today because, like many Americans, I am deeply troubled by the Democrats' reckless calls to abolish ICE, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency. That is why I am introducing a resolution to condemn calls for the abolishment of ICE and express support for all officers and personnel who carry out ICE's important mission of protecting American borders. With the ever present threat of international terrorism in the post-9/11 era, abolishing ICE is unthinkable. As our country battles threats from abroad, a historic opioid crisis, and increasing rates of violence against law enforcement officers, we must show our support for the mission of ICE. That is what we see all of you at ICE and your commitment and that the Senate supports you.

ICE's mission is simple: to protect Americans from the cross-border crime

and illegal immigration that threaten our communities. The criminal trafficking of persons and goods across our borders is among the greatest threats to public safety in this country. When ICE agents take to the streets, they are looking to protect our most vulnerable from being exploited by cartels and international gangs like MS-13. This violent gang has taken hold in at least 42 States, including Louisiana.

Just last year, ICE agents removed a million pounds of narcotics and more than 4,800 gang members from the streets of this country. They arrested nearly 800 members of the notoriously violent MS-13 gangs, like Juan Blanco, who was arrested after assaulting someone with a machete in Baton Rouge. Those numbers are just a small fraction of the nearly 127,000 arrests made by ICE agents against people who came here and committed violent crimes against law-abiding Americans. Those criminals were responsible for

more than 50,000 assaults, 2,000 kidnappings, and 1,800 homicides.

However, in 2017, assaults on law enforcement officers also rose dramatically. This wasn't limited to police officers; assaults on ICE agents nearly tripled last year. Now, I am shocked to hear that some of my colleagues are calling for this important Federal agency to be abolished. In fact, I learned today that some Democrats in the House of Representatives plan to introduce legislation that would abolish ICE and expose its agents to the scrutiny of international courts. This open contempt for ICE is astonishing, and it belittles the courage of those who work for this Agency and engage in the legitimate defense of our borders.

The Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency performs vital functions that are necessary to any government, like securing its borders. Last year, agents worked tirelessly around the clock to rescue 1,422 victims of

human trafficking. More than 900 of those victims were children. Abolishing ICE would mean that these people, these precious lives, would still be in grave peril. If we were to heed these extremist calls to abolish ICE, thousands of pounds of heroin, cocaine, and fentanyl would be in our schools and on the streets of our neighborhoods. We cannot ignore the role that ICE agents play in combatting terrorism, sex trafficking, child pornography, gang activity, labor exploitation, and the opioid crisis.

I want to make sure that our agents understand that the American people have their back. My resolution will honor the mission of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency and commend the bravery of these men and women who put their lives on the line every day to dismantle violent and dangerous gangs. I thank all my Republican colleagues who are joining with me on this crucial piece of legislation.

Although much of their work is thankless and goes sight unseen, I am grateful to the thousands of ICE agents who work around the clocks to keep our streets safe. Without them and their tireless service, I can only imagine what our headlines would look like, and I am ashamed of my colleagues on the radical left who are calling for the elimination of this vital agency. I know I speak for more than just myself when I say, simply, don't abolish ICE.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:57 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 488. An act to increase the threshold for disclosures required by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to compensation benefit plans, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 717. An act to promote pro bono legal services as a critical way in which to empower survivors of domestic violence.

The message further announced the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3030. An act to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.

H.R. 3777. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain National Forest System land containing the Nephi Work Center in Juab County, Utah, to Juab County.

H.R. 4032. An act to confirm undocumented Federal rights-of-way or easements on the Gila River Indian Reservation, clarify the northern boundary of the Gila River Indian Community's Reservation, to take certain land located in Maricopa County and Pinal County, Arizona, into trust for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4645. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

H.R. 4819. An act to promote inclusive economic growth through conservation and biodiversity programs that facilitate transboundary cooperation, improve natural resource management, and build local capacity to protect and preserve threatened wildlife species in the greater Okavango River Basin of southern Africa.

H.R. 4989. An act to require the Department of State to establish a policy regarding the use of location-tracking consumer devices by employees at diplomatic and consular facilities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5105. An act to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5480. An act to improve programs and activities relating to women's entrepreneurship and economic empowerment that are carried out by the United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 490. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam.

S. 931. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, as the "George Sakato Post Office".

S. 2692. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4558 Broadway in New York, New York, as the "Stanley Michels Post Office Building".

S. 2734. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the "George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 5:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform

and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the following Members be the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CONAWAY, THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, GOODLATTE, LUCAS, ROGERS of Alabama, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, CRAWFORD, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, YOHO, ROUZER, MARSHALL, ARRINGTON, PETERSON, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, COSTA, WALZ, Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. MCGOVERN, VELA, Meses. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 4204, 4205, and 9131 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. FOXX, Mr. ALLEN, and Ms. ADAMS.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of subtitles A and B of title VI, sections 6202, 6203, 6401, 6406, 6407, 6409, 6603, 7301, 7605, 8106, 8507, 9119, 9121, and 11101 of the House bill, and sections 6116, 6117, 6202, 6206-09, 6301, 6303, 7412, 9102, 9104, 9106, 9111-13, 12408, 12627, and 12628 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SHIMKUS, CRAMER, and TONKO.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of section 12609 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HENSARLING, DUFFY, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title III of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROYCE of California, CHABOT, and ENGEL.

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of sections 2802, 6408, 8104, 8107, 8109, subtitles B and C of title VIII, 8402, 8502, 8503, 8506, 8507, 8509, 8510, 9111, 11614, and 11615 of the House bill, and section 2425, subtitle D of title VIII, sections 8601, 8611, 8621-28, 8631, 8632, 12515, 12601, and 12602 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BISHOP of Utah, WESTERMAN, and GRIJALVA.

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of sections 1601, 4022, 4026, 8502, and 11609 of the House bill, and sections 3113, 7128, 8623, 8630, 8632, 12301, and 12407 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. WALKER, COMER, and Ms. PLASKETT.

From the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of section 7509 of the House bill, and section 7409 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ABRAHAM, DUNN, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of sections 2404, 6223, 6224, 6503, 9117, and 9118 of the House bill, and sections 2415, 2416, 6124, 6304, and 7412 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DENHAM, GIBBS, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3777. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain National Forest System land containing the Nephi Work Center in Juab County, Utah, to Juab County; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4032. An act to confirm undocumented Federal rights-of-way or easements on the Gila River Indian Reservation, clarify the northern boundary of the Gila River Indian Community's Reservation, to take certain land located in Maricopa County and Pinal County, Arizona, into trust for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 4819. An act to promote inclusive economic growth through conservation and biodiversity programs that facilitate transboundary cooperation, improve natural resource management, and build local capacity to protect and preserve threatened wildlife species in the greater Okavango River Basin of southern Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 4989. An act to require the Department of State to establish a policy regarding the use of location-tracking consumer devices by employees at diplomatic and consular facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 5480. An act to improve programs and activities relating to women's entrepreneurship and economic empowerment that are carried out by the United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3030. An act to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.

H.R. 5105. An act to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-5966. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Mid-Session Review of the Budget of the U.S. Government for Fiscal Year 2019"; to the Committees on Appropriations; and the Budget.

EC-5967. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Darren W. McDrew, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5968. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5969. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Standard" (FRL No. 9980-68-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5970. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Priorities List: Partial Deletion of the Beloit Corporation Superfund Site" (FRL No. 9980-64-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5971. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List: Partial Deletion of the Naval Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant Superfund Site" (FRL No. 9980-71-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5972. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Emissions Statement Requirement for the 2008 Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9980-70-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5973. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Revisions to Part 9 Miscellaneous Rules" (FRL No. 9980-94-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5974. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Minnesota; Flint Hills Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) Revision" (FRL No. 9980-96-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5975. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Ohio NSR PM_{2.5} Precursors" (FRL No. 9980-92-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5976. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Approval Plan; Tennessee; Revisions to Stage I and II Vapor Recovery Requirements" (FRL No. 9980-81-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5977. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; 2008 Ozone NAAQS Interstate Transport SIP Requirements" (FRL No. 9980-57-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5978. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Setting Medicare Payment Rates for Clinical Diagnostic Laboratory Tests"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5979. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The MEDIC Produced Some Positive Results but More Could be Done to Enhance its Effectiveness"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5980. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-396, "Helicopter Landing Pad Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5981. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-398, "Student Fair Access to School Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5982. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period from October 1, 2017 through March 31, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5983. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and Federal Employees Dental and Vision Insurance Program: Expiration of Coverage of Children of Same-Sex Domestic Partners; Federal Flexible Benefits Plan: Pre-Tax Payment of Health Benefits Premiums: Conforming Amendments" (RIN3206-AN34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5984. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Debt Collection Recovery Activities of the Department of Justice for Civil Debts Referred for Collection Annual Report"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5985. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of NM2201, 5F-AB-PINACA, 4-CN-CUMYL-BUTINACA, MMB-CHMICA and 5F-CUMYL-P7AICA Into Schedule I" ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA-479)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5986. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

“Controlled Substances Quotas” ((RIN1117-AB48) (Docket No. DEA-480)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5987. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner of the Administration for Native Americans, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-5988. A communication from the Director of the Contract and Grant Policy Division, Office of Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Revised Voucher and Invoice Submission and Payment Process” (RIN2700-AD83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 3229. A bill to enhance the security of the United States and its allies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 3230. A bill to impose a limitation on increases in duties on imports of steel and aluminum from Canada, Mexico, and the European Union, to improve congressional oversight of tariffs imposed to protect national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KING, Mr. HELLER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. JONES, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. COONS):

S. 3231. A bill to establish the Task Force on the Impact of the Affordable Housing Crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

S. 3232. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and title 17, United States Code, to provide greater access to in-State television broadcast programming for cable and satellite subscribers in certain counties; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 3233. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to persons responsible for violence and human rights abuses in Nicaragua, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 3234. A bill to provide at-risk and disconnected youth with subsidized summer and year-round employment and to assist local community partnerships in improving high school graduation and youth employment rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 3235. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a presumption of

service-connection for certain veterans with tinnitus or hearing loss, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 3236. A bill to enhance the ability of Federal agencies to deliver relocation management services to the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 3237. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 12th Street Lobby in Columbus, Georgia, as the “Richard W. Williams Chapter of the Triple Nickles (555th P.I.A.) Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 3238. A bill to improve oversight by the Federal Communications Commission of the wireless and broadcast emergency alert systems; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3239. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 75th anniversary of the integration of baseball; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 3240. A bill to promote botanical research and botanical sciences capacity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. Res. 576. A resolution designating September 4, 2018, as “National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day”, and raising awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 577. A resolution strongly recommending that the United States renegotiate the return of the Iraqi Jewish Archive to Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 578. A resolution honoring the men and women of the Drug Enforcement Administration on the 45th anniversary of the agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. REED, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 579. A resolution honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Nelson Mandela on the centenary of his birth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 580. A resolution recognizing and supporting public awareness of the importance of trademarks and the goals and ideals of the National Trademark Exposition of the United States Patent and Trademark Office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 339

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 428

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 428, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to authorize States to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through enhanced pediatric health homes, and for other purposes.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to designate the area between the intersections of 16th Street, Northwest and Fuller Street, Northwest and 16th Street, Northwest and Euclid Street, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as “Oswaldo Paya Way”.

S. 885

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 885, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include foster care transition youth as members of targeted groups for purposes of the work opportunity credit.

S. 1503

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S. 1917

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 1917, a bill to reform sentencing laws and correctional institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2101

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2101, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the crew of the USS Indianapolis, in recognition of their perseverance, bravery, and service to the United States.

S. 2127

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2127, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 2128

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2128, a bill to improve the coordination and use of geospatial data.

S. 2174

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2174, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the Veterans Crisis Line.

S. 2265

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2265, a bill to promote democracy and the rule of law in Nicaragua, and for other purposes.

S. 2276

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2276, a bill to require agencies to submit reports on outstanding recommendations in the annual budget justification submitted to Congress.

S. 2313

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2313, a bill to deter foreign interference in United States elections, and for other purposes.

S. 2577

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2577, a bill to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004.

S. 2600

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2600, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on indoor tanning services.

S. 2620

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2620, a bill to establish a Federal cyber joint duty program for cyber employees of Federal agencies.

S. 2667

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2667, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to provide for State and Tribal regulation of hemp production, and for other purposes.

S. 2823

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2823, a bill to modernize copyright law, and for other purposes.

S. 2863

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2863, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the opening of the National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 3029

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3029, a bill to revise and extend the Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Act (PREEMIE Act).

S. 3058

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3058, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the requirement that the taxpayer's basis in a building be reduced by the amount of the rehabilitation credit determined with respect to such building.

S. 3166

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3166, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 3172

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3172, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service

Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 3198

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3198, a bill to require annual reports on allied contributions to the common defense, and for other purposes.

S. 3207

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3207, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow for the deferment of certain student loans during a period in which a borrower is receiving treatment for cancer.

S. 3225

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3225, a bill to ensure the humane treatment of pregnant women by reinstating the presumption of release and prohibiting shackling, restraining, and other inhumane treatment of pregnant detainees.

S. 3227

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3227, a bill to reunite families separated at or near ports of entry.

S. RES. 572

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 572, a resolution supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. DAINES):
S. 3229. A bill to enhance the security of the United States and its allies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last week, President Trump was in Europe meeting with other NATO leaders. One of the major issues he raised was the need to bolster energy security throughout NATO. He specifically talked about a natural gas pipeline that the Russians are building between Russia and Germany. It is called the Nord Stream II Pipeline. I have been talking about this pipeline for years.

President Trump was absolutely right to bring up this important subject. Here is how the Boston Herald put it in an editorial over the weekend: "Trump's testy, tough talk to NATO on point." They say the President's tough talk was absolutely on point.

The President pointed out that Germany relies on natural gas for a substantial amount of its energy needs.

More than half of Germany's natural gas imports come from Russia. With this new pipeline, Germany will actually increase its dependence on Russian gas. Russia will have more of an influence on Germany.

Germany and other countries are members of NATO, and the reason they are members of NATO is to protect themselves against Russian aggression. So if you are Germany, why would you want to become more dependent on Russia when you joined NATO and have been a member of NATO for years to protect against Russian aggression? It seems that Germany has turned around now and given Russia influence over its energy security.

President Trump pointed out how strange it seems. I think it seems strange to other members of NATO, and it seems strange to people all across the country. No one who understands the facts can say that President Trump is wrong. President Trump is right. His tough talk to NATO was on point. Even the Obama administration knew it. The rest of NATO knows it. Even Germany knows it. When one country allows another aggressive, opportunistic country like Russia to have that kind of influence over its energy security, I believe it is asking for trouble. Germany seems to be betting that increasing its economic ties to the Kremlin will have no effect on the political manipulations that Russia wants to play on Europe. I think it is a sucker's bet.

Energy security is national security. Energy security is called the master resource for a reason. It powers our country. It powers our economy. It is an instrument of power. It is a force multiplier. It is important for the United States and our allies around the world to have that correct understanding of energy and the impact that it has globally as a geopolitical weapon. We have seen Russia in the past use its natural gas as a geopolitical weapon. Russia threatens other countries. It extorts money from them. It bullies them. Russians then can tell their customers: Do what we say, or we turn off the tap and we shut off your gas. They have done it in the past.

It also means a lot of money going from our NATO allies straight into the Kremlin's pocket. That is money they could be using instead to fund aggression in Europe and other parts of the world. That is what Russia wants to do with the money, if they get that money from Germany, from the energy. They use the money against us and against our NATO allies.

This new pipeline, I believe, was all the desire of the Russian people—and specifically of Vladimir Putin—to put our NATO allies much more under Russia's control. With the new pipeline, Russia is seeking to make Germany and the rest of Europe even more dependent and even more susceptible to this kind of Russian coercion.

The Wall Street Journal had an editorial on the subject last week. They

wrote that “the embarrassment for Berlin and NATO is that Germany is so happy to help Vladimir Putin execute this plan.” That is the embarrassment for Berlin and the embarrassment for NATO. They said: “Usually hostages need to be taken, instead of volunteering.” But that is what Germany is doing right now—volunteering to be Russia's hostage. That is exactly right.

Europe needs new energy, new energy security, and a new energy source. They need diversity. That is what the European Union needs. They need diversity in both the types of energy—that is what our NATO allies need—diversity in the types of energy that they use and where they get their energy from. That is how countries ensure that their own long-term economic health and independence is sound.

Russia has a right to compete in the world market for energy. The trouble starts when Russia gets so much of the market in some of these European countries that they become a monopoly in terms of the way they act. Russia is the largest supplier of natural gas to Europe. Across Europe, nearly 40 percent of the natural gas imports come from Russia. So Russia has incredible control. In some countries, it is virtually 100 percent.

Countries like Germany should be reducing the amount of natural gas they buy from Russia, not increasing it, but that is what this Nord Stream II Pipeline between Russia and Germany does. It increases the amount of natural gas Germany will be buying from Russia.

Germany should absolutely reject the Nord Stream II Pipeline as part of their reduction of dependence on Russia. That would help shrink the influence and the threat Russia continually poses to our NATO allies. It would also help our other allies in the region because, right now, a lot of Russian gas travels through pipelines that cross Ukraine and other countries into Central Europe. These countries make money from the gas crossing their territory, and they get a lot of their energy through these pipelines as well. But remember, Russia has invaded parts of eastern Ukraine. Russia has taken over Crimea. If Russia has their other new pipeline to help export its natural gas, it can shut off the revenue for countries, such as Ukraine, and shut off their energy completely.

Remember, one of the things President Trump has done, which I think has been helpful and which I had been calling for for years during the Obama administration, is actually provide lethal weapons to Ukraine to deal with the incursions coming from Russia to eastern Ukraine. Vladimir Putin actually cut off natural gas supplies to Ukraine in 2006, 2009, and 2014. He invaded Ukraine and annexed Crimea in part to cut off access to the natural gas and oil resources.

This is a pattern Vladimir Putin has of using energy as a weapon, and the best defense against this weapon is for these countries in Europe to have the

kind of energy diversity and energy security that I have recommended.

In March, I wrote a letter to the Treasury and State Departments encouraging the Trump administration to look at ways to stop the construction of the Nord Stream II Pipeline. That is what we need to do—stop the construction of the pipeline. It was a bipartisan effort, and 39 Senators from both parties signed on to the letter to express our concerns to President Trump about what was happening between Russia and Germany.

Today, I take the next concrete step and introduce legislation to do four very important things.

First, the legislation directs our representatives in NATO to work to achieve energy security for our partners throughout Europe and Eurasia.

Second, it calls for a comprehensive strategy that involves increasing American energy exports to these countries being held hostage by Russia.

Third, it requires the Energy Secretary to speed up approvals of American natural gas exports to our NATO allies and other countries.

Finally, it authorizes mandatory U.S. sanctions on the development of Russian energy pipelines like Nord Stream II.

