

summer. By the fifth grade, children without summer learning opportunities are 2 years behind their peers.

Students need a safe, stable place to learn over the summer. That is why I am so proud to have introduced legislation to help close the achievement gap and reduce food insecurity.

The Summer Meals and Learning Act will help fund summer reading programs at schools that already serve as summer meal sites, providing the support and stability at-risk youth need to grow and thrive. Every child deserves the opportunity to achieve their goals. It is my hope that this legislation will help students stay on the path to success.

IMPROVING MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the members of the House Armed Services Committee for their hard work on this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

Malmstrom Air Force Base is home to the 341st Missile Wing, which maintains and operates one-third of the U.S. ICBM force. Servicemembers at Malmstrom protect our country, but the base can do more to keep America safe and secure. With some work, the base's runway can, once again, host flying missions.

I especially thank and recognize Mr. TURNER from Ohio. We worked on a measure that could reform the basing process to focus on improving existing facilities like Malmstrom instead of building new ones.

This bill begins the process of including Malmstrom in future Air Force basing decisions to host aircraft, potentially increasing the number of men and women serving there.

I appreciate the Montana Defense Alliance for its advocacy on behalf of Great Falls and all the servicemembers at Malmstrom and elsewhere who keep our country safe.

CONGRATULATING ROYAL OAK CITY MANAGER DON JOHNSON ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate my constituent and Royal Oak city manager, Don Johnson, on his retirement after 14 years with the great city of Royal Oak.

Don started as city manager right at the height of the Great Recession. To hear him tell it, the city was flat broke. Royal Oak was facing huge revenue shortfalls, and Michigan families were hurting.

In the years since, he has helped Royal Oak turn around and become one

of the most desirable places to live and visit. Royal Oak saw a jump of \$10 million in revenue in 10 years, truly an outstanding accomplishment for the people of Royal Oak and a testament to Don's hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Don for his years of service and wish him the very best in his next chapter.

PROTECTING MILITARY WIDOWS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Congress should strive for Democrats and Republicans in Washington to truly work together. When the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act reached 365 bipartisan cosponsors, I was grateful to share the good news. That is a remarkable more than 80 percent of Congress.

House Democrats had the ability to bring the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act to the floor tomorrow to repeal the widow's tax. Instead, Democratic leadership has diverted a vote by tacking it onto a flawed and hyperpartisan bill without notice late at night, which they know will not receive support on both sides of the aisle.

This is heartbreaking for the 65,000 military widows in America. However, it is not too late to do the right thing and keep this as a standalone bipartisan bill.

I encourage our colleagues across the aisle to put H.R. 553 on the Consensus Calendar. Together, we can give servicemembers and their families the recognition they deserve.

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

USE FAMILY FARMS AS SUPPLIERS FOR ARMED FORCES

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

Mr. DELGADO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for voting to include my amendment to the NDAA that will allow our armed services to aid small farmers across the country.

Two weeks ago, the USDA released its congressional district-specific data for the "Census of Agriculture" and reported that in my district, New York's 19th Congressional District, 96 percent of the farms there are small family farms.

During our most recent in-district work period, I visited small farms back home in Rensselaer and Montgomery Counties and learned more about their work with organizations to help veterans gain the skills needed to transition to jobs in agriculture.

Today, the House passed my amendment that requires a report from certain Defense agencies on programs, policies, and practices relating to

small farms, farms owned by new and beginning farmers, veteran farmers, and minority farmers in order to better understand how much the Armed Forces are working with small farms to supply commissaries and feed servicemembers.

With this data, Congress and Defense agencies can work together to expand opportunity for our small family farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for standing with me on this very important issue.

□ 1215

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 11, 2019, at 11:00 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1811.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEVIN of Michigan). Pursuant to House Resolution 476 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. 2500.

Will the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1220

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. 2500) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. PETERS (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 10, 2019, a fourth set of en bloc amendments offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. — PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO TRANSFER DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES TO AZERBAIJAN.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2020 may be used to transfer defense articles or services to Azerbaijan unless the President certifies to Congress that the transfer of such defense articles or services does not threaten civil aviation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, one programming note: At this point in the schedule, we were scheduled to deal with three SHERMAN amendments, No. 20, No. 21, and No. 22.

No. 22, also in the Rules Committee numbering No. 83, was included in an en bloc adopted by this House last evening.

Amendment No. 20, Rules Committee No. 301, is not being considered at this time because it will be included in an en bloc that comes up later today.

So we are now focused on No. 21, Rules Committee No. 82, and I rise in support of that amendment.

Mr. Chair, on September 1, 1983, Korean Air Lines 007 was shot down—269 casualties, including a Member of this House, Congressman Larry McDonald.

On July 17, 2014, Malaysia Airlines number 17 was shot down—298 casualties.

If there is one thing this House can agree on, it is that we are opposed to shooting down—especially, deliberately shooting down—civilian aircraft. And

yet the Government of Azerbaijan has stated, with regard to flights going into Stepanakert Airport, that they envision the physical destruction of airplanes landing in that territory.

This threat has been repeated several times by Azeri officials, and in times past, Azerbaijan has actually shot at civil airliners going into Stepanakert Airport. That is why this amendment is necessary. It prohibits the transfer of Defense Department articles to Azerbaijan unless the President can certify that the weapons being transferred will not threaten civilian aviation.

It would be a tragedy if a civilian airliner were shot at or shot down as it landed or took off from Stepanakert Airport in the Republic of Artsakh. But if that, God forbid, ever happens, let it not be an American weapon.

We are on notice that anti-aircraft weapons transferred to Azerbaijan may very well be used against civilian aircraft. That is why it is necessary for us to have this provision.

After 23 years of studying these issues on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am not convinced that we should transfer any weapons, under any circumstances, to the Government of Azerbaijan until it comes to the table and resolves the Artsakh dispute. But, certainly, we should not, having been put on notice, transfer weapons that we cannot be sure will not be used to shoot down civilian aircraft.

I am pleased to have the cosponsorship of this amendment by Representatives SPEIER, SCHIFF, and PALLONE, and I believe that this is a necessary step. Because, as we provide weapons to countries around the world, we should not provide anti-aircraft weapons that we believe might very well be used to shoot down our civilian aircraft.

I would point out that the Stepanakert airport is located in the Republic of Artsakh, previously known as the Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh, a historically Armenian territory that was lumped in with Azerbaijan by no less than Joseph Stalin in a deliberate effort to create ethnic tensions in the Caucasus to the benefit of the Soviet Union and in an effort to punish the Armenian people.

The people of Artsakh established their independence decades ago, and whatever your view as to the status of that territory, you should support this amendment unless you believe it is appropriate to shoot down civilian aircraft.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. SHERMAN that conditions defense transfers to Azerbaijan.

Azerbaijan actively contributes to international security efforts. We see

their forces working alongside coalition forces in countering terrorism in Afghanistan, in addition to contributing a logistics supply route vital to U.S. and coalition forces.

Azerbaijan lies in a compromising position between two hostile forces: Russia and Iran. Our bilateral relationship and the incredible amount of support the Azeris have provided to U.S. missions in Afghanistan were strong indicators of how our partnership has grown since Azerbaijan first gained its independence in 1991. We must not limit our ability to provide reciprocal support to our friend and partner in a tumultuous region.

Putin's history of utilizing military force against its neighbors, such as Ukraine and Georgia, forebodes his willingness to use the same methods against others that counter him.

The United States Department of State is responsible for the review of sales and transfers of defense articles and services. They exercise this responsibility through an interagency process that assesses each possible arms transfer on a case-by-case basis. Mr. SHERMAN's amendment unnecessarily singles out Azerbaijan by placing an additional certification requirement on the State Department's armed sales review process.

The length of time this amendment would add to the defense exports review process is detrimental in the event of an attack by militarily superior Russia against our security partner, Azerbaijan, while providing no added benefit to our bilateral relationship. This would include a lengthening of time in reviewing arms sales intended for Azeri forces operating in counterterrorism operations in Afghanistan.

Nagorno-Karabakh is an Armenian-occupied territory inside the borders of Azerbaijan, which has undergone bitter conflict for two decades.

The OSCE Minsk Group, co-chaired by the United States, has sought a peaceful solution to the conflict since 1992. By conditioning sales to Azerbaijan, the United States Congress would tilt the United States neutral position as a member of the Minsk Group and hinder resolution efforts in Nagorno-Karabakh. By taking sides, the trust that has been built up by the U.S. and Azerbaijan through the group's efforts would be gravely diminished, and the conflict would degenerate further.

□ 1230

The NDAA is not the appropriate vehicle for taking sides on a political issue, nor should it be used to influence a process that clearly lies within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

This amendment is not required. The Department of Defense already adheres to the provisions of the Department of State's March 2019 extension of section 907, which specifies that assistance to Azerbaijan will not be used for offensive purposes against Armenia.

I oppose this amendment, which halts the positive momentum of our bilateral relationship, particularly with the arrival of U.S. Ambassador Lee Litzenberger in January of this year.

Mr. 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. SHERMAN).

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer amendment No. 23 as the designee of Representative GABBARD.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 1268. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FROM THE SPECIAL DEFENSE ACQUISITION FUND.

Section 114(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) Notwithstanding paragraph (3), none of the funds made available from the Special Defense Acquisition Fund for any fiscal year may be made available to provide any assistance to Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates if such assistance could be used by either country to conduct or continue hostilities in Yemen.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, 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. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of the amendment offered by Representative GABBARD of Hawaii on the limitation on the use of funds from the Special Defense Acquisition Fund for Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.

This fund allows the U.S. military to preorder weapons for sale to foreign militaries and is intended to reduce wait times for weapons or related services.

While this is normally a good way to prevent a long and detrimental wait for our allies to use weapons in self-defense, is it unconscionable that it be used to kill and wound civilians in an unjust war.

Saudi Arabia and the UAE have, since 2015, been bombing schools, hospitals, buses, and other civilian targets.

As of March of this year, nearly 18,000 people have been killed or injured by

this bombing campaign since hostilities began in 2015, according to the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights.

Thousands more have been displaced by the fighting, and millions are faced with starvation, hunger, and disease.

This has created a humanitarian crisis, destroyed water supplies, and created shortages in food and medical care.

We have already passed a resolution seeking to end U.S. involvement in this slaughter, only to have the President veto it, while he continues to supply Saudi Arabia with U.S. missiles and bombs.

This amendment will prevent the military from speeding supplies to Saudi Arabia and the UAE and will do much to alleviate the suffering of the people of Yemen.

Mr. Chair, I ask that all Members support this amendment and end our involvement in this shameful war, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment prohibiting the use of funds from the Special Defense Acquisition Fund to provide assistance to Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates if such assistance could be used in hostilities in Yemen.

Nearly every Member in this Chamber has made it very clear that we are concerned about civilian casualties resulting from the conflict in Yemen. However, this amendment does not address that concern.

The war in Yemen must end, but, as Iran continues to finance terror and help the Houthis, who have overthrown the government, the consequence will be utter devastation for the Yemeni civilians.

Our assistance for the coalition opposing Houthi and Iranian terror in Yemen started in 2015 during the Obama administration when the Houthis overthrew a legitimate government, with Iran's assistance.

The Houthis fired missiles against the coalition, with support from Iran, and the U.S. provided intelligence and logistical support in compliance with the Law of Armed Conflict.

Iran poses a massive geostrategic threat in the area around Yemen, throughout the Middle East, and to the United States and many of our allies.

Right now, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Yemen, and the U.S. share a common adversary in Iran.

We cannot signal to Iran that their continued aggression will be tolerated. Iran's nefarious activities must be countered effectively.

The coalition continues to face an onslaught of Houthi attacks on civilian targets, and the U.S. needs a nuanced approach that helps our Nation, our partners, and avoids civilian casualties.

Instead, this amendment slams the door shut, crushing any opportunity to see the region and civilians protected.

Have no doubt: The coalition will continue to purchase arms, including defensive weapons, from other sources that have no regard for how these weapons are deployed.

As a result of this amendment, the war in Yemen will not end, nor will it assist the United States or our strategic allies in containing Iran's malign influence in the region.

Mr. Chair, I urge Members to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, again, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in subtitle G of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. ____ PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF EMERGENCY AUTHORITIES FOR THE SALE OR TRANSFER OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES TO SAUDI ARABIA AND THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be made available to process a commercial sale or foreign military sale, or to transfer, deliver, or facilitate the transfer or delivery, of any defense article or service to Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates pursuant to any certification of emergency circumstances submitted in accordance with section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) with respect to such countries, including any such certification submitted to Congress before the date of the enactment of this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, 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. Mr. Chair, I don't have any philosophical objection to supporting our allies.

Saudi Arabia and the UAE are still America's allies. But what I object to and what many of us in Congress object to is the bypassing of Congress in selling arms to Saudi Arabia and the UAE.

