

clear, this bill actually helps keep spouses of elderly patients from impoverishment and out of costly nursing home settings. For spouses of patients receiving home or community-based care, the bill will protect them from impractical reductions in their income or resources and ensures that they can live out their lives with independence and dignity.

Finally, we clarified the authority of State Medicaid fraud and abuse control units that investigate and prosecute abuse and neglect of Medicaid beneficiaries. This is simply good government. It is good government oversight, and it protects patients who are some of America's most vulnerable.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friends on the Energy and Commerce Committee for their work on the bill: Dr. BURGESS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALBERG, and their counterparts on the Democratic side, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WELCH, and, of course, Chairman PALLONE.

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I thank Chairman PALLONE, Republican leader WALDEN, and the Energy and Commerce Committee staff for their hard work to help this bipartisan package come together.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank my colleague, Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL, for working with me on extending Medicaid Follows the Person. I also thank my colleagues, Representative MATSUI, Representative ESHOO, Representative WELCH, and Representative WALBERG, for their hard work on this package.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to echo the words of my colleague, Mr. GUTHRIE, and thank all of those who helped bring this bill to the floor today. I give particular thanks to Chairman PALLONE and Ranking Member WALDEN for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 3253.

As a caregiver, I have met so many people in the last few years who are desperate and scared and who need us to care. This bill does that. I hope the House today will show this country we can act bipartisanship, giving hope.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3253, 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. BROOKS of Alabama. 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.

# DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 436 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. 2740.

Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1509

## 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. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, with Ms. ADAMS (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 13, 2019, amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 116-111 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) had been disposed of.

## AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY OF INDIANA

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 436, as the designee of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), I offer amendments en bloc, which are at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 35, 37, 42, 46, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 62 printed in part A of House Report 116-111, offered by Mr. VISCLOSKY of Indiana:

## AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. STEWART OF UTAH

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$200,000)".

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$200,000)".

## AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Page 223, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$8,500,000)".

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$8,500,000)".

## AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Page 223, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 248, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 249, line 1, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

## AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO OF CALIFORNIA

Page 247, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,500,000)".

Page 247, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$9,500,000)".

## AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO OF CALIFORNIA

Page 223, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 248, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 249, line 1, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

## AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Page 217, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000) (reduced by \$2,000,000)".

## AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 248, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 249, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 249, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

## AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF MISSOURI

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000) (reduced by \$5,000,000)".

## AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 228, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,500,000)".

Page 228, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

## AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 246, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$4,800,000)".

Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,800,000)".

## AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be made available to the Taliban.

## AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT OF ARIZONA

Page 246, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

## AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. CARSON OF INDIANA

Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$4,000,000)".

## AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. BARR OF KENTUCKY

Page 222, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$6,000,000)".

Page 226, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 227, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

## AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 223, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".

Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL OF MICHIGAN

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$7,700,000)”.

Page 300, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. BERA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,000,000)”.

Page 233, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$20,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 222, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,300,000)”.

Page 222, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$4,300,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 251, line 10, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 251, line 10, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 251, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 251, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. EMMER OF MINNESOTA

Page 223, line 4, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)” after the dollar amount.

Page 247, line 17, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)” after the dollar amount.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN OF GEORGIA

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$16,000,000)”.

Page 228, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 229, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 230, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$8,000,000)”.

Page 246, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$8,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 222, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,000,000)”.

Page 246, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$4,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Page 246, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$6,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

Page 222, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. BRINDISI OF NEW YORK

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 247, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. PAPPAS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. PAPPAS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Page 246, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,500,000)”.

Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$2,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MS. SHERRILL OF NEW JERSEY

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MS. SHERRILL OF NEW JERSEY

Page 246, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 246, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MS. TORRES SMALL OF NEW MEXICO

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, the amendments included in the en bloc were made in order by the rule, and they have been agreed to by both sides. They improve the bill. I support the amendment and urge its adoption.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment, and I thank the Defense Subcommittee chairman for working with our side to include many amendments important to our Members. The chairman has been a great partner and has been very fair throughout this process.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, let me thank the chair of the Defense Subcommittee and ranking member of the subcommittee as well.

I am delighted that my amendment No. 12 has been made in order and that we will have an opportunity to save and improve the lives of many women around the world.

My amendment provides flexibility for the Secretary of Defense to allocate resources needed to provide technical assistance by U.S. military women to military women in other countries

combating violence as a weapon of war, terrorism, human trafficking, and narcotics trafficking to ameliorate their impact on women and girls around the globe.

Madam Chair, the most vulnerable people in vulnerable nation-states are women and girls and women and children. That is both in terms of sexual violence and domestic violence, and also in terms of the denial of access to education.

As the co-chair of the Congressional Afghanistan Caucus, I am reminded of the aftermath of the Afghan war. As we began to write the constitution, we thought we had made progress. But the Taliban, after a period of time, began to burn the schools that were designated for girls only.

This amendment allows women in the military of these respective countries that are prone to hostilities, violence, and disparate treatment of women and girls to be able to work with our women in the United States military and be able to be trained on the issues of fighting terrorism, human trafficking, and narcotics trafficking.

According to a UNICEF report, rape, torture, and human trafficking by terrorist and militant groups have been employed as a weapon of war affecting over 20,000 women and girls, and those numbers are going up.

My amendment will curb terrorism abroad by making available American technical and military expertise to militaries in other countries, like Nigeria, who are combating violent jihadists. Boko Haram, of course, was at the center of taking the Chibok girls, and it is important to be able to utilize these activities.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD “U.S. Special Operations Command’s HEROs Combat Human Trafficking” and “The Role of the Military in Combating Human Trafficking: A South African Perspective.”

[From DoD News, Jan. 4, 2018]

U.S. SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND’S HEROS COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING  
(By Shannon Collins)

WASHINGTON.—January is National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month, and the Defense Department has teams who work year-round to combat these crimes worldwide.

The Human Exploitation Rescue Operative, or HERO, Child-Rescue Corps is a program developed by U.S. Special Operations Command, Warrior Care Program-Career Transition, the National Association to Protect Children and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, said Army Col. Kimberly Moros, chief of SOCOM’s career transition initiatives.

“The HERO Child-Rescue Corps Program is designed for wounded, injured and ill transitioning service members and veterans who receive training in high-tech computer forensics and law enforcement skills to assist federal agents in the fight against online child sexual exploitation,” she said. “Upon successful completion of the program, HERO interns will have the knowledge, skills and experience to apply for careers with federal, state and local police agencies and other organizations in the field of computer forensics.”

Since 2013, more than 130 veterans and transitioning service members have entered the HERO program. Of the successful graduates, 74 have been offered careers in federal law enforcement and another 31 are in internships, Moros said.

"HEROs and HERO interns now make up over 25 percent of the Homeland Security computer forensics workforce," said Robert Kurtz, unit chief for HERO at Homeland Security Investigations.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING

"Human trafficking includes using force, fraud or coercion to compel a person to provide labor, services or sex. It's a violation of basic human rights," said Linda Dixon, DOD Combating Trafficking in Persons Office Program Manager. "Combating trafficking in persons is a duty that DOD takes seriously as we do in other situations that bring harm to our nation. It is a global concern, and our goal is to educate every member of DOD on how to recognize and report human trafficking in the U.S. as well as around the world."

The three most common forms of trafficking, according to DOD's Combating Trafficking in Persons office, are forced labor, sex trafficking, and child soldiering.

Moros said the idea behind the HERO Corps is a simple one.

"When it comes to hunting those who prey on the innocent, who better than our nation's most highly trained military veterans?" she said. "Much of today's human trafficking and child sexual exploitation is technology facilitated. Offenders utilize the internet and digital technologies to coordinate their activity, advertise, share information and hide evidence. HEROs receive training in counter-child exploitation as well as digital forensics and victim identification. And they are then embedded with federal law enforcement."

She said the HERO Child-Rescue Corps saves children in several ways. "As law enforcement first responders, they are at every crime scene, searching for critical clues that might provide evidence for an arrest or to find a victim," Moros said.

Back at the forensic lab, the HERO is the lead digital investigator, searching out clues that can lead to organized criminal rings, evidence of sexual assault or production of child abuse imagery, she said.

"In many cases, it has been the relentless focus and military mindset that has allowed HEROs to go beyond the digging that might be done in traditional law enforcement to find a victim," she added.

Kurtz said federal law enforcement is just beginning to track rescues. In 2016, Homeland Security Investigations identified and rescued 820 known child victims from sexual exploitation.

"But the real number is undoubtedly many times greater," Moros said. "As a major segment of the digital forensic workforce, and one especially dedicated to combating child sexual exploitation and trafficking, they [HEROs] have been instrumental in working hundreds of those cases."

#### THE ROLE OF THE MILITARY IN COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING: A SOUTH AFRICAN PERSPECTIVE

(By Nina Mollema, University of South Africa)

#### ABSTRACT

Human trafficking is a complex and diverse crime affecting both individuals and countries across the world. As a significant facet of transnational organised crime and one of the most lucrative criminal enterprises globally, human trafficking was ranked as the second most profitable crime

around the world in 2015, making it the fastest-growing source of revenue for organised criminal operations internationally. In 2015, South Africa implemented comprehensive antitrafficking legislation. Before such legislation was enacted, the South African government also ratified several international and regional human rights instruments in terms of which specific duties are imposed upon the state to combat and punish the crime effectively, including the protection of the rights of victims. The focus of the study on which this article reports, is the desired role of the military in combating human trafficking in South Africa. In 2004, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) adopted a policy on combating trafficking in human beings. The policy sets out various strategies for ensuring regional cooperation in combating human trafficking. It is suggested that the South African National Defence Force (SANDF) take the initiative in formulating a similar policy in order to effect better co-operation amongst nation states in Africa, especially in the southern region of Africa, to combat human trafficking. In order to address the role of the SANDF in the fight against human trafficking meaningfully and to develop evidence-based strategies and policies, regional coordination in combating trafficking is paramount. The article examines current legislation, instruments and strategies as regards human trafficking in order to make recommendations for counter-trafficking policy standards and best practices for the SANDF.

#### INTRODUCTION

Although not a novel phenomenon, the crime of human trafficking is complex, diverse, and constantly evolving as traffickers develop new tactics to trade in human beings. Human trafficking affects not only individuals, but also countries across the world. It has been estimated by various international organisations that millions of victims are trapped in trafficking. Although both international entities and domestic jurisdictions have proposed various strategies to combat the rapidly growing problem of human trafficking, the combating of this criminal activity remains a challenge for all branches of law enforcement, including the military. The primary international instrument, the United Nations (UN) Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, Supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime of 2000 (Trafficking Protocol) is already 17 years old; yet, regional and national efforts to combat trafficking have produced minimal positive results. South Africa is no exception in this regard. Since the end of apartheid, the jurisdiction has been experiencing an increase of illegal immigrants from all over Africa, as well as other foreign countries. It has further been acknowledged that since 1994, the trafficking of men, women, and children into various exploitative sectors, such as labour trafficking and involuntary sex work, amongst others, have also escalated in South Africa.

This multi-dimensional illicit modern-day slavery industry must be fought at national, regional and international level with an integrated, multi-sectoral approach. In this respect, the SANDF also has a role to play, and can learn a great deal from NATO, amongst others, for guidelines and best practices. The Policy on Combating Trafficking in Human Beings of 2004 of this intergovernmental military alliance recognises that human trafficking feeds on corruption and organised crime, and has "the potential to destabilise fragile governments". As no such policy currently exists in the SANDF, it is proposed

that the Defence Force evaluate and develop policies, strategies and force design through the implementation of specific evidence-based codes of conduct or strategic plans to combat this offence.

Apart from the violation of the fundamental human rights of persons being trafficked, trafficking is a substantial source of revenue for criminal organisations whose activities may destabilise legitimate governments and undermine the mission of the military. The crime may become a security issue and undercut military operations. However, as known from previous experiences, military troops themselves can create or increase the demand for trafficked women.

This article is structured as follows: it is first necessary to explain which conduct falls under human trafficking in South African and international law. Second, the measures government have taken to combat this crime in South Africa are considered. Next, the role of the military in South Africa in combating human trafficking is considered and compared with international and regional efforts. Recommendations are then finally made for steps to be taken by the military to play a more significant role in combating human trafficking.

#### BACKGROUND TO HUMAN TRAFFICKING IN SOUTH AFRICA

Although people have heard of human trafficking, very few people really know what it entails and the role it plays in international organised crime. As a significant facet of transnational organised crime and one of the most lucrative criminal enterprises globally, human trafficking was ranked as the second most profitable crime around the world in 2015, making it the fastest-growing source of revenue for organised criminal operations internationally.

In order to combat the trade in human cargo, legal jurisdictions have adopted a range of international standards and obligations, of which the UN's Trafficking Protocol is the most significant. Following the prototype of the Trafficking Protocol, governments around the world have also committed themselves to enact national human trafficking legislation to address modern-day slavery. In Africa, where the scourge of trafficking is widespread, South Africa is one of the few nations that actively pursue the punishment of human trafficking. This is vital as South Africa with its viable and developing economy has become a magnet for illegal migrants and human traffickers, attracting people from the whole continent fleeing from political and economic upheaval, armed conflict," the HIV/AIDS pandemic, food insecurity and unemployment. The resultant poverty in especially South Africa's regional neighbours, still grappling with the aftereffects of colonisation and failed statehood, has furthermore caused an exodus to South Africa for better life opportunities. Traffickers are said to service the demand of the very lucrative human smuggling industry, especially in conflict and postconflict areas. In many illegal migration cases, displaced people make desperate decisions by relying on initially 'benevolent' smugglers who transform into ruthless traffickers, keeping the illegal migrants captive as human slaves. Trafficking in the jurisdiction is additionally complex and diverse as it consists of culturally unique trafficking types such as *ukuthwala*. The country has been listed as a human trafficking source, transit, and destination country for men, women

and children to, from and within South Africa for mainly labour and sex trafficking.