It is in the national security interests of our country to help our allies reduce their dependence on Russian energy. Where those countries don't see it for themselves, we need to show them how important it is for their own security. Our NATO alliance is strong. A robust energy security strategy will make it even stronger.

When Vladimir Putin looks at natural gas, he doesn't think natural gas; he thinks politics, he thinks money, and he thinks power, because that is how he equates the energy he supplies to these countries, on which they have become so dependent—money, power, politics.

Germany and other countries in Europe and NATO should be doing all they can to diversify their sources of energy so they can help reduce the threat Russia poses to them. The United States should do all we can by exporting our abundant natural gas to our allies as quickly as possible. We have more than enough natural gas to meet our own needs and to export to our friends around the world. We can boost the security of our NATO allies and our friends around the world, and we should be doing it. We can do it through a peaceful process and a peaceful means without spending tax dollars, while at the same time growing our American economy with the production of American energy.

When President Trump came to office, he said: It is no longer about energy security or energy independence; it is about energy dominance. Given what we have been blessed with in this country and the amount of energy and resources we have, we have an opportunity and, I believe, an obligation to use that energy wisely and productively.

Vladimir Putin thinks about energy as money, as power, and as politics, and I think that what we need to do with the resources we have, as I am introducing in this legislation today, is a very commonsense approach.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 3234. A bill to provide at-risk and disconnected youth with subsidized summer and year-round employment and to assist local community partnerships in improving high school graduation and youth employment rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, nearly 5 million young people ages 16 to 24, or 1 in 9 youth, are disconnected from both school and work. These disconnected youth often face significant barriers; they are three times more likely than other youth to have a disability, twice as likely to live below the federal poverty threshold, and significantly more likely to live in racially segregated neighborhoods. Disconnection can leave young people without the entry-level work experience and post-secondary credentials they need to succeed in the workforce and with significantly less lifetime earnings than the typical worker.

Disconnection also imposes significant costs on affected young people, their communities, and the overall economy. According to Measure of America, in 2013, youth disconnection resulted in \$26.8 billion in public expenditures, including spending on health care, public assistance, and incarceration.

Dedicated Federal funding to support summer and year-long employment for youth can help to mitigate and prevent disconnection, as well as help young people, their communities, and the economy to flourish and develop our future workforce. Twenty years ago, dedicated Federal funding supported an estimated 500,000 summer jobs for youth. However, when the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA) eliminated Federal stand-alone funding, participation in summer youth employment programs dropped by 50 to 90 percent in most local areas. Through targeted resources and supports, including funding for summer and year-long employment and comprehensive supports for youth, we can move closer as a country toward reconnecting the millions of young people who have slipped through the cracks and prevent disconnection from occurring in the first place.

This is why I am pleased to introduce today The Opening Doors for Youth Act. The Opening Doors for Youth Act aims to assist the 5 million at-risk young people who are disconnected from both school and work find summer or year-long jobs that help them to succeed in future careers. The bill provides, Federal funding so local communities can create partnerships with businesses, mentoring, financial lit-

eracy planning, and other supportive services. Through the partnerships, workforce boards can use funds to cover up to 75 percent of wages for each eligible young person participating in the program.

Young people play a critical role in our economy and communities and we must ensure that they have the resources and skills to find and maintain jobs that set them up for future success. With the right resources, city governments, local workforce boards, school districts, and employers can work together to help us close the employment gap we're seeing for at-risk young people. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle consider The Opening Doors for Youth Act commonsense legislation that moves the needle forward on promoting access for all youth to meaningful employment.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 576—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 4, 2018, AS “NATIONAL POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE AWARENESS DAY”, AND RAISING AWARENESS AND UNDERSTANDING OF POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE

Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. NELSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 576

Whereas designating September 4, 2018, as “National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day” will raise public awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease, one of the most prevalent, life-threatening genetic kidney diseases;

Whereas National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day will help to foster an understanding of the impact polycystic kidney disease has on patients and their families;

Whereas polycystic kidney disease is a progressive, genetic disorder of the kidneys that causes damage to the kidneys and the cardiovascular, endocrine, hepatic, and gastrointestinal organ systems;

Whereas polycystic kidney disease has a devastating impact on the health and finances of people of all ages, and equally affects people of all races, genders, nationalities, geographic locations, and income levels;

Whereas, of the people diagnosed with polycystic kidney disease, approximately 10 percent have no family history of the disease, with the disease developing as a spontaneous (or new) mutation;

Whereas there are very few treatments and still no cure for polycystic kidney disease, which is one of the 4 leading causes of kidney failure in the United States;

Whereas 50 percent of patients with polycystic kidney disease suffer kidney failure at an average age of 53, causing a severe strain on dialysis and kidney transplantation resources and on the delivery of health care in the United States;

Whereas polycystic kidney disease instills in patients fear of an unknown future with a life-threatening genetic disease and apprehension over possible discrimination, including the risk of losing their health and life insurance, their jobs, and their chances for promotion;

Whereas countless friends, loved ones, spouses, and caregivers of patients with polycystic kidney disease must shoulder the physical, emotional, and financial burdens that polycystic kidney disease causes;

Whereas the severity of the symptoms of polycystic kidney disease and the limited public awareness of the disease cause many patients to live in denial and forego regular visits to their physicians or avoid following good health management, which would help avoid more severe complications when kidney failure occurs;

Whereas people who have chronic, life-threatening diseases like polycystic kidney disease have a predisposition to depression because of their anxiety over pain, suffering, and premature death;

Whereas the PKD Foundation and its more than 50 volunteer chapters around the United States are dedicated to—

(1) conducting research to find treatments and a cure for polycystic kidney disease;

(2) fostering public awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease;

(3) educating patients and their families about the disease to improve their treatment and care; and

(4) providing support, including by sponsoring the annual “Walk for PKD” to raise funds for polycystic kidney disease research, education, advocacy, and awareness; and

Whereas the PKD Foundation is partnering on September 4, 2018, with sister organizations in Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, and other countries to increase international awareness of polycystic kidney disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 4, 2018, as “National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day”;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day to raise public awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease;

(3) recognizes the need for additional research to find a cure for polycystic kidney disease; and

(4) encourages all people in the United States and interested groups to support National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day through appropriate ceremonies and activities to promote public awareness of polycystic kidney disease, and to foster an understanding of the impact of the disease on patients and their families.

SENATE RESOLUTION 577—STRONGLY RECOMMENDING THAT THE UNITED STATES RENEGOTIATE THE RETURN OF THE IRAQI JEWISH ARCHIVE TO IRAQ

Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 577

Whereas, before the mid-20th century, Baghdad had been a center of Jewish life, culture, and scholarship, dating back to 721 B.C.;

Whereas, as recently as 1940, Jews made up 25 percent of Baghdad's population;

Whereas, in the 1930s and 1940s, under the leadership of Rasheed Ali, anti-Jewish discrimination increased drastically, including the June 1–2, 1941, Farhud pogrom, in which nearly 180 Jews were killed;

Whereas, in 1948, Zionism was added to the Iraqi criminal code as punishable by death;

Whereas, throughout 1950–1953, Jews were allowed to leave Iraq under the condition that they renounce their citizenship;

Whereas, as result of past persecution, few Jews remain in Iraq today, and many left their possessions and treasured artifacts behind;

Whereas the Ba'ath regime confiscated these artifacts, later dubbed the Iraqi Jewish Archive, from synagogues and communal organizations;

Whereas, on May 6, 2003, members of the United States Armed Forces discovered the Iraqi Jewish Archive, which included 2,700 books and tens of thousands of documents, in the heavily damaged and flooded basement of the Mukhabarat (secret police) headquarters;

Whereas, under great urgency and before adequate time could be dedicated to researching the history of the Iraqi Jewish Archive, an agreement was signed between the National Archives and Records Administration and the Coalition Provisional Authority on August 20, 2003, stating that the Iraqi Jewish Archive would be sent to the United States for restoration and then would be sent back to Iraq after completion;

Whereas the Iraqi Jewish community is the constituency of the Archive and is now represented by the diaspora outside Iraq;

Whereas the current Government of Iraq has publicly acknowledged the importance of the Archive and demonstrated a shared respect for the wishes of the Iraqi Jewish diaspora by attending the December 2013 burial of several Torah fragments from the Archive in New York;

Whereas United States taxpayers invested \$3,000,000 to restore the Iraqi Jewish Archive, and the National Archives and Records Administration has worked diligently to preserve the artifacts;

Whereas the National Archives and Records Administration has, from 2013 to 2018, displayed the Iraqi Jewish Archive in—

- (1) Washington, DC;
- (2) New York, New York;
- (3) Kansas City, Missouri;
- (4) Yorba Linda, California;
- (5) Miami Beach, Florida;
- (6) Dallas, Texas;
- (7) Atlanta, Georgia; and
- (8) Baltimore, Maryland;

Whereas the exhibition of the Iraqi Jewish Archive across the United States and its cataloguing online has enabled people throughout the world and especially the Iraqi Jewish community diaspora to discover, learn about, and reflect upon the rich history of the Jewish community in Iraq;

Whereas, in February 2014, the United States Senate unanimously passed a resolution calling on the Administration to extend the agreement to keep temporarily the Iraqi Jewish Archives in the United States;

Whereas the Administration reached an agreement with the Government of Iraq to keep the Archive in the United States until September 2018; and

Whereas the Iraqi Embassy to the United States has said that the Iraqi Jewish community, like other communities in Iraq, played a key role in building the country, shared in its prosperity, and also suffered exile and forced departure because of tyranny: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) strongly urges the Department of State to renegotiate with the Government of Iraq the provisions of the current agreement that establish the date by which the artifacts of Iraqi Jewish Archive are meant to return to Iraq in order to ensure that they are kept in a place where long-term preservation and care can be guaranteed;

(2) recognizes that the Iraqi Jewish Archive should be housed in a location that is accessible to scholars and to Iraqi Jews and their descendants who have a personal interest in it;

(3) recognizes that the initial agreement between the National Archives and Records Administration and the Coalition Provisional Authority was signed before knowing the complete history of the Iraqi Jewish Archive;

(4) reaffirms the United States' commitment to cultural property under international law; and

(5) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to ensuring justice for victims of ethnic and religious persecution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 578—HONORING THE MEN AND WOMEN OF THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION ON THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AGENCY

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 578

Whereas the Drug Enforcement Administration (referred to in this preamble as the "DEA") was—

(1) established by an Executive order on July 1, 1973; and

(2) given the responsibility to coordinate all activities of the Federal Government directly related to the enforcement of the drug laws of the United States;

Whereas the more than 8,900 men and women of the DEA, including special agents, intelligence analysts, diversion investigators, program analysts, forensic chemists, attorneys, and administrative support staff, as well as more than 2,700 task force officers and hundreds of vetted foreign drug law enforcement officers—

(1) serve the United States with courage; and

(2) help protect the people of the United States from drug trafficking, drug abuse, and related violence;

Whereas, during the 45 years since the establishment of the DEA, the agency has targeted and brought to justice numerous criminals from around the world;

Whereas, throughout the 45-year history of the DEA, the agency has continually adapted to evolving trends of drug trafficking organizations by targeting individuals involved in the manufacturing, distribution, and sale of drugs, including cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine, marijuana, ecstasy, controlled prescription drugs, and new psychoactive substances;

Whereas, during the past decade, DEA special agents—

(1) seized—

- (A) more than 65,000 kilograms of heroin;
- (B) 1,240,000 kilograms of cocaine;
- (C) 3,240,000 kilograms of marijuana;
- (D) more than 191,000 kilograms of methamphetamine; and

(E) more than 23,000,000 dosage units of controlled prescription drugs; and

(2) identified more than 600 new psychoactive substances, including controlled substance analogues;

Whereas the DEA has deployed enforcement and regulatory tools and strategies to address the threat posed by new psychoactive substances, including controlled substance analogues, which—

(1) mimic the effects of known licit and illicit controlled substances, including fentanyl; and

(2) are largely responsible for driving the opioid epidemic that claimed the lives of more than 42,000 individuals in the United States in 2016;

Whereas, with 91 foreign offices located in 70 countries, the DEA has the largest inter-

national presence of any Federal law enforcement agency, facilitating—

(1) close collaboration with international partners around the world, including in the Republic of Colombia, the United Mexican States, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and the People's Republic of China, through information-sharing, training, and technology; and

(2) the provision of resources that have resulted in the disruption or dismantling of 300 priority target drug trafficking organizations in the Republic of Colombia, 226 in the United Mexican States, 53 in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and 45 in the People's Republic of China;

Whereas, throughout the history of the DEA, employees and members of the agency's task forces have sacrificed their lives in the line of duty, including Emir Benitez, Gerald Sawyer, Leslie S. Grosso, Nickolas Fragos, Mary M. Keehan, Charles H. Mann, Anna Y. Mounger, Anna J. Pope, Martha D. Skeels, Mary P. Sullivan, Larry D. Wallace, Ralph N. Shaw, James T. Lunn, Octavio Gonzalez, Francis J. Miller, Robert C. Lightfoot, Thomas J. Devine, Larry N. Carwell, Marcellus Ward, Enrique S. Camarena, James A. Avant, Charles M. Bassing, Kevin L. Brosch, Susan M. Hoefler, William Ramos, Raymond J. Stastny, Arthur L. Cash, Terry W. McNett, George M. Montoya, Paul S. Seema, Everett E. Hatcher, Rickie C. Finley, Joseph T. Aversa, Wallie Howard, Jr., Eugene T. McCarthy, Alan H. Winn, George D. Althouse, Becky L. Dwojeski, Stephen J. Strehl, Richard E. Fass, Frank Fernandez, Jr., Jay W. Seale, Meredith Thompson, Juan C. Vars, Frank S. Wallace, Jr., Shelly D. Bland, Rona L. Chafey, Carrol June Fields, Carrie A. Lenz, Kenneth G. McCullough, Shaun E. Curl, Larry Stelten, Royce D. Tramel, Alice Faye Hall-Walton, Elton Lee Armstead, Terry Loftus, Donald C. Ware, Jay Balchunas, Thomas J. Byrne, Jr., Samuel Hicks, Forrest N. Leamon, Chad L. Michael, Michael E. Weston, James Terry Watson, and Brent L. Hanger; and

Whereas many other DEA employees and task force officers have been wounded or injured in the line of duty, including 14 who have received the DEA Purple Heart Award: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Drug Enforcement Administration on the occasion of its 45th anniversary;

(2) honors the heroic sacrifice of the employees of the agency who have sacrificed their lives or who have been wounded or injured in the service of the United States; and

(3) gives heartfelt thanks to all the men and women of the Drug Enforcement Administration for their past and continued efforts to protect the people of the United States from the dangers of drug abuse.

SENATE RESOLUTION 579—HONORING THE LIFE, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND LEGACY OF NELSON MANDELA ON THE CENTENARY OF HIS BIRTH

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. REED, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 579

Whereas Nelson Mandela was born on July 18, 1918, as Rolihlahla Mandela in the village of Mvezo in the Eastern Cape of South Africa;

Whereas Nelson Mandela became a political activist as a young man and engaged in diverse acts of civil disobedience and resistance during the struggle against apartheid, the state-enforced system of racial segregation and systematic oppression maintained by the former white minority government of South Africa;

Whereas Nelson Mandela was arrested twice in 1952 for his participation in the Defiance Campaign, which involved the organized contravention of apartheid laws through acts of civil disobedience, and received a suspended sentence of imprisonment with hard labor;

Whereas, on August 5, 1962, as a leader of the African National Congress and the African National Congress Youth League, Nelson Mandela was arrested for his activism to end the discriminatory policies of apartheid;

Whereas, on June 12, 1964, Nelson Mandela was found guilty of all charges against him and sentenced to life imprisonment;

Whereas the global movement to release Nelson Mandela and end the South African system of apartheid—

(1) employed international economic sanctions, such as the sanctions under the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-440; 100 Stat. 1086); and

(2) included the condemnation of apartheid by countless citizens, artists, intellectuals, and activists of the United States;

Whereas, on February 11, 1990, under increasing international pressure and domestic campaign efforts, Nelson Mandela was released from prison after 27 years, 6 months, and 1 week of continuous incarceration;

Whereas, on his release, Nelson Mandela earned international recognition for leading efforts to foster reconciliation, peace, and democracy and for bringing about a negotiated transition ending the apartheid system and establishing universal suffrage and equal rights for all South Africans;

Whereas, on July 4, 1993, former President Bill Clinton awarded Nelson Mandela and Frederik Willem de Klerk the Philadelphia Liberty Medal;

Whereas, on October 1, 1993, the Nobel Peace Prize was jointly awarded to Nelson Mandela and Frederik Willem de Klerk “for their work for the peaceful termination of the apartheid regime, and for laying the foundations of a new democratic South Africa”;

Whereas, between April 16 and April 29, 1994, the citizens of South Africa voted in the first fully representative, multiracial national elections in the history of South Africa;

Whereas, on May 9, 1994, the National Assembly elected Nelson Mandela as President of the Republic of South Africa under a government of national unity;

Whereas, during his term as President of South Africa from 1994 to 1999, Nelson Mandela—

(1) led the peaceful transition from apartheid minority rule to multicultural, multiracial, and multiparty democracy; and

(2) played a critical role in the ongoing efforts of South Africa to foster national reconciliation;

Whereas, on July 29, 1998, Congress awarded Nelson Mandela the Congressional Gold Medal;

Whereas the decision of Nelson Mandela to step down after 1 term as the elected President of South Africa was a commendable act exemplifying his commitment to democratic principles and serves as a model for elected leaders around the globe;

Whereas, on July 9, 2002, former President George W. Bush honored Nelson Mandela with the Presidential Medal of Freedom;

Whereas on November 10, 2009, the United Nations General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution to designate July 18 as Nelson Mandela International Day;

Whereas the United States was a proud sponsor of the resolution;

Whereas, on December 5, 2013, Nelson Mandela died at the age of 95;

Whereas former President George W. Bush called Nelson Mandela “one of the great forces for freedom and equality of our time”;

Whereas former President Barack Obama called Nelson Mandela “the last great liberator of the 20th century” and observed that “Mandela taught us the power of action, but he also taught us the power of ideas; the importance of reason and arguments; [and] the need to study not only those who you agree with, but also those who you don’t agree with”;

Whereas, on July 28, 2014, former President Barack Obama renamed the Young African Leaders Initiative fellowship the “Mandela Washington Fellowship for Young African Leaders” in honor of Nelson Mandela;

Whereas July 18, 2018 marks the centenary of the birth of Nelson Mandela, which provides an opportunity for people around the world to reflect on his life and promote his legacy;

Whereas, through the leadership of Nelson Mandela, the notion and spirit of “Ubuntu”, a South African term referring to the interconnectedness and harmony of humanity, has spread throughout the world; and

Whereas Nelson Mandela leaves a legacy that transcends his time and place in history and will guide and inspire future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Nelson Mandela;

(2) celebrates the leadership and commitment of Nelson Mandela to fighting discrimination, poverty, and inequality and to promoting human rights and justice for all;

(3) recognizes the shared history between South Africa and the United States, the embedded legacies of racial discrimination and division in both countries, and the shared and continuing efforts to overcome those challenges in the manner exemplified by Nelson Mandela;

(4) encourages the Administration of President Donald Trump to foster the enduring relationship between the people and governments of South Africa and the United States; and

(5) encourages people around the world to reflect on the importance of tolerance, forgiveness, and peace in honor of the centenary of the birth of Nelson Mandela.