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

How do we know this was a fake emergency? Because there is no emergency to the United States or to UAE or to Saudi Arabia regarding the war in Yemen.

It is a horrific humanitarian problem. The Saudi-led coalition has killed countless civilians. But it is not an emergency that would justify weapons sales to Saudi Arabia and UAE that bypass congressional procedure.

And, in fact, it has been recently reported that the UAE is now pulling its troops out of Yemen. What kind of emergency is this that would require the bypass of Congress to sell arms to UAE and Saudi Arabia?

In addition, we had a hearing in the Foreign Affairs Committee where the Trump administration official admitted that many of these arms would not even be ready for months, if not years, in order to be sold.

So, it is unacceptable that the administration is trying to bypass Congress.

What this amendment will do is simply say you cannot declare a fake emergency to bypass Congress to sell these arms. If you want to sell these arms to Saudi Arabia and UAE, you have to do it through the normal process.

Mr. Chair, I request an "aye" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, which would prohibit any funds from being used to process any arms sales or transfers to Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates pursuant to emergency certification made under the Arms Export Control Act.

The President's emergency certification of May 24 to move 22 arms sales as an emergency was to address increased threats from Iran to U.S. security interests and Iran's continued efforts to destabilize the region, which directly impacts our strategic allies.

The Democrat majority had been holding onto arms sales through congressional notification requirements and abusing oversight power with the Arms Export Control Act. Some of these requests by the administration had been on hold for over a year, and there was no progress in determining why.

We witnessed just last month, on June 19, Iran shot down a U.S. military

asset, a drone over international waters, one of many examples of Iranian aggression toward the United States and other nations, many in that region surrounding Iran.

There is no doubt that Iran is an increased threat.

Mr. Chair, I urge Members to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise in strong support of the Lieu amendment.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this amendment, which will prevent the sale of weapons to the Gulf without undergoing the proper congressional notification process.

This administration invented an emergency in the Middle East in order to circumvent the process of congressional review over arms sales, an egregious and legally questionable move, to put more weapons in the hands of regimes who are responsible for perpetrating horrific civilian casualties in Yemen, often with U.S. weapons.

The administration briefed this body on Iran just days before the supposed emergency was declared, yet never mentioned anything at the time about an emergency.

The administration claims that Iran poses such an imminent threat to our allies that emergency assistance is needed for Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates to defend themselves, yet most of these weapons are offensive weapons and much of the sale will be delivered months or years from now.

The logic doesn't make sense because there is no logic. This is an administration that has coozied up to Riyadh, sweeping aside gross human rights abuses, turning a blind eye to the Saudis taking a buzz saw to a Washington Post reporter, and supporting an intervention in Yemen that is causing famine, destruction, and mounting loss of life.

Just because you don't like the process doesn't mean you get to ignore it. This action has implications far beyond this current sale, and if Congress doesn't reassert our proper role in the process, we risk giving up our authority in the arms sale process entirely.

Mr. Chair, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this excellent amendment.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I just want to point out Chairman ENGEL has been approaching this issue in a little more of a surgical approach in looking at Federal law. I think that that would be the more appropriate tactic in being able to work together in a bipartisan fashion on this issue.

This amendment, with all due respect to my good friend from California, is a little more of a sledgehammer. I think he would probably say that that would be true, unapologetically.

I, though, would certainly encourage my colleagues, really, on both sides of

the aisle, to be able to work together through concerns that others may have rather than passing this particular amendment.

There has been a hold that has been placed for a very long time. And I would encourage any Members of Congress who are responsible for that hold or support the hold to articulate to us and to the administration exactly what the hold is, what the concerns are, and how we can work through it together.

I hope that we all are in unanimity with concern over Iranian aggression in the Middle East. We are all in unanimity with concern when we see Iran—beyond the rhetorical calling us the great Satan—pledging death to America, building a land bridge across the Middle East, supporting Assad in Syria and financing Hezbollah in Lebanon.

And, certainly, there are the concerns with the movement in shipping lanes around Yemen, a conflict that the Houthis, in overthrowing a legitimate government, did with the backing of the Iranians.

So, there are a lot of concerns that we have on our side of the aisle as it relates to Iranian aggression, and I hope that we can work together in dealing with those concerns that we all have as it relates to Iranian aggression.

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

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I agree Iran is a malign influence in the Middle East, but that doesn't mean the administration gets to bypass Congress in selling arms to Saudi Arabia and the UAE.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I respect the gentleman's point about how we need to work towards an agreement to how Congress can have the most constructive role possible on arms sales.

The concern here is the tendency of the White House to declare an emergency when they simply want to do something that we haven't allowed them to do. It is troubling because it takes us out of the process, so we need to find a way to make sure that they can't do that.

It is not a huge mystery why these arms sales have been held up. We are concerned about Iran's malign influence. We are also concerned about the actions that Saudi Arabia has been taking in that region that could be stirring up conflict and making it easier for Iran to have that malign influence; quite specifically, killing civilians in Yemen in a way that generates sympathy, certainly, for the Houthis in Yemen but then sympathy for that side.

So, we are worried about the way Saudi Arabia is conducting this war, certainly, and we are also worried about other actions by Saudi Arabia. Certainly, the murder of the journalist, Jamal Khashoggi, has not been answered for to this point.

So, simply selling weapons to Saudi Arabia at this point is something that is going to take time and is going to raise questions.

For the President to simply bypass us, taking us out of the process in that situation, I think, undermines our role.

That is the purpose of this amendment, and I urge adoption.

□ 1245

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I also think it is important to note that the United States has not engaged in direct hostilities in Yemen. We stopped the refueling of Saudi aircraft, so the activities have actually, in many respects, been walked back from what was historically known as being directly engaged in hostilities on the ground, which is just not the case here as it relates to the United States.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, this issue has bipartisan support, and I request an “aye” vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, again, I would urge all of my colleagues to oppose 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. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer amendment No. 26 as the designee of Mr. KHANNA.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in subtitle G of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12 ____ . PROHIBITION ON SUPPORT FOR MILITARY PARTICIPATION AGAINST THE HOUTHIS.

(a) PROHIBITION RELATING TO SUPPORT.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to provide the following forms of United States support to Saudi-led coalition's operations against the Houthis in Yemen:

(1) Sharing intelligence for the purpose of enabling coalition strikes.

(2) Providing logistical support for coalition strikes, including by providing maintenance or transferring spare parts to coalition members flying warplanes engaged in anti-Houthi bombings.

(b) PROHIBITION RELATING TO MILITARY PARTICIPATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available

for any civilian or military personnel of the Department of Defense to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of the Saudi and United Arab Emirates-led coalition forces in hostilities against the Houthis in Yemen or in situations in which there exists an imminent threat that such coalition forces become engaged in such hostilities, unless and until the President has obtained specific statutory authorization, in accordance with section 8(a) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(a)).

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The prohibitions under this section may not be construed to apply with respect to United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at al Qaeda or associated forces.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a variation on a bill that this House passed and the Senate passed as well that the President vetoed that would cut off any U.S. support for the Saudi coalition that is fighting in Yemen.

And I will agree with some discussion that came earlier that this is a complicated situation because we are concerned about the malign influence of Iran in the region. But the problem is the way the war has been conducted in Yemen.

As I mentioned earlier on the previous amendment, the civilian casualties and the way the war has been conducted has undermined, I believe, our efforts to arrive at a peaceful solution and to begin to limit the Iranian influence in the region.

I met with Saudi Arabian officials as they explained to me what their targeting strategy was, and how they were trying to mitigate civilian casualties, but I was not impressed because whatever they showed me on these pieces of paper, it has been well-documented that they bombed a school bus, killing a large number of children. They actually bombed a funeral, a funeral that had a lot of the key leaders in Yemen at it that were going to be responsible for negotiating a peace agreement. And on countless other instances they have bombed civilian targets.

There is also a very aggressive blockade going on in Yemen that is having a devastating humanitarian impact.

Now, I understand that Iran is also doing things that we should oppose. They are killing civilians; they are stirring up difficulties. But we are not supporting Iran. We are not responsible for that piece of it.

But to the extent that we participate in helping Saudi Arabia, through intelligence sharing, through refueling, through a variety of different means, we are participating in the atrocities that are being committed on that side, and we should not be. It is not what is going to lead us to a peaceful solution.

I also want to emphasize that this amendment, as did the bill that we

passed, very carefully carves out the activity that we are engaged in in Yemen to counter violent extremist groups like al-Qaida and ISIS that have arisen in the region.

We have a counterterrorism presence in Yemen. This amendment in no way restricts us from continuing that counterterrorism activity. This is focused on the civil war in Yemen.

And it is worth noting that, as we get to the point now where Iran is involved, that is not the way it started. Basically, the Houthis in Yemen were an oppressed minority and suffered decades of mistreatment at the hands of whoever happened to be in charge in Yemen, which led to the revolt.

Now, since that time, the Houthis have committed all manner of atrocities, as well as the war moved forward. But initially, this was a civil war that doesn't really have anything to do with the terrorism fight that we are doing. And I think it is incredibly important for the credibility of our foreign policy to clearly differentiate between our activities, our legitimate activities, in Yemen to stop those terrorists in Yemen who threaten us and threaten our allies in the region, and the activities of this broader civil war that, as I said, I believe, is merely creating more violence in the Middle East and empowering Iran by creating widespread sympathy across the board and in the United States for the Houthis and for the people in Yemen who are being the victims of these bombing attacks.

The U.S. should step back from this. And if Saudi Arabia is the great ally that everyone has said they are, we should be able to have a conversation with them about how they change their actions, so we can be in a better position to support them and lead toward greater peace in the region and contain Iran. That is what we need to do.

But the current policy isn't working, so this amendment makes it clear the United States is not supporting the Saudi-led coalition that is engaged in the civil war in Yemen, and I urge support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I completely support Congress' solemn duty under Article I of the Constitution to authorize the commitment of U.S. troops to foreign hostilities; but that is not the only issue here.

This amendment attempts to block intelligence sharing to our strategic partners such as Saudi Arabia at a time when those partners have civilian targets that are actively being attacked by Iran-backed Houthi rebels.

Intelligence sharing can help our partners protect their forces and their civilians. It can also help them ensure that they are hitting their correct targets, thereby minimizing civilian casualties.

Additionally, the Iran-backed Houthis are stepping up its attacks on U.S. assets in Yemen. CENTCOM confirmed that the Houthis shot down a U.S. drone earlier this summer. If we cut off intelligence sharing with our strategic partners, it will certainly have repercussions that diminish our abilities to protect our own assets.

There is reason that a bipartisan majority supported exempting intelligence sharing from the War Powers Resolution on Yemen that we considered earlier this year. It is because this type of cooperation is essential to U.S. interests in the region, including ensuring responsible conduct of the war in Yemen.

It is important to point out that here, in this case with Yemen, the Houthis overthrew a government with the backing of Iran. Iran is the world's largest state sponsor of terror. They do many malign, nonnuclear, nefarious activities.

While, for good reason, we give the most amount of attention to Iran's nuclear activities—they call Israel the Little Satan, the United States the Great Satan, and they pledge death to America in their parliament and on their streets and in their holidays—they have been attempting to build a land bridge to the west of the country.

They have a much more growing influence within the government of Iraq. They have been propping up Assad in Syria. They have been financing rockets and other activities to support Hezbollah in Lebanon.

When you look towards the Strait of Bab al-Mandab, and the area around Yemen, and the strategic advantage for Iran to be able to successfully help the Houthis in overthrowing this government and having long-term security, Iranian aggression has caused a realignment of different alliances within the Middle East.

Many of these nations are looking at Israel differently than they used to because they are so concerned with Iranian aggression.

I think what is most important for U.S. interests in the Middle East and, specifically, in Yemen, one, it is critically important, and as the gentleman said in his point, minimizing civilian casualties must be of a bipartisan concern. It should be one of international concern, most importantly, for innocent civilians who end up losing their life.

Additionally, those who are cutting off access to humanitarian aid is also of great concern and great debate.

So for myself, speaking for myself specifically, as it relates to Yemen, I am greatly concerned by the Houthis activities backed by Iran, and it is one that we should successfully be hoping that that aggression is pushed back to the point that Houthis are unsuccessful; that Iran is unsuccessful, and they are pushed back to their own country, back in a defensive posture, and we don't see further aggression in more countries.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. As a veteran, and as a member of the House Intelligence Committee, I have had the privilege of seeing firsthand how intelligence supports U.S. foreign policy abroad and just how important our allies are when fighting our adversaries.

Intelligence sharing relationships act as a force multiplier, ensuring the security of the United States and our allies. As we have seen time and time again, restricting such critical information sharing results in disastrous repercussions.

Even as we debate this amendment, our strategic partners, such as Saudi Arabia, have civilian targets that are being attacked by Iran-backed Houthi rebels. These same Iran-supported rebels pose a threat to U.S. military personnel in the region.

