

weren't the Republicans lighting up social media and down on this floor complaining about the fact that the President refused to forward badly needed humanitarian dollars to the region.

Where was the outrage when the President effectively pulled the United States out of the peace process? Remember, the United States, under the Obama administration—whatever you think about Obama's strategy—was in the peace process, was a partner to try to figure out a way forward for Syria. Donald Trump, as has been his strategy internationally, pulled us out of that diplomatic conversation, left the diplomatic playing field to the Iranians, to the Russians, and to the Turks. Where was the outrage when the United States walked away from the negotiating table?

How about the shutdown of the refugee program? Once again, if your focus is on the cataclysm of humanitarian disaster on the ground in Syria, why weren't there all sorts of Members of the Republican Party coming down to the floor and complaining when the President decided to not allow any more Syrian refugees—those fleeing terror and torture—to come to the United States?

What about outrage over the fact that the President proposed cutting the State Department by 40 percent—the State Department that is going to be in the driver's seat when we eventually get to the point of putting Syria back together politically?

Why is there outrage only today? Well, here is the answer, I think, and it worries me. I think there is outrage today because many Members of the Republican Party still cling to this outdated, empirically disproved, fantastic notion that the American military can solve complicated, convoluted political problems in the Middle East.

We have amazing men and women in the Armed Forces, but there are limits to what they can do. And history—especially the history of the last 15 years—tells us that big U.S. military presence in the Middle East often creates as many problems as it solves.

The Republicans who are complaining about this make it sound as if we had a couple divisions in Syria. We didn't. We had 2,000 troops. We had 2,000 troops compared to the hundreds of thousands of troops fighting on behalf of the Syrian regime, the Iranian militias, the Kurdish forces, the rebel forces, the remnants of ISIS's forces. Two thousand troops isn't enough to bluff. It isn't enough to gain a negotiating foothold. It is, frankly, just enough to keep faking it in Syria—doing just enough militarily to say that we are doing something to be able to sleep at night while never actually doing anything sufficient to change the balance of power. That has been the story of both President Obama's and President Trump's policy in Syria. We do just enough to convince the rebels that they should keep going but never enough to actually tackle Bashar al-

Assad. All we have done is keep the civil war running and running and running.

I have really terrible news for you all. Assad is going to win this war. He was always going to win this war because the folks who were on his side had much bigger equities—Russia and Iran—than the folks who were on the side of the rebels. Now, that really stinks, that Bashar al-Assad is going to win, but you have to make policy based on the real world, not on some world that you imagine.

These neoconservatives are still—even after 4,000 Americans were killed in Iraq and 30,000 were wounded, they are still clinging to this notion that a couple thousand U.S. troops are going to be able to solve the problems in Syria. Listen. I get it. Restraint in the face of evil is really hard stuff. But hubris in the face of evil is worse.

So what should we be doing? I won't spend too much time on this, but we should get out of the civil war. We should admit that we have just prolonged it instead of trying to end it. We should keep working with our partners and keep using airpower to keep ISIS on the run. We should rescue Syrians with a generous refugee program, both helping our partners in the Middle East rescue Syrians and bringing them to the United States when they pass our vetting program.

We should stop angering our allies all over the world, but particularly in that region, and get back into the diplomatic game.

Finally, we should stop believing that our only leverage in negotiations in Syria or anywhere else in the world is military force. Put up a promise of massive investment in Syria after a peace deal is signed—likely, frankly, costing a fraction of what we spent in Iraq—and you will discover that you quickly get a seat at that table again.

But it is time that we give up on this notion that these brave, capable American soldiers can fix these complicated, tribal, political, economic, and religious problems in the Middle East. They are brave, and they are capable, but there are things they can do, and there are things they can't do. Every time we put our troops in situations where they are doomed to fail, when we are not prepared to give them the resources to succeed, as was always the case in Syria—spare me this notion that 2,000 American troops were going to be able to fix Syria—every time we put them in situations where they can't win, we undermine American influence, and we undermine the power of our military.

I don't agree with how the President did this. Once you have made that commitment, boy, it doesn't make a lot of sense to pull the rug out from under our partners right as the tough stuff starts to come. I don't agree that he didn't do it in consultation with anybody in this place or anybody on his national security team. I think that his announcement today is ham-handed

and embarrassing, but his instincts aren't entirely wrong on the question of what American troops can and can't do in the Middle East.