SENATE RESOLUTION 580—RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF TRADEMARKS AND THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE NATIONAL TRADEMARK EXPOSITION OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 580

Whereas intellectual property is instrumental to the economy of the United States by fueling innovation and creating jobs;

Whereas Congress and the Congressional Trademark Caucus understand the impor-

tance of trademarks and wish to support the United States Patent and Trademark Office in operating to drive economic growth and enhance the competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas the first National Trademark Exposition took place more than 30 years ago in Washington, D.C.;

Whereas, in an increasingly competitive global marketplace, counterfeit goods pose an escalating threat to businesses and jobs in the United States;

Whereas counterfeit goods cost the United States billions of dollars and countless jobs annually;

Whereas it is important for Congress and consumers to understand the impact of counterfeit goods on the economy of, and the health and safety of consumers in, the United States;

Whereas low quality counterfeit goods can—

(1) be dangerous to consumers and harmful to entrepreneurs; and

(2) erode consumer confidence in brands; Whereas trademark registration and Federal trademark law assist the public in—

(1) discerning between authentic and counterfeit merchandise; and

(2) stopping the flow of counterfeit goods;

Whereas consumers in the United States encounter an average of 1,500 trademarks each day;

Whereas it is important for the United States to strive to have the best intellectual property system possible that is understood by the public of the United States;

Whereas the Congressional Trademark Caucus focuses on supporting initiatives that increase awareness of, and foster a productive public dialogue about, the importance of trademarks and the risks associated with counterfeit goods;

Whereas the National Trademark Exposition supports the work of the Congressional Trademark Caucus by facilitating the education of thousands of consumers; and

Whereas educating the public about the value of brand names and trademarks in an increasingly competitive global marketplace serves the public interest of helping to safeguard consumers against deception and confusion in the marketplace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) there should be greater public awareness of the importance of trademarks for the society and economy of the United States;

(B) the 2018 National Trademark Exposition of the United States Patent and Trademark Office provides a unique opportunity to—

(i) educate the people of the United States about trademarks; and

(ii) encourage—

(I) a greater understanding of the role that trademarks play in the economy of the United States; and

(II) corporations, small businesses, governmental agencies, and nonprofit organizations to share information with the public about trademarks; and

(C) the United States Patent and Trademark Office and the Smithsonian Institution should be recognized for orchestrating a free, family-friendly event that educates tens of thousands of people about the importance of trademarks; and

(2) the Senate supports efforts to increase public awareness of the importance of trademarks, including the goals and ideals of the 2018 National Trademark Exposition of the United States Patent and Trademark Office held on July 27 and 28, 2018.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3397. Mr. ROUNDS (for Mr. RISCH) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 526, to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes.

SA 3398. Mr. ROUNDS (for Mr. FLAKE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2850, to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3397. Mr. ROUNDS (for Mr. RISCH) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 526, to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 4.

SA 3398. Mr. ROUNDS (for Mr. FLAKE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2850, to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SEC. ____ . USE OF FUNDS IN WMAT SETTLEMENT FUND FOR WMAT RURAL WATER SYSTEM.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF WMAT RURAL WATER SYSTEM.**—Section 307(a) of the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–291; 124 Stat. 3080) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “, (b)(2),” after “subsections (a)”.

(b) **FUNDING.**—Section 312(b)(2)(C)(i)(III) of the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–291; 124 Stat. 3093) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, including the planning, design, and construction of the WMAT rural water system, in accordance with section 307(a).”.

SEC. ____ . EXPANSION OF PUEBLO OF SANTA CLARA LAND ELIGIBLE FOR 99-YEAR LEASE.

Subsection (a) of the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955 (commonly known as the “Long-Term Leasing Act”) (25 U.S.C. 415(a)), is amended—

(1) by striking “Indians,,” and inserting “Indians,;”

(2) by inserting “Ohkay Owingeh pueblo,” after “Cochiti,;”

(3) by inserting “the pueblo of Santa Clara,” after “Pojoaque,;”

(4) by striking “the the lands” and inserting “the land”;

(5) by striking “lands held in trust for the Pueblo of Santa Clara,;” and

(6) by striking “lands held in trust for Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are au-

thorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Sharks”.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nominations of Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary (Management), and Denise Natali, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary (Conflict and Stabilization Operations), both of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, CUSTOMS, AND GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS

The Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness of the Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Molly Patrick, Lane Davis, Victoria Barczyk, James Payne, and Gabe Dabin, interns from Senator KENNEDY’s office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE: REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for the 2018 second quarter Mass Mailing report is Wednesday, July 25, 2018.

An electronic option is available on Webster that will allow forms to be submitted via a fillable pdf document. If your office did no mass mailings dur-

ing this period, please submit a form that states “none.”

Mass mailing registrations or negative reports can be submitted electronically or delivered to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510–7116.

The Senate Office of Public Records is open from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. For further information, please contact the Senate Office of Public Records at (202) 224–0322.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 942; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Coast Guard Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203(a):

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Andrew S. McKinley

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MICROLOAN MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 346, S. 526.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 526) to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Microloan Modernization Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “intermediary” has the meaning given the term in section 7(m)(11) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(11)); and

(2) the term “microloan program” means the program established under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)).

SEC. 3. MICROLOAN INTERMEDIARY LENDING LIMIT INCREASED.

Section 7(m)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(3)(C)) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$6,000,000”.

SEC. 4. MICROLOAN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 7(m)(4)(E) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(4)(E)) is amended by striking “25 percent” each place that term appears and inserting “50 percent”.

SEC. 5. SBA STUDY OF MICROENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall conduct a study and submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the operations (including services provided, structure, size, and area of operation) of a representative sample of—

(A) intermediaries that are eligible to participate in the microloan program and that do participate; and

(B) intermediaries (including those operated for profit, operated not for profit, and those affiliated with a United States institution of higher learning) that are eligible to participate in the microloan program and that do not participate;

(2) the reasons why intermediaries described in paragraph (1)(B) choose not to participate in the microloan program;

(3) recommendations on how to encourage increased participation in the microloan program by intermediaries described in paragraph (1)(B); and

(4) recommendations on how to decrease the costs associated with participation in the microloan program for eligible intermediaries.

SEC. 6. GAO STUDY ON MICROLOAN INTERMEDIARY PRACTICES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report evaluating—

(1) oversight of the microloan program by the Small Business Administration, including oversight of intermediaries participating in the microloan program; and

(2) the specific processes used by the Small Business Administration to ensure—

(A) compliance by intermediaries participating in the microloan program; and

(B) the overall performance of the microloan program.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the Risch amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3397) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To strike section 4)

Strike section 4.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. ROUNDS. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 526), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 526

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 “Microloan Modernization Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “intermediary” has the meaning given the term in section 7(m)(11) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(11)); and

(2) the term “microloan program” means the program established under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)).

SEC. 3. MICROLOAN INTERMEDIARY LENDING LIMIT INCREASED.

Section 7(m)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(3)(C)) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$6,000,000”.

SEC. 4. SBA STUDY OF MICROENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall conduct a study and submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the operations (including services provided, structure, size, and area of operation) of a representative sample of—

(A) intermediaries that are eligible to participate in the microloan program and that do participate; and

(B) intermediaries (including those operated for profit, operated not for profit, and those affiliated with a United States institution of higher learning) that are eligible to participate in the microloan program and that do not participate;

(2) the reasons why intermediaries described in paragraph (1)(B) choose not to participate in the microloan program;

(3) recommendations on how to encourage increased participation in the microloan program by intermediaries described in paragraph (1)(B); and

(4) recommendations on how to decrease the costs associated with participation in the microloan program for eligible intermediaries.

SEC. 5. GAO STUDY ON MICROLOAN INTERMEDIARY PRACTICES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report evaluating—

(1) oversight of the microloan program by the Small Business Administration, including oversight of intermediaries participating in the microloan program; and

(2) the specific processes used by the Small Business Administration to ensure—

(A) compliance by intermediaries participating in the microloan program; and

(B) the overall performance of the microloan program.

Mr. ROUNDS. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 347, S. 791.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 791) to amend the Small Business Act to expand intellectual property education and training for small businesses, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ROUNDS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. ROUNDS. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 791) was passed, as follows:

S. 791

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 “Small Business Innovation Protection Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the SBA;

(2) the term “Director” means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the USPTO;

(3) the term “SBA” means the Small Business Administration;

(4) the term “small business concern” has the meaning given the term in section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a));

(5) the term “small business development center” means a center described in section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648); and

(6) the term “USPTO” means the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the USPTO and the SBA are positioned to—

(A) build upon several successful intellectual property and training programs aimed at small business concerns; and

(B) increase the availability of and the participation in the programs described in subparagraph (A) across the United States; and

(2) any education and training program administered by the USPTO and the SBA should be scalable so that the program is able to reach more small business concerns.

SEC. 4. SBA AND USPTO PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director, shall develop partnership agreements that—

(1) provide for the—

(A) development of high-quality training, including in-person or modular training sessions, for small business concerns relating to domestic and international protection of intellectual property;

(B) leveraging of training materials already developed for the education of inventors and small business concerns; and

(C) participation of a nongovernmental organization; and

(2) provide training—

(A) through electronic resources, including Internet-based webinars; and

(B) at physical locations, including—

(i) a small business development center; and

(ii) the headquarters or a regional office of the USPTO.

SEC. 5. SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

Section 21(c)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (S), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (T), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(U) in conjunction with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, providing training—

“(i) to small business concerns relating to—

“(I) domestic and international intellectual property protections; and

“(II) how the protections described in subclause (I) should be considered in the business plans and growth strategies of the small business concerns; and

“(ii) that may be delivered—

“(I) in person; or

“(II) through a website.”.

Mr. ROUNDS. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDING THE WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 416, S. 2850.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2850) to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ROUNDS. I ask unanimous consent that the Flake amendment at the desk be agreed to, that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3398) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SEC. ____ . USE OF FUNDS IN WMAT SETTLEMENT FUND FOR WMAT RURAL WATER SYSTEM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF WMAT RURAL WATER SYSTEM.—Section 307(a) of the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–291; 124 Stat.

3080) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “, (b)(2),” after “subsections (a)”.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 312(b)(2)(C)(i)(III) of the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–291; 124 Stat. 3093) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, including the planning, design, and construction of the WMAT rural water system, in accordance with section 307(a).”.

SEC. ____ . EXPANSION OF PUEBLO OF SANTA CLARA LAND ELIGIBLE FOR 99-YEAR LEASES.

Subsection (a) of the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955 (commonly known as the “Long-Term Leasing Act”) (25 U.S.C. 415(a)), is amended—

(1) by striking “Indians,,” and inserting “Indians,;”;

(2) by inserting “Ohkay Owingeh pueblo,,” after “Cochiti,;”;

(3) by inserting “the pueblo of Santa Clara,,” after “Pojoaque,;”;

(4) by striking “the the lands” and inserting “the land”;

(5) by striking “lands held in trust for the Pueblo of Santa Clara,,” and

(6) by striking “lands held in trust for Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo”.

The bill (S. 2850), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 19, 2018

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, July 19; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Bounds nomination; further, that all time in recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count against postcloture time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING THE LIFE, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND LEGACY OF NELSON MANDELA

Mr. COONS. Mr. President on this date a century ago, an extraordinary life began that would change the lives of millions of others. One hundred years ago today, Nelson Mandela was born in the village of Mvezo in a countryside of grass-covered rolling hills in the Eastern Cape of South Africa. That day began a 95-year journey of one man who led the South African people to liberation and whose legacy continues to reverberate through time.

Over the course of his life, Nelson Mandela, known by his nickname “Madiba,” became venerated as a global advocate for justice and equality by millions—arguably, more than any other political figure of our time. Through political activism and resistance, Madiba led a revolution by shepherding his people from racial division, hate, and subjugation to freedom, tolerance, and democracy.

One of the most striking aspects of Nelson Mandela’s leadership as the first President of a truly free, non-racial, nonsexist South Africa was his enormous capacity for forgiveness and his ability to open his heart to those who were once his brutal oppressors.

Twenty years after he was released from a lifetime in prison, Nelson Mandela invited to dinner at his own home one of his former jailers, a man with whom he had become close friends, saying that their friendship reinforced his belief in the essential humanity of even those who had kept him for so long behind bars. How long? Twenty-six years, 6 months, and 1 week.

Despite all of those years, months, and days of continuous imprisonment, Nelson Mandela never himself became a prisoner to hate. Madiba set the example of healing, forgiveness, and reconciliation that ultimately allowed South Africa’s rainbow nation to emerge from the ashes of brutal racial oppression.

His example is particularly timely and powerful in light of the polarization, distrust, and division in our world and even in our own Nation today. History reminds us, though, that this reconciliation, this openness, is not a new phenomenon.

Fifty-two years ago this summer, in June of 1966, then-U.S. Senator Robert F. Kennedy delivered a memorable speech at the University of Cape Town in South Africa. Speaking to a nation then deep in the throes of the cruel injustices of apartheid, Senator Bobby Kennedy began his speech by describing “a land in which the native inhabitants were at first subdued, but relations with whom remain a problem to this day; a land which defined itself on a hostile frontier; a land which was once the importer of slaves, and must now struggle to wipe out the last traces of that former bondage.” Kennedy then paused before famously concluding: “I refer, of course, to the United States of America.”

Then, as now, the differences between the United States and South Africa are significant. Yet Americans and South Africans share more than we might recognize or want to acknowledge. On the positive side, we share remarkable constitutions and inspiring foundational documents in South Africa's Freedom Charter and our own Declaration of Independence, whose fundamental principles are profound and inspiring but whose lived experiences have so far fallen short. We also share a deep commitment to democracy, societies grounded in the rule of law, a vibrant and free press, and capable and independent judiciaries. We are also multilingual, multifaith democracies, Federal republics that have incredible human histories and deep and rich natural resources. Both South Africa and the United States have demonstrated how important civic institutions are to sustaining democracy and preserving the progress of humanity.

Today, on what would have been Nelson Mandela's 100th birthday, the United States is itself facing serious challenges to the very institutions that underpin and preserve our hard-won democracy. As we weather these challenges together as a nation, let us find inspiration in Mandela's life and legacy. Let us remember that on his long walk to freedom, Nelson Mandela taught the need to study not only those with whom we agree but also those with whom we disagree and to be willing to compromise and find common ground.

In Madiba's words:

It is easy to break down and destroy. The real heroes are those who make peace and build.

In the years to come, it is my hope that the United States and South Africa will look to each other as both nations continue to struggle against the legacy of racial injustice, reverse our growing economic inequality, and protect our evolving experiments in democracy.

Nelson Mandela ventured to shape the world as it should be. He showed us that values such as forgiveness, respect, and tolerance are not just words but concrete actions we can all take.

I am inspired by Madiba's example to keep fighting for a better, more just world here in the U.S. Senate, as I was first inspired in the fall of 1986 when I traveled to South Africa to volunteer for the South African Council of Churches during the anti-apartheid struggle.

Just 2 years ago, I had a chance as a new Senator to revisit Johannesburg and Cape Town with a delegation that included Senator Kennedy's daughter, Kerry Kennedy, and a whole host of the Kennedy clan. Our own Congressman JOHN LEWIS, a leader in America's civil rights struggle; my friend and colleague Congressman STENY HOYER; and two survivors of the racially motivated shooting in a church in downtown Charleston, Polly Sheppard and Felicia Sanders, were there to serve as a living

example of the challenges and the difficulties of reconciliation, of forgiveness, and of grace.

We had remarkable experiences. We met with Desmond Tutu, my former supervisor at the Council of Churches decades ago, a winner of the Nobel Peace Prize and someone who helped lead the peace and reconciliation process in South Africa. We also heard from today's chancellor of the University of Cape Town, Nelson Mandela's widow, Graca Machel.

Our reflections were interrupted by student protesters demanding a more just dispensation in today's South Africa—a jarring reminder that even the greatness of the remembrance of Bobby Kennedy and Nelson Mandela is not enough to still the relentless yearning for more—more justice and more equality—by the youngest among us.

I still today believe in Nelson Mandela's vision for the world—a world governed by justice and equality and peace and cooperation for the common good. But it is important to remember just how much we have to do together as a global community to hear each other, forgive each other, and get there.

Nelson Mandela once famously said: "I am not a saint, unless you think of a saint as a sinner who just keeps trying." So today let us remember Nelson Mandela's relentless trying, his historic contribution to South Africa and the world, and the example of his struggle to promote human rights and justice for all. Madiba's service is an enduring reminder of what it means to place the good of a nation's people above one's own narrow self-interests—a lesson from which we can all benefit.

I am pleased to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the birth of a giant of history and to honor Nelson Mandela's lifetime of extraordinary service with a bipartisan resolution submitted today. Today, let us rededicate ourselves to his vision for our world and together work tirelessly to make it a reality.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:24 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 19, 2018, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SCOTT HUTCHINS, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS, VICE CATHERINE E. WOTEKI.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

LANE GENATOWSKI, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE ELLEN DUDLEY WILLIAMS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAVID HALE, OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MIN-

ISTER, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (POLITICAL AFFAIRS), VICE THOMAS A. SHANNON, JR., RESIGNED.

KIP TOM, OF INDIANA, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE.

DONALD Y. YAMAMOTO, OF WASHINGTON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF SOMALIA.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

CHARLES WICKSER BANTA, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2022, VICE MARIA ROSARIO JACKSON, TERM EXPIRED.

MICHELLE ITZCAK, OF INDIANA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2020, VICE IRVIN M. MAYFIELD, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

BARBARA COLEEN LONG, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2022, VICE DEEPA GUPTA, TERM EXPIRED.

CARLETON VARNEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2022, VICE PAUL W. HODES, TERM EXPIRED.

COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RICHARD S. TISCHNER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE NANCY MARIA WARE, TERM EXPIRED.