South Africa has the highest number of asylum seekers in the world. Although South Africa supports large numbers of refugees and asylum seekers, the jurisdiction is also home to an estimated five million illegal immigrants, including some three million Zimbabweans. In response to the dynamics of supply and demand, migration (which has always been endemic in Africa) to South Africa is aided by the porous nature of the country's borders and coast lines, as well as ineffective monitoring of land, rail and sea transportation modes. Trafficked people are indistinguishable amongst these flows.

In order to tackle the multi-dimensional crime of human trafficking in the country, South Africa became a signatory to the Trafficking Protocol in 2000, and ratified the instrument in 2004. As a result, the jurisdiction became subject to international obligations in terms of which specific duties were imposed upon the state to combat and punish the crime effectively and to protect the rights of victims. The need to enact domestic anti-trafficking legislation was prioritised, and on 29 July 2013, the Prevention and Combating of Trafficking in Persons Act 7 of 2013 (Trafficking Act) was signed into law but only became operational on 9 August 2015. The Act introduces a universally acceptable but still country-specific definition of human trafficking:

'Trafficking' includes the delivery, recruitment, procurement, capture, removal, transportation, transfer, harbouring, sale, exchange, lease, disposal or receiving of a person, or the adoption of a child facilitated or secured through legal or illegal means, within or across the borders of the Republic, of a person trafficked or an immediate family member of the person trafficked, by means of:

- (a) a threat of harm;
- (b) the threat or use of force, intimidation or other forms of coercion;
- (c) the abuse of vulnerability;
- (d) fraud;
- (e) deception or false pretences;
- (f) debt bondage;
- (g) abduction;
- (h) kidnapping;
- (i) the abuse of power;
- (j) the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to obtain the consent of a person having control or authority over another person; or
- (k) the giving or receiving of payments, compensation, rewards, benefits or any other advantage,

for the purpose of any form or manner of exploitation, sexual grooming or abuse of such person, including the commission of any sexual offence or any offence of a sexual nature in any other law against such person or performing any sexual act with such person, whether committed in or outside the borders of the Republic.

In essence, this definition holds that persons are trafficked if they have been moved within a country or to another country, as a result of force, fraud or manipulation and are exploited or compelled to work under threat of violence for no pay, beyond subsistence. The definition is very broad, and except for the requirement that a person be removed, transported, or transferred from one place to another, other acts such as the mere harbouring of a person through a threat of intimidation with the intent to exploit the person are sufficient for the crime to be committed. With regard to the role of the military, the moving of a person from one country to another, or within the country, through deceptive or violent means for any

type of exploitative purpose is of particular significance. The exploitative purposes may include forced labour, involuntary sex work, begging, stealing, drug running, forced marriage and the sale of body parts, amongst others.

Amongst other requirements, the Trafficking Protocol obliges member states to criminalise trafficking, and to investigate and prosecute traffickers. The Trafficking Protocol also instructs that states must adopt or strengthen legislative or other measures to discourage the demand that fosters all forms of exploitation of persons that lead to trafficking. States are to determine which measures to take in accordance with the domestic legislation and policies of each state as well as in accordance with the financial and human resource capabilities of the state.

Another important condition that the Protocol stipulates for signatory states is to undertake border control measures. Border management is one of the roles the SANDF is expected to play in South Africa, along with other secondary functions such as peacekeeping and humanitarian support. However, very few joint efforts have been made with neighbouring countries to deal multilaterally with border issues and crimes such as human trafficking and human smuggling. Co-operation between South Africa and its neighbours in this regard is usually not of a preventative nature, but only takes place after the occurrence of smuggling or trafficking has been discovered.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of Chairman VISCLOSKEY'S En Bloc Amendment, which includes Jackson Lee #12.

I wish to thank Chairman MCGOVERN and Ranking Member COLE of the Rules Committee for making this Jackson Lee Amendment in order.

I thank Chairwoman VISCLOSKEY and Ranking Member CALVERT for their hard work in bringing Division C, the Defense portion of this omnibus appropriations legislative package, to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe and their work in ensuring that they have resources needed to keep our Armed Forces the greatest fighting force for peace on earth.

Madam Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple and straightforward and affirms an example of the national goodness that makes America the most exceptional nation on earth.

The purpose of Jackson Lee Amendment #12, which is identical to the amendment adopted twice in the last Congress, is to provide the Secretary of Defense flexibility to allocate resources needed to provide technical assistance by U.S. military women to military women in other countries combating violence as a weapon of war, terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking.

Madam Chair, the United States is committed to combating violent extremism, protecting our borders and the globe from the scourge of terrorism.

The United States Armed Forces possess an unparalleled expertise and technological capability that will aid not only in combating and defeating terrorists who hate our country and prey upon innocent persons, especially women, girls, and the elderly.

But we must recognize that notwithstanding our extraordinary technical military capabilities,

we face adversaries who adapt very quickly because they are not constrained by geographic limitations or norms of morality and decency.

Al Qaeda, Boko Haram, Al Shabaab, ISIS/ISIL and other militant terrorists, including the Sinai's Ansar Beit al-Maqdis in the Sinai Peninsula which poses a threat to Egypt.

Jackson Lee Amendment #12 help provide the Department of Defense with the resources needed to provide technical assistance to countries on innovative strategies to provide defense technologies and resources that promote the security of the American people and allied nation states.

Terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking and their impact on women and girls across the globe has had a great adverse impact on us all.

According to a UNICEF report, rape, torture and human trafficking by terrorist and militant groups have been employed as weapons of war, affecting over twenty thousand women and girls.

Looking at the history of terrorism highlights the importance of providing technical assistance through our military might, as this enables us to combat terrorism which now can plague us here in the United States.

Jackson Lee Amendment #12 will help curb terrorism abroad by making available American technical military expertise to military in other countries, like Nigeria, who are combating violent jihadists in their country and to keep those terrorists out of our country.

Time and again American lives have been lost at the hands of terrorists.

These victims include Christians, Muslims, journalists, health care providers, relief workers, schoolchildren, and members of the diplomatic corps and the Armed Services.

This is why the technical assistance offered by our military personnel is integral to promoting security operation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft for missions to empower local forces to combat terrorism.

Terrorists across the globe have wreaked havoc on our society and cannot not be tolerated or ignored, for their actions pose a threat to our national security and the security of the world.

Madam Chair, from the United States to Africa to Europe to Asia and the Middle East, it is clear that combating terrorism remains one of highest national priorities.

Collectively, helping our neighbors and their military build capacity to combat terrorism, eradicate human trafficking, stop narcotics trafficking and negate their impact on women and girls across the globe serves our national interest.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support Jackson Lee Amendment #12 by voting for the Chairman's En Bloc Amendment to Division C of RCP 116-17.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support the underlying amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

□ 1515

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I rise today to support my amendment, which would prohibit taxpayer money from going directly to the Taliban.

According to recent news stories, the Defense Department asked Congress for

funding that could be used to reimburse the Taliban for transportation and other expenses. That is quite simply absurd.

For many years, I have worked in a bipartisan way to shine a light on how American tax dollars are being misspent in Afghanistan. There have been a number of oversight reports conducted by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction that highlight how these programs have been mismanaged and poorly run for years.

The SIGAR has identified a disturbing amount of waste, fraud, and abuse totaling in the billions of dollars. This level of wasteful spending is staggering, yet we continued pouring money down the drain anyway. But sending taxpayer dollars straight to the Taliban, despite the price paid by men and women in uniform, is the ultimate insult.

We owe it to the taxpayers to not waste any more of their money.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which would increase the funding level to Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) from the Department of Defense by four million dollars above current levels. I want to thank Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman VISCLOSKY for his support of this program and of this amendment.

Since 1837, HBCUs have served as training grounds for generations of African American students and scholars, and more recently, these important institutions have strengthened America's scientific workforce. Educating students and communities as anchors of academic excellence, HBCUs have a storied past and a dynamic present in their unique role of raising up new academic leaders against the grain of decades of discrimination and racism.

Building on this long history of achievement through investment, my amendment will increase resources for HBCUs by strengthening the Department of Defense's investments in the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering programs at HBCUs and their corresponding national security benefits.

HBCUs support some of the most cutting-edge defense and national security-related research in the country. Armed with these continued investments, HBCUs will be able to maintain their unique role in buttressing important national security initiatives.

For example, these programs support research in mobile computers that can be deployed to aid our servicemen and service-women on the battlefield.

Additionally, these programs are helping to improve the way our intelligence community classifies and manages large infrared photographs taken on important reconnaissance missions.

At a time when we are encouraging more training for students in the STEM fields, and promoting the benefits of a more diverse workforce in research and in the high-tech sectors, increasing DoD's investments for Historically

Black Colleges and Universities strengthens these goals and institutions, as well as our national security. I am encouraged that this amendment was included in the package of bipartisan en bloc amendments. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to increase funding for the Air National Guard's Facility Modernization and Sustainment account. I appreciate the support of the chairman for its inclusion in en bloc No. 2 to the Defense Appropriations bill.

I am so proud of the work of the men and women in the National Guard, including in my home state of Wisconsin.

Unfortunately, decrepit, outdated, and decaying Air National Guard facilities are a disservice to the men and women who put on the uniform.

They deserve facilities that are up-to-date and which will help improve their ability to carry out their missions in defense of our nation and their communities.

Yet, we know that such aging and inefficient facilities exist nationwide including in my district where the 128th Air Refueling Wing is operating out of a building which was built in 1970, has aging and hard to maintain critical building systems and where much of the current square footage is unusable. That's according to the Defense Department. This is not an isolated story which is why I think an increase here is necessary.

I appreciate the chairman, in his mark, for boosting funding for this critical account. I applaud his recognition of the situation facing many Air Guard units across the country and his commitment to putting funding into this account.

But the needs simply continue to outpace available resources.

I am aware that there are National Guard units across our country that have worthwhile projects directly related to military readiness that they would like to pursue. This additional funding should be prioritized for projects that can help increase mission readiness at minimal additional costs to the taxpayers.

For example, projects that would give help Air Guard units take advantage of and utilize available local assets such as national jet fuel pipelines to provide instant access to additional fuel reserves and provide a critical second, reliable, secure and convenient fuel delivery method that would help ensure that strategic missions such as refueling could continue uninterrupted should the primary method of receiving fuel be disrupted.

Now that the House has approved my amendment, I would urge the Defense Department to utilize these additional funds for needed projects that directly sustain mission readiness and contribute to our national defense. The reality is that there are plenty out there.

Again, I support the Chairman's mark and I am grateful for the inclusion of my amendment to help enable more projects that can build greater resiliency for execution of critical State and Federal Air National Guard missions.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chair, Lyme disease is the most prevalent vector-borne disease in the United States today, and members of the U.S. Armed Forces are not immune to its debilitating effects, as they train and complete exercises out in grassy and wooded areas.

According to the February 2018 Medical Surveillance Monthly Report, published by the

Armed Forces Health Surveillance Branch, tick-borne diseases accounted for more than half of the confirmed cases of vector-borne diseases among service members—active duty and reserve—recorded over seven years, from 2010–2016. Lyme disease alone had the largest number of confirmed cases.

In its inaugural report to Congress, the federal Tick-Borne Disease Working Group stated that "Tick-Borne Diseases have rapidly become a serious and growing threat to public health in the United States. Despite many scientific unknowns, experts agree that the incidence and distribution of tick-borne diseases are increasing." The Working Group also stated that "Federal funding for tick-borne diseases is less per new surveillance case than that of any other disease."

While the tick-borne disease research at CDMRP has been continuously funded at \$5 million since Fiscal Year 2016, the Working Group's report is a sign that there is still much more to be done.

The amendment I offer today will increase funding by \$2 million for the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program (CDMRP) for the purposes of tick-borne disease research. The added funding will enable the CDMRP to support more innovative research to address gaps in knowledge and information on tick-borne diseases. Military and civilian personnel and their dependents who are at risk will be better informed and prepared with enhanced awareness, education, and research programs.

I urge support for this amendment—we cannot shortchange our federal responsibility. We owe it to the countless patients, including our men and women in uniform suffering from tick-borne diseases and their families.

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the en bloc amendment, and to thank the Defense Subcommittee Chairman, Mr. VISCLOSKY, for including the Sherrill Amendment 58 in the en bloc package.

My amendment reduces the Surface and Shallow Water Mine Countermeasures program by \$5 million in order to add \$5 million for the Navy to advance the qualification and certification of Advanced Manufacturing processes for the integration of 3-D printed components into undersea warfare platforms. This amendment furthers the Navy's goal of embracing cutting-edge technologies.

3-D printing reduces the cost of manufacturing parts for which there is limited supply. It also creates unique parts that would otherwise be prohibitively expensive to make with traditional manufacturing.

I am very proud of the work Marotta Controls in Montville, New Jersey, is doing to support this very effort. Marotta is a family-owned business, now in its third generation of ownership. President and CEO Patrick Marotta is proudly carrying on the work his grandfather began when he founded the company during WWII. I thank Marotta Controls for their work to ensure efficiency and quality control to enable our Navy's submariners to continue to play their critical role in defense of our nation.

I thank Defense Subcommittee Chairman VISCLOSKY and Ranking Member CALVERT for their leadership in adopting this important provision.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam 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 246, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I would like to begin by thanking the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order, as well as Chairman VISCLOSKY and Ranking Member CALVERT for their hard work on this division of the appropriations package.

Madam Chair, I offer this bipartisan amendment with my good friends and colleagues, Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. LIEU, in support of electromagnetic railgun, a technology that has been described as “revolutionary” and a potential multi-mission “game changer.”

The electromagnetic railgun truly transforms naval power projection. This technology can rapidly launch high-velocity projectiles capable of precision strikes at a range of more than 100 miles, all without the need for combustible propellants or motors. Ships deploying with this system will have longer ranges, deeper magazines, and lower cost-per-shot than conventional naval artillery.