I can't believe I am saying this. I think the President may have learned more than many of my friends in the Senate have.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. I ask unanimous consent to be recognized along with my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator SHAHEEN, to enter into a colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

SYRIA

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am in distress to be on the floor of the Senate today with my colleague, Senator GRAHAM, to express our deep and profound disappointment in President Trump's decision to withdraw U.S. troops from northeast Syria.

We had the opportunity to visit Syria this summer, and we saw what a difference our troops had made there in the fight against ISIS in stabilizing Syria along the northern Turkish border. We saw the response from the Syrians we talked to, both the Kurds and Arabs, as we drove along the road. We saw children and people in the area flashing a victory sign at our troops, and you can see from this map the land that is controlled by the Syrian Democratic Forces, our partners in Syria, so this is the United States and Syrian Democratic Forces.

We have a significant piece of Syria that is now peaceful and stabilized and ISIS has been thrown out of that part of Syria, but the President's decision—which was announced by a tweet—is dangerous, premature, and wholly inconsistent with the facts on the ground in Syria and our own military's advice.

I was listening to Senator RUBIO earlier today talking about what is the plan? What is the plan if we withdraw? Well, I will tell you what the plan is. There is no plan. There is no follow-on to what we are going to do if we withdraw from Syria. What we know is, the work of our combined joint task force, Operation Inherent Resolve, and its partner forces, the Syrian Democratic Forces, is truly remarkable. Again, we can see it. We can see it in this brown section of the country where we have control and there is peace and stability.

Senator GRAHAM and I, when we visited this summer, we went to Manbij, which was controlled by ISIS for 3 years. We walked through the market in Manbij without any body armor, with no guards. We talked to people in that community about what life was like under ISIS.

I talked to one woman who told me she did not go out of her house the entire time ISIS controlled Manbij, for 3 years. She went out of her house once to visit the doctor.

We saw women strolling through the market. We saw children playing. We saw people who were happy to be back in their own communities. They said to us: Please stay. We are worried about what will happen if the Americans leave Manbij.

We also flew over Kobane, right here on the Turkish border. I remember all of the TV coverage of the fight for Kobane and what it looked like.

We could see it was being rebuilt, not with money from the United States but with money from the region. We could see all the building going on. We flew over a center where they were holding some of the most dangerous foreign fighters who had been captured in the fight against ISIS, being held right here in Kobane. Then we went down to Ayn Issa, where we saw, directly, the difference certain forces had made in helping to guard our outposts where our troops were stationed. We saw detention facilities where they were holding, again, fighters from Syria who had fought for ISIS.

We then went over to Al-Hasakah where we saw a prison that was being built to hold the most dangerous of the foreign fighters. Those foreign fighters who—we don't know what will happen if we withdraw our troops. There will be nobody there to support the Syrian Democratic Forces that are holding hundreds of those fighters. What happens? Do they get released?

Do they come back to the United States and to Europe where they can engineer terrorist attacks? Do they go back into the villages and restart another terrorist group? There is no—we don't know what is going to happen there because there is no follow-on plan.

Again, we heard from people everywhere we went how important it was to have American troops stationed in Syria—about 2,000 American troops who have made such a huge difference there. They serve a vital shield against ISIS cells that are still operating in Northeast Syria. While the President claims that the threat of ISIS within Syria has dissipated, the conditions on the ground paint a very different picture. So working with our partners we have achieved gains against ISIS because we have partnered with the Syrian Democratic Forces that are partly Kurd and partly Arab. If those Syrian Democratic Forces lose the support of the United States, we run the risk of a resurgence of ISIS and the possible capitulation or all-out destruction of Kurdish resistance in the region.

What does that mean? That means those ISIS elements are emboldened. They may go underground, but they may reemerge. If we don't remember history, we are destined to repeat it. That is what happened in Iraq. We left al-Qaida, moved to Syria, and they reemerged as an even bigger threat. If we leave, it is not at all clear what is going to happen.

These are hard-fought gains that are critical to ensuring that we win the

fight against terrorism in the Middle East. If we leave, we are going to cede influence in that region to Russia, to Iran, to Assad. In fact, just moments after this decision was announced this morning, we heard the chair of Russia's State Duma, the chair of the Defense Committee, Vladimir Shamanov said: "U.S. plans in Syria had failed," and he added that we, the United States, had decided to make this knight's move in order to avoid a "shameful end."