Yesterday, this body debated an amendment tasking the ODNI to provide an annual report on civilian casualties.

You know what helps minimize civilian casualties? Intelligence. Intelligence helps ensure that the correct targets are hit, while minimizing collateral damage.

I am gravely concerned with the dangerous long-term implications of this ill-advised amendment. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has the right to close.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would just encourage all my colleagues to oppose this amendment for reasons that were stated, hopefully, with great concern across this entire body on both sides of the aisle as it relates to Iranian aggression.

We need to work together, really all around the world or wherever the United States can be of assistance to minimize civilian casualties, to get access to humanitarian aid.

There is debate at times of who is responsible, but I think it is important for us to do a better job working together to achieve the results that are in the best interests of the United States, even though we have debates at times of the best way to get there.

I encourage all Members to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I think the intelligence sharing point the gentleman from Arkansas made is very important. Let me say, there are multiple countries involved in this coalition in Yemen.

In working with the UAE, for instance, they actually do take steps to minimize civilian casualties and are reasonably successful about it in the operations that they have conducted, both from the air and the ground.

Saudi Arabia has not. And believe me, I certainly understood the malign influence of Iran and their relationship with the Houthis. But Saudi Arabia, time and time again, regrettably, has not used this intelligence sharing in a way that minimizes civilian casualties.

I had cited the instances earlier of the school bus that was bombed; the funeral party that was bombed; the civilians who are continually hit. They are not using this intelligence sharing in a way to minimize civilian casualties. And I think we need to make a statement that they are going to have to change their ways before we continue to do this.

On the broader issue, and that is really what Yemen is about for U.S. policy purposes, is Iran's influence in the region and, also, the role that Saudi Arabia plays in the violence. And the problem I have with the administration's policy right now is it would do nothing to contain what Saudi Arabia is doing, which only exacerbates the violence and creates openings for Iran. So we need to balance that.

As far as Iran is concerned, right now it is hard to say where the administration's policy is going. It is a maximum pressure campaign. We have seen Iran lash out since we abandoned the nuclear deal. They are now moving more in the direction of developing a nuclear weapon than they were before we abandoned the nuclear deal.

The administration is now saying that they want to force Iran to the table to stop them from getting a nuclear weapon.

We need a better policy in Iran. I urge support for the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1300

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in subtitle G of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12 . . . REPEAL OF PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER OF ARTICLES ON THE UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST TO CYPRUS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the direct sale or transfer of arms by the United States to Cyprus would advance United States security interests in Europe by helping to reduce the dependence of the Government of Cyprus on other countries for defense-related materiel, including countries that pose challenges to United States interests around the world; and

(2) it is in the interest of the United States—

(A) to continue to support United Nations-facilitated efforts toward a comprehensive solution to the division of Cyprus; and

(B) for the Republic of Cyprus to join NATO's Partnership for Peace program.

(b) MODIFICATION OF PROHIBITION.—Section 620C(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2373(e)) is amended by adding at the end of the following new paragraph:

“(3) The requirement under paragraph (1) shall not apply to any sale or other provision of any defense article or defense service to Cyprus if the end-user of such defense or defense service is Cyprus.”.

(c) EXCLUSION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS FROM CERTAIN RELATED REGULATIONS.—Beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall not apply a policy of denial for exports, re-exports, or transfers of defense articles and defense services destined for or originating in the Republic of Cyprus if—

(1) the request is made by or on behalf of Cyprus; and

(2) the end-user of such defense articles or defense services is Cyprus.

(d) EXCEPTION.—This exclusion shall not apply to any denial based upon credible human rights concerns.

(e) LIMITATIONS ON THE TRANSFER OF ARTICLES ON THE UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST TO THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The policy of denial for exports, re-exports, or transfers of defense articles on the United States Munitions List to the Republic of Cyprus shall remain in place unless the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees not less than annually that—

(A) the Government of the Republic of Cyprus is continuing to cooperate with the United States Government in efforts to implement reforms on anti-money laundering regulations and financial regulatory oversight; and

(B) the Government of the Republic of Cyprus has made and is continuing to take the steps necessary to deny Russian military vessels access to ports for refueling and servicing.

(2) WAIVER.—The President may waive the limitations contained in this subsection for one fiscal year if the President determines that it is essential to the national security interests of the United States to do so.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman

from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, the Republic of Cyprus is a strategic partner of the United States and has played a critical role in combating terrorism and nuclear proliferation in the Eastern Mediterranean region. The United States regularly participates in joint exercises with Cyprus, including annual multinational search and rescue and crisis management exercises, and we coordinate training programs for Cyprus in explosives management and disposal, cybersecurity, counterterrorism, and maritime safety and security.

Through information sharing, training programs, and other international and regional security initiatives, the United States and Cyprus work hand in hand to combat terrorist activity in Europe and the Eastern Mediterranean region. The United States also works closely with Cyprus to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and Cyprus has helped foster an effective international nonproliferation regime.

In 2015, the U.S. joined Cyprus, as members of the Proliferation Security Initiative, in cohosting a regional nonproliferation workshop focusing on inspecting and identifying proliferation material.

Yet despite the critical security partnership between our two countries, the United States has had an arms embargo in place against Cyprus since 1987. This policy was initially intended to prevent Turkey from using American weapons to occupy Cyprus and to provide space for reunification talks after Turkey's 1974 invasion of Cyprus and its subsequent occupation of the northern territory.

However, more than 3 years since the embargo was first implemented, Turkey still has more than 30,000 troops occupying the northern territory of Cyprus, reunification talks have not produced intended results, and the U.S. is unable to maintain a full security relationship with a key partner in combating terrorism.

Even today, Turkey continues to use its U.S.-backed military might to threaten Cyprus' energy exploration by continually harassing drilling vessels in its exclusive economic zone. And Turkey is not merely threatening the Republic of Cyprus, but significant American investments by ExxonMobil and Noble Energy and the interests of key U.S. allies in Greece, Egypt, and Israel, all of whom are partners with Cyprus on energy developments.

The outdated and ineffective arms embargo forces Cyprus, an EU member, and one of only three countries with a status of forces agreement with Israel, to obtain defense articles from countries like Russia that seek to undermine U.S. interests in the region.

We need to enact policies that strengthen our relationship with Cyprus and counteract dangerous ele-

ments in the region which threaten our national security interests and the interests of our allies and partners in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Our inability to provide Cyprus with necessary equipment needed to defend its sovereignty and its economic interests threatens our own national security.

Lifting the arms embargo will allow Cyprus to better establish itself as a frontline state for Western security interests, defend itself from external threats, and will ensure that Cyprus is no longer forced to seek assistance for its defense from countries like Russia. It will also make regional security cooperation smoother for the United States by making sure our partners can obtain compatible defense systems and training from the U.S. military.

My bipartisan amendment would repeal the ineffective embargo and ensure that Cyprus has the equipment necessary to continue to help the U.S. combat terrorism and international crime, and protect significant natural gas finds and the infrastructure that can bring this energy source to Europe.

The Senate has already taken up this issue and passed language to repeal the embargo with bipartisan support during its consideration of the NDAA. The House should follow suit and support passage of my bipartisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Cyprus is a vital and strategic international partner, and we need to make sure we are treating it as such. I urge adoption of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Rhode Island, and I want to agree in substantial measure with what he said about the progress that Cyprus has made both in countering Russian influence and in combating international money laundering and other issues on which we have been working with them. I do believe that, as the gentleman indicated, the embargo that has been in place since 1987 ought to be considered and looked at, and there ought to at least be considered a plan to gradually move away from that embargo if and as Cyprus continues to make progress in weaning itself off Russian weapons and the other priorities that we have with them.

What I worry about is, all of a sudden, in a total of a 10-minute debate on the National Defense Authorization Act, that we come in and say, “Okay, the embargo is gone; what has been in place since 1987, never mind anymore,” without really thinking through the consequences and having that plan that helps us work with Cyprus to get to a better place.

And I don't need to remind Members that this area is very complex, with a

number of actors that have intense interest in what happens in Cyprus and in the region. I am not saying that we don't move in that direction, but I am saying, to come here with a 10-minute debate and say, "Okay, never mind what we have done since 1987" is fraught with danger.

So, for that reason, I must oppose this amendment. I appreciate the progress that is being made. I think it is important to look for ways to build on that progress, but for us to come in and say, "Oh, never mind; we are going to upend something that has been in place for so many years" would be dangerous.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his thoughts. I would only say that the best way to assist Cyprus in weaning itself from the reliance of Russian weaponry is to lift the arms embargo, and this is something that both Cyprus and the United States have studied for a very long time. The best way to strengthen this partnership and alliance is to repeal this embargo.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, Congressman GUS BILIRAKIS, for cosponsoring this amendment and for his leadership on this issue.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the amendment put forward by my good friend, Representative CICILLINE, to lift the antiquated and failed prohibition on defense article and service transfers to our Eastern Mediterranean ally—the Republic of Cyprus.

In 1987, the U.S. Department of State placed the Republic of Cyprus on a list of countries to which sales and transfers of defense articles and services is prohibited under the International Trade in Arms Regulations. The reason for the prohibition has never been clear. However, it appears to have been imposed in the erroneous belief that it would somehow encourage Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots to resolve the nearly 45-year division of the territory of Cyprus.

Unfortunately, no progress toward a peaceful and just settlement has occurred since the prohibition was imposed in 1987. The lack of progress is due to Turkish stubbornness most recently demonstrated by Turkey's insistence on antiquated and obstructive stances, such as the Treaty of Guarantee, which would allow for future unilateral Turkish military interventions and is completely unacceptable and contradicts the governing principals of a European Union member state.

It is time to lift the arms prohibition on the Republic of Cyprus. It is in the best interests of the United States for the Republic of Cyprus to look to the United States, and not any other nation, to procure its defense articles.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In subsection (b) of section 1087—

(1) redesignate paragraphs (7), (8), and (9) as paragraphs (9), (10), and (11), respectively; and

(2) insert after paragraph (6) the following:

(7) An analysis of reasons for any disparity between third party public estimates and official United States Government estimates of civilian casualties resulting from United States or joint operations, including with respect to each specific mission, strike, engagement, raid, or incident.

(8) A comparison of a representative sample of pre-strike collateral damage estimates and confirmed civilian casualty incidents for the purposes of developing possible explanations for any gaps between the two and assessing how to reduce such gaps.

In paragraph (10) of section 1087(b), as redesignated, add at the end before the period the following: “, including an analysis of the principal and secondary causes of civilian casualties in a suitably representative sample of air operations that includes both planned and dynamic strikes”.

In paragraph (1) of section 1087(d), insert “and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives” after “congressional defense committees”.

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. — AMENDMENTS RELATING TO CIVILIAN CASUALTY MATTERS.

(a) MODIFICATION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR POLICY ON CIVILIAN CASUALTY MATTERS.—Section 936 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232; 10 U.S.C. 134 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by inserting “appropriate to the specific regional circumstances” after “publicly available means”; and

(ii) by inserting “or in-person” after “Internet-based”;

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, including for acknowledging the status of any individuals killed or injured who were initially reported as lawful targets, but subsequently determined not to be lawful targets” after “operations”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by inserting “or other assistance” after “payments”; and

(II) by striking “necessary” and inserting “reasonable and culturally appropriate”; and

(C) in paragraph (7), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (10); and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) uniform processes and standards across the combatant commands for integrating civilian protection into operational planning, including assessments of the optimal staffing models for tracking, analyzing, and responding to civilian casualties in named military operations of various sizes and compositions, to include multinational coalition operations;

“(9) cultivating, developing, retaining, and disseminating lessons learned about the proximate cause or causes of civilian casualties, and practices developed to prevent, mitigate, or respond to such casualties; and”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) COORDINATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The senior civilian official designated under subsection (a) shall develop and implement steps to increase coordination with the Chiefs of Mission and other appropriate positions in the Department of State in any country with respect to which the policy required pursuant to subsection (a) is relevant.

“(2) MATTERS FOR COORDINATION.—The coordination required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) The development of publicly available means, appropriate to the specific regional circumstances, including an internet-based or in-person mechanism, for submission to the United States Government of allegations of civilian casualties resulting from United States military operations.

“(B) The offering of reasonable and culturally appropriate ex gratia payments or other assistance to civilians who have been injured, or to the families of civilians killed, as a result of United States military operations.”;

(4) by inserting after subsection (d), as redesignated, the following:

“(e) BRIEFING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the senior civilian official designated under subsection (a) shall brief the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on—

“(1) the updates made to the policy developed by the senior civilian official pursuant to this section; and

“(2) the efforts of the Department to implement such updates.”.