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

DONALD L. PALMER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 12, 2021, VICE MATTHEW VINCENT MASTERTSON, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. MARYANNE MILLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL T. PLEHN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

ILDA Y. ISAZA
MATTHEW J. KING

To be major

YOBANKA E. PAEZ-MUNOZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

SAMANTHA S. RIEGER-PINSON

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

KENNETH F. KLOCK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

BRANDON C. KLING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

BURTON C. GLOVER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MANUEL REYES, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

EMMANUEL D. EISENSTEIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MARSHALL L. BARTEE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

DONALD C. CARMICHAEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ETHAN P. CARTER
GREGORY L. CLARK
LASHONDA D. COLESWIGGINS
JOHN C. DAVIS
BRYAN J. GREEN
GEORGE F. HENRY, JR.
ROBERT E. H. JOHNSON
THOMAS R. KIRBY
PETER P. MACK
TEALLA H. MARTIN
AARON B. NEAL
WILLIAM S. ROBBINS
NEIL T. ROEDER
MICHAEL A. SEISE
NEIL E. THOWE
GREGORY J. VENVERTLOH
DAVID L. WASHINGTON
SAMUEL R. WETHERILL IV

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

PATRICIA J. RASMUSSEN
AMY L. SANDERS
TRACY H. SCHMITT
RONALD M. SOUTHERLAND
DICKIE J. VEST, JR.
KENT J. VINCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JEREMY W. BERNDT
MONICA MARTINEZ
AMY M. RAMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

SCOTT M. EVERHART
VERNON G. LANCE
MARK A. MILLER
ALBERT SOHNEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

WILLIAM PEREZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBYN D. BOLGLA
JAMES J. BOR
KATHLEEN D. KAPPEL
NICOLE T. KEENEY
KEVIN M. LOVE
RHONDA D. WYNDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL C. AMPELAS
JAMES F. BRINKMAN
MELISSA A. BUSOVSKYMCNEAL
JULIO A. CHALELA
JANE E. GROSS
CHARLES T. HUDDLESTON
KERMIT D. HUEBNER
GREGORY M. JOHNSTON
JUSTIN L. KNOWLES
TIMOTHY O. PFEIFFER
JORDAN E. PINSKER
STEPHEN R. TRAVIS
TIMOTHY G. VEDDER
WILLIAM A. WALTERS III
DANIEL R. WILLIAMS
KAREN C. WRIGHT
KURT G. ZIMMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL S. ALLAIN

BRYON W. FETTY
PAUL W. GROTELUSCHEN
MICHAEL L. LAZO
GEOFFREY B. LINCOLN
ERIC J. MARTINSON
ANTHONY P. MCGINTHY
RANDALL J. MYSZKA
PAUL R. PETERSON
LAURA J. STEPHENS
MONTY K. TORRES
CARMEN M. TUCKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DONNA M. KENTLEY
AARON C. KYER
GARY W. LOUDEN
STEPHEN P. MCKENZIE
HEIDI R. MUNRO
ROY C. OUANO
MICHAEL S. ROSCOE
DAVID J. SKELLEY, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KIMBERLY D. DEJESUS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROYAL M. MINOR III
CRAIG E. PARSONS
BENITO E. RODRIGUEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

EDWARD L. BARRON, JR.
BENJAMIN A. BLACKBURN III
SEAN P. CONNOLLY
FRANKLIN R. FLORENCE
GABRIEL A. ISOYE
ALVARO MAYA
MICHAEL B. MOREHEAD
MICHELE M. RICH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LORI J. ALLERT
RICHARD T. ALSDORF, JR.
CATHY BALZANO
DANA F. BARRETT CAMPBELL
SMITH V. L. BASE
EILEEN C. BROWN
JAMES M. COMPLIMENT
DARRIN B. DAILEY
JOAN R. DAVIS
TIMOTHY B. DAVIS
CATHERINE F. DEVITTO
PAUL E. ESACHINA
ALECIA A. HARRISON
CHRISTOPHER W. HONEA
FAITH L. JUNGHAN
DEBRA L. KRISAK
MICHELLE D. LAFLEUR
TONI A. LOFTUS
DENNIS C. LOURA
ARLENE LUCKY
KAREN L. MCGUIRE
JAY H. MOTOKAWA
MAEVELYN A. ODONNELL
CLAUDIA A. PETERSON
JOHN M. PROVENZANO
ROBERT R. RAMONAS
DAVID C. REED
RODNEY L. SANDERS
SONIA A. M. TENADU
LARA K. TERAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CARL W. ADAMS
SANDEEP K. AGGARWAL
MICHAEL O. BARRON, JR.
IAN H. BLACK
TIEN D. BUI
BRUCE T. BURKS
WILLIAM T. BURNETT
MICHAEL B. COOK
PAUL J. CORCORAN
DOUGLAS J. CREEDON
MARC P. DIFAZIO
BRENDAN T. DOHERTY
CHARLES H. DUKES
TIMUR S. DURRANI
FARHAM K. GHAVAMI
ELLINA HALL
HANY E. HANNA
JOSHUA P. HERZOG
LYNN C. HUFFMAN
MALENE INGRAM
DIANE K. JONES
JONATHAN KITCHIN

PAUL J. KUBIAK
GREGORY LACY
RALPH E. LAYMAN III
JACK C. LEONG
TRACY S. LOPER
STEVEN A. LORBER
WILLIAM E. NORTHRINGTON
PHILIP R. PALMER
KRISHNA PATEL
JOHN C. PAUMIER
DIANA RIERA
MICHAEL J. ROACH
BRENDA ROSARIO PADRON
LOREN P. SIMPSON
WILLIAM R. SMITH
ADA D. STEWART
CHARLES A. STILLMAN
GARY STOLOVITZ
STEVEN G. SUGDEN
KENNETH L. WILSON
KEVIN M. WOODS
JOHN H. WU

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KORY A. ANGLESEY
CHRISTOPHER S. CASNE
JOSEPH W. CHARLES
MARK J. CHRISTENSEN
BRAD G. COLEMAN
LUKE A. COWLEY
ARCE D. DOBLE, JR.
JOSEPH A. DUNAWAY
MARCEL T. DUPLANTIER
NATHANIEL H. HERRON
ANDREW B. HUNT
STERLING P. INGRAM IV
MICAH J. KILLETICO
ERIC L. MARTENS
JEROD D. MCCULLY
TATE L. METLEN
GARETH A. MONTGOMERY
ROBERT L. OLSON
JOSHUA M. PERRY
ROBERT S. RAMSEY
BRENT D. RICHARDSON
DAWN C. ROE
BRIAN B. SCHONEFFELD
KENNETH D. SOWELL
JAMES T. STEWART
FRANCIS J. TAY, JR.
BRENT J. UYEHARA
BENJAMIN C. WAITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

DAVID W. ALEXANDER
JOHN D. AULT
GREGORY A. CATES
VICTORIA A. CHAPPELL
JOHN D. CONNOLLY
SAMUEL CONTRERAS
CRISTIANO S. DESOUSA
PETER W. DIETZ
GARY W. FOSHEE
DOUGLAS A. GRACE
ERIC P. HAMMEN
SONG S. HWANG
DAVID J. JELTEMA
CHARLES W. JOHNSON
RONALD J. KENNEDY
DAVID D. J. KIM
RICHARD S. LEE
RUSSELL D. MARTIN
AARON T. MILLER
SUNNY MITCHELL
ROBERT S. NELSON
THOMAS P. OPLANAGAN
ROBERT W. PETERS
RANDAL K. POTTER
CARL P. RHOADS
AARON D. ROBERTSON
RICHARD C. SMOTHERS
COREY T. THORNTON
JOHN C. VANDYKE
BRUCE A. VAUGHAN
RICHARD H. WIESE
HAROLD B. WOODRUFF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JONATHAN D. ALBANO
VINCENT M. J. AMBROSINO
KARLIE M. BLAKE
CLINTON S. BRYANT
JASON D. CALANDRINO
WILLIAM I. COFFERBUCK IV
BRIAN D. COLBURN
SUQUON D. COMBS
ERIC J. COOMES
DIANA I. DALPHONSE
AUTUMN L. DANIEL
EUGENE DAWSON, JR.
ERIK A. DECKER
DUNCAN R. ELLIS
KRISTEN J. ELLIS
KIRK A. ENGLER

KENNETH E. FINDLEY
 MONICA M. FREY
 MAXINE J. J. GARDNER
 JASON P. HARPER
 WILLIAM B. HUNT
 SCOTT T. HUTTLESTON
 JASON V. ILETO
 IAN G. ILIFF
 BRENNAN J. KEMPER
 MICHAEL A. KIDD
 GENE M. LATTUS, JR.
 SCOTT A. LONG
 BENJAMIN I. MAY
 DONALD M. MCINTYRE
 JAMIE L. MITCHELL
 MICHAEL J. MULLERHEIM
 BENJAMIN S. NICHOLS
 CHRISTOPHER F. OCONNOR
 THURMAN B. PHILLIPS
 DOUGLAS M. QUINN
 CHRISTOPHER C. RADKE
 MICHELLE A. SIMMONS
 JARROD H. SMITH
 DONNA L. SMOAK
 ALBERT T. SONON IV
 JARED J. SWEETSER
 JOHN TAMEZ
 ROBIN L. TAYLOR
 ANDREW J. TEW
 BLAKE A. WHITTLE
 RAYMOND C. YAU
 JAMES P. ZAKAR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JANE J. ABANES
 EDUARDO F. BARNET
 JAMES R. BIRKLA
 COLLEEN C. BLOSSER
 CONNIE J. BRAYBROOK
 BRIAN K. BURDICK
 PATRICIA D. BUTLER
 RHONDA H. CANTU
 MARCELO A. CENTAURE
 MOLLY A. COOK
 MICHAEL J. CORNELL
 ROBERT F. CUENTO
 TERESA C. DENT
 RONALD G. DEWEEES
 ELIZABETH M. DRAKE
 CAROLYN H. ELLISON
 JAMES L. ESTOESTA
 EBONY J. FERGUSON
 SUZANNE N. FIERROS
 KAREN A. FLANAGAN
 CANDACE R. FOURA
 ABDON F. GALERA
 DANILLO A. GARCIA DUENAS
 SARAH E. GENTRY
 JASON A. GOFF
 JASON M. GUZMAN
 PENELOPE J. HEIGES
 ANDREA M. HERNANDEZ
 ELISABETH B. HOLMES
 JOHN A. HOYOS
 DAVY J. JENKINS
 JOANNA T. JOHNSON
 MARIA KENNEDY
 ROBERT J. KIMBERLING
 HEATHER L. KIRK
 TRACY R. KRAUSS
 DUANE J. LAMPERT
 LYL A. LAW
 DERRICK LEBEAU
 JONATHAN D. LEVENSON
 JACQUELINE LOPEZ
 KATHLEEN M. MACAPAGAL
 SCOTT M. MACDONALD
 JENNIFER J. MAGUIRE
 SCOTT A. MCGILL
 MATTHEW P. MCMAHON
 JOSE A. MERCADO
 REGINALD MIDDLEBROOKS
 JEFFREY A. MILES
 CHAD B. MOORE
 THERESA D. MORRIS
 SARA L. NACZAS
 PETER I. NYILAS
 TED U. PAGULAYAN
 STEPHANIE M. PAONE
 KENDRA L. PENNINGTON
 TRAVIS J. PETERSON
 MARGARET M. REYNOLDS
 MATTHEW V. REZA
 SHANNAN C. ROTRUCK
 AMANDA E. SCHAFFELD
 REBECCA A. SCHROEDER
 KATIE E. SCHULZ
 MARC A. SILFIES
 JAMIE M. SORENSON
 ANDREAS STILLER
 DAMIAN M. STORZ
 RANDY L. TOLBERT
 KELLY A. TROUT
 MICHELLE L. WESTCOTT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

MATTHEW S. BAILEY
 JOHN J. BATTISTI
 DENIZ M. BAYKAN

MICHAEL W. BLOOMROSE
 DAVID A. CHRISTENSON
 SARAH J. COTTRILL
 JUSTIN C. HENDERSON
 WILLIAM A. HOLT
 MICHAEL J. HUSSEY
 JOCELYN E. LOFTUSWILLIAMS
 JOSHUA R. LORENZ
 JOHN A. V. LOVASTIK
 DAVID A. MELSON
 MICHAEL G. MONTAGUE
 CAMERON R. NELSON
 PETER R. OSTROM
 JENNIFER L. POLLIO
 JESSICA L. PYLE
 TRACY L. REYNOLDS
 KATHERINE E. SHOVLIN
 RACHEL E. TREST
 ALLISON E. WARD
 MEREDITH S. WERNER
 LENA E. WHITEHEAD
 ADAM B. YOST

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

LYNDA S. AMELL
 CHRISTOPHER E. BARNES
 ALLISON L. BENNETT
 WILLIAM O. BENNETT
 EDWARD BRINSTON
 HYRUM T. BROSSARD
 ALAN D. CHRONISTER
 KATHLEEN A. COLTER
 RODERICK DAVIS, JR.
 CHRISTOPHER S. DEANGELIS
 KYLE D. DOHM
 KORRINA R. DONALD
 NICOLE J. DUTTON
 ASHLEE C. ESPIRITU
 JOSEPH J. FORD, JR.
 REINA GOMEZ
 DANIEL L. IMMEKER
 ELMER L. JIMENEZ
 JAMES M. KEENER
 KIMBERLY L. LITTEL
 NICHOLAS J. MARTIN
 FELECIA E. MCCLELLAN
 KINAU Y. MCCOY
 WILFREDO MORALES
 MARKEECE L. MURRIEL
 JAMES M. NOGLE
 KIMBERLY A. OELSCHLAGER
 AYODELE O. OLABISI
 EMILY A. OWENS
 CINDI L. PALACIOS
 MICHAEL G. PROUTY
 MATHEW B. RARIDEN
 JENIFER M. SCANCELLEA
 MARK P. SIMONS
 DAVID J. SOHL
 LISSSETH C. THOMAS
 JESUS S. THOMPSON
 AYESA B. TOLER
 TYLER J. TOWERS
 JEREMY H. WESTCOTT
 BRANDON J. WILLIAMS
 CHADWICK Y. YASUDA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

LALEH ABDOLAZADEH
 WILLIAM P. BOGGESS
 MARTIN J. BRAUD
 JASON N. BURKES
 KATHERINE L. CHENG
 LORA L. CHOW
 JEFFREY L. CULBREATH
 CORINNE C. DEVIN
 DAVID M. DOW II
 DANIKA J. DOWNEY
 COLIN A. ELIOT
 BENJAMIN D. FITZHARRIS
 REBECCA A. FRAZER
 JARED A. GELLER
 EDUARDO GOMEZ
 JESUS M. GONZALEZ
 MICHAEL J. GRAU, JR.
 FRED J. HARPER III
 SCOTT A. HOCKER
 JACQUELINE A. M. HOGAN
 DANIEL J. HONL
 JAIME L. JAMES
 BROCK J. JOHNSON
 BENJAMIN J. LAGO
 DARIEN G. LAZARO
 ANDREA D. LISSELL
 BRADLEY D. MARTINSEN
 GHOFFREY T. McMURRAY
 PATRICK T. MDRRELL
 HOAN B. NGHIEM
 MARK A. NOCERA
 JAMES M. OBRIEN
 ANDREW C. PARK
 CHRISTOPHER D. PARKS
 MICHAEL L. FAYNE
 LEONEL PEREZ, JR.
 DAVID M. RASMUSSEN
 BENJAMIN L. RICKS
 GREGORY E. RINGLER
 JUSTIN L. ROGERS
 JAMES M. ROSS

FREDERICK J. RUMFORD IV
 ANGELA C. SESSA
 ANDREW D. SILVESTRI
 DEREK D. SODEN
 SARA A. STIRES
 CLARENCE S. TANG
 STEPHEN M. WADE
 LESLIE H. WALLACE
 MARY N. WILLIAMSTREESH
 DONAVON A. YAPSHING
 CHRISTOPHER L. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

LISA L. ABELS
 KEITH A. ALFIERI
 LEE R. ALLEN
 ALEX T. ALLWEIN
 GEORGE C. BALAZS
 RUSSELL P. BALMER
 TAYLOR A. BANKS
 JEREMY P. BARAN
 NADINE S. BARKSDALE
 ANTHONY M. BIELAWSKI
 VERONICA E. BIGORNIA
 KEISHA N. BLAIR
 BENJAMIN R. BLEVINS
 ERIN M. BLEVINS
 DENISE BOGGSWILKERSON
 TAMARA BRAINARD
 JACK R. BRANDAU
 ANDREW M. BRANHAM
 ERIK D. BRINK
 STEPHEN M. BRONAUGH
 HELEN L. CANN
 SHANNON M. CAPP
 BRETT M. CHAMBERLIN
 DARREN CHERRY
 GREGORY T. CHESNUT
 ROBERT D. CHIARUTTINI
 EVA CHOU
 JAMES C. CLIFFORD
 MARY J. CLINGAN
 WILLIAM K. CONLEY II
 JONATHAN COOKE
 JAMES S. CORTES
 MARK P. COSBO
 TIFFANY C. COX
 HAMPTON A. CRIMM
 RAYMOND J. CUDNIK III
 MICHAEL E. CUNNINGHAM
 FRANCIS P. CUOZZO
 NATHAN S. CUTLER
 BENNETT L. DAVIS
 AMBER N. DECHAMBEAU
 ANGELA M. DICHALOMEACHAM
 TIMOTHY J. DONAHUE
 MICHAEL L. DUXEY
 ERYN J. H. DUTTA
 CHARLES S. EISENBERG
 JEREMY S. ENNIS
 WILLIAM L. FALLS
 JAMIE L. FITCH
 DEREK L. FOERSCHLER
 BRIAN C. FOLEY
 CHRISTOPHER W. FOSTER
 JANELLE A. FOX
 AMY J. FRANKSTON
 KYLE D. GADBOIS
 MICAH J. GASPARY
 ANTHONY A. GIBERMAN
 DAVID M. GLASSMAN
 SARAH L. GRANGER
 ROLF E. GRANING
 MICHAEL S. GREEN, JR.
 JUSTIN A. HARDER
 TRAVIS E. HARELL
 GREGORY S. HENDERSON
 ANTONIA J. HENRY
 MATTHEW F. HOEFLER
 MATTHEW A. HUMPHREYS
 ANDREW P. HURVITZ
 DINCHEN A. JARDINE
 SHANE D. JENSEN
 PAUL D. JOHNSON
 KEVIN D. JOHNSON
 LUCAS A. JOHNSON
 MARK S. JOHNSON
 REBECCA L. JOHNSON
 JAIME H. KAPUR
 MATTHEW W. KELLER
 JEAN D. KEMP
 BENJAY J. KEMPNER
 SHELLIE M. KENDALL
 BRIAN M. KEUSKI
 TIM I. KIM
 JOANNA R. KRAUSE
 ANDREW C. KUNG
 LAURA M. LAUER
 MICHAEL R. LEADER
 SCOTT LIU
 JOHN M. LYDON
 MICHELLE M. LYNCH
 JOHN S. MADDOX
 FRANKLIN C. MARGARON
 APRIL S. MATTIASEK
 PAUL D. METZGER
 MATTHEW M. MICHALOWICZ
 JESSICA M. MILLER
 JONATHAN P. MILLER
 RUSSELL J. MILLER
 JOSHUA W. MINYARD
 DAVID A. MOORE
 ERIN K. MOORE

LUCAS A. MUELLER
 MEREDITH R. NEAL
 NILS H. OLSON
 MONICA D. ORMENO
 YAN T. ORTIZPOMALES
 ANDREW M. PARSONS
 MICHAEL B. PAUL
 AARON J. PHARISS
 KEVIN A. PINKOS
 BRYAN J. PLATT
 KRISTINA M. POLK
 AARON T. POOLE
 AARON D. REED
 JASON P. RICE
 SHANNON L. RIGLER
 VICTOR A. RIVERA
 DARIN M. ROLFE
 CRYSTAL A. RUSSELL
 LEAH S. SAG
 JULIA A. SAVITZ
 CAROLINE M. SCHLOCKER
 MICHAEL S. SCULLY
 PETER G. SEGUIN
 HEATHER L. SHIBLEY
 ADAM C. SISCHY
 CHRISTOPHER S. SMITH
 CHRISTOPHER A. STETLER
 ALAN A. STRAWN

JIMMY SUVATNE
 ERIC R. TERPSTRA
 ANDREW J. TOMPKINS
 ADELAINE D. TRASK
 SCOTT A. TRASK
 EDWARD R. UTZ
 JAIME VEGA
 ANGELA G. VIERS
 DAVID M. VOLK
 WILLIAM R. VOLK
 ROBERT B. WALTON
 ALICIA L. WARNOCK
 LAUREN A. WEBER
 NICHOLAS J. WELLS
 DENNIS A. WHITE
 COLIN R. YOUNG
 JERRY YUAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JAVIER LOPEZMARTINEZ

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR THE PERSONAL RANK OF CAREER AMBAS-

SADOR IN RECOGNITION OF ESPECIALLY DISTINGUISHED SERVICE OVER A SUSTAINED PERIOD:

PHILIP S. GOLDBERG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 DAVID M. HALE, OF NEW JERSEY
 MICHELE JEANNE SISON, OF MARYLAND
 DANIEL BENNETT SMITH, OF VIRGINIA

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 18, 2018:

THE JUDICIARY

ANDREW S. OLDHAM, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203(A):

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ANDREW S. MCKINLEY

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MARGIE ANN LUETKEMEYER LUEBBERT ON THE CELEBRATION OF HER 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Margie Ann Luetkemeyer Luebbert on the celebration of her 90th Birthday.