This technology has already received initial investments; however, current and future investment is absolutely vital to ensure the railgun module being designed is built to meet the needs of the Future Surface Combatant specifications and can be tested aboard existing naval vessels.

The additional \$10 million provided by this amendment will help keep delivery of an integrated prototype mount system on its original timeline of being ready by 2021. Continued investment in this program will also support live-fire engagement testing using hypervelocity projectiles and the next generation of shipboard compatible pulsed power.

While I believe the United States continues to lead the way, our adver-

saries are not resting on their laurels, as they are also investing, researching, and developing these groundbreaking technologies. Earlier this year, for instance, reports emerged of the Chinese Navy fielding an electromagnetic railgun. So it is absolutely critical that we not allow them or anyone to beat us to the punch.

Given the maturity of the technology and the urgency impressed upon us by our competitors, I hope the House will send a well-funded railgun program to the Senate.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's persistence to provide robust funding for the Navy's electromagnetic railgun and recognize that he has offered a similar amendment on the fiscal year 2019 appropriations bill.

I would point out to my colleagues that the bill currently fully funds the budget request of the administration at \$15 million for the railgun program.

While I do not think the additional \$10 million investment will accelerate the development of a demonstrator mount and continued testing, I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, first of all, I want to thank Chairman VISCLOSKY and Ranking Member CALVERT for their comments and their support and for their hard work on the consideration of this division of the appropriations package and all they have done and continue to do to advance our national security and make sure that our warfighters never enter a fair fight.

This bipartisan amendment supports game-changing technology that is already demonstrating tactically relevant capability. Just last month at White Sands Missile Range, the Navy fired a railgun on a 34-degree trajectory at 6 megajoules and will be firing at 20 megajoules in September.

By building upon years of development and investment, the Navy railgun will be tested as early as next year aboard surface vessels, firing explosive and nonexplosive projectiles at air- and sea-based targets.

Along with my colleagues Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. LIEU, I urge support of this amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam 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 Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam 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 245, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, my amendment would provide \$2 million for civics education grants under the Department of Defense National Defense Education Program as authorized by the House fiscal year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act that was reported out of the Armed Services Committee last week.

Madam Chair, it is not an exaggeration to say American democracy is under attack, and we need to shore up our defenses. Foreign governments, particularly Russia, are actively engaged in efforts to undermine our democracy and sow seeds of discord among the electorate, and they have been frighteningly successful.

In the special counsel's report on Russian interference in the 2016 Presidential election, Director Mueller described Russia's election-meddling operations as “sweeping and systemic.”

Russia systematically waged a misinformation campaign to weaken our confidence and participation in the democratic process, including by discouraging voting, undermining confidence in our institutions of government, promoting false political narratives, and widening social divisions.

Madam Chair, we need to increase our resilience to these attacks on our democracy, and I believe civics education must be a major part of this strategy. Civics programs provide students with an understanding of American law, how government works, and the skills to participate in democracy.



A citizenry armed with a civics background, I believe, is absolutely crucial to a healthy democracy; and in the context of the threats that we face today, I believe it is vital to the stability of our democracy.

Unfortunately, only 17 percent of Americans say they can trust the Federal Government to do what is right at least most of the time; only 26 percent of Americans can name all three branches of government; and less than 30 percent of fourth, eighth, and twelfth grade students scored proficient on the 2014 National Assessment of Education Progress civics test.

Furthermore, in 2016, only 56 percent of the United States voting-age population voted in the Presidential election, a number lower than most other developed democratic nations.

It should come as no surprise that we are vulnerable to misinformation campaigns. Too many of us do not fully understand or engage in the democratic process.

Madam Chair, I believe that we need to increase participation and improve civic knowledge, and education is, I believe, the way to do it.

\$2 million for civics education is just a start, but it will fund the development of innovative, evidence-based civics programs at the Department of Defense schools to start with.

Working with colleges and universities or expert nonprofits, DOD schools will help pilot new curricula targeted to improving longitudinal metrics, including democratic participation and media literacy. This will allow us to build new programs, test their efficacy, and, from there, chart a broader path forward.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and encourage the development of more effective civics education programs.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I simply want to take the time to thank my colleague for the work he is doing to advocate and advance knowledge of our Nation's youth on the rights and duties of citizenship. Again, I thank him for his work.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers, and I will close by just thanking Chairman VISCLOSKY and Ranking Member CALVERT for their work on the Defense Subcommittee portion of this package and for their commitment to our national defense.

As I said, I am troubled by the work of our enemies and adversaries to try to undermine confidence in government, sowing divisions among the elec-

torate. I am hoping that by strengthening our civics education, starting with our young people, we will build resiliency into protecting our democracy and everything that we love about this country.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam 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 Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam 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 247, line 17, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to provide an additional \$10 million for the National Security Innovation Network, or NSIN, which was originally called MD5.

Section 225 of the 2018 NDAA authorized the national security innovation and entrepreneurial education programs, including what is now known as NSIN. NSIN aims to educate and build a network of innovators and entrepreneurs equipped with the expertise, know-how, incentives, and resources required to develop, commercialize, and apply technology for defense and national security applications.

NSIN initiatives provide education and technology innovation and entrepreneurship. Of note, they provided a unique pathway for veterans to leverage their expertise, while learning cutting-edge business innovation methodology, and apply their knowledge to new national security problems.

Through these initiatives, DOD is growing a cadre of entrepreneurs that are adept at critical thinking, innovative problem solving, and the creation of successful ventures that deliver eco-

nomic national security and social value.

One initiative in the National Security Innovation Network is the highly successful Hacking for Defense course. Hacking for Defense, or H4D, is a course currently taught at more than two dozen universities across the Nation. It pairs student teams with sponsors from across the defense and intelligence community to apply lean start-up methodology developed in Silicon Valley to rapidly solve challenging, nonclassified national security problems.

H4D was authorized in the 2018 National Defense Authorization Act and has been taught for 3 years, already producing innovative solutions to national security problems. For example, a team at Columbia University helped Special Operations Command automate communication of essential information from the battlefield to Central Command; a Stanford team helped develop an innovative way for Navy SEALs to spend less time underwater.

These and other successful innovations have been developed by students in these classes. The innovation and entrepreneurial education that occurs with H4D also helps to train the next generation of our industrial-based innovators. In this way, it provides tremendous benefit to our national security.

Madam Chair, I have had discussions with Chairman VISCLOSKY on this amendment about the best way to move forward with this funding increase, and I believe we have come to an agreement on the best way to move forward to get an even bigger increase.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), chairman of the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I certainly do support his amendment.

The amendment expands the Hacking for Defense program, designed to provide students the opportunity to learn how to work with the Department and intelligence community to better address the Nation's emerging threats. It is an important activity, and he is absolutely correct.

Madam Chair, I would point out for my colleagues that, in the current fiscal year, this program was funded at \$15 million. In the current budget—and I appreciate his advocacy on behalf of this program—that has now been increased to \$40 million. Money is not everything, but it is important to this program to make sure it is adequately funded.

I, again, thank the gentleman very much for his work.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman VISCLOSKY for his work on this appropriations bill and for working with me on this amendment.

America's strength and entrepreneurship and innovation, we need to use those to protect our Nation in a rapidly evolving threat environment and

maintaining our security. A small increase in investment in Hacking for Defense helps us do this, while also training the next generation of innovators who understand the need to contribute to our national security.

Madam Chair, with the agreement of the chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), 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 C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Directive-type Memorandum (DTM)-19-004, Military Service by Transgender Persons and Persons with Gender Dysphoria, March 12, 2019 (effective date April 12, 2019).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise to offer this amendment on behalf of Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER from California, who has been a determined leader and partner in pushing back on this administration's ban on transgender servicemembers.

Madam Chair, this amendment is very simple. It states that no money appropriated in this Defense appropriations bill will be used to implement the President's ban on transgender servicemembers. No money shall be used to ask whether or not a servicemember has transitioned: to force them to remain closeted in a Don't Ask, Don't Tell environment; to force them out to their colleagues before they are ready to outwardly express who they are; and to ultimately force them out of the service.

The President and his administration wrongfully argue that it is about military readiness and unit cohesion, but these arguments are the same ones that were made to keep the military racially segregated.

Madam Chair, my service in an integrated armed service did not harm readiness, and neither does the service of the more than 14,000 transgender soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.

Transgender servicemembers increase lethality and readiness. They have served honorably and have received prestige commendations. They

are proof that anyone who can serve should be afforded the opportunity to serve. This legacy of honorable service will outlast this administration, this transgender ban, and this administration's attack on transgender Americans everywhere.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to do what is right: Put country before party; defend the thousands of Americans who are making the greatest sacrifice they can make for our country. Defend the brave and patriotic servicemembers who all came before Congress to talk about their service and the service of other transgender servicemembers. Defend them unquestionably. Defend the thousands of transgender servicemembers impacted. Defend them as they have defended us.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, this amendment risks undermining the readiness of our military at a time when we can least afford it. It does so by prohibiting the implementation of a careful and thoughtful policy developed by a panel of military experts last year regarding military service by transgender individuals.

Then-Secretary of Defense Mattis wrote that, in his best professional judgment, allowing military service by transgender individuals in the absence of this policy could "undermine the readiness, disrupt the unit cohesion, and impose an unreasonable burden on the military that is not conducive to military effectiveness and lethality."

This current policy is not—I repeat, not—a ban on service by transgender individuals. It carefully balances the readiness needs of the military with the medical needs of transgender individuals who wish to serve.

As new recruits, those individuals can serve openly under their biological gender so long as they have not suffered from gender dysphoria within 36 months and have not undergone gender transition procedures.

Furthermore, the new policy only applies to those seeking to join the military after its April 12, 2019, implementation and allows the service and the Coast Guard to waive its application in individual cases.

This issue is not one of social policy but of deployability. Individuals with medical conditions that do not allow them to deploy, such as those identified in the policy, adversely impact military readiness and reduce the military's warfighting capability.

I would also point out that individuals who require daily injections for other medical conditions are also not deployable, such as people who have diabetes.

Madam Chair, the military is an institution with one primary mission: to

fight and win our Nation's wars. Anything that interferes with its readiness for that mission poses an unacceptable risk to our men and women in uniform.

Unfortunately, this amendment poses just such a risk by disregarding the military's professional judgment and interfering with the policy developed to preserve warfighting readiness.

Madam Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to do so as well, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, no one would argue that military readiness and deployability are paramount, but transgender servicemembers do not inherently impact either.

Every service chief testified that transgender service would not disrupt unit cohesion or readiness and emphasized soldier deployability and not their gender identity.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), chairman of the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I would point out that the chiefs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the Commandant of the Marine Corps testified that the inclusive policy adopted under the Obama administration has caused no readiness issues. A panel of retired military Surgeons General released a report finding the ban's rationale for inclusion is contradicted by ample evidence and that the ban "harms readiness through forced dishonesty, wasted talent, double standards, and barriers to adequate care."

Madam Chair, this is the right thing to do, and I would simply close by saying, with so much anger and so much hate in this world today, it is time to be kind to people.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague and also Congresswoman SPEIER for their leadership on this critical issue.

Madam Chair, I am so disappointed that in 2019 this amendment is even necessary. Our military is strong and capable because of our dedicated servicemembers, including nearly 15,000 transgender troops.

This year, the Armed Services Committee held a hearing on the President's policy, and Active-Duty transgender servicemembers testified before the House for the first time. Each one was an incredibly capable, experienced, and decorated leader.

The DOD's exhaustive review found no valid reason to ban these patriotic



Americans who meet the same criteria as their peers.

For 3 years, our military has operated under a de facto inclusive policy where thousands could serve openly with, to quote General Millie, “precisely zero unit cohesion problems.”

□ 1545

Eighteen militaries already have inclusive policies without incidents or impact to readiness, and the facts reveal this policy for what it is: discrimination.

I urge my colleagues to support Ms. SPEIER’s amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam 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 Maryland will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part A of House Report 116–111.

Mr. AMASH. Madam 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 C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to submit a certification under section 702(h) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, or for an acquisition pursuant to such a certification, if such certification does not include the following sentence: “This certification does not authorize any acquisition that intentionally targets a person reasonably believed to be located outside the United States if a significant purpose of such targeting is to acquire the communications of a particular, known person reasonably believed to be in the United States, any acquisition of a communication as to which no participant is a person who is targeted pursuant to the authorized acquisition, or any acquisition of a communication known to be entirely domestic”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For more than a year, Republicans have been speaking forcefully about the use of FISA to gather intelligence on people associated with the Trump campaign. The concern is that some information was inappropriately included in an application submitted to

the FISA court which then found probable cause and granted an order to authorize surveillance of a Trump associate.

I appreciate my colleague’s concerns about Americans’ Fourth Amendment rights, but if my colleagues are concerned about the part of FISA used during the 2016 Presidential campaign, they should be terrified of section 702.

Under section 702 of FISA, the FISA court does not approve targets. There are no individualized applications or requirements to show probable cause in order to collect communications. The government can search and sweep in billions of communications, including communications of Americans, and then query that data for a particular American’s communications without a warrant.

The communications can be used to investigate and prosecute Americans. The government can use an American’s data to send them to prison without ever obtaining a warrant for it.

The Amash-Lofgren amendment puts in basic safeguards to allow the government to continue using section 702 for its stated purpose of gathering foreign intelligence, while limiting the government’s warrantless collection of Americans’ communications under FISA.

This amendment gives my Republican colleagues an opportunity to show that their concern about Fourth Amendment violations extends to the countless Americans that are impacted by the government’s warrantless FISA surveillance.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, the proposed change inserts a new test for the certification of acquisition and is likely meant to make it more difficult for the NSA to target foreign nationals if the intended target is in communication with someone in the United States.

I would point out, however, to the gentleman that this is an appropriations bill. This is not an authorization bill. The amendment is a serious change in policy and deserves more than 10 minutes of debate in this Chamber on our bill.