(b) MODIFICATION OF ANNUAL REPORT ON CIVILIAN CASUALTIES IN CONNECTION WITH UNITED STATES MILITARY OPERATIONS.—Section 1057 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “congressional defense committees” and inserting “appropriate congressional committees”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “and, when relevant, makes ex gratia payments or provides other assistance to the victims or their families, including—

“(A) whether interviews were conducted with witnesses and survivors of United States lethal actions, directly or through a third party or intermediary;

“(B) whether the investigation relied on public reports or other nongovernmental sources; and

“(C) the process, criteria, and methodology used to assess external allegations of civilian casualties, including the sources of such allegations.”;

(B) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end before the period the following: “, including any assistance and support, as appropriate, provided for civilians displaced by such operations”;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (9); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

“(6) A list of allegations where the Department could confirm United States military activity but could not confirm civilian casualties due to lack of evidence, and any steps taken to further corroborate the allegations.

“(7) A list of allegations that the Department could not fully assess in a Civilian Casualty Assessment Review (CCAR) due to lack of information and any steps taken to obtain additional information needed to conduct a CCAR.

“(8) A description of the specific criteria the Department employed during the CCAR to determine that a civilian casualty is more likely than not to have occurred.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(1) the congressional defense committees; and

“(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I always view military policy as a measure of last resort in our foreign policy. When the American military is engaged anywhere in the world, it often comes at the cost of American lives and the lives of innocent civilians. These are the most tragic costs of war, one reason why we can never, ever be reckless in the use of military force.

Civilian casualties are a tragedy. They also give extremist groups fodder to radicalize and recruit new fighters. We need to do everything in our power to reduce the number of civilian casualties. The Pentagon has made progress in this area thanks in part to new requirements Congress put in place. My amendment would build on this progress in a number of ways.

First of all, it would help fill in the blanks when it comes to our own planning and reporting about civilian casualties. Right now, there tends to be a big difference between what the Defense Department estimates in terms of civilian casualties before a military strike and what the Department reports after and, again, a big difference between our official reporting and what NGOs report. My amendment would require a new analysis of these disparities to help figure out why we are getting it wrong ahead of time and why there is such a wide range of reporting after the fact.

Secondly, while the Pentagon has done good work developing sound policies in this area, more must be done on implementation. My measure would improve consistent standards across all the combatant commands.

Thirdly, this amendment will help improve the way we gather information about civilian casualties. It will establish new criteria and methods to assess allegations of casualties, and it will make sure we work more effectively with local populations.

Lastly, we need to understand that the Defense Department needs to keep learning and adapting. My amendment would require standards for incorporating lessons learned so our policies and practices will continue to improve as time goes on.

Because this is a learning process, I will say that this amendment won't give us a perfect policy. We need to keep working toward more comprehensive, responsible ways of preventing and addressing civilian casualties. We need to keep giving the Defense Department the tools it needs to do so. This measure will provide a few more of those tools, and I am glad the House is able to consider it today.

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me start off by being very clear on this issue: Our military forces aim for zero civilian casualties—zero—and one civilian casualty during a military operation is one too many. No one understands this better than our men and women in uniform who go through extreme efforts to continually avoid civilian casualties, and no committee understands this better than the House Armed Services Committee.

So this amendment that we are discussing now is one of several that we have seen this year that unnecessarily expand and increase reporting on civilian casualties and allegations of civilian casualties caused by our men and women in uniform.

I am disappointed that, once again, the majority chose to give up Defense Committee jurisdiction to another outside committee. So this amendment would, in effect, give an outside committee additional reporting on what amounts to ongoing and current military operations.

To date, this has been the exclusive jurisdiction of the Defense Committee's. In fact, the civilian casualty frameworks that we are discussing today were put in place in previous NDAs under the previous Republican majority on a bipartisan basis. We tried to work in additional edits to this amendment, given the importance of this issue, but those edits were refused by the majority, which is why we are debating this today.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this.

After serving 30 years in the Air Force and serving with multiple air operation centers, I know how hard our military works to get this right. Our military forces go through extreme measures to avoid civilian casualties.

At any given time, combatant commanders have multiple boards, centers, cells, and working groups that are focused on reducing civilian casualties, in addition to the work of the various target development working groups.

Additionally, there are significant and recurring legal reviews conducted as proposed targets are evaluated for compliance with the law of war by judge advocates, legal advisers, and target engagement authorities—and this is before any strike is even taken.

To evaluate civilian casualties and allegations, military commanders look at and consider reports from all sources, including NGOs, credible media sources and outlets, and even social media.

In addition to evaluating all these various reports, they look at the video surveillance that they have and other forms of data from their ISR assets, witness observations; they take human intelligence and other forms of intelligence.

Of course, there are going to be differences in initial reporting—and sometimes even months afterwards—between what DOD sees and what other groups are seeing, but this is war, and war is chaos. And our adversaries frequently also inflate civilian losses to further their aims.

So my position is this. We have a great process in place. It is working. The military has given it their very best to get this right. The integrity of our military commanders is such that we can trust their effort with what they are doing now, and any discrepancies, they are acknowledged and they are investigated, and they try to get it as right as they can.

To say our military does not take these allegations of civilian casualties seriously means you don't understand the policy, the process, and the level of effort that goes into avoiding these casualties in the first place. And investigating any allegations of civilian casualties in any post operation, they do their very best to get this right.

Our military is working hard. They are trying to achieve our objectives. I stand in objection to the amendment.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I would respectfully remind my colleagues that the Foreign Affairs Committee has jurisdiction over authorizations for the use of military force, and military strikes are conducted under authority from the Foreign Affairs Committee. It shares jurisdiction.

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, this isn't an easy subject to deal with, but it cannot be swept under the rug. It is good that the Pentagon has taken steps in recent years to adopt stronger and more responsible policies when it comes to civilian casualties.

□ 1315

We need to keep pressing forward on this work to make sure we have the best information, to make sure this is a problem taken seriously and being dealt with, and to make sure the United States is behaving responsibly when these tragedies do occur.

Mr. Chair, I ask for Members to support this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chair, in closing, again, I think it is important to note that as a matter of practice on the ground, we want zero civilian casualties, not only for law of war and ethical reasons but because our troops are often there to work alongside and protect civilian populations, so any unnecessary force creates additional enemies. One civilian casualty is one too many.

But this amendment is unnecessary because there are already considerable policies in place and reporting that occurs to minimize any and all civilian casualties.

This amendment is also unnecessary because there is, in addition, substantial and continued coordination that occurs between the DOD and the State Department, starting at the country team level and extending back to the Pentagon and Foggy Bottom, which also includes coordination with the National Security Council and the intelligence community.

Again, we don't want to give up our jurisdiction on the House Armed Services Committee when we are talking about military operations and knowing that our troops do anything and everything they can to ensure there are zero civilian casualties.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in subtitle D of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12. REPORTS RELATING TO THE NEW START TREATY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should seek to extend the New START Treaty, from its initial termination date in February 2021 to February 2026, as provided for under Article XIV of the Treaty, unless—

(1) the President determines and informs the appropriate congressional committees that Russia is in material breach of the Treaty; or

(2) the Treaty is superseded by a new arms control agreement that provides equal or greater constraints, transparency, and verification measures with regard to Russia's nuclear forces.

(b) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO WITHDRAW FROM THE NEW START TREATY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2020 may be used to take any action to withdraw the United States from the New START Treaty, unless the President determines and so informs the appropriate congressional committees that Russia is in material breach of the Treaty.

(c) ASSESSMENTS FROM DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—

(1) RELATING TO EXPIRATION OF NEW START TREATY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an intelligence assessment based on all sources of the national security and intelligence implications of the expiration of the New START Treaty without the United States and Russia having entered into a new arms control agreement that provides equal or greater constraints, transparency, and verification measures with regard to Russia's nuclear forces. The assessment shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex, and shall include the following elements:

(A) A description of the size and posture of Russia's nuclear forces, including strategic nuclear warheads and strategic delivery vehicles, as well as predicted force levels through February 2026 under each of the following potential scenarios:

(i) The Treaty expires in February 2026 without such a replacement agreement.

(ii) The Treaty is extended until February 2026.

(B) A description of Russia's likely response to an expiration of the New START Treaty, including potential changes to Russia's nuclear forces, conventional forces, as well as Russia's willingness to negotiate an arms control agreement on Russian non-strategic or tactical nuclear weapons, short- and intermediate-range delivery systems, (including dual-capable and nuclear-only), and new strategic delivery systems (such as the kinds announced by President Putin on March 1, 2018) in the future.

(C) An assessment of the strategic impact on United States and Russian strategic nuclear forces if the Treaty is not extended and such an agreement is not concluded, including the likelihood that Russia pursues new strategic offensive arms research and development programs.

(D) An assessment of the potential quantity of Russia's new strategic delivery systems (such as the kinds announced by President Putin on March 1, 2018) between 2021 and 2026, and the impact to strategic stability between Russia and the United States as related to Russia's existing strategic forces.

(E) An assessment of the impact on United States allies if the limitations on Russia's nuclear forces are dissolved if the Treaty is not extended and such an agreement is not concluded.

(F) A description of the verification and transparency benefits of the Treaty and a description of the Treaty's impact on the United States' understanding of Russia's military and nuclear forces.

(G) An assessment of how the United States' confidence in its understanding of Russia's strategic nuclear arsenal and future nuclear force levels would be impacted if the Treaty is not extended and such an agreement is not concluded.

(H) An assessment of what actions would be necessary for the United States to remediate the loss of the Treaty's verification and transparency benefits if the Treaty is not extended and such an agreement is not concluded, and an estimate of the remedial resources required to ensure no concomitant loss of understanding of Russia's military and nuclear forces.

(2) RELATING TO RUSSIA'S WILLINGNESS TO ENGAGE IN NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL NEGOTIATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an intelligence assessment based on all sources of Russia's willingness to engage in nuclear arms control negotiations and Russia's priorities in these negotiations. The assessment shall be submitted in an unclassified form but may contain a classified annex, and shall include the following elements:

(A) An assessment of Russia's willingness to extend the New START Treaty and its likely negotiating position to discuss such an extension with the United States.

(B) An assessment of Russia's interest in negotiating a broader arms control agreement that would include nuclear weapons systems not accountable under the New START Treaty, including non-strategic nuclear weapons.

(C) An assessment of what concessions Russia would likely seek from the United States during such negotiations, including what additional United States' military capabilities Russia would seek to limit, in any broader arms control negotiation.

(d) REPORTS AND BRIEFING FROM SECRETARY OF STATE.—

(1) RELATING TO NATO, NATO MEMBER COUNTRIES, AND OTHER UNITED STATES ALLIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit a report, which shall be in an unclassified form but may contain a classified annex, and provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(A) an assessment of the likely reactions of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), NATO member countries, and other United States allies to a United States decision not to extend the New START Treaty or enter into a new agreement with Russia to replace the Treaty that provides equal or greater constraints, transparency, and verification measures with regard to Russia's nuclear forces; and

(B) a description of the consultations undertaken with such allies in which the New START Treaty was raised, and the level of allied interest in, recommendations on, or concerns raised with respect to discussions between the United States and Russia relating to the Treaty and other related matters.

(2) RELATING TO ONGOING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW START TREATY.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until the New START Treaty is extended or expires,

the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit a report, which shall be in an unclassified form but may contain a classified annex, to the appropriate congressional committees with an assessment of the following elements:

(A) Whether the Russian Federation remains in compliance with its obligations under the New START Treaty.

(B) Whether implementation of the New START Treaty remains in the national security interest of the United States.

(3) RELATING TO OTHER MATTERS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter until the New START Treaty is extended or expires, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees that includes the following elements:

(A) A description of any discussions with Russia on the Treaty or on a broader, multilateral arms control treaty with Russia and other countries on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms, and discussions addressing the disparity between the non-strategic nuclear weapons stockpiles of Russia and of the United States, at the Assistant Secretary level, Ambassadorial level, or higher.

(B) The dates, locations, discussion topics, agenda, outcomes, and Russian interlocutors involved in those discussions.

(C) An identification of the United States Government departments and agencies involved in the discussions.

(D) The types of systems, both nuclear and nonnuclear, discussed by either side in such discussions as the potential subjects of an agreement.

(E) Whether an offer of extension of the Treaty for any length of time, or to negotiate a new agreement, has been offered by either side.

(e) REPORT AND BRIEFING FROM SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of State, shall submit a report, which shall be in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex, and provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) an assessment of the impact on the United States nuclear arsenal and posture of the expiration of the New START Treaty without the United States and Russia having entered into a new agreement with Russia to replace the Treaty that provides equal or greater constraints, transparency, and verification measures with regard to Russia's nuclear forces;

(2) a description of the potential changes to the expected force structure of the Armed Forces to respond to potential changes in Russia's nuclear posture if the limitations in the Treaty are no longer in force, and in the absence of such a new bilateral or multilateral agreement, and an estimation of expected costs necessary to make such changes to the force structure of the Armed Forces;

(3) a description, to be submitted jointly with the Secretary of Energy, of potential changes to the modernization plan for the United States nuclear weapons complex, which anticipates the continued existence of the Treaty, if the Treaty is not extended or such a new bilateral or multilateral agreement is not concluded;

(4) a description of the strategic impact on United States and Russian strategic nuclear forces if the Treaty is not extended or such a new bilateral or multilateral agreement is not concluded; and

(5) a description of potential changes regarding United States nuclear weapons for-

ward deployed to Europe and regarding the nuclear deterrent of the United Kingdom and France, if the Treaty is not extended or such a new bilateral or multilateral agreement is not concluded.