On August 3, 1928, Margie was born to Henry and Regina Luetkemeyer in Meta, Missouri and was a welcomed addition to the families of her beloved grandparents Anton and Anna Luetkemeyer and George and Angela Dickneite. A joyous union of marriage began when Margie married her late husband Fritz on February 4, 1950. Fritz and Margie welcomed 4 children to their family: Kathy, Steven, Mark, and Kristen. Margie enjoys the love of 11 grandchildren and 18 great-grandchildren with 2 more on the way.

Throughout the years, Margie worked for Mid-America Bank in Meta. In her retirement, she has been committed to public service in various capacities. The community banks in Meta and Linn have benefited from her banking experience by her service on the board of directors. Margie has also been actively involved with the St. Cecelia Parish in Meta and especially enjoys the yearly picnic. Margie and I share a love of baseball and the St. Louis Cardinals along with her favorite college team, the University of Missouri Tigers. The love of sports runs in Margie's family and many of her children and grandchildren are involved in local and college sports such as: baseball, basketball, and softball. She is their biggest cheerleader at their sporting events.

Of her many accomplishments, Margie considers one of her greatest to be the organization of the family reunion for the Anton and Anna Luetkemeyer family in Jefferson City in 1992. It was certainly no small feat with the 15 descendants and their families for a total of over 450 people joining the celebration that day. The reunion was such a grand event the local TV station reported on it during their evening newscast.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in wishing Margie Ann Luetkemeyer Luebbert a very Happy 90th Birthday. Best wishes for much happiness and health in the years to come.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MR. CRAIG DALBY

HON. SUZAN K. DELBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Craig Dalby of Kirkland, Washington on his retirement from the Na-

tional Park Service after 35 years of distinguished public service. In his role as the Pacific West Region Chief of Public Information, Mr. Dalby has liaised with the public as an agency spokesperson and has worked with Members of Congress from the Pacific West to promote and preserve our public lands for future generations.

For 23 years, Mr. Dalby served as regional lead for geographic information systems, where he was a pioneer of commercial GIS software that modernized the National Park Service and established the technology as a bureau standard. Because of Craig's foresight and innovative thinking, the NPS is now a prolific user of this and other software that make our preserved lands more accessible to our government and to the public.

In addition to these contributions to the National Park Service, Mr. Dalby also went above and beyond in his service to the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency. Throughout his career, he has worked to conserve and improve our North Coast and Cascades Network Parks and Puget Sound Basin, which are vital to our Northwest landscape and defining elements of our great states.

Mr. Dalby exemplifies the versatility, expertise, and dedication of our public servants. I join my colleagues in congratulating him for his achievements and thanking him for his contributions to our western states and to our nation.

THE BROTHERHOOD CRUSADE'S HALF CENTURY OF EXCELLENCE

HON. KAREN BASS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, for fifty years, the Brotherhood Crusade has pursued its vision of South Los Angeles as a safe, thriving, culturally relevant, and inclusive community, a community that provides all residents equitable access to human and social services, a community continually improving its quality of life.

On June 15, 2018, the Brotherhood Crusade held a gala celebration, and welcomed supporters to the California Science Center, a fitting location given the organization's unrelenting focus on education. Founder Walter Bremond, Jr. would surely be proud that the dream he funded with a personal loan has grown to be one of the most effective organizations in South Los Angeles, lifting up young Black men and their families and creating countless stories of success.

Upon joining forces with Danny J. Bakewell, Sr., Walter's vision really began to take shape. Together, they designed a viable charitable institution to aid the Black community. Danny Bakewell, Sr. would go on to lead the organization for 35 years with a relentless focus on social justice.

In its five decades, the organization has reached hundreds of thousands of under-

served and under-represented youth in South Los Angeles. I applaud the organization's current leadership by my dear friend, Brotherhood Crusade President and CEO, Charisse Bremond Weaver.

Following in the footsteps of her father, Charisse has worked hard to expand services in the 13 years since she donned the mantle of leadership. She has added programs in youth development, educational enrichment, financial literacy and health education programs that reach thousands of South Los Angeles residents in need.

I am pleased and proud to offer my congratulations to the Brotherhood Crusade's leaders, staff, volunteers, participants and alumni, and to call attention to its legacy and accomplishments, as well as its thriving programs and promising future.

RECOGNIZING JIM MARKEL AND PERRY JONES

HON. GREG GIANFORTE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two Montana veterans and entrepreneurs committed to creating good-paying Montana jobs and revitalizing their community.

Jim Markel and Perry Jones own Red Oxx Mfg. Inc., a producer and retailer of durable travel bags. Their award-winning products are handcrafted in Montana, have nationwide recognition, and account for over \$2.5 million in annual company sales.

The U.S. Small Business Administration named Red Oxx Montana's Veteran-Owned Business of the Year in 2016. CEO Markel served in the U.S. Marine Corps, and company president Jones in the U.S. Navy.

The Red Oxx factory and retail store are in a commercial and industrial area east of Billings' vibrant downtown. Looking to reenergize the neighborhood instead of relocating the business as it grew, Markel served on an advisory board of the Billings Industrial Revitalization District.

Improvements guided by the district are attracting new businesses, renewing the area, and creating greater opportunity and more jobs.

This spring, Markel and Jones broke ground on a project that will transform about half a city block into a large outdoor event center, turning broken asphalt and recycled metal into an open, green space with ornamental fencing, sculptures, and park benches.

The event center will host community activities, feature performances, and be available for local nonprofit organizations to hold benefit events. Several years in the making, the event center will play a critical role in further rejuvenating the neighborhood.

Mr. Speaker, for their service to our country, entrepreneurship, and dedication to their community, I recognize Jim Markel and Perry Jones for their spirit of Montana.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

RECOGNIZING S. MARTINELLI &
COMPANY

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize S. Martinelli & Company, a family owned and operated business located in Watsonville, California, as they celebrate their 150th anniversary. Over the past century and a half, Martinelli's has become a household name across the United States and around the world, known for producing the highest quality sparkling cider and apple juice.

Founded in 1868, Martinelli's has persevered through two World Wars, Prohibition, the Great Depression, and an increasingly globalized marketplace. Despite having faced radically changing environments and numerous challenges, Martinelli's never altered its mission to produce juices made from one hundred percent U.S. grown, hand-picked apples, with no chemical preservatives or sweeteners.

Though Martinelli's has adopted technological advances over the years to improve and preserve their fresh apple flavors, they remain committed to historical traditions of washing, hand-sorting, and freshly pressing each apple. Martinelli's distinctive and crisp flavor comes from their time-honored blend of locally grown Newtown Pippin, Gala, Fuji, Granny Smith, Jonagold, Mutsu and Honeycrisp apples. John Martinelli, fourth generation family member and CEO of S. Martinelli & Company, tastes every batch of juice produced to ensure its quality meets company standards.

Martinelli's is a Certified Green Company devoted to employing sustainable practices such as recycling, water and energy conservation, and land preservation. Martinelli's also works closely with local and regional growers to ensure that their products are made with the freshest apples available in the Western U.S. In addition to their focus on environmental sustainability, Martinelli's is developing new organic orchards in order to increase production of certified organic juices. These initiatives represent Martinelli's dedication to preserving and expanding the heritage of apple orchards in Pajaro Valley, while enhancing the beauty of the area.

We are fortunate to have a family run company like Martinelli's call the central coast of California home for four generations. Their devotion to quality of product, sustainability, tradition, and community health is unrivaled and has enormously benefited our community. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize S. Martinelli & Company for 150 years of excellence in producing apple juice and sparkling cider.

RECENT ATTACKS AGAINST
ISRAEL

HON. NORMA J. TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern regarding the recent attacks on Israel at two of its borders. On

Israel's Northern border, Syrian drones crossed into Israeli airspace; on Israel's Southern border, Hamas launched more than 200 rockets and mortars from the Gaza Strip. One rocket hit a home; another landed in the courtyard of a Synagogue. These attacks are appalling and unnecessary provocations on Israel. The damage they are doing to Israel is real and should be not only measured in terms of property destroyed, but also the sense of insecurity that Israelis experience every day. This is not the path to peace.

I can only imagine the terror and anxiety that we would feel if the United States were attacked at both our borders in a single week. We are fortunate to have good diplomatic and security relations with all our neighbors. Sadly, our close ally Israel does not have the same luxury. I am reminded of my visit to Israel in 2012, at a time when the country was also under attack. I am inspired today, as I was then, by the resolve of the Israeli communities that live across the border from Gaza and Syria. These communities refuse to cower in fear, despite the constant threat of attack. Their reliance is a testament to the spirit of the Israeli people, which we see manifested in so many ways, such as Israel's economic leadership the fields of science, technology, and energy.

The United States must continue to stand with Israel. We must work with our allies to curb the aggressive actions of Iran and its proxies, and we must renew our efforts to bring about a resolution of the conflict in Syria, which has allowed Iran to expand its military presence in Syria. At the same time, we must recommit ourselves to supporting a just and lasting peace between Israel and the Palestinians.

PUNISHING CONTINUED
OCCUPATION OF UKRAINE ACT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill sanctioning Russia for its continued occupation of Ukraine. This bill sends a strong signal by going after Russian financial institutions, which are one of the few soft areas of Russian President Vladimir Putin's underbelly.

On February 27, 2014, Russia invaded and occupied Ukraine's Crimea region. Russia continues to ignore the Minsk Agreement and sanctions to date have failed to alter President Putin's calculations regarding Crimea and eastern Ukraine.

Putin's regime relies on several large financial institutions to implement its policies and keep the regime afloat. That is why I am introducing a bill to impose sanctions on Russian financial institutions.

Russia's continued occupation of Ukraine is intolerable and continued aggression and violation of international norms is unacceptable. Congress must use every tool available to change President Vladimir Putin's behavior.

I want to urge my colleagues to pass this important bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding missed votes due to a flight delay. Had I been present for roll call vote number 329, H.R. 4946 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1075 North Tustin Street in Orange, California, as the "Specialist Trevor A. Win'E Post Office", I would have voted Yea. Had I been present for roll call vote number 330, H.R. 4960 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 511 East Walnut Street in Columbia, Missouri, as the "Spc. Sterling William Wyatt Post Office Building", I would have voted Yea.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2019

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes:

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the Interior and Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations bill. I applaud Chairman CALVERT and his staff, along with Ranking Member MCCOLLUM and her team for crafting a responsible bill.

As a former chairman of this subcommittee, I know firsthand the challenges assembling this bill presents. There are diverse views across the United States on how our public lands and environment should be managed. For those of us that represent states with high percentages of federal lands—more than 60 percent in Idaho—you would be hard pressed to find a more important bill in Congress.

The bill before us today addresses the most important issues in Idaho. Perhaps most pressing is the need to adequately fund wildfire suppression and prevention. If you look at the National Interagency Fire Center (NIFC) outlook map, it indicates that almost my entire district is at an increased fire threat during July and August. Sadly, this has been the new normal.

The bill under consideration today addresses this by fully funding the 10 year average for wildfire suppression and provides an additional \$500 million to combat this growing threat. It also provides increased funding for prevention efforts. Next year, relief is on the way in the form of my Wildfire Disaster Funding Act, which will treat catastrophic fires like natural disasters. This will set us on a path to reduce the threat of wildfires and allow land managers to do the prevention work without their resources being stolen to fight fires.

The bill also contains many other important provisions:

Provides Funding for PILT that is vitally important in Idaho for rural counties that depend on it.

Establishes certainty for biomass which is critical to the landscape of our forests.

Rolls back regulations like the previous Administration's "Waters of the United States" rule.

Provides increased funding to address the \$12 billion backlog in to our National Parks.

Provides \$2.6 billion for the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Loan fund, which states and localities use for water infrastructure projects.

The list goes on, but the underlying point is the Interior and Environment bill is a critical piece of legislation, especially for those of us in western states. I want to reiterate my appreciation to Chairman CALVERT and his staff of Dave LesStrang, Darren Benjamin, Betsy Bina, Jaclyn Kilroy, Kristin Richmond, Ian Foley, and Mac Cloyes. Their late nights and early mornings have produced a product that members of Congress, particularly in the west, should be proud of.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2019

SPEECH OF

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes:

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, I would like to thank Chairman CALVERT for his great work on this bill, and my colleague Mr. OLSON for his support of this amendment.

My amendment would simply reduce the National Recreation and Preservation account by \$20 million, and then increase it by the same amount with the intent of using these funds to increase the budget of the National Maritime Heritage grant program.

This program provides federal funding for local and state operated maritime educational exhibits and preservation projects.

The United States has a rich history of maritime excellence that has played an important role in the U.S. becoming the powerful nation that it is today.

It is important that we preserve these great ships rather than let them fall into disrepair.

It is an insult to their legacy to let them sink rather than help them stay afloat.

For example, right outside my district back in Texas floats the Battleship *Texas*, the last great dreadnought.

But maybe not for long.

Growing up, I always looked forward to visiting the Battleship.

My best friend and I would climb from top to bottom, firing every gun and squeezing down every port hole.

When commissioned in 1914 she was the most powerful war ship the world had ever seen.

She was the first of her kind to mount anti-aircraft guns, use commercial radar, and launch an aircraft.

As the flagship of the U.S. fleet, she battered the Nazi defenses during the D-Day invasion at Normandy and also helped the invasions of Iwo Jima and Okinawa.

Then, at the end of the war, she made three trips to bring American servicemen back home.

Today, she serves as a museum and a reminder of wars long past.

Nearly 70 years after school children used nickels and dimes to pay for her move to her namesake state, here she still floats, but maybe not for long.

The Texas Department of Parks and Wildlife has jurisdiction of the battle wagon, but state funding has been sporadic and federal funding non-existent.

That is where this amendment comes into play.

We owe it to the Texans who served to save the Battleship *Texas*.

This battleship, like so many battlefields and sacred, historical landmarks across our country, is consecrated with the blood of Americans.

Without the *Texas*, things might have gone a little bit differently for us at D-Day or in the Pacific Theater.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE HEROIC MOYER
BROTHERS

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today to celebrate and commemorate the service of the seven Moyer brothers who fought in World War II. For a single family to send seven members to serve our nation in its time of need, they must have had a great love for America and what it stands for.

Franklin, Charles, Hile, James, Jay, Leonard, and Leslie, the children of Charles and Nina Moyer, were born and raised in Bass Lake Township, Washburn County. The brothers represented Wisconsin in almost every distinct branch of the military, serving in the Navy, Army, Merchant Marines, and Army Air Corps.

It is with great gratitude that I recognize these fine men who have made not only Wisconsin proud, but also the nation as a whole. Seven brothers. Seven stories. Seven immeasurable contributions to freedom, all from Wisconsin's 7th Congressional District.

On behalf of my family and Wisconsinites in every corner of our state, I would like to express my sincerest thanks to the Moyer brothers for their service to our nation when we needed them the most.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DR. MACK
MORRIS ON 50 YEARS OF MIN-
ISTRY

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Dr. Mack Morris on his 50 years of min-

istry. Dr. Mack Morris currently serves as the Senior Pastor of Woodridge Baptist Church in Mobile, Alabama.

Dr. Morris, a native of Dothan, Alabama, has faithfully served the Lord, our local community, the people of Alabama, and beyond for over half a century. Dr. Morris felt the call of the Lord and surrendered to the ministry at Maple Avenue Baptist Church in Geneva, Alabama in 1967. He was licensed to preach at the White House Baptist Church in Bay Minette, Alabama in 1968.

Within his period of dedicated service, Dr. Morris was called and served faithfully at all the following churches in Alabama: White House Baptist, Bethel Baptist, Tillman's Corner Baptist, Heritage Baptist, Old Spanish Fort Baptist, Jubilee Baptist, and Woodridge Baptist. Dr. Morris has been a supportive, faithful, and loyal advocate for his community throughout his ministry.

Dr. Morris has served on the Alabama State Board of Missions and Executive Board of the Alabama Baptist State Convention, as Moderator of the Mobile Baptist Association, as the first president of the Board of Regents at the University of Mobile, and as a trustee at the University of Mobile for eleven years.

During his 50 years of ministry, Dr. Morris has spread the Word of the Lord and His Saving Grace by officiating over 165 weddings, conducting over 547 funerals, and has seen the salvation and baptism of over 2,500 men, women, and children.

On behalf of Alabama's First Congressional District and the countless people his ministry has impacted, I want to recognize and share my deep gratitude with Dr. Mack Morris for his tireless service to our community.