The issue belongs in the authorizing committees. I do not believe that this amendment has benefited from the work of the authorization process, and I do believe it would potentially put American lives at greater risk.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chairwoman, a vote for this amendment is also a vote to keep the President in check. For 2 years now my Democratic colleagues have spoken about the administration’s violation of civil liberties and its disregard for laws passed by Congress.

Section 702 is a broad authority with limited oversight and its regular use

involves the warrantless collection of Americans’ data. Even under previous administrations, the government has misled or kept information from Congress about its use of surveillance authorities, including their impact on Americans.

The government has also repeatedly failed to abide by legal limitations placed on those surveillance powers. The Fourth Amendment recognizes that broad surveillance powers are too dangerous to be put in the hands of any President.

The Amash-Lofgren amendment protects Fourth Amendment secured rights by limiting the ability of the President to unconstitutionally collect Americans’ communications without a warrant.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. For over 3 years, the House Intelligence Committee posted bipartisan classified and unclassified education sessions for Members to learn about FISA section 702.

FISA section 702 is a critical national security authority that has helped the United States collect vital intelligence on terrorists and other hostile actors located overseas. After vigorous debate, we were able to pass a bipartisan, bicameral compromise bill in the last Congress that preserved the operational flexibility of section 702 while instituting reforms to further protect U.S. persons’ privacy.

President Trump signed this legislation into law in January of 2018. The amendment today seeks to reopen a debate that was settled last Congress. Rather than debating this issue within the relevant committees of jurisdiction, however, Members who lost the debate last year now seek to have another bite at that apple to subvert the legislative process by bypassing those committees. If passed, I fear this amendment will have devastating consequences on our national security.

First, the amendment creates new, strict requirements on targeting of foreign actors overseas just because the hostile foreign actor is communicating with an associate in the United States. If this amendment were to pass, if a terrorist located in a foreign country communicates with conspirators located in the United States, the intelligence community might not be able to use section 702 to target that terrorist because he is communicating with a person in the United States.

For example, the intelligence community was able to thwart Najibullah Zazi’s planned terrorist attack to detonate explosives in Manhattan. If this amendment were enacted, the FBI and NSA might not have been able to use 702 to target the al-Qaida courier in Pakistan communicating back to conspirators in the United States, thus resulting in another terrorist attack in New York City.

Section 702 was enacted to prevent this type of event. This example illustrates the amendment's callous disregard for the history of the program.

Second, the amendment would limit NSA's abouts communication collection. Abouts communication collection takes place in NSA's upstream collection, and due to how internet communications work, allows NSA to collect the communications that may reference a 702 target's email address.

Again, we debated this issue last Congress and placed a statutory restriction on NSA's ability to continue abouts collection until meeting certain requirements.

I strongly urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chairwoman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chairwoman, my colleague is parroting the same thing we hear each time we try to make any reforms to the government surveillance authorities. These arguments are no longer credible.

Just a few months ago, the former Director of National Intelligence admitted that the government "may have oversold" the importance of the NSA's dragnet of Americans' phone records when Congress was considering reforms in 2013. Now we have seen reports that the program has been shuttered entirely despite the government's dire warnings about limiting it to protect Americans' rights.

Madam Chair, my amendment still allows the government to use section 702 for its purpose of surveilling foreigners overseas. All it does is limit things like collecting fully domestic communications.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chairwoman, I understand I have the right to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas, (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, and I want to rise to offer my support for his tireless efforts on this topic, in particular.

It should not be a hard question that the American citizens, the people who live here afforded protections under our Constitution, should not be targeted unnecessarily, even when we are doing our appropriate job to target those who wish to do us harm abroad.

I believe that the amendment in question attempts to do just that, to ensure we have those tools to target those abroad while protecting American citizens, and I thank the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan and the gentlewoman from California for sponsoring this amendment. This is needed.

I just want to remind this body of a couple statements. One was made by Attorney Emmet Flood talking about what took place with the President of the United States, and he said this:

We would all do well to remember, if it can happen—talking about the FISA issue—if it can happen to a President, imagine what they can do to you and I. Imagine what they can do to you and I. We need reform in this program.

Second, CHUCK SCHUMER. When the leader in this Congress, leader in the Senate was on the Rachel Maddow Show on January 3 talking about what took place with the President—

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Chair, Mr. SCHUMER said this, about the President. He said: "Let me tell you: You take on the intelligence community—they have six ways from Sunday at getting back at you."

That is not how it is supposed to work in this country. That is not how it is supposed to work. The unelected people answer to the elected individual. This is about reforming this program, making sure it respects our fundamental liberties. I respect the gentleman for bringing the amendment forward.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chairwoman, when I go back to my district, I hear from my constituents and they always ask: What is wrong with Washington? We can see what is wrong with Washington right here. We have Republicans for months saying: We are worried about FISA abuse. FISA is out of control.

Here we are trying to limit FISA, and they are running against it. They are saying: No, we can't limit FISA. Democrats say: We want to hold the President in check. Executive powers are out of control.

We have an amendment to hold the President in check. This is our time to stand up for the American people.

I am sick of going home and telling them that neither side wanted to defend their rights. I want to thank Ms. LOFGREN for joining me in this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, may I ask the Chair how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairwoman, section 702 authorizes the intelligence

community to target the communications of non-U.S. persons located outside the United States for foreign intelligence purposes.

This FISA section 702 program is an important tool for the intelligence community to gather foreign intelligence information to protect the homeland against international terrorism, weapons proliferation, hostile actions, cyber actors, and other threats to the national security.

Importantly, its focus is on foreigners located abroad. It does not allow the intelligence community to target U.S. persons. Section 702 collections already include significant protection for civil liberties and privacy.

While the amendment may be well-intentioned, I fear it will upset the delicate balance reflected in current wording of this provision. The recent comprehensive review and bipartisan reauthorization of section 702 by Congress would strongly suggest that additional changes to the program without a full review of the potential impact is ill-advised.

Madam Chairwoman, intelligence officials from the Obama administration and the Trump administration have asserted, as FBI Director Christopher Wray recently reiterated, that section 702 is one of the most viable tools we have in our toolbox to keep America safe. Accordingly, I oppose this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I am opposed to the amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan and the gentlelady from California.

Bipartisan majorities of the House and Senate have recognized the national security importance of the section 702 program, that it can help protect our country and respect the privacy of our citizens, and that these goals need not be in conflict. This near consensus was founded in part on recognition of the 702 program's close and regular examination by the DNI and DOJ, by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, by The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, by inspectors general—and of course, by the judiciary and intelligence committees in the House and Senate.

Even against this background, I have long supported privacy and transparency reforms that preserve the undoubted value of the section 702 program to U.S. National security. For that reason, I joined in strongly backing the bipartisan compromise legislation, which imposed new privacy safeguards while reauthorizing section 702 activities. And I do strongly believe that, as Members of Congress charged with upholding the Constitution, we should be actively and always looking for ways to shore up section 702's already rigorous regime for protecting the rights of U.S. persons—in a fashion that still permits the IC to accomplish its mission.

And that is where I think the amendment goes too far, and needlessly risks doing serious harm to what is perhaps our government's most valuable mechanism for obtaining the communications of foreigners overseas.

With its addition of new, unnecessary and confusing legal requirements, the amendment

would risk the section 702 program's temporary cessation, while the IC takes steps to understand and comply with the amendment's mandates.

Moreover, as written the amendment strongly suggests that the IC immediately would have to stop collecting the communications of a suspected terrorist abroad, simply because the suspected terrorist was communicating with an individual thought to be within in the United States. The IC should not be required to cease collection of intelligence in situations where it is entirely appropriate to collect it, and where we most badly need to IC to do so—such as the Najibullah Zazi case, where the IC detected and foiled what would have been a deadly terrorist plot to detonate explosives on subway lines in Manhattan.

The amendment would also deny funds for so-called “abouts” collection, which the IC on its own decided to discontinue in 2017—and thus go well beyond the compromise carefully crafted by Congress the following year. Under existing law such collection might resume one day, provided the IC first convinces the courts and congress that such collection can be conducted in a manner that fully safeguards privacy rights. The IC should not be banned from collecting intelligence in a fashion that protects privacy, if it can devise an appropriate means of doing so. And yet that is precisely what the amendment would take off the table, in advance.

I see no reason to disturb the balance that we struck in 2018, after such extensive and rigorous deliberation. And I see many, strong reasons to leave in place this critically necessary intelligence gathering tool, on which our intelligence professionals rely every day.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam 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 Michigan will be postponed.

□ 1600

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 25 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in part A of House Report 116–111.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam 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 248, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,000,000)”.

Page 249, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$20,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, our servicemen and -women suffer from arthritis at disproportionately high rates compared to the civilian population. Arthritis is the leading cause of disability among our veterans and the second leading cause of medical discharge among members of the Army. However, there is currently no dedicated funding for researching arthritis among our servicemembers and veterans.

This bipartisan amendment, which my friend from West Virginia, Congressman MCKINLEY, and I have worked on as co-chairs of the Congressional Arthritis Caucus, would provide dedicated funding for arthritis research in the military.

Establishing this line of funding within the CDMRP will help improve our understanding of arthritis in the military. While some CDMRP money is already used to research arthritis, this funding can fluctuate from year to year and is not specified in statute. Our researchers need stable, consistent funding in order to complete the long-term studies needed to better understand this disease.

I am proud that our amendment is supported by over 20 veterans service organizations.

I thank Chairman VISCLOSKEY for his consideration of this proposal and for his commitment to continue working with us on future appropriations bills to include arthritis research. With this commitment, we are prepared to withdraw the amendment.

Madam Chair, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in part A of House Report 116–111.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam 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 241, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,333,000)”.

Page 245, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,333,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I thank Mr. VISCLOSKEY and his staff for their tireless dedication to putting together such a comprehensive Defense appropriations bill. The work the gentleman's committee does to ensure our Armed Forces has the funding it needs keeps America

safe. I am grateful for his dedication to this important task.

I am pleased to offer my amendment that would increase funding for life support systems on Ohio-class submarines. This program is important for ensuring the Ohio class reaches its 42-year service life extension.

Submarines are a critical component of our Nation's nuclear triad, which ensures the United States has a constant deterrent against nuclear strikes from nations that would do us harm. To keep this triad strong, we must ensure that the Ohio-class submarines remain in operation until the Columbia class can take their place.

Putting modern, low-pressure life support systems on our submarines is an essential part of ensuring the longevity of this program.

I understand the chairman's concerns about the Navy's implementation of submarine life support systems. When Congress appropriates money, it must be spent efficiently and promptly. I believe this program should be funded at the historic level of \$11,968,000.

Madam Chair, I will offer to withdraw my amendment and work with the chairman to ensure the Navy effectively manages this program and that Congress provides robust support for it in future years.

I am asking the chairman if we will work together on this important issue moving forward.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, just to address the issue for a moment, I really appreciate the gentlewoman for bringing this to all Members' attention. She is absolutely correct that this is a very important program.

I will point out that I think the most important point she made is that the Navy and the government have to be very efficient in the expenditure of these funds. It is an important program, but I would point out that the Navy has awarded contracts late for the last few years, causing the program to remain perpetually behind.

Again, though, I understand that what the gentlewoman and the committee want is to let us get this back on track and make sure it is properly funded. I absolutely would be happy to work with the gentlewoman on this.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman, and I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in part A of House Report 116–111.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam 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 247, line 17, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000) (reduced by \$5,000,000)” after the dollar amount.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED  
BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Chair, my amendment inadvertently contains a numerical drafting error that would increase spending. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified with the form that I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

The amendment is modified to read as follows:

Page 247, line 17, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000) (reduced by \$5,000,000)” after the dollar amount.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I am pleased to offer my amendment that addresses an important supply chain issue related to defense electronics.

Driven by environmental regulations outside the United States, the worldwide \$1 trillion commercial electronics industry converted to lead-free components over 15 years ago. Despite this global transition, the United States aerospace and defense electronics industry continues to rely upon lead-based assembly technology because lead-based assembly is considered structurally superior.

To ensure the reliability and performance of lead-free technology for defense and aerospace electronics, additional research and development are needed. Because the DOD electronics market is just a small fraction of the broader electronics market, commercial industry needs Federal leadership in this area.

As technological advances in civilian electronics continue to incorporate lead-free technology, this problem will only become more acute. As a result, the DOD cannot rapidly integrate state-of-the-art lead-free components, including semiconductors, for cutting-edge technologies like hypersonics, artificial intelligence, and robotics that impact numerous DOD weapons systems.

This disconnect between the defense and commercial electronics industries can no longer be ignored.

My amendment, which I am offering with my colleague Representative

BRAD SCHNEIDER, emphasizes the importance of the DOD funding research to increase the capacity of the defense industry to produce lead-free electronics that meet the performance requirements of our Nation's Armed Forces. This research will ensure that American manufacturers can supply the men and women who keep us safe with modern, resilient technology that meets their unique needs.

I look forward to working with the DOD and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee to ensure funding for the development of this program.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding me time and simply would suggest that the committee has no opposition to the amendment.

I would point out that, again, she struck a chord with me when she talked about the supply chain problems we have in the United States of America across the industrial sector.

Again, I appreciate her raising this and offering the amendment.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 36 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Texas, 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 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$9,000,000)”.

Page 246, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$9,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, this amendment provides an additional \$9 million to address one of the Army's top unfunded priorities, future vertical lift.

The funding would allow the Army to speed up the acquisition timeline for

the replacement of the Black Hawk helicopter, which first entered service in 1979. The additional range and payload that will be available via the Black Hawk replacement will ensure that our troops are provided with the most technologically advanced equipment.

The Army currently enjoys a competitive advantage over our adversaries, and investment into future vertical lift will ensure that we continue to have that advantage.

Madam Chair, I ask for support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, the Army identified a \$75.6 million unfunded requirement for the future vertical lift program, and this amendment helps to address that by adding an additional \$9 million, as the chairman brought out, to this program.