(f) PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATION IN ADVANCE OF EXPIRATION OF NEW START TREATY.—Not later than September 7, 2020, if the New START Treaty has not been extended, and if the United States and Russia have not entered into a new treaty to replace the New START Treaty, the President shall submit a report, which shall be in an unclassified form but may contain a classified annex, to the appropriate congressional committees that contains the following elements—

(1) an assessment as to whether the limits of the New START Treaty on Russia's strategic nuclear forces advance United States national security interests;

(2) an explanation of how the United States will address the imminent expiration of the New START Treaty, including—

(A) a plan to extend the New START Treaty before it expires;

(B) a plan to otherwise retain the Treaty's limits on Russia's nuclear forces; or

(C) a plan to provide for the expiration of the Treaty, including—

(i) a justification for why the expiration of the Treaty is in the national security interest of the United States; and

(ii) a plan, including steps the United States military and the intelligence community will take before February 5, 2021, to account for the expiration of the Treaty and the failure to replace it with a new agreement to maintain confidence in United States nuclear deterrence requirements and a similar level of confidence in intelligence information regarding Russia's nuclear forces.

(g) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS IN EVENT OF EXPIRATION OF NEW START TREATY.—If the New START Treaty expires before the United States and Russia enter into a new arms control agreement to replace the Treaty that provides equal or greater constraints, transparency, and verification measures with regard to the Russia's nuclear forces, not later than 30 days after such expiration—

(1) the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing changes to the expected force structure of the Armed Forces and estimating the expected costs necessary to make such changes; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report—

(A) describing the manner in which the current United States nuclear modernization plan, which anticipates the continued existence of the Treaty, will be modified without the existence of the Treaty; and

(B) including—

(i) the information required to be submitted in the report required by section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1576);

(ii) a separate 10-year cost estimate from the Department of Defense to implement a nuclear sustainment plan; and

(iii) a separate 10-year cost estimate from the Department of Energy to implement a nuclear sustainment and modernization plan.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term “intelligence community” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

(3) NEW START TREATY; TREATY.—The terms “New START Treaty” and “Treaty” mean the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed on April 8, 2010, and entered into force on February 5, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, my amendment is something that really should be a no-brainer. It says we need to maintain strong and verifiable limits on Russia's nuclear forces.

We all know that a robust nuclear deterrent has been a pillar of American security since the beginning of the Cold War, but so has arms control.

Democratic and Republican administrations alike have used arms control agreements to constrain Russia's nuclear forces. These agreements have allowed us to keep eyes on the ground so we can confirm what the Russians are doing.

They have stopped arms races. They have strengthened peace. I fear this administration wants to throw all of that out the window.

The President's withdrawal from the INF Treaty is sending us down a dangerous path toward a renewed nuclear arms race. Don't get me wrong: Russia's violation of the INF Treaty is unacceptable, but the question is how we respond to it. Instead of using diplomacy and pressure to push the Russians back into compliance, the administration is following Russia's lead and walking away. This sends a terrible message and signals a broader ideological contempt for the value of arms control.

Now the debate is shifting to New START. This treaty has won the praise of diplomats and defense and intelligence officials as a tool for advancing our national security interests. It allows us to keep a lid on competition with a hostile Russia. The New START Treaty places strong limits on Russia's strategic nuclear forces, meaning the nuclear weapons that can reach the United States.

This treaty also gives us strong mechanisms to make sure Russia is holding up its end of the bargain. It provides unique insights into Russia's nuclear forces, information that would be impossible to replace. Indeed, up to this point, the State Department has certified that Russia is in full compliance with the New START Treaty.

The clock is ticking. The New START Treaty is set to expire in a year and a half. It can be extended another 5 years until 2026, but only if the

United States and Russia agree to do so.

My amendment sets out what should be a commonsense approach. It says that as long as Russia remains in compliance with the treaty, the administration should work to extend the New START Treaty unless the administration can complete a replacement agreement with equal or greater constraints on the Russians.

We cannot accept anything less.

The amendment also requires a series of reports from the administration on potential consequences if the treaty lapses and requires the President to present a plan to Congress on how to deal with these consequences.

Like so many other aspects of its foreign policy, the Trump administration has sent confusing messages about extending the treaty. They recently called it “unlikely,” noting a desire to move beyond the existing arms control regime with Russia to tackle other issues like tactical nuclear weapons and China.

Those are important issues, too. I agree with that. The United States should push ahead with a new arms control agreement, but in the meantime, we shouldn’t throw out the baby with the bathwater. We should extend New START. After all, we cannot allow Russia free rein to expand its nuclear forces.

What I hope this administration understands is that arms control is a critical tool in a much broader effort as we compete with Russia. Arms control reduces uncertainty. It creates patterns and predictability. It helps us make sure our forces and programs are tailored to deal with the challenges we are facing.

Mr. Chair, I ask Members to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chair, I applaud my colleague’s determination to ensure that the United States is doing everything possible to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, I think this amendment does not have that impact.

We are engaged now in a situation with respect to New START, that it is a treaty that was designed, implemented, and adopted in a world that is very different from the one in which we live today.

Those of us on this side of the aisle do not suggest, and are not suggesting, that we should withdraw from the treaty, so it is a little bit disingenuous for the amendment to suggest that no funds should be used to withdraw. We do not want to withdraw from the treaty. It is an important treaty. However, we also think we shouldn’t blindly extend the treaty.

In today’s world, in which we know the treaty does not cover the types of

weapons that the Russians are developing, nor does it cover at all the types of weapons systems that the Chinese are developing and deploying, we want to make sure that the United States is able to provide those kinds of restrictions across the board, not simply stick to a treaty that limits only particular types of weapons systems and only with respect to Russia.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment because I think it is very important that we not tie the President’s hands, that we not send that message to the President and to our adversaries.

I think the Russians would very much like to see this treaty extended as it is. They would very much like to not be constrained in the development of tactical nuclear weapons and the development and deployment of systems that aren’t covered by the treaty.

Those of us who are arguing in favor of ensuring the treaty covers all the threats would like to see a much more robust arms control system than the one that would be in place if we simply extended this treaty without considering the possibility of including the Chinese and the Russians. The administration, in fact, has said precisely that.

The President has urged that the National Security Council look at ways that we can make sure the treaty covers all of our security needs, not simply extend it beyond the 2021 date.

We think it is important that the President have that ability. We also think it is important that the Congress not send a message to our adversaries that we are simply urging the President to extend this treaty as is.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, then let me split it. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), a well-respected member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and one of our subcommittee chairs.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Chairman ENGEL’s amendment, inspired by a bipartisan New START bill, which is cosponsored by Mr. MCCAUL, the ranking member, and of which I am a proud cosponsor. It is a bill that urges extension of the New START Treaty.

Russia’s broad range of destabilizing influence is well known. We need to do everything we can to constrain Russia’s arsenal to the best of our ability, and we have an effective tool in place.

We have heard from so many leaders about why this is important, people who support this amendment, like General John Hyten, Commander of the United States Strategic Command.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I want to point out that I agree with my col-

league that this treaty is outdated, that Russia and China are developing weapons that exceed what is included here, but that is all the more reason why we need the time afforded by extending this treaty to develop a stronger replacement.

We shouldn’t do what Russia wants. That is why I oppose this President, which Russia wants.

We need to have a stronger replacement for this treaty, and this amendment does exactly that. It gives us the time to get there while ensuring our safety in the meantime.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wyoming has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), my colleague, the esteemed ranking member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I simply want to make two points.

One is that the Under Secretary of State for Arms Control is supposed to meet with her Russian counterpart on this issue next week. What are we doing? We come to the floor, and we want to tie her hands. We want to restrict her ability to negotiate with the Russians. That doesn’t make any sense to me.

There has been discussion about flaws in the treaty, how it has not kept up with changes in technology. Yet the House wants to come and say, “Well, we think we ought to extend it anyway,” giving the Russians a benefit that they don’t have to give anything up for.

It may be that we come to a point where we think extending New START makes sense. The Russians ought to participate in that as part of a negotiation, not a unilateral move for us.

Secondly, I have to note more broadly in this bill that when New START was ratified, part of the agreement was, yes, we will go down to a lower number of nuclear weapons, but we are going to put increased investment into the nuclear weapons complex to make it more responsive, because with lower weapons, if something goes wrong, you have less margin for error.

This bill before us cuts the requested funding from the nuclear weapons complex. It cuts funding requested for the Minuteman III replacement. It cuts in a variety of ways our attempt to have a strong nuclear deterrent.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close.

Mr. Chair, I would like to ensure that our colleagues recognize the limitations of the treaty that my colleague, Mr. ENGEL, is suggesting we extend.

The treaty is insufficient with respect to the arms that it limits. The

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 187, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

AYES—242

Adams Gomez
 Aguilar Gonzalez (TX)
 Allred Gottheimer
 Axne Green, Al (TX)
 Barragán Grijalva
 Bass Haaland
 Beatty Harder (CA)
 Bera Hastings
 Beyrer Hayes
 Bishop (GA) Heck
 Blumenauer Higgins (NY)
 Blunt Rochester Hill (CA)
 Bonamici Himes
 Boyle, Brendan Hollingsworth
 F. Horn, Kendra S.
 Brindisi Horsford
 Brooks (IN) Houlihan
 Brown (MD) Hoyer
 Brownley (CA) Huffman
 Bustos Hurd (TX)
 Butterfield Jackson Lee
 Carbajal Jayapal
 Cárdenas Jeffries
 Carson (IN) Johnson (GA)
 Cartwright Johnson (TX)
 Case Kaptur
 Casten (IL) Katko
 Castor (FL) Keating
 Castro (TX) Kelly (IL)
 Chu, Judy Kennedy
 Cicilline Khanna
 Cisneros Kildee
 Clark (MA) Kilmer
 Clarke (NY) Kim
 Clay Kind
 Cleaver Kirkpatrick
 Clyburn Krishnamoorthi
 Cohen Kuster (NH)
 Connolly Lamb
 Cooper Langevin
 Correa Larsen (WA)
 Costa Larson (CT)
 Courtney Lawrence
 Cox (CA) Lawson (FL)
 Craig Lee (CA)
 Crist Lee (NV)
 Crow Levin (CA)
 Cuellar Levin (MI)
 Cummings Lewis
 Cunningham Lieu, Ted
 Davids (KS) Lipinski
 Davis (CA) Loebsock
 Davis, Danny K. Lofgren
 Dean Lowenthal
 DeFazio Stivers
 DeGette Luján
 DeLauro Luria
 DelBene Lynch
 Delgado Malinowski
 Demings Maloney,
 DeSaulnier Carolyn B.
 Dingell Maloney, Sean
 Doggett Matsui
 Doyle, Michael McAdams
 F. McBath
 Engel McCollum
 Escobar McEachin
 Eshoo McGovern
 Espallat Meeks
 Evans Meng
 Finkenauer Moore
 Fitzpatrick Morelle
 Fletcher Moulton
 Foster Mucarsel-Powell
 Frankel Murphy
 Gallego Nadler
 Garamendi Napolitano
 Garcia (IL) Neal
 Garcia (TX) Neguse
 Golden O'Halleran

Watson Coleman Welch
 Wexton Wild

NOES—187

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Armstrong
 Arrington
 Babin
 Bacon
 Baird
 Balderson
 Banks
 Barr
 Bergman
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Bost
 Brady
 Brooks (AL)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Buschson
 Budd
 Burchett
 Byrnes
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Cline
 Cloud
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Conaway
 Cook
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Curtis
 Davidson (OH)
 Davis, Rodney
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Estes
 Ferguson
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foxx (NC)
 Fulcher
 Gaetz
 Gallagher
 Gianforte
 Gibbs
 Gohmert

Fudge
 Gabbard
 Higgins (LA)
 McNeerney
 Norton
 Palmer

Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Newhouse
 Norman
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Pence
 Perry
 Posey
 Ratcliffe
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (SC)
 Riggelman
 Guest
 Roby
 Rodgers (WA)
 Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rooney (FL)
 Rose, John W.
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Rutherford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smucker
 Spano
 Stauber
 Steube
 Stewart
 Taylor
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Timmons
 Tipton
 Turner
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walker
 Walorski
 Waltz
 Watkins
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Wright
 Yoho
 Young
 Zeldin

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 199, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

AYES—231

Adams
 Aguilar
 Allred
 Axne
 Barragán
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyrer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brindisi
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Case
 Casten (IL)
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Cisneros
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Cooper
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Cox (CA)
 Craig
 Crist
 Crow
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Cunningham
 Davids (KS)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny K.
 Dean
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Delgado
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Engel
 Escobar
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Evans
 Finkenauer
 Fitzpatrick
 Fletcher
 Foster
 Frankel
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia (IL)
 Garcia (TX)

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Armstrong
 Golden
 Gomez
 Gonzalez (TX)
 Gottheimer
 Green, Al (TX)
 Grijalva
 Haaland
 Harder (CA)
 Hastings
 Hayes
 Heck
 Higgins (NY)
 Hill (CA)
 Himes
 Horn, Kendra S.
 Horsford
 Houlihan
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (TX)
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kim
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Lamb
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI)
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Luria
 Lynch
 Malinowski
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McAdams
 McBath
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mucarsel-Powell
 Murphy
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 Ocasio-Cortez

NOES—199

Omar
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Peters
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rose (NY)
 Rouda
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan
 Sablan
 San Nicolas
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shalala
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Speier
 Stanton
 Stevens
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres Small
 (NM)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Underwood
 Van Drew
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Vislosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wexton
 Wild
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1404

Ms. STEFANIK changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”
 So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) 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.

Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón
(PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)

NOT VOTING—8

Fudge
Gabbard
Higgins (LA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1409

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. BRINDISI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from New York (Mr. BRIN-
DISI) on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 243, noes 187,
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

AYES—243

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)

NOES—187

Abraham
Allen
Amash

Balderson
Banks
Barr
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cunningham
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón
(PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Simpson
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer

NOT VOTING—8

Fudge
Gabbard
Higgins (LA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1414

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES
OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from California (Mrs.
TORRES) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

Babin
Bacon
Baird

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 205, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

AYES—225

Adams Green, Al (TX) Pappas
 Aguilar Grijalva Pascarell
 Allred Haaland Payne
 Axne Harder (CA) Peters
 Barragán Hastings Peterson
 Bass Hayes Phillips
 Beatty Heck Pingree
 Bera Higgins (NY) Pocan
 Beyer Hill (CA) Porter
 Blumenauer Himes Pressley
 Blunt Rochester Horsford Price (NC)
 Bonamici Houlihan Quigley
 Boyle, Brendan Hoyer Raskin
 F. Huffman Rice (NY)
 Brown (MD) Jackson Lee Richmond
 Brownley (CA) Jayapal Rooney (FL)
 Bustos Jeffries Rose (NY)
 Butterfield Johnson (GA) Rouda
 Carbajal Johnson (TX) Roybal-Allard
 Cárdenas Kaptur Ruiz
 Carson (IN) Keating Ruppertsberger
 Cartwright Kelly (IL) Rush
 Case Kennedy Ryan
 Casten (IL) Khanna Sablan
 Castor (FL) Kildee San Nicolas
 Castro (TX) Kilmer Sánchez
 Chu, Judy Kim Sarbanes
 Cicilline King (NY) Scanlon
 Cisneros Kirkpatrick Schakowsky
 Clark (MA) Krishnamoorthi Schiff
 Clarke (NY) Kuster (NH) Schneider
 Clay Lamb Schrier
 Cleaver Langevin Scott (VA)
 Clyburn Larsen (WA) Scott, David
 Cohen Larson (CT) Serrano
 Connolly Lawrence Sewell (AL)
 Cooper Lawson (FL) Shalala
 Correa Lee (CA) Sherman
 Courtney Lee (NV) Sherrill
 Cox (CA) Levin (CA) Sires
 Craig Levin (MI) Slotkin
 Crist Lewis Smith (NJ)
 Crow Lieu, Ted Smith (WA)
 Cummings Lipinski Soto
 Davids (KS) Loeb sack Spanberger
 Davis (CA) Lofgren Speier
 Davis, Danny K. Lowenthal Stanton
 Dean Lowey Stevens
 DeFazio Luján Suozzi
 DeGette Luria Swalwell (CA)
 DeLauro Lynch Takano
 DeBene Malinowski Thompson (CA)
 Delgado Maloney, Carolyn B. Thompson (MS)
 Demings Carolyn B. Titus
 DeSaulnier Maloney, Sean Trahan
 Deutch Matsui Underwood
 Dingell Mc Bath Torres (CA)
 Doggett Mc Collum Torres Small
 Doyle, Michael McEachin (NM)
 F. McGovern Trahan
 Engel Meeks Trone
 Escobar Meng Underwood
 Eshoo Moore Vargas
 Espallat Morelle Veasey
 Evans Moulton Vela
 Finkenauer Mucarsel-Powell Velázquez
 Fitzpatrick Murphy Visclosky
 Fletcher Nadler Wasserman
 Foster Napolitano Schultz
 Frankel Neal Watson Coleman
 Gallego Neguse Welch
 Garamendi Norcross Wexton
 Garcia (IL) O'Halleran Wild
 Garcia (TX) Ocasio-Cortez Wilson (FL)
 Gomez Omar Wilson (SC)
 Gonzalez (TX) Pallone Wittman
 Gottheimer Panetta Yarmuth

NOES—205

Abraham Bergman Budd
 Aderholt Biggs Burchett
 Allen Bilirakis Burgess
 Amash Bishop (GA) Byrne
 Amodei Bishop (UT) Calvert
 Armstrong Bost Carter (GA)
 Arrington Brady Carter (TX)
 Babin Brindisi Chabot
 Bacon Brooks (AL) Cheney
 Baird Brooks (IN) Cline
 Balderson Buchanan Cloud
 Banks Buck Cole
 Barr Bucshon Collins (GA)

Collins (NY) Huizenga Riggelman
 Comer Hunter Roby
 Conaway Hurd (TX) Rodgers (WA)
 Cook Johnson (LA) Roe, David P.
 Costa Johnson (OH) Rogers (AL)
 Crawford Johnson (SD) Rogers (KY)
 Crenshaw Jordan Rose, John W.
 Cuellar Joyce (OH) Rouzer
 Cunningham Joyce (PA) Roy
 Curtis Katko Rutherford
 Davidson (OH) Keller Scalise
 Davis, Rodney Kelly (MS) Schrader
 DesJarlais Kelly (PA) Schweikert
 Diaz-Balart Kind King (IA) Scott, Austin
 Duffy Kinzinger Sensenbrenner
 Duncan Kustoff (TN) Shimkus
 Dunn Emmmer Kustoff (TN) Simpson
 Estes LaHood Smith (MO)
 Ferguson LaMalfa Smith (NE)
 Fleischmann Lamborn Smucker
 Flores Latta Spano
 Fortenberry Lesko Stauber
 Fox (NC) Long Stefanik
 Loudermilk Lucas Stel
 Gaetz Luetkemeyer Steube
 Gallagher Marchant Stewart
 Gianforte Marshall Stivers
 Gibbs Massie Taylor
 Gohmert Mast Thompson (PA)
 Golden McAdams Thornberry
 Gonzalez (OH) McCarthy Timmons
 González-Colón McCaul Turner
 (PR) McClintock Upton
 Gooden McHenry Van Drew
 Gosar McKinley Wagner
 Granger Meadows Walberg
 Graves (GA) Meuser Walden
 Graves (LA) Miller Walker
 Graves (MO) Mitchell Walorski
 Green (TN) Mooleenaar Waltz
 Griffith Mooney (WV) Watkins
 Grothman Mullin Weber (TX)
 Guest Newhouse Webster (FL)
 Guthrie Norman Wenstrup
 Hagedorn Nunes Westerman
 Harris Olson Williams
 Hartzler Palazzo Wilson (SC)
 Hern, Kevin Palmer Wittman
 Herrera Beutler Pence Womack
 Hice (GA) Perry Woodall
 Hill (AR) Posey Wright
 Holding Ratcliffe Yoho
 Hollingsworth Reed Young
 Horn, Kendra S. Reschenthaler Zeldin
 Hudson Rice (SC)

NOT VOTING—8

Fudge Mc Nerney Plaskett
 Gabbard Norton Radewagen
 Higgins (LA) Perlmutter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1418

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 182, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]

AYES—247

Adams Gonzalez (TX) Pascarell
 Aguilar Payne Gottheimer
 Allred Green, Al (TX) Peters
 Amash Grijalva Peterson
 Axne Haaland Phillips
 Barragán Harder (CA) Pingree
 Bass Hastings Pocan
 Beatty Hayes Porter
 Bera Heck Pressley
 Beyer Higgins (NY) Price (NC)
 Bishop (GA) Hill (CA) Quigley
 Bishop (UT) Himes Raskin
 Blumenauer Horn, Kendra S. Rice (NY)
 Blunt Rochester Horsford Richmond
 Bonamici Houlihan Rose (NY)
 Boyle, Brendan Hoyer Rouda
 F. Huffman Roybal-Allard
 Brindisi Hurd (TX) Ruiz
 Brown (MD) Jackson Lee Ruppertsberger
 Brownley (CA) Jayapal Rush
 Bustos Jeffries Ryan
 Butterfield Johnson (GA) Sablan
 Carbajal Johnson (TX) San Nicolas
 Cárdenas Kaptur Sánchez
 Carson (IN) Keating Sarbanes
 Cartwright Kelly (IL) Scanlon
 Case Kennedy Schakowsky
 Casten (IL) Khanna Schiff
 Castor (FL) Kildee Schneider
 Castro (TX) Kilmer Schradler
 Chu, Judy Kim Schrier
 Cicilline Kind Scott (VA)
 Cisneros King (NY) Scott, David
 Clark (MA) Kirkpatrick Serrano
 Clarke (NY) Krishnamoorthi Sewell (AL)
 Clay Kuster (NH) Shalala
 Cleaver Lamb Sherman
 Clyburn Langevin Sherrill
 Cohen Larsen (WA) Sires
 Cole Larson (CT) Slotkin
 Connolly Lawrence Smith (NJ)
 Cooper Lawson (FL) Smith (WA)
 Correa Lee (CA) Soto
 Costa Lee (NV) Spanberger
 Courtney Levin (CA) Speier
 Cox (CA) Levin (MI) Stanton
 Craig Lewis Stauber
 Crist Lieu, Ted Stefanik
 Cummings Lipinski Stevens
 Davids (KS) Loeb sack Suozzi
 Davis (CA) Lofgren Swalwell (CA)
 Davis, Danny K. Lowenthal Takano
 Dean Lowey Thompson (CA)
 DeFazio Luján Thompson (MS)
 DeGette Luria Thompson (PA)
 DeLauro Lynch Titus
 DeBene Malinowski Trahan
 Delgado Maloney, Carolyn B. Torres (CA)
 Demings Carolyn B. Torres Small
 DeSaulnier Matsui (NM)
 Deutch Mc Adams Trahan
 Dingell Mc Bath Trone
 Doggett Mc Collum Turner
 Doyle, Michael McEachin Underwood
 F. McGovern Upton
 Engel Meeks Van Drew
 Escobar Moore Vargas
 Eshoo Morelle Veasey
 Espallat Moulton Vela
 Evans Mucarsel-Powell Velázquez
 Finkenauer Murphy Visclosky
 Fletcher Nadler Wasserman
 Foster Napolitano Schultz
 Frankel Neal Watson Coleman
 Gallego Neguse Welch
 Garamendi Norcross Wexton
 Garcia (IL) O'Halleran Wild
 Garcia (TX) Ocasio-Cortez Wilson (FL)
 Gomez Omar Wilson (SC)
 Gonzalez (TX) Pallone Wittman
 Gottheimer Panetta Yarmuth
 Young

NOES—182

Abraham Banks Bucshon
 Aderholt Barr Budd
 Allen Bergman Burchett
 Amodei Biggs Burgess
 Armstrong Bost Byrne
 Arrington Brady Calvert
 Babin Brooks (AL) Carter (GA)
 Bacon Brooks (IN) Carter (TX)
 Baird Buchanan Chabot
 Balderson Buck Cheney

Cline Holding
 Cloud Hollingsworth
 Collins (GA) Hudson
 Collins (NY) Huizenga
 Comer Hunter
 Conaway Johnson (LA)
 Cook Johnson (OH)
 Crawford Johnson (SD)
 Crenshaw Jordan
 Cunningham Joyce (OH)
 Curtis Joyce (PA)
 Davidson (OH) Katko
 Davis, Rodney Keller
 DesJarlais Kelly (MS)
 Diaz-Balart Kelly (PA)
 Duffy King (IA)
 Duncan Kinzinger
 Dunn Kustoff (TN)
 Emmer LaHood
 Estes LaMalfa
 Ferguson Lamborn
 Fleischmann Latta
 Flores Lesko
 Foxx (NC) Long
 Fulcher Loudermilk
 Gaetz Lucas
 Gallagher Luetkemeyer
 Gianforte Marchant
 Gibbs Marshall
 Gohmert Massie
 Gonzalez (OH) Mast
 Gonzalez-Colón McCarthy
 (PR) McCaul
 Gooden McClintock
 Gosar McHenry
 Granger McKinley
 Graves (GA) Meadows
 Graves (LA) Meuser
 Graves (MO) Miller
 Green (TN) Mitchell
 Griffith Moolenaar
 Grothman Mooney (WV)
 Guest Mullin
 Guthrie Newhouse
 Hagedorn Norman
 Harris Nunes
 Hartzler Olson
 Hern, Kevin Palazzo
 Herrera Beutler Palmer
 Hice (GA) Pence
 Hill (AR) Perry

