

brought long-overdue national attention to missing and murdered indigenous women.

After meeting with local families of victims, State and local law enforcement, and regional Tribes, it has become clear to me that central Washington has a unique perspective on this crisis.

The stories about these women are heartbreaking. It is with these stories and mine that I have urged both House Judiciary and Natural Resources Committees to hold a field hearing on the Yakama Nation reservation to learn firsthand how this crisis is plaguing our communities.

I am pleased to have gained the support of local Tribes and the YWCA in Yakima in calling for a field hearing, and I am eager to have committee members hear their stories as well.

Thankfully, justice was served upon Savanna's murderers. We owe the same justice for the many murdered, missing, indigenous women.

SENIOR COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM AND CONSTITUENT GERALDINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues the story of one of my constituents, Geraldine, as a reminder that the work that we do here on the floor impacts people's lives.

Geraldine received assistance from the Senior Community Service Employment Program, which is also known as SCSEP.

We provided \$464 million to SCSEP in the minibuss package that we passed yesterday, H.R. 2740. The bill included fiscal year 2020 funding for critical programs at the Department of Labor that help Americans like Geraldine find jobs and gain new skills in their journey to become reemployed, programs like Job Corps, Registered Apprenticeship, YouthBuild, and, of course, SCSEP.

Geraldine is a perfect example of why this funding is so important. She is a mother and a grandmother and the main provider for her granddaughter and two grandchildren.

When the financial crisis of 2008 hit, she lost her job, a devastating moment for her family's only source of income. She quietly retired, but like far too many Americans, she did not have enough savings to stop working.

Her family needed her, and she needed to find work, a task made difficult with her age, existing skill set, and, now, gap in employment. Fortunately, Geraldine was able to take advantage of SCSEP through Easterseals in New Jersey.

Created by the Older Americans Act of 1965, the Senior Community Service Employment Program has helped low income, unemployed seniors learn new,

in-demand skills and reenter the workforce for more than 50 years. Participants enrolled in SCSEP receive a subsidized minimum wage for work at a nonprofit agency while learning skills to help them reenter the workforce.

But SCSEP does more than just skills training. Its greatest success is helping seniors regain their sense of confidence and self-fulfillment. Some programs have services that help seniors get glasses or even pay rent and utility bills.

Geraldine shared this with me, that SCSEP was instrumental in helping her regain her sense of purpose. She was so successful in her program, that she was offered a position at Easterseals to support new participants in the program through their own journeys to reemployment, people who were previously in the same position as she.

Increasingly, seniors like Geraldine have become the primary caretakers for their grandchildren. This is especially true for places that have been ravaged by the opioid crisis.

That is why it is so important that we support more programs at SCSEP at the Department of Labor. There are countless seniors out there with nowhere to turn. SCSEP is one of the answers that gets them back to work.

Madam Speaker, before I close, I want to share with you one last anecdote from Geraldine.

She shared with me her story about a boy in her community who didn't want to throw away broken crayons. In defiance of his dad, this little boy said even broken crayons still color just as brightly as ever. Geraldine says that she sees herself in broken crayons and knows that her colors shine just as brightly as any others.

We must ensure that critical programs like SCSEP are fully funded as grandparents across America are increasingly becoming the primary breadwinners in their families.

I am proud that my colleagues and I voted to pass H.R. 2740 yesterday, and as a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, I am committed to advocating for more programs that support our seniors.

NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, Tuesday morning, I had the honor of being in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, at the State capitol to speak about my bill, Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act. The House Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee at the State legislature hosted a panel to discuss my legislation that would increase milk options in school lunchrooms across the country.

Later that morning, we gathered in the capitol rotunda with State law-

makers and representatives of the dairy industry, dairy farm families from throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to rally in support of putting whole milk back in our schools.

Madam Speaker, dairy products like milk contain 9 essential nutrients that can help reduce your risk of high blood pressure, osteoporosis, and certain cancers. It is helpful with weight management. And whether it is protein to help build and repair muscle tissue of active bodies or Vitamin A to help maintain healthy skin, dairy products are a natural nutrient powerhouse.

I was especially glad to participate in these events, because June is National Dairy Month.

Proudly, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is one of the largest milk-producing States in the Nation, and this annual tradition celebrates the contributions the dairy industry and dairy farm families have made to the world. It is my hope that, through this legislation, we will be able to allow students to select the type of milk that they love best, including flavored and whole milk.

This legislation is in response to changes made in 2010 to the School Lunch Program. That year, the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act amended the nutrition standards and mandated that flavored milk must be fat-free.

This law, along with the lowest participation in the program, led to an alarming decline in milk consumption in schools since 2010. Declining milk consumption in schools not only impacts students where they don't get the nutrition that they need, but also the dairy farm families in rural communities across the Nation.

In addition to the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act, I recently introduced another bill with Congressman JOE COURTNEY to expand milk options for students and reverse the decline of milk consumption in schools. The School Milk Nutrition Act of 2019 reaffirms and codifies a recent regulation from the USDA by providing schools with the option to serve lowfat milk with flavor, and it requires that milk offered is consistent with the most recent dietary guidelines for Americans.

In November of 2017, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced regulatory changes for the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs, including a provision that provides schools with the option to serve lowfat 1 percent flavored milk.

□ 0915

I urge my colleagues to sign on to these bills during National Dairy Month and allow our students the option of consuming the type of milk that they love with the nutrition that they need.

I thank the Pennsylvania lawmakers and members of the dairy industry who stood together in Harrisburg on Tuesday in support of the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act.

Milk is the official beverage of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I hope we will soon allow students everywhere the option to drink whole milk with their lunches, should they choose to enjoy it.