Madam Chair, this is a good program. I support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROY. Madam 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 Indiana will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 39 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) and have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$500,000) (increased by \$500,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chairman, this amendment deals with additional funds for reporting on climate change impacts on our national security.

I would point out that, in 2014, the Department of Defense issued a climate change adaptation roadmap that

described the very serious and significant ways that climate change threatens the national security of the United States of America.

□ 1615

It found that rising global temperatures, changing precipitation patterns, climbing sea levels, and more extreme weather events will intensify the challenges of global instability, hunger, poverty, and conflict.

It will likely lead to food and water shortages, pandemic disease, disputes over refugees and resources, and destruction by natural disasters in regions across the globe.

Earlier this year, the department released another report that found that more than two-thirds of the military's operationally critical installations are threatened by climate change.

It noted that the effects of a changing climate are a national security issue, with potential impacts to the Department of Defense's missions, operational plans, and installations.

As an example, the Air Force currently oversees 15 radar sites in Alaska. Since the Cold War, they have monitored the airspace above much of the Bering Sea and the Arctic. When the radar sites were selected in the 1950s, along Alaska's coastlines and deep in its interior, melting permafrost and coastal erosion were not yet long-term strategic concerns for the department.

However, the melting of permafrost is happening more rapidly than Pentagon officials predicted, and it is causing the ground beneath the sites to crumble. Three radar sites in Alaska were forced to close in 2007 due in part to soil erosion.

A 2014 Government Accountability Office report found that the installations are seeing erosion that the Pentagon did not expect to occur until 2040.

This amendment ensures that the Department of Defense continues to provide scientifically based information about the effects of climate change on national security.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, just 5 months ago, the Department of Defense completed a public assessment titled "Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense."

The report accompanying the bill includes further directive language regarding additional reporting requirements for the department.

How many reports do we need on this topic in 1 year? This amendment is extraneous and unnecessary; I urge my colleagues to oppose it; and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I would simply state that the depart-

ment must be transparent in reporting the strategic, operational, and financial costs of climate change.

I would ask support for 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 Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam 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 Indiana will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam 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 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$4,356,000) (reduced by \$4,356,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, today I rise to speak on behalf of the bipartisan amendment No. 41 to division C of the Defense appropriations division to H.R. 2740.

My amendment seeks to provide an increase of \$4,356,000 to further support the Department of Defense's Innovative Readiness Training program, bringing its total recommended funding level for fiscal year 2020 to \$30 million. This proposed increase is made possible by reducing the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide account by the same amount.

The Innovative Readiness Training program, IRT program, is a Department of Defense military training opportunity, exclusive to the United States and its territories, that delivers joint opportunities to increase deployment readiness.

Simultaneously, IRT provides key services with lasting benefits for communities across our Nation, thus strengthening the bonds between the American people and the U.S. military.

Each year, this program enhances deployment readiness for approximately 7,000 servicemembers by providing hands-on, real-world training experience for mission-essential tasks, often in remote or underserved areas across the country.

Military units have an opportunity to refine their engineering, healthcare,

diving, and transportation skills by performing services and developing projects for American communities that otherwise would not have the resources to conduct them on their own.

In 2018, the services led 39 missions across the United States. My constituents in Puerto Rico are among those who have greatly benefited from this program.

A year after Hurricane Maria devastated our island, 200 servicemembers participated in two of these missions to provide no-cost medical and construction services to local residents.

Through the Ola de Esperanza Sanadora mission, they assisted local authorities in providing medical, dental, and optometry care to over 3,800 patients. Similarly, they partnered with Habitat for Humanity to build a three-family home designed to resist hurricanes in the Quintana neighborhood of San Juan.

Earlier this year, the 1st Mission Support Command and the U.S. Army Reserve Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico soldiers joined more than 500 members from different DOD components in a mission on the island that provided medical service to over 9,000 patients, delivered over 2,000 eyeglasses, and completed over 10,000 medical procedures.

Participating units, therefore, increased their readiness and obtained valuable, hands-on training experience while helping thousands of their fellow American citizens in Puerto Rico receive the care they need.

Other communities across the Nation have also benefited greatly from this program. In Alaska, as an example, the program supports missions like Operation Arctic Care, which provided roving medical and dental care to rural and Alaska Native villages.

In the Northern Mariana Islands—and I want to thank Congressman SABLON for being an original cosponsor of this amendment—these missions have helped renovate and improve the Tinian Health Clinic.

In Mississippi, this mission has partnered with a local foundation in a multi-year mission to build a special-needs camp.

Given how these missions have been vital in improving our servicemembers' readiness while simultaneously offering quality services to thousands of Americans, I strongly believe Congress should provide as much support as possible for the program. This amendment seeks to do that.

I commend Chairman VISCLOSKY, Ranking Member CALVERT, and the House Appropriations Committee for including a \$10 million increase above the President's budget request, and my amendment simply seeks to complete this effort by providing an additional increase to bring the program total budget to \$30 million, consistent with the recommended funding level in the Senate version for the fiscal year 2020.

Madam Chair, I want to conclude by thanking my colleague Congressman

SABLAN from the Northern Mariana Islands for cosponsoring my amendment. I urge my colleagues to join this effort, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, I rise today because 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 238, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$7,500,000) (increased by \$7,500,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This amendment would establish a pilot program that would allow an expeditionary sea base, ESB, to be equipped with weaponry to defend itself.

This pilot program is needed because, currently, an ESB must be accompanied by a destroyer when on a mission. To deploy a destroyer, operational costs add up to \$33 million.

If the \$7.5 million pilot program—which is the cost—is passed, then this expeditionary sea base will be able to protect itself and a destroyer will no longer be required to accompany it, allowing the destroyer to complete other missions.

This pilot program does not mean the ESB will go out actively using its weaponry. Rather, the intent of this program would be to free up the destroyer for other missions without leaving an ESB defenseless.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for this amendment. They make that fine ship in San Diego, California, and we want to defend it to the hilt, so we appreciate this amendment.

It makes the bill a better bill, and I thank the gentleman for bringing that bill forward.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, I would just say, this is a return on invest-

ment. This is a good investment that will save this country a lot of money with its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam 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 C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue export licenses for the following defense items, including defense articles, defense services, and related technical data, described in the certification Transmittal Numbers DDTC-17-079, DDTC-17-094, DDTC 17-112, DDTC-17-126, DDTC-17-128, DDTC-18-013, DDTC-18-029, DDTC-18-030, DDTC-18-050, DDTC-18-080, DDTC-18-103, DDTC-18-109, DDTC-18-110, DDTC-19-001, 17-0B, 17-BM, 17-CR, 17-CU, 18-AU, 18-BE, 19-AA and 19-AR.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On May 24, the Trump administration notified Congress that it was declaring a so-called emergency to bypass congressional review of 22 arms sales to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.

I am offering this amendment because there is no emergency, just a conflict in Yemen that has killed thousands of civilians with U.S.-made weapons and a Congress that is tired of being complicit. That is why we voted last month to pass bipartisan, bicameral resolutions to end U.S. support for the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen.

Despite that clear signal from Congress, the administration decided to use an emergency power to go around us and push through an unpopular arms package that would likely be used in that conflict.

That package includes an unprecedented proposal to move production of precision-guided munitions to Saudi Arabia, essentially outsourcing jobs to the kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Simply put, this is an egregious abuse of the emergency authority we gave the executive and a direct affront to our institution.

To add insult to injury, the arms in question aren't even available to be exported. As Assistant Secretary of State

for Political-Military Affairs Clarke Cooper testified last week, most of these weapons systems will not be ready for months, if not potentially years.

Our arm sales process was designed to include congressional review specifically to ensure that each case serves U.S. interests.

If the administration believes that these sales can stand on the merits, they should make their case to Congress. Until they do, we must use the power of the purse and every other avenue to block them.

I also want to thank Chairman VIS-CLOSKY for his leadership and support as well. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, at the outset, it should be clear: There is no country that is more hostile to the interests of the United States and our allies, especially Israel, than Iran.

In fact, as we debate this bill, the U.S. and our partners in the region are under serious threat from Iran and its proxies.

As our commander of the U.S. Central Command, General Frank McKenzie, said recently, the Iranian threat remains imminent.

Just last week, Iranian Revolutionary Guard forces used a type of magnetic mine—a limpet mine—to attack Japanese and Norwegian oil tankers in the Gulf of Oman.

□ 1630

In addition to this threat to international freedom of navigation and commerce, Iran's Houthi proxies have launched sustained attacks on airports and other infrastructure targets within Saudi Arabia.

In this context, it is clearly in the national interest of the United States to ensure that our partners in the region have the capabilities they need to counter a hostile Iran.

The sweeping scope of this amendment, however, seeks to block all 22 of these arms sales instead of those few that may be of particular concern. For example, it would attempt to prevent the transfer of precision-guided munitions to our ally Jordan, as well as a number of other seemingly non-controversial cases.

Madam Chair, we need to work with our partners in the region to accomplish common objectives on counterterrorism and in deterring Iran, including through timely U.S. defense transfers.

Arbitrarily stopping a large number of arms sales, regardless of their sensitivity, will hinder the ability of our combatant commander to accomplish these goals. It will also undermine the reputation of the United States as a reliable security partner and provide opportunities to China or Russia to erode U.S. influence in the region.



I want to acknowledge that all of us are deeply concerned with the ongoing humanitarian crisis in Yemen. I support the efforts of the executive branch to work with the U.N. Special Envoy toward a political resolution of this conflict.

It is also unfortunate that the Department of State decided to utilize an emergency waiver authority on the arms sales that are the subject of this amendment. Congressional oversight over arms transfers is an important responsibility, and it would have been best had these sensitive matters been handled through the traditional consultative process.

This is not the appropriate vehicle to vindicate those congressional prerogatives. That responsibility rests with the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees, and not in this bill.

Madam Chair, accordingly, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Chair, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from California.

I simply note that the issue here is not whether we should sell arms to our allies, such as Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. The issue is whether Congress should have a role or we are going to be completely bypassed by this administration.

That is all this amendment seeks to do, to have Congress take a role in the way we have always taken a role in arms sales.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VIS-CLOSKY).

Mr. VIS-CLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the gentleman for offering the amendment.

The operative word here is "bypass." The administration has used an obscure, rarely used provision to skirt congressional review of arms sales with Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.

The administration's lack of justification for using this emergency authority with respect to these sales is troubling, especially when you consider much of the equipment contained in these cases would not be delivered for months, as the gentleman from California rightfully pointed out.

Congress is a coequal branch of government and has oversight responsibilities to review such cases before we sell major weapons systems to other countries. These review requirements are on the books for a reason, and this amendment helps to ensure that the law is adhered to and that Congress is respected and can meet its constitutional requirement.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I compliment my colleague from California. This is something that is very serious, and obviously, we have been talking about it for a long time now.

We are a coequal branch of government. We want the executive branch, no matter who is in the executive branch, to respect the fact that we are.

That is clear to the people in this House. We have voted that way, and we have talked that way. We believe that what the administration did by calling these weapons "emergency" was not the right thing to do. It is clearly not an emergency. It is clearly a way of skirting around Congress. It is clearly a way of trying to not work with Congress.

I think that it is time that the Congress takes back important things, such as declaring war, such as sending these things to our allies.

I feel very, very strongly, and I think that my colleagues will, too, that Mr. LIEU should be supported in this.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, we need to stand by our allies and oppose Iran. This amendment is not helpful. I encourage all of our colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. GALLAGHER OF WISCONSIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam 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 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$96,000,000)".

Page 246, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Page 247, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$76,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last December, in lockstep with our NATO allies, the U.S. determined that Russia is in material breach of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces, or INF, Treaty. This followed determinations by the State Department in 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017 that Russia has failed to comply with its INF obligations.

As one of only two parties in the agreement, and the only party currently playing by the rules, the U.S. is subject to severe restrictions on our military capabilities faced by no other nation on Earth. This problem is especially acute in Asia, where the U.S. must project power across vast distances and with enormous logistics chains.

While the original treaty was about intermediate-range nuclear weapons, China has seized upon the potential of conventional missiles of intermediate ranges, which are likewise banned under the INF. The Chinese military has invested in thousands of conventional ground-based missiles, roughly 95 percent of which would be prohibited by the treaty if Beijing were a signatory.

This arsenal puts us on the wrong side of the cost competition. As you can see from this chart from the non-partisan Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, the U.S. military is dangerously outranged at intermediate distances.

No matter how capable or affordable, our ships, fighters, and bombers will never be cheaper than ground-based missiles. This is a recipe for disaster, both in war and in peacetime competition.

Two years ago, to remedy this, Congress began R&D funding for ground-based conventional intermediate missiles. Now that the United States is months away from a post-INF world, Congress is threatening to undo this process by zeroing out R&D for these purely conventional missile systems.

To be clear, early-stage R&D on intermediate missiles is allowable under the treaty. It is why we have been doing it over the past 2 years.

The cuts contained in this bill already go beyond what is mandated by the agreement. It would not only keep us unilaterally tied to a treaty that no one else is honoring, but it would also expand the scope of our commitment by blocking R&D funding.

Madam Chair, this is insanity. No other conventional weapons system would ever be held to this standard. We wouldn't do it for planes. We wouldn't do it for ships. We wouldn't do it for tanks. Yet, we are doing it for missiles that would provide credible, dispersed, and lethal firepower.

I understand that my colleagues, some on both sides of the aisle, have concerns on nuclear weapons. I understand. I appreciate that. I would welcome a conversation with any of my colleagues about prohibiting R&D dollars from going toward intermediate-range nuclear missiles.

But despite the INF name, this amendment has nothing to do with nuclear weapons. This is all about conventional deterrence.

Go talk to the men and women who are downrange in the Indo-Pacific Command who are, on a daily basis, dealing with the real-world ramifications of an increasingly unfavorable

conventional military balance. They will tell Members, and, indeed, they have told us on the Armed Services Committee, that deploying intermediate-range conventional missiles in Asia would help increase our deterrence and, therefore, improve our ability to avoid war, which is what it is all about.