NOT VOTING—9

Bilirakis Higgins (LA) Perlmutter
 Fudge McNerney Plaskett
 Gabbard Norton Radewagen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1423

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 Stated for:
 Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, during rollcall Vote number 443 on the Connolly amendment, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “no” when I should have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. SHALALA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 251, noes 178, not voting 9, as follows:

Adams
 Aguilar
 Allred
 Axne
 Bacon
 Barragán
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brindisi
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Carabajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Case
 Casten (IL)
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Cisneros
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Cooper
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Cox (CA)
 Craig
 Crenshaw
 Crist
 Crow
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Cunningham
 Davids (KS)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny K.
 Davis, Rodney
 Dean
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Delgado
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Duncan
 Engel
 Escobar
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Evans
 Finkenauer
 Fitzpatrick
 Fletcher
 Foster
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia (IL)
 Garcia (TX)
 Gohmert
 Golden
 Gomez
 Gonzalez (TX)

[Roll No. 444]

AYES—251

González-Colón
 (PR)
 Gottheimer
 Green, Al (TX)
 Griffith
 Grijalva
 Grothman
 Haaland
 Harder (CA)
 Hastings
 Hayes
 Heck
 Herrera Beutler
 Higgins (NY)
 Hill (CA)
 Himes
 Horn, Kendra S.
 Horsford
 Houlihan
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jefferson
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (TX)
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kim
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Scott (VA)
 Krishnaoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Serrano
 Lamb
 Langevin
 Larson (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Sherrill
 Sires
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI)
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loebsack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lofgren
 Lowey
 Luján
 Luria
 Lynch
 Malinowski
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Massie
 Matsui
 McAdams
 McBath
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mucarsel-Powell
 Murphy
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar
 Pallone

NOES—178

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Armstrong
 Arrington
 Babin

Burchett
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Cline
 Cloud
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Conaway
 Cook
 Crawford
 Curtis
 Davidson (OH)
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Estes
 Ferguson
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foxx (NC)
 Fulcher
 Gaetz
 Gallagher
 Gianforte
 Gibbs
 Gonzalez (OH)
 Gooden
 Gosar
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green (TN)
 Guest
 Guthrie
 Hagedorn
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hern, Kevin
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice (GA)
 Hill (AR)
 Holding

Hollingsworth
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson (SD)
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA)
 Keller
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger
 Kustoff (TN)
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Latta
 Lesko
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Marchant
 Marshall
 Mast
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 Meadows
 Meuser
 Miller
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Newhouse
 Norman
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Pence
 Perry
 Posey
 Ratcliffe

Reed
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (SC)
 Roby
 Rodgers (WA)
 Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rose, John W.
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Rutherford
 Scalise
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smucker
 Spano
 Stauber
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stewart
 Taylor
 Thornberry
 Timmons
 Tipton
 Turner
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Waltz
 Watkins
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Wright
 Young
 Zeldin

NOT VOTING—9

Frankel Higgins (LA) Perlmutter
 Fudge McNerney Plaskett
 Gabbard Norton Radewagen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1427

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MS. OMAR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COX of California). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 210, not voting 9, as follows:

Baird
 Brady
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Biggs
 Bucshon
 Budd

[Roll No. 445]

AYES—219

Adams García (IL) Norcross
 Aguilar Garcia (TX) O'Halleran
 Amash Gomez Ocasio-Cortez
 Barragán Gonzalez (TX) Omar
 Bass Green, Al (TX) Pallone
 Beatty Griffith Pappas
 Bera Grijalva Pascarell
 Beyer Grothman Payne
 Bishop (GA) Haaland Phillips
 Blumenauer Harder (CA) Pingree
 Blunt Rochester Hastings
 Bonamici Hayes Porter
 Boyle, Brendan Heck Pressley
 F. Higgins (NY) Price (NC)
 Brindisi Hill (CA) Quigley
 Brown (MD) Himes Raskin
 Brownley (CA) Horn, Kendra S. Reed
 Bustos Horsford Rice (NY)
 Butterfield Hoyer Richmond
 Carbajal Huffman Rose (NY)
 Cárdenas Jackson Lee Rouda
 Carson (IN) Jayapal Roybal-Allard
 Cartwright Jeffries Ruiz
 Case Johnson (GA) Ruppertsberger
 Casten (IL) Johnson (TX) Rush
 Castor (FL) Kaptur Ryan
 Castro (TX) Keating Sablan
 Chu, Judy Kelly (IL) San Nicolas
 Cicilline Kennedy Sánchez
 Cisneros Khanna Sarbanes
 Clark (MA) Kildee Scanlon
 Clarke (NY) Kilmer Schakowsky
 Clay Kim Schiff
 Cleaver Kind Schneider
 Cline Kirkpatrick Schrader
 Clyburn Krishnamoorthi Schrier
 Cohen Kuster (NH) Schweikert
 Connolly Langevin Scott (VA)
 Cooper Larsen (WA) Scott, David
 Correa Larson (CT) Serrano
 Costa Lawrence Sewell (AL)
 Courtney Lawson (FL) Shalala
 Cox (CA) Lee (CA) Sherman
 Crist Lee (NV) Sires
 Crow Levin (CA) Smith (WA)
 Cuellar Levin (MI) Soto
 Cummings Lewis Speier
 Cunningham Lieu, Ted Stanton
 Davids (KS) Lipinski Swallowell (CA)
 Davis (CA) Loeb sack Takano
 Davis, Danny K. Lofgren Thompson (CA)
 Dean Lowenthal Thompson (MS)
 DeFazio Lowey Titus
 DeGette Luján Tlaib
 DeLauro Lynch Tonko
 DelBene Maloney, Torres (CA)
 Delgado Carolyn B. Torres Small
 Demings Maloney, Sean (NM)
 DeSaulnier Massie Trahan
 Deutch Matsui Trone
 Dingell McBath Underwood
 Doggett McClintock Vargas
 Doyle, Michael McCollum Veasey
 F. McEachin Vela
 Engel McGovern Velázquez
 Escobar Meeks Vislosky
 Eshoo Meng Wasserman
 Espallat Moore Schultz
 Evans Morelle Waters
 Finkenauer Mucarsel-Powell Watson Coleman
 Fitzpatrick Murphy Welch
 Foster Nadler Wexton
 Frankel Napolitano Wilson (FL)
 Gallego Neal Yarmuth
 Garamendi Neguse

NOES—210

Abraham Brady Comer
 Aderholt Brooks (AL) Conaway
 Allen Brooks (IN) Cook
 Allred Buchanan Craig
 Amodei Buck Crawford
 Armstrong Bucshon Crenshaw
 Arrington Budd Curtis
 Axne Burchett Davidson (OH)
 Babin Burgess Davis, Rodney
 Bacon Byrne DesJarlais
 Baird Calvert Diaz-Balart
 Balderson Carter (GA) Duffy
 Banks Carter (TX) Duncan
 Barr Chabot Dunn
 Bergman Cheney Emmer
 Biggs Cloud Estes
 Bilirakis Cole Ferguson
 Bishop (UT) Collins (GA) Fleischmann
 Best Collins (NY) Fletcher

Flores LaMalfa Scalise
 Fortenberry Lamb Scott, Austin
 Foxx (NC) Lamborn Sensenbrenner
 Fulcher Latta Sherrill
 Gaetz Gao Shimkus
 Gallagher Long Simpson
 Gianforte Loudermilk Slotkin
 Gibbs Lucas Smith (MO)
 Gohmert Luetkemeyer Smith (NE)
 Golden Luria Smith (NJ)
 Gonzalez (OH) Malinowski Smucker
 González-Colón Marchant Spanberger
 (PR) Marshall Spino
 Gooden Mast Stauder
 Gosar McAdams Stauber
 Gottheimer McCarthy Stefanik
 Granger McCaul Steil
 Graves (GA) McHenry Steube
 Graves (LA) McKinley Stevens
 Graves (MO) Meadows Stewart
 Green (TN) Meuser Stivers
 Guest Miller Suozzi
 Guthrie Mitchell Taylor
 Hagedorn Moolenaar Thompson (PA)
 Harris Mooney (WV) Thornberry
 Hartzler Moulton Timmons
 Hern, Kevin Mullin Tipton
 Herrera Beutler Newhouse Turner
 Hice (GA) Norman Upton
 Hill (AR) Nunes Van Drew
 Holding Olson Wagner
 Hollingsworth Palazzo Walberg
 Houlihan Palmer Walden
 Hudson Panetta Walker
 Huizenga Pence Walorski
 Hunter Perry Walt
 Hurd (TX) Peters Watkins
 Johnson (LA) Peterson Weber (TX)
 Johnson (OH) Posey Webster (FL)
 Johnson (SD) Ratcliffe Wenstrup
 Jordan Reschenthaler Westerman
 Joyce (OH) Rice (SC) Wild
 Joyce (PA) Riggelman Williams
 Katko Roby Wilson (SC)
 Keller Rodgers (WA) Wittman
 Kelly (MS) Roe, David P. Womack
 Kelly (PA) Rogers (KY) Woodall
 King (IA) Rooney (FL) Wright
 King (NY) Rose, John W. Yoho
 Kinzinger Rouzer Young
 Kustoff (TN) Roy Zeldin
 LaHood Rutherford

NOT VOTING—9

Fudge McNeerney Plaskett
 Gabbard Norton Radewagen
 Higgins (LA) Perlmutter Rogers (AL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1431

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF
 WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Washington (Mr.
 SMITH) on which further proceedings
 were postponed and on which the ayes
 prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 243, noes 186,
 answered “present” 1, not voting 8, as
 follows:

[Roll No. 446]

AYES—243

Adams Golden Omar
 Aguilar Gomez Pallone
 Allred Gonzalez (OH) Panetta
 Axne Gonzalez (TX) Pappas
 Barragán Gottheimer Pascarell
 Bass Green, Al (TX) Payne
 Beatty Grijalva Peters
 Bera Haaland Peterson
 Beyer Harder (CA) Phillips
 Bishop (GA) Hastings Pingree
 Blumenauer Hayes Pocan
 Blunt Rochester Heck Porter
 Bonamici Higgins (NY) Pressley
 Boyle, Brendan Hill (CA) Price (NC)
 F. Himes Quigley
 Brindisi Hollingsworth Raskin
 Brown (MD) Rice (NY) Raskin
 Brownley (CA) Horsford Richmond
 Bustos Houlihan Rooney (FL)
 Butterfield Hoyer Rose (NY)
 Carbajal Huffman Rouda
 Cárdenas Jackson Lee Roybal-Allard
 Carson (IN) Jayapal Ruiz
 Cartwright Jeffries Ruppertsberger
 Case Johnson (GA) Rush
 Casten (IL) Johnson (TX) Ryan
 Castor (FL) Kaptur Sablan
 Castro (TX) Keating San Nicolas
 Chu, Judy Kelly (IL) Sánchez
 Cicilline Kennedy Sarbanes
 Cisneros Khanna Scanlon
 Clark (MA) Kildee Schakowsky
 Clarke (NY) Kilmer Schiff
 Clay Kim Schneider
 Cleaver Kind Schrier
 Cloud Kirkpatrick Schweikert
 Clyburn Krishnamoorthi Scott (VA)
 Cohen Kuster (NH) Scott, David
 Cole Lamb Serrano
 Connolly Langevin Sewell (AL)
 Cooper Larsen (WA) Shalala
 Correa Larson (CT) Sherman
 Costa Lawrence Sherrill
 Courtney Lawton (FL) Lee (CA)
 Cox (CA) Lee (NV) Sires
 Craig Levin (CA) Smith (WA)
 Crist Levin (MI) Soto
 Cuellar Lewis Speier
 Cummings Lieu, Ted Stanton
 Cunningham Loeb sack Swallowell (CA)
 Davids (KS) Lofgren Takano
 Davis (CA) Lowenthal Thompson (CA)
 Davis, Danny K. Dean Swallowell (CA)
 DeFazio Luján Takano
 DeGette Luria Thompson (CA)
 DeLauro Lynch Thompson (MS)
 DelBene Malinowski Thompson (PA)
 Delgado Maloney, Titus
 Demings Carolyn B. Tlaib
 DeSaulnier Maloney, Sean Tonko
 Deutch Massie Torres (CA)
 Dingell Matsui Torres Small
 Doggett McAdams (NM)
 Doyle, Michael McBath Trahan
 F. McCollum Trone
 Engel McEachin Underwood
 Escobar McGovern Van Drew
 Eshoo Meeks Vargas
 Espallat Meng Veasey
 Evans Moore Vela
 Finkenauer Morelle Velázquez
 Fitzpatrick Moulton Vislosky
 Foster Mucarsel-Powell Wasserman
 Frankel Fletcher Schultz
 Gallagher Murphy Waters
 Gallego Nadler Watson Coleman
 Garamendi Neal Welch
 Garcia (IL) Neguse Wexton
 Garcia (TX) Norcross Wild
 Gohmert O'Halleran Wilson (FL)
 Ocasio-Cortez Yarmuth