Make no mistake. They are celebrating in Moscow tonight after the President's announcement, just like they are celebrating in Tehran tonight because of the President's announcement because we are going to leave the field in Syria to those countries that are aggressors against the United States.

I urge President Trump to listen to his military and diplomatic advisers before he goes any further on this shortsighted decision.

It is important to understand that U.S. leadership is essential to completely defeating ISIS and to bringing an end to the violence in Syria. It is also important to reassure our allies that America keeps its word; that when partnering with us, we are there to support you. If we leave now, what does that say to anybody else in the future who may want to partner with the United States on any conflict? It says: You can't count on the United States because we may just pull out on you tomorrow if the President suddenly thinks it is in his interests—not in the interests of the United States but in his interest to withdraw.

This is a reckless decision, and it is undoubtedly going to have consequences for years to come for our military and for our ability to partner with others internationally. The only ones who are going to benefit from this decision are our enemies.

So I am pleased to partner with Senator GRAHAM on a resolution that would express the sense of the Senate that we should not be withdrawing our troops from Syria, that there is too much at stake here for us to take this reckless action and send the wrong message to our partners in the rest of the world.

I am pleased to join my colleague, Senator GRAHAM, and we will do everything we can to urge the President to reverse this reckless decision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank my colleague from New Hampshire.

Let me ask the question, when we went to Syria and Iraq together, did anyone in the military suggest to you that withdrawing in the foreseeable future was a good idea?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Absolutely not. In fact, they talked about how pleased they were with the gains we had made, with the partnership, with the SDF, with what they were seeing in terms of stabilizing those communities, people coming back to their homes, rebuild-

ing, and how important it was for us to stay there.

Mr. GRAHAM. Did they also not say that the Syrian Democratic Forces were some of the best allies we had since 9/11?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Without a doubt, and we saw that firsthand, as you remember. When we saw them guarding our outposts, when we saw them in the communities, when we saw them in the detention facilities, trying to abide by international standards with respect to the foreign fighters they were guarding, it was very impressive.

Mr. GRAHAM. Did anyone suggest to you that the war against ISIS in Syria was over and had been won?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Not at all. In fact, if you look at this map, you can see this orange color. That is one of the pockets that remains of ISIS. Right here. We have not yet eradicated ISIS, and that does not account for some of the cells that exist throughout this area.

Mr. GRAHAM. Do you remember being told that thousands of ISIS fighters had gone back into the fabric of Syria and that they will reemerge under the right conditions?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Absolutely, and it is what we saw in Iraq.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, I just want to state that this has been a long struggle. Most Americans, all things being equal, would like to get all of our troops home.

The Middle East is a very complicated place. I share the President's desire to withdraw our forces when it makes sense. As to the public at large, I want to stress that having been in the military for quite a while, I am very aware of the sacrifices required to go overseas and serve in Iraq, Syria, and Afghanistan. I have come to conclude that a presence over there is still necessary to keep us safe here.

There is a division in this body about whether we should have a wall as part of border security. I think we need a wall as part of border security to secure our southern border. Every Democrat is for border security; we just maybe have a different way of doing it.

What I tried to tell the President, with apparently very little effect, is that you are right to want to secure our border because drugs are coming across, criminals are coming across, and illegal immigration is a problem in the country, and securing the border is part of the solution, but I told him I don't know of any way to defend the Nation from radical Islam by building a wall.

There is no wall we can build between us and the forces of radical Islam that reside in Africa and the Mideast—places like Syria and Iraq. I tried to convey to him that our deployed forces, in partnership with others, is a virtual wall. It is the best hope we have of stopping another 9/11, protecting ourselves and our allies; that a forward deployed presence gives us eyes and ears on the ground, working with others to protect the homeland

and to destroy over time the scourge called radical Islam.

The partnership between us and the Syrian forces, which has been mostly Kurds, has been very successful.

I want to compliment the Senator from New Hampshire for taking the floor and expressing a resolve to maintain a fairly small military footprint in Syria and having connected to that our own national security interests. Maybe the good news—if there is any from today—is that Democrats and Republicans, after 16 or 17 years of looking at this war, are beginning to come together—that troops are necessary sometimes in some places where military action alone will not win the war but is certainly necessary, and that partners are a good thing.