Madam Chair, I cannot be clear enough. By zeroing out R&D funding for intermediate-range conventional missiles, this bill undermines our ability to credibly deter aggression. Whatever we think about nuclear weapons, these cuts make them more important to American defense planning, not less, by reducing our options to restore growing imbalances in conventional power.

This is a mistake that I fear will cost the United States in more ways than one. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which would restore funding for R&D for intermediate-range conventional missiles and provide the Department with the flexibility it needs to pursue this critical capability.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, the Russians are cheating on the INF Treaty. That does not mean we should compound the first problem by creating a second problem. Don't make a bad situation worse.

Our energy and focus should remain on diplomacy and multilateral efforts to bring Russia back into compliance with the INF Treaty.

The INF Treaty, which was signed by President Reagan in 1987, established an agreement between the United States, Russia, and a number of other countries to not field ground-launched cruise and ballistic missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers. This treaty was instrumental in arresting the arms race, defusing tensions, and ultimately, bringing an end to the Cold War.

I find it very concerning that, due to the President's suspension of compliance in February, the INF Treaty will be officially null and void on August 2. This was all done without exhausting all diplomatic efforts and with limited congressional input.

The conditions established in the treaty are crucial to European security.

I find it disingenuous that the statement of administration policy on this bill implies NATO endorses the U.S. developing an intermediate-range cruise missile capability. The Brussels summit declaration by NATO heads of state and government in July 2018 stated that the INF Treaty has been crucial to Euro-Atlantic security and that we remain fully committed to the pres-

ervation of this landmark arms control treaty.

The December 2018 statement by the NATO Foreign Ministers reinforced this by stating that the treaty had been crucial in upholding NATO's security for over 30 years.

The February 2019 statement by the North Atlantic Council continued to call on Russia to return to compliance with the treaty. It did not endorse the development of INF-violating weapons by the U.S. or any other member of the alliance.

NATO's official position on the treaty remains that NATO's focus is to preserve the INF treaty.

There is no question Russia has not upheld its promises as a signatory to the treaty. However, I believe the irresponsible actions of the Russian Government do not require the U.S. to jump headlong into a costly and unnecessary arms race that will promote greater instability, which harkens back to the policies and actions that defined the most perilous phases of the Cold War.

This amendment would negate previous U.S. nonproliferation and arms control efforts. It is neither prudent nor wise.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Chair, I want to quickly say that a treaty that no one else is abiding by is merely a suicide pact with ourselves.

Secondly, even if you disagree with my assessment of the INF, this limits our ability to conduct R&D, which isn't prohibited by the treaty.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I will be very quick.

I am shocked: The Russians are cheating.

Now that our treaty obligations are suspended, the United States needs to move forward with developing ground-launched INF missile capability.

Madam Chair, I support the gentleman's amendment.

□ 1645

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for this spirited debate.

I just would ask that we consider what we want the world to look like in a post-INF environment, because that is where we are headed, and we have multiple options we need to pursue. We are limiting ourselves. We are taking a step backward if we do not approve this amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I believe that it is necessary to maintain a credible and effective nuclear deterrence.

I also strongly believe that multilateral diplomatic efforts, including the INF Treaty and other international agreements, that encourage all countries to restrain potentially bad behavior are key elements of U.S. national security.

Beyond this particular amendment, it is my hope that the administration will reconsider its efforts to unilaterally abrogate from our national responsibility to uphold the INF Treaty, and instead, to work with Congress and our allies abroad to address and rectify long-standing arms control concerns with Russia and other global actors.

I will continue to be a strong advocate for diplomacy and remain a willing and available partner to the administration and our colleagues in regard to this treaty and other important issues.

Madam Chair, I do oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam 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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. GALLAGHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), 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 223, line 22, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$19,600,000)".

Page 238, line 2, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$19,600,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Chair, it is my privilege to offer my colleague, Ms. CHENEY's, amendment to restore badly needed funding for Trident II Modifications relating to low-yield submarine-launched ballistic missile warheads.

This amendment seeks to address an urgent operational requirement. Russia has a nuclear doctrine known as escalate to deescalate. This doctrine emphasizes using low-yield nuclear weapons against U.S. and allied forces on the battlefield.

As the logic behind this doctrine goes, destroying large portions of NATO forces with low-yield nuclear weapons would leave allied decision-makers with an unenviable decision between accepting Russian conquest and the effective end of NATO, or launching strategic nuclear weapons and ushering in a nuclear holocaust.

In other words, they put the onus of escalation and all of the attendant international opprobrium on us.

I don't know about you, but that does not sound like a good choice to me.

The Nuclear Posture Review is actually clear on this subject: "Expanding flexible U.S. nuclear options now, to include low-yield options, is important for the preservation of credible deterrence against regional aggression . . . will raise the nuclear threshold and help ensure that potential adversaries perceive no possible advantage in limited nuclear escalation, making nuclear weapons employment less likely."

Critics may argue that we have already had low-yield weapons in our arsenal and we do not need a submarine-launched variant. They also argue against displacing strategic weapons with low-yield options in limited missile SSBN missile tubes.

But as the Nuclear Posture Review finds, sea-launched low-yield weapons provide tangible advantages compared to dual-capable aircraft.

I quote again: "A low-yield SLBM warhead and SLCM will not require or rely on host nation support to provide deterrent effect. They will provide additional diversity in platforms, range, and survivability, and a valuable hedge against future nuclear 'break out' scenarios."

I just would emphasize, to close, the findings from the Nuclear Posture Review are not partisan. This amendment is actually advancing a bipartisan position.

Former Obama Secretary of Defense Ash Carter has gone on record saying: "My views are reflected in the latest Nuclear Posture Review."

Jim Miller, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy during the Obama administration, has argued that "Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis' 2018 Nuclear Posture Review offers continuity with past U.S. policy and plans, including those in the 2010 NPR. It deserves broad bipartisan support. Its proposal for a low-yield SLBM weapon and a new nuclear-tipped sea-launched cruise missile are sensible responses to changed security conditions, especially Russia and North Korea."

We have heard time and again from this body, rightly, that we need to push back on Russian aggression. On this, we are unified as a body. This is a tangible step to do so.

As General Hyten, head of U.S. Strategic Command, has argued, this capability is: ". . . necessary to our strategic deterrence mission and will serve to disabuse any adversary of the mistaken perception they can escalate their way to victory."

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment on a bipartisan basis, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I, again, strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment. This amendment would provide funding for the deployment of the ill-conceived low-yield nuclear warhead on Ohio-class ballistic missile submarines.

I believe that deploying this warhead would amplify the risk of a devastating nuclear conflict with Russia by reducing the threshold of nuclear use and increasing the risk of miscalculation.

Deploying the W76-2 warhead on ballistic missile submarines carries especially great risk.

I would ask the Members of this body to consider, if we deploy a low-yield warhead aboard our nuclear submarines, would Russia regard such weapons as less of a threat than our existing submarine-launched nuclear missiles?

If we were to use such a weapon, even in response to a Russian first use of low-yield weapons, would Russia be likely to act with restraint, or would Russian leaders instead assume that we have initiated a strategic nuclear attack, and respond in kind?

Do we really believe that any nuclear exchange can avoid escalation by using low-yield weapons?

The significant danger of miscalculation is greater than any marginal benefit we might gain from having another low-yield capability in our nuclear arsenal.

I would point out that suggesting that barring the deployment of this is akin to unilateral disarmament is simply not true.

This bill includes robust funding for maintaining and modernizing our nuclear arsenal. The bill includes more than \$712 million for the development of the Long-Range Standoff Weapon. It provides \$1.6 billion for the Columbia-class Submarine and over \$3 billion for the continued development of the B-21 bomber.

This bill does cut excessive, unproven nuclear programs that generate significant risks without appreciably enhancing our security or that of our allies, but those looking for unilateral disarmament in this bill will not find it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, do you trust the Russians? I don't trust the Russians.

Those who think they are making the world safer by refusing to support the programs should remember the ancient Latin adage, "If you want peace, prepare for war."

That has never been more applicable than in regard to this program.

Madam Chair, this amendment is vital to maintaining deterrence and peace. I would urge my colleagues to support it.

I might point out that the Russians are under the perception that this is a strategic imperative from their perspective. So from my perspective, let's remove that misconception and vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) for his strong words in support.

Madam Chair, I urge all my colleagues to join us in standing up against Russian aggression.

In order to implement the National Defense Strategy, we have to find a way to move to conventional deterrence by denial as opposed to putting all of our eggs in the basket of strategic deterrence by punishment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, in closing, I wish to emphasize that we should not use the most survivable leg of our triad as a tactical warfighting platform.

It is imperative for the House to reaffirm Ronald Reagan's clear-eyed admonition that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject 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 Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam 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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MS. BLUNT  
ROCHESTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam 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 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Delaware.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my

amendment to the division C Defense appropriations of H.R. 2740.

I applaud my colleagues for including expanded authorities in the fiscal year 2019 National Defense Authorization Act that would allow the Defense Department's Space-Available Flights program to benefit veterans with 100 percent service-connected disability.

As you may know, the Space-A program offers free military air travel to eligible participants if there is available space on a flight heading to a destination within the continental United States.

Prior to the fiscal year 2019 NDAA, the Space-A program provided Active Duty, reservists, retirees, and certain family members with this benefit.

Space-A is an example of programs operated by the military that can and do work for the American people.

Expanding the benefit to include 100 percent disabled veterans was common sense, and will help those veterans visit their family, old friends from the service, and even seek services for medical and mental health treatment with the best possible healthcare providers.

For 100 percent disabled veterans in Delaware, the expansion of Space-A offered an especially convenient travel alternative due to the Dover Air Force Base's central location within the State.

Many such communities across the country are similarly improved thanks to this program.

While the effort to expand access to this program to some of our Nation's veterans was well-intentioned, I have heard from some veterans that there may have been an unintended consequence.

The new authorities do not allow caregivers or spouses to travel with eligible veterans as part of the program. For many veterans that are rated as 100 percent disabled, the inability to have their caregiver or spouse join them on the flight effectively disqualifies them from utilizing this incredible program.

We must ensure that all eligible veterans have equal and fair access to the benefits they have earned.

President Lincoln made it clear that it is our country's duty to care and assist those that had borne the battle on behalf of the country, and it is our duty as a country to follow through on that promise.

That is why I request that the Department of Defense provide to Congress an assessment of feasibility or possible issues in expanding eligible participants to include spouses and caregivers when traveling with 100 percent disabled veterans.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on improving this benefit afforded to these veterans.

□ 1700

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I commend the gentlewoman for her work with the committee to make all of us aware of the lack of support that our veterans are facing on the space-available flights. I am happy to report that, because of congressional actions such as hers and her adamant action on this behalf, the Department is updating their air transportation eligibility requirements to expand space-available privileges in no little reason because of the gentlewoman's actions, and I do support her amendment.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Delaware will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam 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 C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for continued research on the Long-Range Standoff missile (LRSO).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman VISCLOSKEY for his leadership on the Defense appropriations bill, as well as Mr. MCGOVERN, our Rules Committee chair, for making this amendment in order.

My amendment deals with one particular piece of the administration's escalation of our nuclear warfighting capability, and that is the long-range standoff weapon, or LRSO. This new nuclear-armed cruise missile does not add to our country's already strong strategic deterrent. Instead, it performs a redundant purpose that can already be accomplished with the stand-off capability of other weapons systems.

The CBO estimates that, over 10 years, canceling the production of this weapon would save us about \$13 billion.

That is \$13 billion that could go into education or infrastructure or healthcare or housing or even investments in foreign assistance and diplomacy that would actually keep us safer.

I am deeply concerned, Madam Chair, that continuing to pour more and more money into building up our nuclear arsenal puts us down a dangerous course. Just this past weekend, we found ourselves in yet another escalation of tensions with Iran, with the Secretary of State saying that the administration is "considering a full range of options," including military options in response to the attack on two tankers in the Gulf of Oman. And just last night, President Trump announced that he is sending another 1,000 American troops to the Middle East.

Meanwhile, let me remind my colleagues that this administration has recklessly torn up former President Reagan's Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces, or INF, Treaty with Russia, pulled out of President Obama's historic nonproliferation accord with Iran, and escalated inflammatory tensions and rhetoric with some of the world's most powerful nuclear-armed states.

The President's agenda outlined in his 2018 nuclear posture review would also resurrect former nuclear capabilities that bipartisan administrations have wisely eliminated. According to many expert observers, some of the upgrades made to our nuclear program in the past few years could be interpreted as plans for a "first strike."

Let me be clear, the Trump administration's plan to develop the LRSO cruise missile is not only wasteful, but potentially dangerous. It will make our country, in my opinion, less safe. The weapon is expected to be significantly more capable than the cruising system it is replacing. It will be likely harder to detect, have a longer range, fly faster, and be more accurate. The weapon will also be deployed on advancing penetrating bombers, which are less detectable and designed to infiltrate enemy air defenses.

In contrast, the system that the LRSO is replacing is only carried by the B-52, which flies relatively slowly and is easily spotted by radar. As a result, the new cruise missile and bomber could allow attacks on an array of targets without being detected first, and that could lead to devastating miscalculation and, potentially, to accidental nuclear war.

Madam Chair, don't just take my word for it. Let me tell you that former Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis stated that he is not sold on the LRSO. Why are we appropriating money to something that the former Secretary of Defense for the Republican administration is not sold on?

In a Washington Post op-ed in 2015, William Perry, Secretary of Defense from 1994 to 1997, and Andy Weber, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense

Programs from 2009 to 2014, wrote about the LRSO: "Some have argued that a new nuclear-capable air-launched cruise missile is necessary to allow future Presidents the 'flexibility' to engage Russia or China in limited nuclear war. That is Cold War thinking, and it is dangerous. Such 'tactical' use of nuclear weapons would be a grave mistake."