IN MEMORY OF CHESTER "CHET"
MORGAN

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a man I have been fortunate enough to call neighbor and friend. Chester "Chet" Morgan, of Vernon, Connecticut, left this earth on Saturday after a lifetime of service to his community, his state and his nation. I'd like to take a few moments to reflect on his generosity and service.

Born in Manchester, CT, Chet Morgan's selfless life was inspired by President John F. Kennedy's 1961 inaugural call to action in which he asked not what our country could do for us, but what we could do for our country. For not only his country, but also his state, town and family, Chet did a great many good works.

In addition to his career with the Connecticut Department of Transportation, Chet served as a sergeant major in the 169th Infantry Battalion of the Connecticut National Guard for 30 years. He spent several of those years as his unit's First Sergeant at Connecticut's National Guard headquarters in Hartford and retired at the rank of sergeant major. It seems this line of work was Chet's true vocation and in 2017 he was inducted into the Connecticut Veterans Hall of Fame for his years of service in and outside of the Guard.

Chet felt loyalty not only to his country, but to his state. In 1976 he was elected to the

Connecticut State Legislature as the representative from the 56th district, his hometown of Vernon. He served until 1983 and the highlights of his tenure include supporting important legislation that provided a greater quality of life for Connecticut's citizenry through improvements like smoke-free restaurants and free tuition for Connecticut National Guardsman attending state colleges and universities.

Chet was also a staunch advocate for working families during his time in the legislature. In the 1960s he was a member of the International Association of Machinists while employed at Pratt & Whitney Aircraft. He was a courageous leader in a difficult strike in that era, and he and his closest friend, Chuck Harlow, manned the picket lines at the height of the struggles. He enjoyed telling those stories in the later years, particularly after Chuck passed away suddenly in the 1980s.

In 1986 when I launched my first campaign for the legislative seat Chet had held earlier, he generously helped me win that race, which I will never forget. Later as a candidate for the Second Congressional District, Chet volunteered to drive me to political events and offered valuable counsel during the long hours we spent together on the road.

Chet was also very involved in local government and community organizations. He served four terms on the Vernon Town Council and was chairman of the Vernon Planning and Zoning Committee in 2011 and 2012. He was actively involved in the Connecticut State Employees Association Local 2001, the Rockville American Legion Post 14, and the Rockville Lodge of Elks No. 1359, where he was recognized as Veteran Volunteer of the Year by the Elks National Veterans Service Commission.

And while I'm sure this comes as a surprise to no one, Chet was a model family man. He and his wife Sylvia celebrated their 60th wedding anniversary last year. Together they raised three children, Kevin, Daniel and Laura Beth who collectively gifted them with 16 grandchildren and great-grandchildren. It's clear Chet impressed the importance of service upon his children and grandchildren, as several of them have followed in his footsteps of service to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me in honoring Chet Morgan, a man to whom we can all look as a model of leadership and service. Chet's loss will be felt for years to come but his legacy will endure for much longer.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, for personal reasons, I was unable to vote yesterday, July 17, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted: Yea on Roll Call No. 331; Yea on Roll Call No. 332; Yea on Roll Call No. 333; Yea on Roll Call No. 334; and Yea on Roll Call No. 335.

RUSSIA ENERGY INTERESTS IN EUROPE

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, control of energy equals national security.

I rise to warn how Russia through hybrid warfare seeks to destabilize and divide our closest European Allies through control of their energy supply. As Americans well know, whoever controls the energy spigot, controls the function of a nation. Russia uses its growing dominance of energy in Europe as its primary pressure point to destabilize the West and our alliances.

That is why I was floored that President Trump inserted himself so haphazardly into Europe's energy debate. Nord Stream II poses new, troubling dependency threats by Russia on Europe's energy security.

It boosts undemocratic Russia's claw hold on the European continent.

Russia is weaponizing energy in countries across Europe, including Germany and Ukraine, creating a dangerous new dependency by recipient nations. The fight for Ukraine's liberty depends on its energy independence in the future. The free world must help Europe and Ukraine to reduce their economic reliance on Russian gas.

Risking alienation of nations that share freedom's values is counterproductive. It aids and abets our enemies.

I include in the RECORD President Trump's and Putin's comments.

EXCERPT OF PRESIDENT TRUMP'S AND PRESIDENT PUTIN'S PRESS CONFERENCE FOLLOWING THEIR SUMMIT IN HELSINKI, JULY 2018

RESPONSES TO A QUESTION ABOUT ENERGY IN EUROPE AND THE NORDSTREAM II PIPELINE PROJECT

Trump: Well, actually I called him a competitor. And a good competitor he is. And I think the word "competitor" is a compliment. I think that we will be completing when you talk about the pipeline. I'm not sure, necessarily, that it's in the best interests of Germany or not, but that was a decision that they made. We'll be competing—as you know, the United States is now—or soon will be, but I think it actually is right now the largest in the oil and gas world.

So we're going to be selling LNG, and we'll have to be competing with the pipeline and I think we'll compete successfully, although there is a little advantage locationally.

So I just wish them luck. I mean, I did. I discussed with Angela Merkel in pretty strong tones. But I also know where they're all coming from and they have a very close source. So we'll see how that all works out.

Putin: We are aware of the stance of President Trump, and I think that we, as a major oil and gas power, and the United States as a major oil and gas power as well, we could work together on regulation of international markets, because neither of us is actually interested in the plummeting of the prices. And the consumers will suffer as well, and the consumers in the United States will suffer as well. And the shale gas production will suffer. Because beyond a sudden price break-up (ph), it's no longer profitable to—to produce gas.

But nor we are interested in driving prices up, because it will drain just as—just as from all other sectors of the economy, from (in-

audible) building (ph), et cetera. So we do have space for cooperation here.

That's the first thing.

Then about the Nord Stream 2, Mr. President voiced his concerns about the possibility of disappearance of transit through Ukraine. And I reassured Mr. President that Russia stands ready to maintain this transit. Moreover, we stand ready to extend this transit contract that's about to expire next year in case—if the dispute between the economic entities—dispute will be settled in the Stockholm arbitration court.

H.R. 3030, H.R. 5480, H.R. 5105, H.R. 4819

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we voted on a number of critical pieces of legislation. One of these, which I supported, was H.R. 3030, the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2017, sponsored by my friend ANN WAGNER.

This bill will strengthen our efforts to anticipate, prevent, and mitigate genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes.

Our Foreign Service officers are often on the front lines where there is a risk or reality of atrocity crimes. H.R. 3030 will ensure they have the right training to recognize and respond to early warning signs of such crimes. This legislation will also strengthen Congressional oversight by requiring the President to annually report on what is happening on the ground, how the United States has responded, and recommendations for strengthening U.S. response. I was proud to cosponsor this bill and I commend my colleagues for supporting it.

I commend my colleague for naming this bill after the late, iconic Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel. He spoke so powerfully about the unique, persistent evil of anti-Semitism that generated the Holocaust, warning that "the antisemite is by definition ideologically fanatic and pathologically racist . . . an antisemite is someone who has never met me, never heard of me, yet he hates me."

Mr. Wiesel and I worked together at the historic 2004 Berlin conference of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. There 55 participating governments committed to specific, significant actions to combat anti-Semitism. They were following the parliamentary movement to get the OSCE to fully and forcefully fight anti-Semitism. That movement originated in a Helsinki Commission hearing I chaired in May 2002 and I was proud to lead this movement together with parliamentarians from Germany, the UK, and France.

In his Berlin keynote address, Mr. Wiesel said, "We know . . . that anti-Semitism is dangerous not only to Jews but to countries too, where it is allowed to flourish . . . When a Jew is slapped in the face, humankind itself falls to ground . . . Antisemitism is rooted in hatred; its language is a language of hatred, its doctrine is filled with hatred—and hatred by its nature, always runs overboard, crossing geographical boundaries and ethnic affiliations. It is a contagious disease."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wiesel also dedicated his life to the prevention of other genocides, calling for action to prevent genocides in Bosnia,

Rwanda, and Sudan. Yet another genocide was committed after Sudan, this one against Christians, Yazidis, and other religious and ethnic minorities in Iraq and Syria by ISIS. The survival of these ancient communities depends on humanitarian, stabilization, and recovery assistance from the United States and other countries.

Last June this house unanimously passed H.R. 390, the Iraq and Syria Genocide Emergency Relief and Accountability Act, so that our aid reaches the genocide survivors and perpetrators are held accountable. The Senate has still not been given the opportunity to vote on this urgently needed legislation. I again call for the Senate to pass H.R. 390 now and send it to the President for his signature. This legislation will significantly strengthen the ongoing efforts of his Administration to directly help Christian and Yazidi genocide survivors at risk of extinction.

Another critical piece of legislation for which I voted in support was the Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act, H.R. 5480.

Chairman ROYCE's Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act expands, and improves upon, our previous microenterprise legislation. By way of background, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has a long history in this field, dating back at least to former chairman Ben Gilman's Microenterprise for Self-Reliance and International Anti-Corruption Act of 2000. I myself introduced the Microenterprise Results and Accountability Act of 2004, and a bill that amended the 2000 legislation, both of which became law.

In keeping with a deeper understanding of how to combat poverty and maintaining a needed focus on women, Chairman ROYCE's bill broadens the scope from microenterprise to include small and medium enterprises. While it is important to make sure that the very poor are not being neglected, small and medium enterprises help power development and thereby empower the poor. Thus I encouraged all to support H.R. 5480 and the House voted to pass the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I also supported H.R. 5105, the BUILD Act.

I thank my friend and colleague, Mr. TED YOHO of Florida, for offering this critical and visionary legislation. This legislation will modernize development finance to benefit the developing world, consistent with U.S. policy objectives.

To cite one critical component, the BUILD Act serves to counteract China's strategy in Africa, which uses development finance as a means to serve China's ends, even if that means propping up brutal dictators.

I thank Chairman ED ROYCE for his leadership in guiding this legislation through the Foreign Affairs Committee, and for his responsiveness to concerns I had relayed, relating to China.

In particular, I appreciate changes made to the initial draft of this bill concerning the denominating of future loans in foreign currencies.

While the International Development Finance Corporation that this legislation would create needs to have flexibility, including issuing loans in foreign currencies, we must remember it is also the long-term geostrategic goal of China, Russia, and certain other countries to replace the dollar as the world's reserve currency.

I therefore appreciate Chairman ROYCE's amended text, which adds, "Foreign currency denominated loans and guarantees should only be provided if the Board determines there is a substantive policy rationale for such loans and guarantees."

Beyond this, however, there should be a clear policy statement on the importance and overall strategic interest in retaining the dollar as the world's reserve currency. Indeed, earlier this year, China met with central bankers from 14 African nations to discuss the viability of using China's yuan as the reserve currency for the region.

This nonetheless underscores the urgency for creating an International Development Finance Corporation, which the BUILD Act accomplishes, while underscoring the need for policy guidance that loans in foreign currencies not be used to undermine reserve dollar dominance.

I further voiced support of H.R. 4819, the DELTA Act, introduced by my friend and colleague Mr. JEFF FORTENBERRY of Nebraska, of which I was a cosponsor.

There is much in this bill to recommend it—from prioritizing anti-poaching and wildlife trafficking efforts in the greater Okavango River Basin, to helping preserve the majestic elephant and other endangered species, to providing sustainable livelihoods for local communities.

One other aspect of this bill which I highlighted was that it enables us to partner with, and coordinate efforts with, the countries of Botswana, Namibia and Angola.

Botswana and Namibia in particular are two countries which are often overlooked, but which have made great strides in recent years towards becoming responsible partners. Both are, in the context of Africa, good places in which to do business, and should be commended for their efforts in improving governance. Their partnership in the greater Okavango initiative underscores this trend.

Angola is a nation which, after decades of civil war followed by strongman rule, is beginning to tackle corruption under new President João Lourenço. While it remains to be seen how far and how quickly Angola can go toward becoming a reliable partner and a country in which to do business, its inclusion as a DELTA Act partner country is a sign of confidence in the future.

I urged my colleagues to support the DELTA Act, and it also passed the House yesterday.

CONGRESSIONAL TRIBUTE FOR
THE EMPLOYEES OF FLEET
READINESS CENTER-EAST IN
HONOR OF THEIR 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize a vital strategic asset for Marine aviation. Fleet Readiness Center-East (FRC-East) has been generating combat air power for America's Marines and naval forces for 75 years. The organizational history begins December 16, 1943, when it opened as the Assembly and Repair Department at Marine

Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina to perform aircraft maintenance for the air station and nearby airfields.

After distinguished and commendable service in the final years of World War II, the facility's name changed to the Overhaul and Repair Department. With the advent of the jet age, the depot continued to expand to meet the needs of combat aviation during the Korean War.

In the mid-1960s, the Depot specialized in Navy and Marine Corps rework and had become a vital source in supporting fleet operations during the Vietnam War. In 1967, the facility was organizationally detached from Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point and placed under Navy management as a naval air rework facility. In 1968, the facility ranked as the second largest industrial plant in North Carolina.

The late 1970s saw significant changes and modernization for the facility. It was during this period that the facility attained the highest degree of productivity in its history. The Depot received numerous awards for excellence in productivity and cost reduction.

During the 1980s and 1990s, the Depot received many upgrades to improve productivity, support and expand the aviation capabilities to keep current with new technology and workload. In November 1987, a team departed for the third time in history to Antarctica to repair an aircraft that had crashed nearly 16 years earlier. The facility was then renamed the Naval Aviation Depot.

The Depot provided assistance to the fleet in Operations Desert Shield/Desert Storm in Iraq with field team deployments to various locations for engines, components, aircraft, ground support equipment and squadron support. Since this time, FRC-East supported the War in Iraq and Afghanistan and the Global War on Terrorism.

Today, FRC-East has grown to become the largest industrial employer east of Interstate 95 with 119 buildings and 2.1 million square feet, spanning over 147 acres valued at \$1.36 billion. The workforce includes more than 3,900 employees, which provide aircraft, engine and component maintenance, engineering and logistics support for U.S. forces and 24 foreign nations.

On this 75th anniversary year, I would like to thank the outstanding employees of FRC-East for their continued outstanding service and support to our nation, our allies, and its Eastern North Carolina community. I wish FRC-East continued success for its next 75 years of support to our warfighters.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF
ED KIRKWOOD

HON. MIKE KELLY

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of my constituents from Butler, Pennsylvania, Mr. Ed Kirkwood. This Friday, July 20th, Ed will be retiring following over 34 years of commendable public service.

Ed has proudly served as the Butler Township Manager for the last 10 years. In this role, Ed oversaw the day-to-day operations of

Butler Township while spearheading various projects and serving as the administrative officer of the township. Prior to this position, Ed spent over 18 years managing the City of Lower Burrell—Where he made a positive and lasting impact that can still be felt today.

Throughout his tenure, Ed has displayed an admirable work ethic and a sincere desire to make a difference. His stewardship of Butler Township has resulted not only in continued prosperity of its businesses and residents, but also transformed the overall professional environment. Local officials have a direct impact on residents through a number of capacities, which Ed realized and cherished. Regardless of the situation or circumstances, Ed always remained resilient and kept the township on the right path—Focusing on the best interests of the people he felt privileged to represent.

Though he made a career for himself in public service, Ed still managed to give back to his community as a volunteer. He has participated on a number of boards and served as a member of numerous committees, continuously striving to make a difference and better the lives of others. Ed participated in the committees that were formed to rewrite and modernize both the First and Third Class Township Codes, which eventually granted cities legal authority to operate in an efficient manner.

In addition, Ed was the Director of the “U-Comp Board” which was developed to assist municipalities and authorities across the state with unemployment solutions and assistance. Ed served on the Little League Board of Directors for nearly 20 years and volunteered as a mentor for individuals who committed first time offenses.

Ed’s decades of service prove him to be a leader in every sense of the word. I am grateful to represent such a service-minded individual who has been both honorable and effective. Under his management, Butler Township has flourished while residents and businesses have been enriched.

Ed is the epitome of a devoted public servant and his strong leadership has provided a solid vision for Butler Township. His unique people skills, thoughtfulness and integrity have resulted in many years of professional and invaluable service for which he will be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Ed Kirkwood for his lifelong dedication to public service and for all of the work he has done to better the community. Furthermore, I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Ed on his well-earned retirement and wishing him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

HONORING COLONEL ROGER
DONLON

HON. JOHN J. FASO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Colonel Roger Donlon for his exemplary service to our nation. A native of Saugerties, New York, Mr. Donlon bravely served our country in the U.S. Army for thirty years. Though his humility, fierce loyalty, and steadfast patriotism, Mr. Donlon has redefined

bravery and showed us that our freedoms have not come without many sacrifices.

In May 1964, Mr. Donlon was sent to Vietnam as Captain of the U.S. Army 7th Special Forces Team A-726 assigned to defend Camp Nam Dong. In the early hours of July 6, 1964, a Viet Cong battalion unleashed a surprise attack on Camp Nam Dong. Throughout the five-hour battle, Mr. Donlon remained focused and determined, swiftly repositioning himself around the camp, directing counterfire, giving his men encouragement, and even providing care to the wounded despite his own injuries. His valiant efforts in the face of Viet Cong aggression made Mr. Donlon the first person to receive the Medal of Honor, the military’s highest decoration, in the Vietnam War.

Although Mr. Donlon’s formal service in the U.S. Army has ended, his service to our country continues today. Through his active involvement with the Medal of Honor Foundation’s Medal of Honor Character Development Program, the Westmoreland Scholar Foundation, as well as regularly talking to students and servicemen and women, Mr. Donlon is an important role model for our communities, our military, and the next generation of soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring Colonel Roger Donlon on his lifetime of hard work and dedicated service to the United States.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber Roll Call votes 331 through 335 on Tuesday, July 17, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted “Nay” on Roll Call votes 331 and 332, and “Yea” on Roll Call votes 333, 334, and 335.

TRIBUTE TO IOWA SELECT FARMS AND THE DEB AND JEFF HANSEN FOUNDATION

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Iowa Select Farms and the Deb and Jeff Hansen Foundation for being honored by the Army National Guard for their outstanding support of Army Guard Soldiers across the state of Iowa.

Iowa Select Farms has been honoring Iowa’s soldiers for 12 years now by distributing pork and pork products to all military families during the holidays. Lieutenant General Timothy J. Kadavy, director of the Army National Guard, noted the “positive impact” that employers such as the Deb and Jeff Hansen Foundation have on Soldiers’ lives and thanked those “who do so much for the men and women who serve in the Army National Guard.”

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize Iowa Select Farms and the Deb and Jeff Hansen Foundation today. I know that my

colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in applauding their ongoing support of our military members.

HONORING CHIEF IRA LEWIS

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of Chief Ira Lewis (USCG, retired) of Harker’s Island, North Carolina, and recognize his turning 100 years old on August 2, 2018. On Saturday, August 18, 2018, the Town of Harker’s Island and the surrounding community will formally honor Chief Lewis as their oldest living citizen. The celebration will include a United States Coast Guard reunion, parade, and recognition ceremony.