I have come to conclude that when it comes to the war on terrorism, I would rather fight it in the enemy's backyard than ours. I would rather have partners than do it alone. I think the decision today by the President—and I think it was his alone—is disastrous to our own national security and those 2,200 whom Senator SHAHEEN talked about and the great job they have done; that by withdrawing them, we have basically taken a part of the wall down and have now an open-border policy when it comes to ISIS in Syria; that the consequence of this decision makes it far more likely that there will be a corridor from Tehran into Lebanon and to Hezbollah. Our presence there made it more difficult to the Iranians.

Who would be celebrating this decision? Everybody whom we hate likes what is going on. The Russians are up to no good all over the world. Their statement says everything you need to know about this decision. The only reason they are not dancing in Tehran and ISIS camps is they just don't believe in dancing. They are as happy as they will ever be—and they are not into being happy.

To the President, you won the election. You beat me and many others. You have the right to make this decision, but the Congress has the duty to hold you accountable. I wish we had done more of this in a bipartisan fashion when President Obama withdrew from Iraq. If I am nothing, I am consistent. I want this President to be successful. I will help him at every turn.

Generally speaking, I am very pleased with his domestic policy and most of the time his foreign policy. I am shocked by this. I think this is a decision that is against sound military advice. I intend to do our part as a Congress to make sure that history records how this decision was made.

There is a clear record that President Obama's decision to withdraw from Iraq and not leave a residual force proved to be wrong and was against military advice at that time. I have yet to find one person in the administration of the national security team who thinks this decision was a good decision. This was made against sound military advice.

I don't think "General Trump" is going to be any better than "General Obama." I don't think "General Graham" is the answer to this problem. I think those who are in the fight, who have been doing it for 17 years—the national security team the President has—are the experts. Mr. President, if you don't like them or trust them, fire them. What you have done, in my view, is set us back.

The chatter out there is pretty disturbing. I talked with General Mattis today. It is pretty clear that the ripple effect of this is going to be as bad as we think it will be.

To our Kurdish partners, I am sorry. I don't support this decision, and I am hoping it will change.

President Trump, leadership is about adjusting and being able to change your mind when circumstances warrant it. I am not saying we need to be in Syria forever. I am saying now is not the time to leave, and Senator SHAHEEN made a very compelling case about conditions on the ground.

The winners are Russia, Iran, ISIS, and Assad. The losers are the Kurdish people, who came to our aid when almost nobody would. The Arabs who are part of the Syrian Democratic Forces are big-time losers. I can only imagine what it is like tonight in Manbij.

I saw in the eyes of the people that we were partnered with, hope and trust: America is here. America is good. Maybe our suffering is over.

When I look at the flag and the soldiers who wear it on their sleeve, we are not a perfect country, but we are a damn good country. What makes us a good people is that we do the hard things.

We are not the policemen of the world. I understand that, but we are the glue that holds this world together. We have betrayed our Kurdish allies if this decision stands. If it is reversed, I will be the first one to applaud the President because that is true leadership. To those who say that we have defeated ISIS in Syria, that is an inaccurate statement. They have been hurt. They have been degraded.

I give the President all the credit in the world for changing our policies regarding the fight against ISIS, but I will not buy into the narrative that they have been defeated in Syria and Iraq.

I just got back from Afghanistan and haven't slept in 2 days. I really appreciate the chance to visit our troops and talk to our generals, but, sure as hell, ISIS is not defeated in Afghanistan. So to say they are defeated is an overstatement, and it is fake news. It is not true. They have been severely damaged, but they will come back unless we are there to stop it.

I don't intend to outsource our national security to any foreign power. This idea that Turkey is going to be the good guy, that Turkey is going to come into Syria and protect us against the rise of ISIS, is just crazy. What Turkey is going to do is unleash holy

hell on the Kurds. In the eyes of Turkey, they are more of a threat than ISIS.

This decision is a disaster on multiple fronts, and I hope it can be changed. There is a resolution urging the President to make a withdrawal decision based on conditions on the ground after a vigorous interagency process.

Mr. President, I, too, want our troops to come home, but I don't want to tell the American people that we are secure when I don't believe we are. And what is odd is that the troops who are actually doing the fighting believe in this more than anybody. They were proud to be partners with the Kurds. Most of them had been to Iraq and Afghanistan numerous times and were heartbroken when we left Iraq and all of the gains lost. Many of them went back to the fight to take it yet again.

So to the body who loves the troops, that is good. The American people respect our troops. If you truly love them, let them win. They are not asking to come home. They do this voluntarily. They understand why they are there. They understand the benefits of being there.