Our nuclear weapons arsenal is about deterrent capabilities, not warfighting. It is troubling, then, that proponents of the LRSO, including the Defense Department, have said that the missile is needed for capabilities "beyond deterrence."

The Pentagon argues that the LRSO could be used to respond "proportionately to a limited nuclear attack." I would argue that this is dangerous Cold War thinking and that there is no such thing as a limited nuclear war.

My amendment is specifically focused on halting development of the LRSO, which wouldn't be deployed until the early 2030s, but we also have to look at this weapon and the message that it is sending as part of this administration's dangerous escalation of our nuclear posture. This President has joked about his nuclear button being "bigger and more powerful" than Kim Jong-un's. This is terrifying, unacceptable, and it is our duty to exert congressional oversight on this issue.

By canceling this weapon, we can send a signal that there is no such thing as limited nuclear annihilation, and instead of promoting weapons that enable nuclear warfighting, we can affirm that a nuclear war can never be won.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, this amendment would prohibit the use of 2020 funds for development of a long-range standoff weapon program.

A long-range standoff missile will be a nuclear-armed air-launched cruise missile that the U.S. Air Force is scheduled to first deploy in the early 2030s.

The LRSO is necessary for maintaining the deterrent capability currently provided by a rapidly aging air-launched cruise missile. According to the Department of Defense, the current air-launched cruise missile is already decades beyond its originally planned service time.

As General John Hayden, Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command, has stated: "The ALCM is encountering sustainability and viability issues from age-related material failures . . . and diminishing manufacturing sources. Parts and materials designed for a 10-year service life are now 35 years old and are obsolete."

In addition to severe problems with maintenance and reliability, the ALCM

has a significant degraded ability to survive modern air defense systems. We also need the long-range standoff weapon because conventional air-launched cruise missiles are unable to effectively meet the same deterrence requirements.

Madam Chair, sustaining the nuclear standoff capability in the air leg of the U.S. strategic triad strengthens our deterrence. Conventional weapons are not capable of fulfilling the nuclear-armed cruise missile's contribution to, and role in, an effective deterrence and reassurance of U.S. allies.

Effective deterrence requires that an adversary believes that the United States can and may respond in kind to a nuclear attack.

For these reasons, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I appreciate the perspective of the gentleman as well, and I would point out that, during the day today, I have risen in opposition to two different nuclear policy issues that would increase spending in our bill. I would like to point out I am opposed, however, to the gentleman's amendment, and her bill does take several actions related to the oversight of the administration's multiple, ongoing nuclear weapon efforts.

First, in the bill, we do reduce the Ground Based Strategic Deterrent program by \$108.7 million.

Second, the bill denies \$19.6 million requested by the administration to deploy a low-yield nuclear warhead on submarine-launched ballistic missiles.

Third, it denies nearly \$100 million requested by the administration to develop two new missile systems that would not be compliant with the INF Treaty.

Fourth, it requires the Navy to submit a report on the cost, requirements, and other matters related to a nuclear submarine-launched cruise missile, which is still in the planning stage.

I would emphasize to all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, this bill does not take a reflexive or ideological position. This bill is the result of thorough oversight, and the committee has striven for a balanced policy. I simply believe this amendment goes too far, and I am opposed to it.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam 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 Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. CROW

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 59 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. CROW. Madam 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 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$13,000,000)".

Page 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$13,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer an amendment supporting an additional \$13 million appropriation for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration Program, known as the REPI Program.

Since 2003, REPI has been tasked with ensuring our military installation readiness by allowing the Department of Defense to enter into cost-sharing partnerships with State and local government to combat encroachment near military installations while simultaneously promoting environmental conservation. The underlying bill appropriates \$87 million for this program, which is a slight increase over last year's enacted amount.

I am thankful to Chairman VISCLOSKY for his recognition of REPI's successes, which have established it as a model for intragovernmental and private partnerships, but there is still more work to be done to ensure that our military operations are able to proceed unimpeded and our natural habitats are protected.

Over the past 15 years, the REPI Program has protected over half a million acres in 33 States by working with Federal, State, and local government entities, private conservation groups, and the military services. These partnerships not only lead to thoughtful encroachment mitigation solutions by expanding the landscape buffer around our military installations, but also result in burden sharing across the stakeholders. Over the life of the program, non-DOD REPI partners have shouldered nearly half of the financial burden of these projects, proving the cost-sharing value of the program.

Not too long ago these partnerships were uncommon; however, the successful partnerships created by the REPI Program are lasting, beneficial to all participants, and often foster new arrangements that would not have happened otherwise. In total, the program is making a difference for the military and our installations.

In my district, Buckley Air Force Base is a prime example of the significant win-win impact that the REPI

Program can have on the installations and the community. By working with partners like the Trust for Public Land and the Colorado Department of Military and Veterans Affairs, the City of Aurora, the REPI Program was able to preserve nearly 300 acres of land.

The environmental protection and antiencroachment measures undertaken at Buckley have protected agricultural and recreational lands while ensuring that Buckley Air Force Base has the land required to conduct operations and even grow to meet additional needs for decades to come.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am not in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, I just find it unnecessary. There is robust funding in the bill for this activity to fight encroachment on our military bases, and that is really kind of between the local government and local State and local groups.

Madam Chair, I make that point, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman yielding again. I think the gentleman is doing good work here. The gentleman is correct that there was an increase of \$2 million from \$85 million from last year's fiscal year in our bill; however, it was a \$12 million increase from the administration's request, so I do applaud him for his work.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, I want to take the opportunity to speak about how the REPI program saves taxpayer dollars, supports military readiness, and preserves our environment.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment for an additional \$13 million that is in line with the amount authorized in the NDAA that was marked up last week to ensure its valuable work can benefit more installations and communities.

Madam 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. CROW).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROY. Madam 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. 60 OFFERED BY MR. CROW

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 60 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. CROW. Madam 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 248, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

Page 249, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to vastly increase funding for ALS research by \$40 million through the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs at the Department of Defense. This is to build on the program's vision to improve treatment and find a cure for this disease, which poses far more questions than answers.

In the United States, 15 people are diagnosed with ALS every day, with an estimated 16,000 Americans living with this degenerative disease. Commonly referred to as Lou Gehrig's disease, the average survival time after diagnosis is only 3 years.

Although an estimated 10 percent of ALS cases are inherited, more than 90 percent are sporadic, and medical research can't yet determine why. It is further complicated for veterans, as research suggests that there is a mutually inclusive relationship between ALS and military service. In fact, veterans who were deployed during the Gulf war are twice as likely to develop ALS.

This disease also hits home for me in many ways. On March 18, our community lost Mike Cimbura to ALS. Mike was, first and foremost, a loving husband and father, but on top of that, he fought ALS ferociously to ensure that ALS will no longer be a hopeless diagnosis. He worked to get right-to-try legislation across the finish line to increase access to experimental treatments that would one day cure this disease.

In my own family, we lost our dear cousin, Jeff Van Brunt, to this disease just last year. Jeff would have just celebrated his 40th birthday. He left behind his wonderful wife, Jill, and kids, Megan, William, Sophia, and Mark.

In short, this disease knows no stranger, impacting communities and families across the country. This disease continues to take loved ones in our communities too early, and we need to continue to fight for funding to find treatments and a cure.

I am extremely grateful to the chairman and his entire team for working to

increase funding this year, but I want to be clear that we need to attack this disease more aggressively.

It costs between \$1 billion and \$2 billion to find a treatment for ALS and can take up to 15 years to bring an effective ALS treatment to market. Furthermore, finding a cure would open up a path to finding cures for other diseases, like Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, multiple sclerosis, and many others.

We owe this to our veterans. We owe this to every member of our community who should not have to face this disease without any hope for a cure.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time, and I withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. COX OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in part A of House Report 116-111.

Mr. COX of California. Madam 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 223, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 248, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 249, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 436, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. COX of California. Madam Chair, I thank the distinguished chairman as well as the distinguished ranking member for the great work with respect to this legislation.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which makes a modest adjustment to H.R. 2740. My amendment would increase funding for the Department of Defense Health Program by \$10 million. This amendment is budget-neutral by reducing the Department of Defense's, the DOD's, Departmentwide operation maintenance fund by the same amount.

The Defense Health Program oversees all medical and healthcare programs for the DOD, and the modification made by my amendment would ensure the Department has sufficient resources to fund vital medical research concerning traumatic brain injury, TBI; post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD; and psychological health. This research would aid servicemembers and civilians alike.

Over the past 10 years, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of servicemembers reported to have PTSD, and we see these increases in both active and nonactive servicemembers.

Since 2001, over 2.7 million servicemembers have served in war zones in



Iraq and Afghanistan, and of those, 300,000 have been diagnosed with TBI. And the DOD estimates that 22 percent of all combat casualties in Iraq and Afghanistan are brain injuries.

The cost of war not only harms our servicemembers who have experienced PTSD, but also the spouses, the parents, the children, and the families, who have hoped and prayed for the safe return of their loved ones. Unfortunately, we have discovered that the battle continues when the servicemembers return home with a PTSD, a TBI, or other nonphysical injury.

Furthermore, whether or not PTSD is a greater risk to female veterans than male veterans is still largely unknown, and as women continue to serve in more active roles in the war and are increasingly exposed to combat situations, their likelihood of experiencing a PTSD, naturally, will rise. So more research is better to understand and help clinicians and other care providers to provide the necessary treatment before symptoms of PTSD become chronic.

We must—we must—do more for those who sacrifice their lives for our freedom. We cannot let them fall through the cracks. That is why my amendment is so critical.

With more of our troops returning from deployment over the next several years, we know that the number of PTSD cases in the U.S. is going to increase, but, today, only 40 percent of servicemembers find relief from current treatments.

The Defense Health Programs provide crucial medical research to provide innovative solutions for servicemembers and family members facing PTSD throughout our Nation.

As many may have seen, just on Sunday night, there are a number of innovative solutions, like stellate ganglion block, or SGB, that are currently being investigated and can be considered game changers in PTSD treatment. So, by investing in new groundbreaking technologies and therapies and trials, this will bring help to servicemembers who have tried current treatments but have found that nothing works.

Madam Chair, my amendment would further invest resources to help inform health professionals on how to best treat our military personnel.

Furthermore, the need for increased funding for PTSD is not limited to only the military, but our overall communities at large. PTSD conditions are on the rise in numerous communities and places throughout our Nation where violence is endemic.

This vital research undertaken by the Department of Defense will benefit everyone: individuals, families, and those communities being affected today. Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and its critical funding for medical research concerning TBI, PTSD, psychological health that will help our servicemembers and our Nation as a whole.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman in this regard, and I share his concerns.

I would simply point out for the RECORD that, in the committee's markup, we have increased funding for this, before the gentleman's amendment, by 24 percent over last year's level.

Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. COX of California. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for yielding.

Madam Chair, I want to express my gratitude to the committee for the inclusion of report language in the bill noting the importance of obtaining advanced microelectronics manufacturing, in support of the defense industrial base, from trusted domestic suppliers.

Ensuring quick, reliable, and secure access to leading-edge microelectronics is often a challenge. The changing global semiconductor industry and the increasing sophistication of U.S. adversaries require us to update our domestic microelectronics security framework by establishing a comprehensive, public-private partnership-structured microelectronics cybersecurity center.

This center can provide the defense industrial base with access to manufacturing resources to support antitamper devices, hardware security, and other evolving new concept technologies that support trusted and assured manufacturing, combined with advanced system integration and packaging technologies.

The Defense-Wide Manufacturing Science and Technology Program enables the Department of Defense to advance reliable and secure state-of-the-art technologies. The funding increase provided in this legislation, along with the increased funding for advanced manufacturing, will facilitate America's innovative, secure, and domestic foundry operations and greatly contribute to our national defense through the establishment of a microelectronics cybersecurity center structured as a public-private partnership.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Florida for raising this important issue.

The committee recognizes the urgent need to invest in trusted foundries, advanced microelectronics cybersecurity, and manufacturing capabilities that will translate our domestic research into fielded capabilities for the warfighter.

□ 1730

I look forward to working with the gentleman as we move forward on this bill.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Chair, I want to begin by thanking the committee for its work on the annual defense spending bill and for the opportunity to speak on issues that are critically important to my constituents in the Lowcountry.

In 2017, Congress mandated that the military service branches consolidate their medical activities under the Defense Health Agency. These reforms were intended to eliminate redundancy and reduce costs while improving access to care.

Unfortunately, the manner in which the Department is implementing these reforms all but guarantees this will not be the case. In my district in South Carolina, we are, unfortunately, already feeling the effects.

Naval Hospital Beaufort provides quality care to an estimated 35,000 servicemembers, retirees, and military families in South Carolina. Just last month, the Department eliminated the naval hospital's urgent care services.

Given the administration's plan to eliminate another 18,000 medical billets nationwide, I am deeply concerned about the effects that further cuts may have on our military and their families.

I am further troubled by the Department's lack of transparency into how they are making decisions with regard to the closure of medical services. In addition, the Department has yet to complete a detailed analysis of how cuts in medical services may impact surrounding communities, especially in rural areas where alternative treatment options may be limited.

As a result, military families in underserved communities face an uncertain future. In Beaufort County, my constituents already face unreasonable wait times to see their doctors. Given the high concentration of veterans in my district, any reduction in services on Naval Hospital Beaufort is certain to further reduce access to care and degrade unit readiness in the Lowcountry.

I thank the committee for its attention to this issue, and I ask that it continues to work with me to ensure servicemembers, retirees, and their families can continue to have access to the care that they need and deserve.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's concern. The committee has been following the implication of the Department's medical reform efforts closely and certainly

shares many of the gentleman's concerns.

The committee has requested the Department provide details of the analysis used to determine changes to medical services at the medical treatment facilities. This analysis would include details on the capacity of the local community, cost impacts on providers, and the risk to the served populations.