Ira Lewis was born on Harker’s Island on August 2, 1918. At the age of 16, he had to make the difficult decision to leave school early in order to support his family. Having four brothers that served either in the Coast Guard or Navy, Ira followed suit and joined the United States Coast Guard in 1938, serving diligently until his retirement on August 1, 1959. From his enlistment through March 1957, Chief Lewis’ assignments included Stations Bellport, Ditch Plans, Forge River, Rockaway Atlantic Beach, Smith’s Point, Napeague and Moriches Lifeboat Station. From March 1957 until his retirement on August 1, 1959, Chief Lewis served as the lighthouse keeper at Montauk Lighthouse, Long Island, N.Y.

After retirement, Chief Lewis returned home to Harker’s Island, North Carolina and began to build his family home with his own hands. This home would house his wife, Maggie; son, Phil; and daughter, Ann. After completing his home, Chief Lewis went to work at the commissary aboard Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point for eleven years. Upon completing his career at the commissary, he started a commercial fishing business, where he piloted two vessels, and persevered through that often challenging career for twenty-three years.

As the commercial industry began to decline, Chief Lewis looked for a new path, and decided to give back to his community. He went on to serve with several boards and community improvement teams. Of note was the Carteret County Harbor Committee, which helped secure funding to upgrade harbors for commercial fishers. Chief Lewis also worked with a team to initiate the Veterans’ Memorial Project, which now stands on the grounds of the Harker’s Island Elementary School.

As a result of his years of service, Chief Lewis was awarded the prestigious and exclusive Order of the Long Leaf Pine in 2013 by the Governor of North Carolina. This award is presented to individuals who have a proven record of extraordinary service to the state. That same year, he was honored with a United States Coast Guard Medallion in recognition of his 95th birthday. A revered man, the Core Sound Waterfowl Museum of Harker’s Island also hosts a permanent Life Saving Service and United States Coast Guard display in honor of Chief Lewis’ many contributions during his career.

Chief Lewis has given his life to public service through his career with the United States

Coast Guard and his work in the community. In recognition of his long life and commitment to service of our nation and fellow Americans, I wish to recognize Chief Ira Lewis.

RECOGNIZING AND CELEBRATING
INTEL CORPORATION'S 50TH AN-
NIVERSARY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues ANNA ESHOO and RO KHANNA, to recognize and celebrate Intel Corporation's 50th anniversary. Intel who some call the "most important company in the world," has long been an enormously significant company of the global digital economy.

On July 18, 1968—50 years ago today—Intel was founded by semiconductor pioneers Bob Noyce and Gordon Moore. One of their first hires was Andy Grove—a refugee who had immigrated from communist-controlled Hungary at the age of 20. He finished his education in the United States at the City College of New York and the University of California, Berkeley. Intel initially set about making memory chips, but within three years had invented the very first microprocessor. For the next thirty years, Noyce, Moore, and Grove were successive CEOs of Intel, during which the company's innovative, cutting-edge research, and industry leading technology profoundly changed how the world connected, communicated, and did business. Starting with just 12 employees at its founding in 1968, Intel has now grown to be the largest semiconductor manufacturer in the world, with over one hundred thousand employees globally.

Since its founding, Intel products pushed the envelope in terms of what computers and microprocessors could achieve. Today, Intel and its founders are rightfully considered icons in Silicon Valley. Bob Noyce and Gordon Moore's decision to strike out on their own with a plan to pursue superior technology helped ignite the startup culture that still defines Silicon Valley to this day. Bob Noyce earned his nickname as "Mayor of Silicon Valley," and was instrumental in crafting the casual, hands-on work environment that remains the standard in Silicon Valley. He provided counsel to countless younger CEO's, among them Steve Jobs. Gordon Moore is the renowned author of "Moore's Law," the guiding principle of the semiconductor industry, which predicts a doubling of the number of transistors on an integrated circuit every two years. Remarkably, that standard still holds true today. Andy Grove's encouragement of innovation, risk-taking, and open communication drove the company to ever-higher levels of success and competitiveness, and has had a lasting impact on the culture of Silicon Valley.

For the past 50 years, Intel has been an engine of innovation in Silicon Valley. Just last week, the San Jose Mercury News reported that—were the San Francisco Bay Area a nation of its own—it would be the 19th largest economy in the world. The astounding success of Silicon Valley can be attributed to many things, but few companies have played such an integral role in the early molding of Silicon Valley into the worldwide leader of in-

novation and technology it is today. Bob Noyce, Gordon Moore, and Andy Grove built a legacy and a company to be proud of, and we join in offering our sincere congratulations to the Intel Corporation for their 50 years of innovation and excellence.

IN APPRECIATION OF CALVIN
MITCHELL AND HIS SERVICE TO
THE HOMELAND SECURITY COM-
MITTEE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as the Ranking Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I rise to express my appreciation of Mr. Calvin Mitchell upon the conclusion of his service to the Committee as a Congressional Fellow.

Since joining the Committee this past November, Mr. Mitchell has made valuable contributions to our legislative and oversight work by sharing his considerable knowledge of federal acquisitions. He has been a reliable resource to our staff on all Department of Homeland Security acquisition-related matters. Additionally, during his tenure on the Committee, Mr. Mitchell was deeply involved in our oversight of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's response to Hurricane Maria which devastated Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Additionally, he helped develop innovative approaches to promote federal procurement opportunities for small businesses and enhance the participation of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) in federal acquisitions.

Throughout his time on the Committee, Mr. Mitchell has displayed a high degree of professionalism and personal commitment to providing Members of the Committee and staff valuable insight and information. In all of this, Calvin has demonstrated benevolence, vitality, and enthusiasm, which has helped all of us enormously.

We thank Calvin for his service to the Committee and our country and wish him the very best as he returns to the General Services Administration.

THE DEVASTATING IMPACT OF
THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S
AUTO TARIFFS ON ALABAMA

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the U.S. Department of Commerce Section 232 investigation into automobile imports and the negative impact that it could have on Alabama's economy. In my district, I have both a Hyundai and Mercedes auto manufacturing facility. Not only do they produce cars for the U.S. and foreign markets, but they provide thousands of high paying jobs for my constituents. Last year alone international automakers invested \$10.2 billion in the state of Alabama, employing more than 80,000 citizens, and providing good wages and benefits to their employees.

On May 23rd, Secretary Wilbur Ross announced that the Commerce Department would begin an investigation into whether imports of automobiles and auto parts threaten national security. However, before the Department of Commerce could begin their investigation, President Trump delegitimized the entire process by prematurely stating that he wanted a 25 percent tariff on automotive imports. We now know that this investigation is just a justification for this administration's desire to implement 19th century style tariffs on America's allies around the globe.

The Peterson Institute for International Economics predicts that if the new auto tariffs are implemented, the United States will lose 624,000 jobs and production would fall by 4 percent. As Members of Congress, we cannot stand by and allow this administration's destructive trade policies to hurt American workers. As a result, I led a bipartisan letter, co-signed by 149 Members of Congress, to Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross expressing concern with the Section 232 investigation into auto imports. The letter highlights the auto industry's importance to working families and the nation's economy, as well as the vast network of international suppliers that the industry relies on to stay competitive.

I strongly urge the Trump Administration to think carefully about the impact of the autos 232 investigation, and the devastating effect tariffs could have on American workers. Rather than endangering American jobs through a trade war with our allies, we need to strengthen our trading relationships to better position U.S. workers in the global marketplace.

HONORING THE BIRTH OF NELSON
MANDELA

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2018

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today marks 100 years since the birth of famed political leader and philanthropist, Nelson Mandela. Often referred to as the "Father of the Nation," Mandela is best known for serving as South Africa's first black head of state and using his administration to dismantle the strict system of apartheid that existed in South Africa from 1948 until the mid-1990s. Since that time, Mandela has become a global icon of democracy and social justice, which is relevant even today as we continue to wrestle with our own issues of divisiveness and racial disparities.

Mandela began his activism at a relatively young age. While studying law at the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, Mandela quickly became involved in a movement fighting against racial discrimination. In 1944, Mandela joined the African National Congress (ANC) and worked to establish its youth league, the ANCYL, in order to help foster new leaders and call for civil disobedience against the new laws that came with apartheid.

By 1961, Mandela co-founded an armed wing of the ANC once the government would not respond to peaceful demands for equality. Mandela was ultimately imprisoned for nearly three decades, where he was subjected to inhumane punishment and other atrocities.

Once Mandela was released from prison, he quickly moved to lead the ANC in negotiations with the governing National Party to bring an end to apartheid. By May 10, 1994, Mandela was elected and sworn in as the first black president of South Africa—a position he would use to bring peace and equality to the nation. After leaving office, he continued to help address global issues through direct intervention and through the Nelson Mandela Foundation. Nelson Mandela died on December 5, 2013, after a long and fruitful life.

Mr. Speaker, Nelson Mandela left behind a lasting legacy that will continue to inspire generations to come. It is fitting that even after one hundred years, as our society continues to overcome challenges to our democracy and social justice, that we honor such a timeless figure in our history. Even in death, his selfless dedication to equality and democratic ideology serve as a reminder that we must always be fighting to defend the values that we hold dear as a nation. It is in the absence of such a strong defense of our values that we succumb to the tyranny and oppression of the past.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the *Extensions of Remarks* section of the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 19, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's *RECORD*.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 24

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Dan Michael Berkovitz, of Maryland, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and James E. Hubbard, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of Agri-

culture for Natural Resources and Environment.

SR-328A

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Elad L. Roisman, of Maine, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Michael R. Bright, of the District of Columbia, to be President, Government National Mortgage Association, and Rae Oliver, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, both of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Dino Falaschetti, of Montana, to be Director, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard

To hold hearings to examine the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's blue economy initiative, focusing on supporting commerce in American oceans and Great Lakes.

SR-253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine factors that are impacting global oil prices.

SD-366

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security

To hold hearings to examine strengthening and empowering United States amateur athletes, focusing on moving forward with solutions.

SR-253

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy

To hold hearings to examine the China challenge, focusing on economic coercion as statecraft.

SD-419

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

JULY 25

9:30 a.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Joseph Maguire, of Florida, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and Ellen E. McCarthy, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Intelligence and Research).

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the race to 5G, focusing on exploring spectrum

needs to maintain United States global leadership.

SR-253

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 2554, to ensure that health insurance issuers and group health plans do not prohibit pharmacy providers from providing certain information to enrollees, H.R. 1222, to amend the Public Health Service Act to coordinate Federal congenital heart disease research efforts and to improve public education and awareness of congenital heart disease, S. 2465, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a sickle cell disease prevention and treatment demonstration program and to provide for sickle cell disease research, surveillance, prevention, and treatment, S. 3016, to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve essential oral health care for low-income and other underserved individuals by breaking down barriers to care, and pending nominations.

SD-430

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the innovation economy, entrepreneurship, and barriers to capital access.

LHOB-1100

2 p.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine the state of play, focusing on globalized corruption, state-run doping, and international sport.

SD-562

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness

To hold hearings to examine destination Mars, focusing on putting American boots on the surface of the red planet.

SR-253

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine American diplomacy to advance our national security strategy.

SD-419

JULY 26

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine the challenges and opportunities of the proposed government reorganization on Office of Personnel Management and General Services Administration.

SD-342

2 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive a closed briefing regarding certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5027–S5078

Measures Introduced: Twelve bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3229–3240, and S. Res. 576–580. **Page S5066**

Measures Passed:

Microloan Modernization Act: Senate passed S. 526, to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S5072–73**

Rounds (for Risch) Amendment No. 3397, to strike section 4. **Page S5073**

Small Business Innovation Protection Act: Senate passed S. 791, to amend the Small Business Act to expand intellectual property education and training for small businesses. **Pages S073–74**

White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act: Senate passed S. 2850, to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S5074**

Rounds (for Flake) Amendment No. 3398, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S5074**

Bounds Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Pages S5045–59**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 50 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 161), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S5044–45**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, July 19, 2018; and that all time in recess, adjournment, morning business, and Leader remarks count against post-cloture time. **Page S5074**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 50 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. EX. 160), Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit. **Pages S5027–44, S5078**
1 Coast Guard nomination in the rank of admiral. **Pages S5072, S5078**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Scott Hutchins, of Indiana, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Research, Education, and Economics.

Lane Genatowski, of New York, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, Department of Energy.

David Hale, of New Jersey, to be an Under Secretary of State (Political Affairs).

Kip Tom, of Indiana, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the United Nations Agencies for Food and Agriculture.

Donald Y. Yamamoto, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Somalia.

Charles Wickser Banta, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022.

Michelle Itczak, of Indiana, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2020.

Barbara Coleen Long, of Missouri, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022.

Carleton Varney, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022.

Richard S. Tischner, of Virginia, to be Director of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia for a term of six years.

Donald L. Palmer, of Florida, to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission for a term expiring December 12, 2021.

2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, and Navy. **Pages S5075–78**

Messages from the House:

Page S5064

Measures Referred:	Pages S5064–65
Measures Placed on the Calendar:	Page S5065
Executive Communications:	Pages S5065–66
Additional Cosponsors:	Pages S5066–67
Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:	Pages S5067–71
Amendments Submitted:	Page S5072
Authorities for Committees to Meet:	Page S5072
Privileges of the Floor:	Page S5072
Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—161)	Pages S5044–45

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:24 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, July 19, 2018. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5074.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SHARKS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine sharks, after receiving testimony from Alistair Dove, Georgia Aquarium, Atlanta; Amy Kukulya, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, Massachusetts; Cheryl Ann Denesha Wilga, University of Alaska, Anchorage; and Robert E. Hueter, Mote Marine Laboratory, Sarasota, Florida.

TRADE AND COMMERCE AT U.S. PORTS OF ENTRY

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness concluded a hearing to examine trade and commerce at United States ports of entry, after receiving testimony from Kevin K. McAleenan, Commissioner, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; Mayor Pete Saenz, Laredo, Texas, on behalf of the Texas Border Coalition; Sergio Contreras, Rio Grande Valley Partnership, Weslaco, Texas, on behalf of the Border Trade Alliance; Kurt Nagle, American Association of Port Authorities, Alexandria, Virginia; and Mary Ann Bucci, Port of Pittsburgh Commission, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary (Management), who was introduced by Senator Cornyn, and Denise Natali, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant

Secretary (Conflict and Stabilization Operations), both of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

ADMINISTRATION'S GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Administration's government reorganization proposal, after receiving testimony from Margaret Weichert, Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget.

INDIAN AFFAIRS LEGISLATION

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 2154, to approve the Kickapoo Tribe Water Rights Settlement Agreement, S. 3060, to repeal section 2141 of the Revised Statutes to remove the prohibition on certain alcohol manufacturing on Indian lands, and S. 3168, to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to make Reclamation Water Settlements Fund permanent, after receiving testimony from Alan Mikkelsen, Senior Advisor to the Secretary of the Interior for Water and Western Resource Issues, and Chair, Working Group on Indian Water Settlements; John E. Tubbs, State of Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation Director, Helena; Lester Randall, Kickapoo Tribe, Horton, Kansas; and Harry Pickernell, Sr., Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation, Oakville, Washington.

FEDERAL INVESTMENT IN DNA ANALYSIS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine promoting justice for victims of crime, focusing on the Federal investment in DNA analysis, including S. 2577, to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004, S. 2345, to amend the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 to provide additional resources to State and local prosecutors, and S. 2266, to authorize the Office on Violence Against Women to improve the handling of crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by incorporating a trauma-informed approach into the initial response to and investigation of such crimes, after receiving testimony from Gerald M. LaPorte, Director, Office of Investigative and Forensic Sciences, National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice; Gretta L. Goodwin, Director, Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office; Debbie Smith, H-E-A-R-T, Williamsburg, Virginia; Matthew J. Gamette, Idaho State Police Forensic Services, Garner, North Carolina, on behalf of the Association of

Crime Lab Directors; and Penny Young Nance, Concerned Women for America, Washington, D.C.

ECONOMIC STABILITY AND SELF-SUFFICIENCY

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine supporting economic stability and self-sufficiency as Americans with disabilities

and their families age, after receiving testimony from Jack Stollsteimer, Deputy Treasurer of Pennsylvania for Consumer Programs, Harrisburg; Kelly Nye-Lengerman, University of Minnesota Institute on Community Integration, Minneapolis; Edward Mitchell, Jackson Area Center for Independent Living, Jackson, Tennessee; and Benjamin Wright, Wilmington, North Carolina.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 23 public bills, H.R. 6414–6436; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 1003 were introduced. **Pages H6556–58**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6558–59**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 982, resolution of inquiry requesting the President, and directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to transmit, respectively, certain information to the House of Representatives referring to the separation of children from their parents or guardians as a result of the President's "zero tolerance" policy (H. Rept. 115–835);

H.R. 2345, to require the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-to-remember dialing code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–836);

H.R. 4881, to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a task force for meeting the connectivity and technology needs of precision agriculture in the United States, with amendments (H. Rept. 115–837);

H.R. 3916, to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to vest in the Secretary of the Interior functions under that Act with respect to species of fish that spawn in fresh or estuarine waters and migrate to ocean waters, and species of fish that spawn in ocean waters and migrate to fresh water, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–838);

H.R. 577, to designate a peak in the State of Nevada as Maude Frazier Mountain (H. Rept. 115–839);

H.R. 3045, to amend the National Trails System Act to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–840);

H.R. 3994, to establish the Office of Internet Connectivity and Growth, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–841);

H.R. 4606, to provide that applications under the Natural Gas Act for the importation or exportation of small volumes of natural gas shall be granted without modification or delay, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–842); and

H.R. 5709, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for enhanced penalties for pirate radio, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–843). **Page H6556**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Fleischmann to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6467**

Recess: The House recessed at 11 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6474**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Chaplain John L. Vernon, Jr., High Point Police Department, High Point, North Carolina. **Page H6474**

Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018—Motion to go to Conference: The House agreed by unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendment and request a conference on H.R. 2, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023. **Pages H6493–95**

Agreed to the Peterson motion to instruct conferees by a yea-and-nay vote of 392 yeas to 20 nays, Roll No. 336. **Pages H6493–95**

Later, the Chair appointed the following conferees:

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Conaway, Thompson of Pennsylvania, Goodlatte, Lucas, Rogers of Alabama, Austin Scott of Georgia, Crawford, Hartzler, Rodney Davis of Illinois, Yoho, Rouzer, Marshall, Arrington, Peterson, David Scott of Georgia, Costa, Walz, Fudge,

McGovern, Vela, Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Kuster of New Hampshire, and O'Halleran.

Page H6501

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of secs. 4204, 4205, and 9131 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Foxx, Allen, and Adams.