I know it must be tough as Commander in Chief to write a letter to the family of the fallen. I know it is a hard decision for any President to make to put people in harm's way, but I just want the President to understand that the troops who do this embrace their mission and believe they are defending their Nation and protecting their families. They accept the risk. If we do follow through with this withdrawal, I am afraid Americans all over the world and here at home are going to be more at risk, not less.

I can't imagine winning this war without allies. If this decision stands, I can't imagine being able to sign up many people in the future to serve with us to defeat enemies that threaten us after today. What hurts so much is to have been on the ground—to see it get bad, to see it get better—and to look into the eyes of the people who are willing to fight with us and see the hope they have that we are finally here.

It hurts so much to know that everybody that we talked to in Manbij—many of them—are going to get killed. They did the honorable thing to come to our aid, to help destroy a common enemy of mankind, ISIS. We have been dishonorable. This is a stain on the honor of the United States.

I hope and pray the President will reconsider this. I know that every National Security Advisor understands that the time is not right to withdraw, that the situation described by Senator SHAHEEN as to what will happen is more likely than not.

If he does not decide to reconsider, then it will be incumbent upon the Congress to speak and hold him accountable. If you are concerned about today's decision as a Member of the Senate, please join this resolution. It is

very evenly worded. We all want the troops to come home, but we want to make sure they come home with honor and that the conditions warrant them leaving.

Right now, we are withdrawing in a dishonorable fashion. We are putting our own Nation more at risk. Just as sure as I am on the floor of the Senate, ISIS will reemerge, and all those who helped us are going to be in jeopardy. It will be harder to get allies in the future. As for these 700 prisoners who were captured on the battlefield, we will hear from them again.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. You talk about those 700 prisoners. A number of them are foreign fighters. A number of them are ISIS fighters from Syria and Iraq. What do you think will happen to those detainees who are being held by the Syrian Democratic Forces if we withdraw and there is no support for what they are doing?

Mr. GRAHAM. One of two things will happen. No. 1, the Syrian Democratic Forces had a very ethical view of treating prisoners. I was astonished at the compliance with law and their desire to take their enemies and treat them better than they were treated. The jail was, quite frankly, very impressive.

Here is what is going to happen. They are going to shoot them or they are going to get out. If Assad takes over before Turkey gets there, they will kill everybody in the jail. So what does it matter if a bunch of ISIS fighters get killed? It is about us. Once they are captured, it matters how we treat them. I want them tried. I want them held off the battlefield. We are not executioners. But the most likely scenario is that ISIS reemerges and they break out.

I promise the President this—and I told President Obama the same thing—if you will stick with it and listen to the generals, no matter whether it hurts me or not, we will be with you. We will give you the political support a Republican can give a Democrat to see this thing through. I promise the President one thing: I will help you where I can, but I am going to hold you accountable. I am going to do everything in my power—if you don't change this decision—to make sure you own it, so the next President will learn from your mistakes.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have a number of consent requests and wrapup as we make our way toward the conclusion of the 115th Congress.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions during today and tomorrow's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES PORTS OF ENTRY THREAT AND OPERATIONAL REVIEW ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 6400 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6400) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a threat and operational analysis of ports of entry, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 6400) was passed.

Mr. CORNYN. 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.

SECRET SERVICE OVERTIME PAY EXTENSION ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 6893, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6893) to amend the Overtime Pay for Protective Services Act of 2016 to extend the Secret Service overtime pay exception through 2020, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill 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 bill (H.R. 6893) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NO HERO LEFT UNTREATED ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from consideration of H.R. 1162 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1162) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to veterans.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill 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 bill (H.R. 1162) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

VETERANS BENEFITS AND TRANSITION ACT OF 2018

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 2248.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 2248) entitled "An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide certain burial benefits for spouses and children of veterans who are buried in tribal cemeteries, and for other purposes," do pass with an amendment.

Mr. CORNYN. I move to concur in the House amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the motion be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Small Business Committee be discharged and that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc: H.R. 6347 and H.R. 6348.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the bills, en bloc, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A bill (H.R. 6347) to adjust the real estate appraisal thresholds under the 7(a) program to bring them into line with the thresholds used by the Federal banking regulators, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

A bill (H.R. 6348) to adjust the real estate appraisal thresholds under the section 504 program to bring them into line with the thresholds used by the Federal banking regulators, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.