I assure the gentleman from South Carolina that the committee will continue to monitor these issues closely.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman very much for acknowledging this problem. Going forward, I will continue to work with the Defense Subcommittee and the Armed Services Committee, as well as the Department, to make sure that military families in the Lowcountry are not left behind as a result of these reforms.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HORSFORD). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. We are moving very close to the conclusion of debate on this portion of H.R. 2740, and my good friend ranking member Mr. CALVERT and I would not be here without our staff.

They have been exceptional, and I do want to thank them: Ariana Sarar, Jackie Ripke, Jennifer Chartrand, Johnnie Kaberle, Kiya Batmanglidj, Walter Hearne, Brooke Boyer, David Bortnick, Matt Bower, Bill Adkins, Hayden Milberg, Paul Kilbride, Shannon Richter, Sherry Young, Kyle McFarland, and Jamie McCormick.

I also thank Joe DeVooght, Preston Rackauskas, Rebecca Keightley, and Christopher Romero, and finally, our two clerks, Becky Leggieri and Leslie Albright.

Again, sincerely, I thank Mr. CALVERT, just a tremendous partner, and all the members of our committee, as well as all the associate staff.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of the ranking member from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), and I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. VISCLOSKEY for the great working relationship we have had going through this legislation in detail. We do this for the men and women who serve the United States military. We want to make sure that they have the best quality of life and, obviously, that we procure the best weapons that are available to make sure that if ever we are in unfortunate circumstances, we do not have a fair fight.

It has been a great experience. I also thank all the staff for the great work that they have done on both the majority and the minority.

I do want to point out one thing to the chairman. There is going to be a meeting tomorrow at the White House, hopefully, about a budget agreement. Hope springs eternal, but, hopefully, we can get a budget agreement with the White House, the House, and the Senate so that we don't have to go into sequestration later this year, which, as the gentleman knows, would be a disaster for the United States military. Let's wish them well as they try to work out an agreement.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the motion that the Committee rise.

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 317, noes 82, answered “present” 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

#### AYES—317

Adams	Cooper	Gottheimer
Aguliar	Correa	Graves (LA)
Allen	Costa	Green (TX)
Allred	Courtney	Grothman
Amodei	Cox (CA)	Haaland
Armstrong	Craig	Hagedorn
Bacon	Crawford	Harder (CA)
Baird	Crenshaw	Hartzler
Balderson	Crist	Hayes
Banks	Crow	Heck
Barr	Cuellar	Hern, Kevin
Barragán	Cummings	Higgins (LA)
Bass	Davids (KS)	Higgins (NY)
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Hill (AR)
Bera	Davis, Danny K.	Hill (CA)
Bergman	Davis, Rodney	Himes
Beyer	Dean	Hollingsworth
Bilirakis	DeFazio	Horn, Kendra S.
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Horsford
Blumenauer	Delgado	Houlahan
Blunt Rochester	Demings	Hoyer
Bonamici	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Bost	Deutch	Hurd (TX)
Boyle, Brendan	Dingell	Jayapal
F.	Doyle, Michael	Jeffries
Brady	F.	Johnson (GA)
Brindisi	Dunn	Johnson (OH)
Brown (MD)	Emmer	Johnson (SD)
Bucshon	Engel	Joyce (OH)
Bustos	Escobar	Joyce (PA)
Butterfield	Eshoo	Kaptur
Calvert	Españolat	Katko
Carbajal	Evans	Keating
Cárdenas	Ferguson	Kelly (IL)
Carson (IN)	Finkenauer	Kelly (PA)
Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Kennedy
Carter (TX)	Fleischmann	Khanna
Cartwright	Fletcher	Kildée
Case	Fortenberry	Kilmer
Casten (IL)	Foster	Kim
Castor (FL)	Fox (NC)	Kind
Chabot	Frankel	King (IA)
Chu, Judy	Fudge	Kirkpatrick
Cicilline	Gabbard	Krishnamoorthi
Clark (MA)	Gallego	Kuster (NH)
Clarke (NY)	Garamendi	Kustoff (TN)
Clyburn	Garcia (IL)	LaHood
Cohen	Garcia (TX)	LaMalfa
Cole	Gianforte	Lamb
Conaway	Gibbs	Langevin
Connolly	Golden	Larsen (WA)
Cook	Gomez	Latta

Lawrence	Pallone
Lawson (FL)	Panetta
Lee (CA)	Pappas
Lee (NV)	Pascrell
Lesko	Payne
Levin (CA)	Pence
Levin (MI)	Peters
Lewis	Peterson
Lieu, Ted	Phillips
Lipinski	Pingree
Loebach	Pocan
Lofgren	Pressley
Long	Price (NC)
Loudermilk	Quigley
Lowenthal	Raskin
Lowe	Reschenthaler
Lucas	Rice (NY)
Luetkemeyer	Rice (SC)
Luján	Richmond
Luria	Riggleman
Lynch	Rodgers (WA)
Malinowski	Roe, David P.
Maloney,	Rogers (AL)
Carolyn B.	Rogers (KY)
Maloney, Sean	Rooney (FL)
Mast	Rose (NY)
Matsui	Rouda
McAdams	Roybal-Allard
McBath	Ruiz
McCarthy	Ruppersberger
McCaul	Rush
McClintock	Rutherford
McEachin	Ryan
McGovern	Sablan
McHenry	Sánchez
McKinley	Sarbanes
McNerney	Scanlon
Meng	Schakowsky
Miller	Schiff
Mitchell	Schneider
Moolenaar	Schrier
Moore	Scott (VA)
Morelle	Scott, Austin
Mucarsel-Powell	Scott, David
Mullin	Sensenbrenner
Murphy	Serrano
Nadler	Sewell (AL)
Napolitano	Shalala
Neal	Sherman
Neguse	Sherrill
Newhouse	Shimkus
Norcross	Simpson
Norman	Sires
Nunes	Slotkin
O'Halleran	Smith (NE)
Ocasio-Cortez	Smith (NJ)

#### NOES—82

Aderholt	Gallagher	Meuser
Amash	Gohmert	Mooney (WV)
Arrington	Gooden	Olson
Babin	Gosar	Palazzo
Biggs	Granger	Palmer
Brooks (AL)	Graves (GA)	Perlmutter
Brooks (IN)	Graves (MO)	Perry
Buck	Green (TN)	Porter
Budd	Griffith	Ratcliffe
Burchett	Guest	Rose, John W.
Burgess	Guthrie	Rouzer
Byrne	Harris	Roy
Castro (TX)	Hice (GA)	Scalise
Cheney	Hudson	Schweikert
Cisneros	Huizenga	Smith (MO)
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Steube
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Stewart
Cloud	Johnson (TX)	Suozi
Collins (NY)	Jordan	Taylor
Comer	Keller	Vela
Cunningham	Kelly (MS)	Waters
Davidson (OH)	King (NY)	Weber (TX)
DeGette	Lamborn	Welch
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Wild
Duncan	Marshall	Wittman
Estes	Massie	Wright
Flores	McCollum	
Fulcher	Meadows	

#### ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Gonzalez (OH)

#### NOT VOTING—38

Abraham	DeLauro	Grijalva
Axne	DesJarlais	Hastings
Bishop (UT)	Doggett	Herrera Beutler
Brownley (CA)	Duffy	Holding
Buchanan	Gaetz	Hunter
Clay	Gonzalez (TX)	Kinzinger
Collins (GA)	Gonzalez-Colón	Larson (CT)
Curtis	(PR)	Meeks

Moulton  
Norton  
Omar  
Plaskett  
Posey

Radewagen  
Reed  
Roby  
San Nicolas  
Schrader

Smucker  
Waltz  
Webster (FL)  
Yoho  
Young

□ 1850

Ms. PORTER, Messrs. GALLAGHER, BYRNE, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. CISNEROS, KELLY of Mississippi, JOHNSON of Louisiana, GUEST, COLLINS of New York, ROUZER, BURCHETT, and AMASH changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. HIMES, Mses. GARCIA of Texas, WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COLE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. LONG, BLUMENAUER, and BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to rise was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LOWENTHAL) having assumed the chair, Mr. HORSFORD, 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. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 431 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. 2740.

Will the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1853

#### 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. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, with Mr. HORSFORD (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 13, 2019, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 98 printed in part B of House Report 116–109 offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) had been postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116–

109 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 78 by Mrs. LESKO of Arizona.

Amendment No. 79 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 80 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 81 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 82 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 83 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 84 by Ms. SPEIER of California.

Amendment No. 85 by Mr. MEADOWS of North Carolina.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 by Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MRS. LESKO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 225, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]

AYES—188

Aderholt	Cook	Hern, Kevin	McClintock	Roe, David P.	Taylor
Allen	Crawford	Hice (GA)	McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)
Amash	Crenshaw	Higgins (LA)	McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry
Amodei	Davidson (OH)	Hill (AR)	Meadows	Rooney (FL)	Timmons
Armstrong	Davis, Rodney	Hollingsworth	Meuser	Rose, John W.	Tipton
Arrington	Diaz-Balart	Hudson	Miller	Rouzer	Turner
Babin	Duffy	Huizenga	Mitchell	Roy	Upton
Bacon	Duncan	Hunter	Moolenaar	Rutherford	Wagner
Baird	Dunn	Hurd (TX)	Mooney (WV)	Scalise	Walberg
Balderson	Emmer	Johnson (LA)	Mullin	Schweikert	Walden
Banks	Estes	Johnson (OH)	Newhouse	Scott, Austin	Walker
Barr	Ferguson	Johnson (SD)	Norman	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Bergman	Fitzpatrick	Jordan	Nunes	Shinkus	Watkins
Biggs	Fleischmann	Joyce (OH)	Olson	Simpson	Weber (TX)
Billirakis	Flores	Joyce (PA)	Palazzo	Smith (MO)	Wenstrup
Bishop (UT)	Fortenberry	Katko	Palmer	Smith (NE)	Westerman
Bost	Foxx (NC)	Keller	Pence	Smith (NJ)	Williams
Brady	Fulcher	Kelly (MS)	Perry	Smucker	Wilson (SC)
Brooks (AL)	Gallagher	Kelly (PA)	Peterson	Spano	Wittman
Brooks (IN)	Gianforte	King (IA)	Ratcliffe	Stauber	Womack
Buchanan	Gibbs	King (NY)	Reschenthaler	Stefanik	Woodall
Buck	Gohmert	Kinzinger	Rice (SC)	Steil	Wright
Bucshon	Gonzalez (OH)	Kustoff (TN)	Riggelman	Steube	Young
Budd	González-Colón	LaHood	Rodgers (WA)	Stivers	Zeldin
Burchett	(PR)	LaMalfa			
Burgess	Gooden	Lamborn			
Byrne	Gosar	Latta			
Calvert	Granger	Lesko			
Carter (GA)	Graves (GA)	Lipinski			
Carter (TX)	Graves (LA)	Long			
Chabot	Graves (MO)	Loudermilk			
Cheney	Green (TN)	Lucas			
Cline	Griffith	Luetkemeyer			
Cloud	Grothman	Marchant			
Cole	Guest	Marshall			
Collins (GA)	Guthrie	Massie			
Collins (NY)	Hagedorn	Mast			
Comer	Harris	McCarthy			
Conaway	Hartzler	McCaul			
			Adams	Gallego	Murphy
			Aguilar	Garamendi	Nadler
			Allred	Garcia (IL)	Napolitano
			Barragán	Garcia (TX)	Neal
			Bass	Golden	Neguse
			Beatty	Gomez	Norton
			Bera	Gottheimer	O'Halleran
			Beyer	Green (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
			Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Pallone
			Blumenauer	Haaland	Panetta
			Blunt Rochester	Harder (CA)	Pappas
			Bonamici	Hayes	Pascarell
			Boyle, Brendan	Heck	Payne
			F.	Higgins (NY)	Perlmutter
			Brindisi	Hill (CA)	Peters
			Brown (MD)	Himes	Phillips
			Brownley (CA)	Horn, Kendra S.	Pingree
			Bustos	Horsford	Plaskett
			Butterfield	Houlahan	Pocan
			Carbajal	Hoyer	Porter
			Cárdenas	Huffman	Price (NC)
			Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Quigley
			Cartwright	Jayapal	Raskin
			Case	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
			Casten (IL)	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
			Castor (FL)	Johnson (TX)	Rose (NY)
			Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Rouda
			Chu, Judy	Keating	Roybal-Allard
			Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
			Cisneros	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
			Clark (MA)	Khanna	Rush
			Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sablan
			Clay	Kilmer	Sánchez
			Cleaver	Kim	Sarbanes
			Clyburn	Kind	Scanlon
			Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
			Connolly	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
			Cooper	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
			Correa	Lamb	Schrader
			Costa	Langevin	Schrier
			Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
			Cox (CA)	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
			Craig	Lawrence	Serrano
			Crist	Lawson (FL)	Sewell (AL)
			Crow	Lee (CA)	Shalala
			Cuellar	Lee (NV)	Sherman
			Cummings	Levin (CA)	Sherill
			Cunningham	Levin (MI)	Sires
			Davids (KS)	Lewis	Slotkin
			Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
			Davis, Danny K.	Loeb sack	Soto
			Dean	Lofgren	Spanberger
			DeFazio	Lowenthal	Speier
			DeGette	Lowe y	Stanton
			DeBene	Luján	Stevens
			Delgado	Luria	Suo zzi
			Demings	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
			DeSaulnier	Malinowski	Takano
			Deutch	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
			Dingell	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
			Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Titus
			F.	Matsui	Tlaib
			Engel	McAdams	Tonko
			Escobar	McBath	Torres (CA)
			Eshoo	McCollum	Torres Small
			Espallat	McEachin	(NM)
			Evans	McGovern	Trahan
			Finkenauer	McNerney	Trone
			Fletcher	Meeks	Underwood
			Foster	Meng	Van Drew
			Frankel	Moore	Vargas
			Fudge	Morelle	Veasey
			Gabbard	Mucarsel-Powell	Vela