Page H6501

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of subtitles A and B of title VI, secs. 6202, 6203, 6401, 6406, 6407, 6409, 6603, 7301, 7605, 8106, 8507, 9119, 9121, and 11101 of the House bill, and secs. 6116, 6117, 6202, 6206–09, 6301, 6303, 7412, 9102, 9104, 9106, 9111–13, 12408, 12627, and 12628 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Shimkus, Cramer, and Tonko.

Page H6501

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of sec. 12609 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Hensarling, Duffy, and Maxine Waters of California.

Page H6501

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title III of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Royce of California, Chabot, and Engel.

Page H6501

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of secs. 2802, 6408, 8104, 8107, 8109, subtitles B and C of title VIII, 8402, 8502, 8503, 8506, 8507, 8509, 8510, 9111, 11614, and 11615 of the House bill, and sec. 2425, subtitle D of title VIII, secs. 8601, 8611, 8621–28, 8631, 8632, 12515, 12601, and 12602 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Bishop of Utah, Westerman, and Grijalva.

Page H6501

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of secs. 1601, 4022, 4026, 8502, and 11609 of the House bill, and secs. 3113, 7128, 8623, 8630, 8632, 12301, and 12407 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Walker, Comer, and Plaskett.

Page H6501

From the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of sec. 7509 of the House bill, and sec. 7409 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Abraham, Dunn, and Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas.

Page H6501

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of secs. 2404, 6223, 6224, 6503, 9117, and 9118 of the House bill, and secs. 2415, 2416, 6124, 6304, and 7412 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to

conference: Representatives Denham, Gibbs, and Bustos.

Page H6501

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement: H. Res. 990, amended, supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nays vote of 244 yeas to 35 nays with 133 answering "present", Roll No. 337.

Pages H6486–93, H6495

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Tuesday, July 17th.

Authorizing the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs: H.R. 1037, amended, to authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nays vote of 414 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 338.

Pages H6495–96

Expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 1001, providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 119) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy, by a recorded vote of 229 yeas to 183 noes, Roll No. 340, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nays vote of 226 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 339.

Pages H6478–86, H6496–97

Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2019: The House continued consideration of H.R. 6147, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019. Consideration began yesterday, July 17th.

Page H6497

Agreed to:

O'Halleran amendment (No. 27 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that was debated on July 17th that moves \$3,000,000 from the Office of the Special Trustee to the Office of Navajo-Hopi Indian Relocation (by a recorded vote of 217 yeas to 196 noes, Roll No. 343);

Pages H6499–H6500

Moore amendment (No. 42 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that bars the use of funds to reorganize or eliminate the Great Lakes Advisory Board;

Page H6502

Moore amendment (No. 45 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that maintains FY 2018 funding for an authorized program to address lead in drinking water; **Pages H6504–05**

Loudermilk amendment (No. 47 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prohibits funds from being used to regulate trailers under the Clean Air Act; **Pages H6506–07**

Byrne amendment (No. 52 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prevents the re-purposing of Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act funds; **Page H6511**

Burgess amendment (No. 53 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that places a funding limitation on the EPA's ability to utilize the Title 42 special pay authority; **Pages H6511–12**

Young (AK) amendment (No. 58 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prevents funds from being used to change existing placer mining plan of operations with regard to reclamation activities; **Pages H6515–16**

Perry amendment (No. 59 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prohibits the EPA from using funds to give formal notification under, or prepare, propose, implement, administer, or enforce any rule or recommendation pursuant to section 115 of the Clean Air Act; **Pages H6516–17**

Posey amendment (No. 64 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that no funds will be made available in contravention of Federal Acquisition Regulation 6.101(a) with respect to aviation helmets; **Page H6521**

Denham amendment (No. 65 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prevents federal funds from being used to implement the State of California's Bay-Delta Plan; **Pages H6521–23**

Abraham amendment (No. 66 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prevents the enforcement of limitations or prohibitions on the use of genetically modified crops in commercial agricultural operations conducted on National Wildlife Refuges; **Page H6523**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 67 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prohibits the use of funds to eliminate or restrict programs aimed at reforestation of urban areas; **Pages H6523–25**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 68 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prohibits funds to be used to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution; **Pages H6525–28**

Larson (CT) amendment (No. 71 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that provides funding within the Department of the Treasury, Departmental Office (\$100,000 from the proposed \$208,751,000) towards a study, led by Treasury with the participation of relevant regulators, to examine the financial impact of the mineral pyrrhotite in concrete home foundations; the study should provide recommendations on regulatory and legislative actions needed to help

mitigate impact on banks, mortgage lenders, tax revenues, and homeowners; **Pages H6530–31**

Young (AK) amendment (No. 72 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund Account by \$2 million and allocates the increase to the Native American CDFI Assistance (NACA) Program; offsets the increase by decreasing funding for GSA rental space by \$2 million; **Page H6531**

Michelle Lujan Grisham (NM) amendment (No. 73 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases funding for Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs) by \$5 million; decreases the General Services Administration Federal Buildings Fund by 15 million; **Pages H6531–32**

Palazzo amendment (No. 74 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that designates a \$25 million increase to CDFI programs; **Page H6532**

Soto amendment (No. 75 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases funding for Tax Counseling for the Elderly by \$1 million; **Pages H6532–33**

Soto amendment (No. 76 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases funding for the IRS's identify theft and refund fraud casework program by \$500,000; **Page H6533**

Kustoff (TN) amendment (No. 78 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases funding to the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program by \$5 million and reduces the General Services Administration's rental of space allocation by \$5 million; **Page H6534**

Murphy amendment (No. 79 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that reduces funding for Small Business Administration, Entrepreneurial Development Programs by \$1 million, and increases it by the same amount, with 1,600,000 of the increase intended for the Women's Business Centers program and \$400,000 intended for Veterans Outreach programs; **Pages H6534–35**

Polis amendment (No. 80 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that provides funding for the SBA to do technical assistance, training and education about the 7(a)(15) employee-ownership loan guarantee program; **Page H6535**

Zeldin amendment (No. 82 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prohibits funds from being used by the GSA to market or sell Plum Island, NY; **Pages H6536–37**

Mullin amendment (No. 43 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prohibits the use of funds for enforcing the Obama Administration's EPA Methane Rule (by a recorded vote of 215 ayes to 194 noes, Roll No. 346); **Pages H6502–03, H6543**

Mullin amendment (No. 44 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prohibits funds from implementing

the Social Cost of Carbon rule (by a recorded vote of 215 ayes to 199 noes, Roll No. 347);

Pages H6503–04, H6543–44

McMorris Rodgers amendment (No. 46 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that limits funding for the implementation of Washington State’s revised water quality standard (by a recorded vote of 227 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 348);

Pages H6505–06, H6544–45

Lamborn amendment (No. 48 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prohibits the use of funds to implement or enforce the threatened species listing of the Preble’s meadow jumping mouse under the Endangered Species Act (by a recorded vote of 213 ayes to 202 noes, Roll No. 349);

Pages H6507–08, H6545

Lamborn amendment (No. 49 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prohibits the use of funds to implement or enforce the threatened species or endangered species listing of any plant or wildlife that has not undergone a review as required by section 4(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (by a recorded vote of 213 ayes to 201 noes, Roll No. 350);

Pages H6508–09, H6545–46

Goodlatte amendment (No. 50 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prohibits the Environmental Protection Agency from using any funds to take retaliatory, or EPA described “backstop” actions, against any of the six states in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed in the event that a state does not meet the goals mandated by the EPA’s Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (by a recorded vote of 213 ayes to 202 noes, Roll No. 351);

Pages H6509–10, H6546–47

Pearce amendment (No. 62 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prevents funds from being used to carry out any rule-making on the status of the Lesser Prairie Chicken (by a recorded vote of 216 ayes to 199 noes, Roll No. 354);

Pages H6518–19, H6548–49

Smith (MO) amendment (No. 70 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prevents the payment of attorney’s fees as part of any settlement the Federal Government enters into under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act (by a recorded vote of 215 ayes to 199 noes, Roll No. 357);

Pages H6529–30, H6550–51

Palmer amendment (No. 83 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prohibits funds from being used to carry out the District of Columbia’s Health Insurance Requirement Amendment Act of 2018 (by a recorded vote of 226 ayes to 189 noes, Roll No. 359);

Pages H6537–38, H6551–52

Meadows amendment (No. 84 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prohibits Federal Funds from being used by the Office of Personnel Management to administer the Multi-State Plan program (by a recorded vote of 223 ayes to 192 noes, Roll No. 360); and

Pages H6538–39, H6552

Rothfus amendment (No. 85 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that prohibits the funds from being used to seize property as a means of enforcing the liability provisions of the District of Columbia individual mandate (by a recorded vote of 231 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 361).

Pages H6539, H6552–53

Rejected:

Biggs amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that was debated on July 17th that sought to transfer funds from the BLM Land acquisition account to the NPS Parks Maintenance Backlog (by a recorded vote of 172 ayes to 237 noes with one answering “present”, Roll No. 341);

Page H6498

Grijalva amendment (No. 25 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that was debated on July 17th that sought to increase the budget for the Department of the Interior Inspector General’s Office by \$2.5 million (by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 223 noes, Roll No. 342);

Pages H6498–99

Adams amendment (No. 29 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that was debated on July 17th that sought to decrease and then increase the EPA Environmental Programs and Management account fund by \$742,000; this increase is to emphasize the need for greater funding for the Environmental Justice program area within the account (by a recorded vote of 194 ayes to 218 noes, Roll No. 344);

Page H6500

Grothman amendment (No. 39 printed in H. Rept. 115–830), as modified, that was debated on July 17th that sought to reduce funding for the National Endowment on the Arts and the Humanities by 15 percent (by a recorded vote of 114 ayes to 297 noes, Roll No. 345);

Pages H6500–01

Carbajal amendment (No. 77 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that sought to strike Section 125, which prevents the IRS from issuing guidance to more clearly define political activity for 501(c)(4) organizations;

Pages H6533–34

Gallego amendment (No. 51 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that sought to ensure none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue grazing permits or leases in contravention of BLM regulations (by a recorded vote of 203 ayes to 212 noes, Roll No. 352);

Pages H6510–11, H6547

Pearce amendment (No. 60 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that sought to prevent funds from being used to treat the New Mexico Meadow Jumping Mouse as an endangered species (by a recorded vote of 206 ayes to 209 noes, Roll No. 353);

Pages H6517–18, H6547–48

Gosar amendment (No. 63 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that sought to support recreational shooting, K–12 education and responsible energy development by prohibiting funds for the Ironwood Forest National Monument that was unilaterally designated

under the Antiquities Act (by a recorded vote of 193 ayes to 220 noes, Roll No. 355);

Pages H6519–21, H6549

Jody B. Hice (GA) amendment (No. 69 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that sought to state that no funds should be made available for Environmental Justice Small Grants issued by the Office of Environmental Justice (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 240 noes, Roll No. 356);

Pages H6528–29, H6549–50

Carbajal amendment (No. 81 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that sought to strike Section 628 which prohibits the SEC from promulgating a political spending disclosure rule (by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 224 noes, Roll No. 358); and

Pages H6535–36, H6551

McHenry amendment (No. 87 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that sought to prohibit any taxpayer funds from going to support the Post Service's efforts to (1) expand or enhance financial services products, or (2) carry out any pilot programs or task forces pursuant to that end (by a recorded vote of 201 ayes to 212 noes, Roll No. 362).

Pages H6540–42, H6553–54

Withdrawn:

Emmer amendment (No. 55 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funding from being used to implement a January 13, 2017 effort by the U.S. Department of Interior and Agriculture to restrict all leasing, exploration, and potential development of approximately 234,328 acres of federal land in Northeast Minnesota;

Pages H6512–14

Grothman amendment (No. 56 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds made available by this Act to be used to implement or enforce the EPA's ground level ozone rule; and

Pages H6514–15

Connolly amendment (No. 57 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited funds from being used to change or modify the 2015 federal coal ash rule (80 Fed. Reg. 21301).

Page H6515

H. Res. 996, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6147) was agreed to yesterday, July 17th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, July 19th.

Page H6555

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today and appears on page H6477.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and twenty-three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages

H6494–95, H6495, H6495–96, H6496–97, H6497, H6498, H6498–99, H6499–H6500, H6500, H6500–01, H6543, H6544, H6544–45, H6545, H6545–46, H6546–47, H6547, H6547–48, H6548–49, H6549, H6549–50, H6550–51, H6551, H6551–52, H6552, H6553, H6553–54. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 11:03 p.m.

Committee Meetings

CRYPTOCURRENCIES: OVERSIGHT OF NEW ASSETS IN THE DIGITAL AGE

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Cryptocurrencies: Oversight of New Assets in the Digital Age". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

POWERING AMERICA: THE ROLE OF ENERGY STORAGE IN THE NATION'S ELECTRICITY SYSTEM

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee Energy held a hearing entitled "Powering America: The Role of Energy Storage in the Nation's Electricity System". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection held a hearing entitled "Oversight of the Federal Trade Commission". Testimony was heard from the following Federal Trade Commission officials: Joseph Simons, Chairman; Maureen Ohlhausen, Commissioner; Noah Phillips, Commissioner; Rohit Chopra, Commissioner; and Rebecca Slaughter, Commissioner.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 6351, the "Advancing U.S. Civil Nuclear Competitiveness and Jobs Act"; and H.R. 6378, the "Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act of 2018". H.R. 6378 and H.R. 6351 were ordered reported, as amended.

MONETARY POLICY AND THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy". Testimony was heard from Jerome H. Powell, Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

THE FUTURE OF MONEY: DIGITAL CURRENCY

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade held a hearing entitled “The Future of Money: Digital Currency”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS IN CENTRAL ASIA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats held a hearing entitled “Current Developments in Central Asia”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5171, the “Ski Area Fee Retention Act”; H.R. 5347, the “Lyon County Economic Development and Environmental Remediation Act”; H.R. 5532, the “Reconstruction Era National Historical Park Act”; H.R. 5556, the “Environmental Compliance Cost Transparency Act of 2018”; H.R. 5923, the “Walnut Grove Land Exchange Act”; H.R. 5979, the “Mill Springs Battlefield National Monument Act”; H.R. 6038, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota; H.R. 6039, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Jamestown Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; H.R. 6040, the “Contra Costa Canal Transfer Act”; and H.R. 6146, the “Cottonwood Land Exchange Act of 2018”. H.R. 5171 was ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 5347, H.R. 5532, H.R. 5556, H.R. 5923, H.R. 5979, H.R. 6038, H.R. 6039, H.R. 6040, and H.R. 6146 were ordered reported, as amended.

REGULATORY DIVERGENCE: FAILURE OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Affairs held a hearing entitled “Regulatory Divergence: Failure of the Administrative State”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 6398, the “Department of Energy Veterans’ Health Initiative Act”. H.R. 6398 was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 6348, the “Small Business Access to Capital and Efficiency Act”; H.R. 6347, the “7(a) Real Estate Harmonization Act”; H.R. 6330, the

“Small Business Runway Extension Act of 2018”; H.R. 6369, the “Expanding Contracting Opportunities for Small Businesses Act of 2018”; H.R. 6367, “Incentivizing Fairness in Subcontracting Act of 2018”; H.R. 6382, the “Clarity on Small Business Participation in Category Management Act of 2018”; H.R. 6316, the “Small Business Advocacy Improvements Act of 2018”; and H.R. 6368, the “Encouraging Small Business Innovators Act”. H.R. 6348, H.R. 6347, H.R. 6330, H.R. 6316, and H.R. 6368 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 6369, H.R. 6367, and H.R. 6382 were ordered reported, as amended.

ARE WE READY? RECOVERING FROM 2017 DISASTERS AND PREPARING FOR THE 2018 HURRICANE SEASON

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled “Are We Ready? Recovering from 2017 Disasters and Preparing for the 2018 Hurricane Season”. Testimony was heard from Jeffrey Byard, Associate Administrator, Office of Response and Recovery, Federal Emergency Management Agency; Charles “Ray” Alexander, Director of Contingency Operations and Chief of the Office of Homeland Security, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; and public witnesses.

AN UPDATE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FOREVER GI BILL: IS VA READY FOR AUGUST 1ST?

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing entitled “An Update on the Implementation of the Forever GI Bill: Is VA Ready for August 1st?”. Testimony was heard from Major General Robert M. Worley II, U.S. Air Force (Ret.), Director, Education Service, Veterans Benefit Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3309, the “Social Security Online Tools Innovation Act”; and H.R. 6377, the “Save Community Newspaper Act of 2018”. H.R. 3309 and H.R. 6377 were ordered reported, as amended.

THE EFFECTS OF TARIFFS ON U.S. AGRICULTURE AND RURAL COMMUNITIES

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Trade held a hearing entitled “The Effects of Tariffs on U.S. Agriculture and Rural Communities”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

STATE OF TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONS

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine the state of transatlantic relations, after receiving testimony from Nathalie Griesbeck, Special Committee on Terrorism, Claude Moraes, Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice, and Home Affairs, and Michael Boni, each a Member of the European Parliament, Brussels, Belgium.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 19, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Kathleen Laura Kraninger, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and Kimberly A. Reed, of West Virginia, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold an oversight hearing to examine Administration reorganization and modernization proposals related to the Department of Energy and the Department of the Interior, 10 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Mary Bridget Neumayr, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Council on Environmental Quality, and John Fleming, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, 10 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Finance: business meeting to consider the nomination of Charles P. Rettig, of California, to be

Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury, 10 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Dennis Dean Kirk, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and to be Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board, Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, and Andrew F. Maunz, of Ohio, both to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and Carmen Guericcoitia McLean, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, 10 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Britt Cagle Grant, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, David James Porter, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, and Julius Ness Richardson, of South Carolina, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, Roy Kalman Altman, and Rodolfo Armando Ruiz II, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, and Raul M. Arias-Marxuach, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing regarding certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH-219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, markup on FY 2019 Homeland Security Appropriations Bill, 9:30 a.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "21st Century Cures Implementation: Examining Mental Health Initiatives", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled "China's Threat to American Government and Private Sector Research and Innovation Leadership", 8:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, July 19

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, post-cloture.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, July 19

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H.R. 6147—Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2019. Complete consideration of H. Con. Res. 119—Expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

House

Bass, Karen, Calif., E1027
Byrne, Bradley, Ala., E1029
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1028
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E1029
DeBene, Suzan K., Wash., E1027
Duffy, Sean, P., Wisc., E1029
Faso, John J., N.Y., E1032

Gianforte, Greg, Mont., E1027
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E1032
Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E1028
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1033
Jones, Walter B., N.C., E1031, E1032
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1030
Kelly, Mike, Pa., E1031
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E1033
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E1027

Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E1028
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1029
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E1033
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E1028, E1030
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1030
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E1033
Torres, Norma J., Calif., E1028
Young, David, Iowa, E1032



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.