ABANDON PLAN FOR ANTI-IMMIGRANT PUBLIC CHARGE RULE

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to demand that the Trump administration stop its assault on immigrant communities and abandon its plan on public charge.

Now let me be clear: No one should be denied a visa due to their possible, potential need for public assistance, also known as public charge. It is beyond appalling that the Department of Homeland Security is using this criterion to prevent deserving families from coming to the United States.

This heartless and un-American proposed rule also makes it extremely difficult for individuals who are seeking a new life in the United States to receive a green card if they are considered likely to use public benefits in the future.

If this rule is implemented, the Trump administration would expand the list of programs to include SNAP, Medicaid, and housing assistance to determine permanent residency.

Madam Speaker, basic programs are there to help struggling families put food on the table and keep a roof over their heads when they need it. Denying immigrant families green card status with this criterion is just plain wrong.

This anti-immigrant rhetoric is not new, Madam Speaker. For over 100 years, the Federal Government has used the argument of public charge in immigration law for inadmissibility or deportation. Public charge was first created when the 47th Congress passed the Immigration Act of 1882. This restricted certain individuals from migrating to the United States.

This legislation specifically targeted unmarried women who were presumed to be a so-called public charge because employers would not employ them, leading the government to take care of them, which is ridiculous.

But it wasn't just women that this law targeted. It was also immigrants from Asia. As many of us are aware, fear of Chinese laborers was part of the anti-immigrant rhetoric of the time. There was widespread fear of the Chinese influence on the economy and the racist perception that these immigrants would not contribute to American society.

This fear was compounded when Chinese immigrants started to bring their families to America and use public infrastructure, such as schools and hospitals.

One of my constituents, Dr. Elaine Kim, who lives in Berkeley, California, experienced this discrimination first-

hand. In her own words, she said: "I am 76, and I am a child of immigrants who arrived in this country in 1903 and 1926, respectively. My parents were not allowed by law to become naturalized citizens and faced very serious racial discrimination in their lifetimes. But they both worked hard, harder than most native-born Americans, all their lives. They contributed importantly to the United States and never, ever caused any legal, social, or economic problems to anyone in this country."

"At 76, I have also worked hard and consider myself a model U.S. citizen. Putting myself through school at a time when most women, and certainly most women of color, faced many obstacles, I finally finished a Ph.D. degree. I served the public for 44 years until I recently retired."

"When I was an impoverished single mother, I received help from both the Maternity and Infant Care Project and unemployment insurance. Now, after working hard and raising a family of hardworking, well-educated children, I receive a modest Social Security check each month as well as Medicare, though I have kept myself in good enough health as to not need much from this entitlement program."

Dr. Kim and her family came to the United States and contributed greatly to our Nation. They used public benefits when hardships occurred, but they paid it back in many ways when they no longer needed the benefits to help their family get by.

The Trump administration is trying to create discriminatory policies that would restrict families such as Dr. Kim's from even entering the country. This harmful, xenophobic argument evokes fear and scapegoats immigrant communities.

Let's get straight to the facts. This country was built and continues to stand on the strength of immigrants. We know that a little help for our hardworking immigrant families reaps exponential returns to our economy and society.

Immigrants contribute in taxes, and they should be able to use social services when they need it, just like every other person in our Nation who pays taxes. Our immigrant community should not be seen as a drain on America but as an investment in our future. We are one Nation.

In closing, I want to reiterate that it is the constitutional duty of Congress to write our immigration laws and ensure that they are equitable to all individuals, regardless of race, age, or socioeconomic status. That is why, last week, during the Homeland Security appropriations markup, I offered an amendment along with Congressmen PRICE, POCAN, and AGUILAR that would make it clear that no Federal funds can be used to expand public charge.

We must defeat this anti-immigrant and un-American public charge rule. I hope that all of my colleagues will stand up and demand that the administration abandon this plan once and for all.

TANKER ATTACKS DON'T JUSTIFY U.S. MILITARY ACTION AGAINST IRAN

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, recent Persian Gulf tanker attacks do not—I repeat, do not—justify unilateral American military action against Iran.

On May 12, 2019, two Saudi Arabian tankers, a United Arab Emirates tanker, and a Norwegian tanker were attacked. According to a Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, and Norway joint report, explosions caused all four vessels to suffer hull breaches.

The report states that limpet mines were "highly likely placed by divers below or at the waterline," and the placement of the mines was "consistent with intention to disable the mobility, but not physically destroy, each vessel."

The report concludes that "these sophisticated attacks were most likely carried out by a state actor." For emphasis, the report does not accuse anyone of conducting the attacks.

On June 13, 2019, a Japanese tanker and Norwegian tanker were attacked with explosive devices that caused considerable fire and hull damage to both tankers.

Who is responsible for these two tanker attacks? There is international disagreement.

America and the United Kingdom blame Iran. Iran denies responsibility. Other nations offer no opinion and caution against a rush to judgment. Perhaps more evidence will persuade the international community that Iran orchestrated these tanker attacks, perhaps not.

Regardless of blame, there are other factors to consider. For example, what is America's national security interest in these six tanker attacks? Not a single attacked tanker is owned by Americans. Rather, they are owned by Saudi Arabia, Norway, the United Arab Emirates, and Japan.

Not a single attacked tanker involved oil produced in America. Rather, all six tankers were shipping Saudi Arabian or United Arab Emirates oil. Neither of the two tankers loaded with cargo was bound for the United States.

Hence, the United States has no national security interest in the six attacked tankers sufficient to trigger an American retaliatory military action against Iran.

There are, however, other nations that do have a national security interest in these tanker attacks. Japan and South Korea import roughly 80 percent of their oil from the Persian Gulf. India imports roughly 60 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf. China imports roughly 50 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf. Western Europe imports almost 20 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf.

Hence, Japan, South Korea, China, India, Western Europe, and many other