NOES—186

Abraham Barr Bucshon
 Aderholt Bergman Budd
 Allen Biggs Burchett
 Amodei Bilirakis Burgess
 Armstrong Bishop (UT) Byrne
 Arrington Bost Calvert
 Babin Brady Carter (GA)
 Bacon Brooks (AL) Carter (TX)
 Baird Brooks (IN) Chabot
 Balderson Buchanan Cheney
 Banks Buck Cline

Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rodgers (WA)	[Roll No. 447]	Craig	Johnson (LA)	Roe, David P.
Collins (NY)	Johnson (SD)	Roe, David P.		Crawford	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Comer	Jordan	Rogers (AL)	AYES—234	Crenshaw	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (KY)		Cuellar	Jordan	Rooney (FL)
Coak	Joyce (PA)	Rose, John W.		Cunningham	Joyce (OH)	Rose, John W.
Crawford	Katko	Rouzer		Curtis	Joyce (PA)	Rouzer
Crenshaw	Keller	Roy		Davidson (OH)	Katko	Roy
Curtis	Kelly (MS)	Rutherford		Davis, Rodney	Keller	Rutherford
Davidson (OH)	Kelly (PA)	Scalise		DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Davis, Rodney	King (IA)	Scott, Austin		Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner		Duffy	Kinzing	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart	Kinzing	Shimkus		Duncan	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
Duffy	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson		Dunn	LaHood	Simpson
Duncan	LaHood	Smith (MO)		Emmer	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Dunn	LaMalfa	Smith (NE)		Estes	Latta	Smith (NE)
Emmer	Lamborn	Smith (NJ)		Ferguson	Lesko	Smucker
Estes	Latta	Smucker		Fleischmann	Long	Spano
Ferguson	Lesko	Spano		Flores	Loudermilk	Staub
Fleischmann	Long	Stauber		Flores	Lucas	Stefanik
Flores	Loudermilk	Stefanik		Fortenberry	Lucas	Stefanik
Fortenberry	Lucas	Steil		Foxx (NC)	Luria	Steube
Foxx (NC)	Luetkemeyer	Steube		Fulcher	Marchant	Stewart
Fulcher	Marchant	Stewart		Gaetz	Marshall	Stivers
Gaetz	Marshall	Stivers		Gianforte	Mast	Taylor
Gianforte	Mast	Taylor		Gibbs	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)
Gibbs	McCarthy	Thornberry		González-Colón	McCaul	Thornberry
González-Colón	McCaul	Timmons		(PR)	McClintock	Timmons
(PR)	McClintock	Tipton		Gooden	McHenry	Tipton
Gooden	McHenry	Turner		Gosar	McKinley	Turner
Gosar	McKinley	Turner		Granger	Meadows	Upton
Granger	Meadows	Upton		Graves (GA)	Meuser	Vela
Graves (GA)	Meuser	Wagner		Graves (LA)	Miller	Wagner
Graves (LA)	Miller	Walberg		Graves (MO)	Mitchell	Walberg
Graves (MO)	Mitchell	Walden		Green (TN)	Moolenaar	Walden
Green (TN)	Moolenaar	Walker		Griffith	Mooney (WV)	Walker
Griffith	Mooney (WV)	Walorski		Grothman	Mullin	Walorski
Grothman	Mullin	Waltz		Guest	Newhouse	Waltz
Guest	Newhouse	Watkins		Guthrie	Norman	Watkins
Guthrie	Norman	Weber (TX)		Hagedorn	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Hagedorn	Nunes	Webster (FL)		Harris	Olson	Webster (FL)
Harris	Olson	Wenstrup		Hartzler	Palazzo	Wenstrup
Hartzler	Palazzo	Westerman		Hern, Kevin	Palmer	Westerman
Hern, Kevin	Palmer	Williams		Herrera Beutler	Pence	Williams
Herrera Beutler	Pence	Wilson (SC)		Hice (GA)	Perry	Wilson (SC)
Hice (GA)	Perry	Wittman		Hill (AR)	Posey	Wittman
Hill (AR)	Posey	Womack		Holding	Ratcliffe	Womack
Holding	Ratcliffe	Woodall		Hudson	Reed	Woodall
Hudson	Reed	Wright		Huizenga	Reschenthaler	Wright
Huizenga	Reschenthaler	Yoho		Hunter	Rice (SC)	Yoho
Hunter	Rice (SC)	Young		Hurd (TX)	Riggleman	Young
Hurd (TX)	Riggleman	Zeldin		Johnson (LA)	Roby	Zeldin
Johnson (LA)	Roby				Rodgers (WA)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—8

Fudge
Gabbard
Higgins (LA)

McNerney
Norton
Perlmutter

Plaskett
Radewagen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1436

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from California (Mr. SHER-
MAN) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 234, noes 195,
not voting 9, as follows:

Adams
Aguilera
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carpal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Clyburn
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Crist
Crow
Cummings
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Español
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman

Biggs
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess

Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cloud
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook

Griffith
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone

Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schraeder
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Viscosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—195

NOT VOTING—9

Fudge
Gabbard
Higgins (LA)

Lamborn
McNerney
Norton

Perlmutter
Plaskett
Radewagen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1440

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU
OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from California (Mr. TED
LIEU) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 239, noes 187,
not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 448]

AYES—239

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Burchett
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Ciilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden

Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez

Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—187

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr

Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd

Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer

Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hudson
Hui zenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (OH)

Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Wright
Robby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Rutherford
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spano
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Cheney
Crenshaw
Fudge
Gabbard

Higgins (LA)
Johnson (LA)
McCarthy
McNerney

Norton
Perlmutter
Plaskett
Radewagen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1445

Messrs. CLINE and SMITH of Missouri changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. ROY changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 180, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 449]

AYES—246

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Ciilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)

Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran

Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—180

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington

Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr

Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)	Hern, Kevin	Rice (SC)	[Roll No. 450]	Crawford	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Riggelman		Crow	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Hice (GA)	Roby	AYES—240	Curtis	Joyce (OH)	Rooney (FL)
Budd	Hill (AR)	Rodgers (WA)		Davis, Rodney	Joyce (PA)	Rose, John W.
Burchett	Holding	Ro, David P.	Adams	DesJarlais	Katko	Rouzer
Burgess	Hudson	Rogers (AL)	Golden	Diaz-Balart	Keller	Rutherford
Byrne	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)	Gomez	Duffy	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Calvert	Hunter	Rooney (FL)	Gonzalez (TX)	Duncan	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rose, John W.	Gosar	Dunn	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Carter (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Rouzer	Gottheimer	Emmer	King (NY)	Sherrill
Chabot	Jordan	Rutherford	Green, Al (TX)	Estes	Kinzinger	Shimkus
Cloud	Joyce (OH)	Scalise	Grijalva	Ferguson	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Cole	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin	Harder (CA)	Fitzpatrick	LaHood	Slotkin
Collins (GA)	Katko	Sensenbrenner	Hastings	Fleischmann	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Collins (NY)	Keller	Shimkus	Hayes	Flores	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Simpson	Heck	Fortenberry	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Smucker	Higgins (NY)	Fox (NC)	Lesko	Smucker
Cook	King (IA)	Smith (MO)	Hill (CA)	Fulcher	Long	Spanberger
Crawford	King (NY)	Smith (NE)	Himes	Gallagher	Loudermilk	Spano
Curtis	Kinzinger	Smith (NJ)	Horn, Kendra S.	Gianforte	Lucas	Stauber
Davis, Rodney	Kustoff (TN)	Smucker	Horsford	Gibbs	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
DesJarlais	LaHood	Spano	Hoyer	Gohmert	Marchant	Steil
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Stauber	Huffman	Gonzalez (OH)	Marshall	Steube
Duffy	Lamborn	Stefanik	Jackson Lee	González-Colón	Mast	Stewart
Duncan	Latta	Steil	Jayapal	(PR)	McCaul	Stivers
Dunn	Lesko	Steube	Jeffries	Gooden	McClintock	Taylor
Emmer	Long	Stewart	Johnson (GA)	Granger	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Estes	Loudermilk	Stivers	Johnson (TX)	Graves (GA)	McKinley	Thornberry
Ferguson	Lucas	Taylor	Kaptur	Graves (LA)	Meadows	Timmons
Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)	Keating	Graves (MO)	Meuser	Tipton
Fleischmann	Marchant	Thornberry	Kelly (IL)	Green (TN)	Miller	Turner
Flores	Marshall	Timmons	Kennedy	Griffith	Mitchell	Wagner
Fortenberry	Mast	Tipton	Khanna	Grothman	Moolenaar	Walberg
Fox (NC)	McCaul	Turner	Kildee	Guest	Mullin	Walden
Fulcher	McClintock	Wagner	Kilmer	Guthrie	Newhouse	Walker
Gallagher	McHenry	Walberg	Kim	Hagedorn	Norman	Walorski
Gianforte	McKinley	Walden	Kind	Harris	Nunes	Waltz
Gibbs	Meadows	Walker	Kirkpatrick	Hartzler	Olson	Watkins
Gohmert	Meuser	Walorski	Krishnamoorthi	Hern, Kevin	Palazzo	Weber (TX)
Gonzalez (OH)	Miller	Waltz	Kuster (NH)	Herrera Beutler	Palmer	Webster (FL)
González-Colón	Mitchell	Watkins	Lamb	Hice (GA)	Pence	Wenstrup
(PR)	Moolenaar	Weber (TX)	Langevin	Hill (AR)	Perry	Westerman
Gooden	Mullin	Webster (FL)	Larsen (WA)	Holding	Ratcliffe	Williams
Granger	Newhouse	Westerman	Larson (CT)	Hollingsworth	Reed	Wilson (SC)
Graves (GA)	Norman	Westerman	Lawrence	Houlahan	Reschenthaler	Wittman
Graves (LA)	Nunes	Williams	Lawson (FL)	Hudson	Rice (SC)	Womack
Graves (MO)	Olson	Wilson (SC)	Lee (CA)	Huizenga	Riggelman	Wright
Green (TN)	Palazzo	Wittman	Lee (NV)	Hunter	Roby	Yoho
Griffith	Palmer	Womack	Levin (CA)	Hurd (TX)	Rodgers (WA)	Young
Grothman	Pence	Woodall	Levin (MI)	Johnson (OH)	Roe, David P.	Zeldin
Guest	Perry	Wright	Lewis			
Guthrie	Posey	Yoho	Lieu, Ted			
Hagedorn	Ratcliffe	Young	Lipinski			
Harris	Reed	Zeldin	Loeb sack			
Hartzler	Reschenthaler		Lofgren			

NOT VOTING—12

Cheney
Crenshaw
Fudge
Gabbard

Higgins (LA)
Johnson (LA)
McCarthy
McNerney

Norton
Perlmutter
Plaskett
Radewagen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1449

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Washington (Mr.
SMITH) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 240, noes 185,
not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

AYES—240

Adams
Aguliar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Brownley (CA)
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Ciilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)

NOES—185

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess

Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarella
Payne
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth

Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggelman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.

NOT VOTING—13

Cheney
Crenshaw
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz

Higgins (LA)
Johnson (LA)
McCarthy
McNerney
Norton

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1453

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr.
CICILLINE) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 252, noes 173,
not voting 13, as follows:

Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cline
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook

[Roll No. 451]

AYES—252

Abraham Green (TN) Peters
 Aguilar Green, Al (TX) Peterson
 Allred Griffith Phillips
 Axne Grijalva Pingree
 Barragán Haaland Pocan
 Beatty Harder (CA) Quigley
 Bera Hastings Raskin
 Beyer Hayes Reed
 Bilirakis Heck Rice (NY)
 Bishop (GA) Higgins (NY) Richmond
 Blumenauer Hill (CA) Riggelman
 Bonamici Himes Rooney (FL)
 Brindisi Horn, Kendra S. Rose (NY)
 Brown (MD) Horsford Rouda
 Brownley (CA) Houlihan Roy
 Bustos Hoyer Roybal-Allard
 Carbajal Huffman Ruiz
 Cárdenas Jackson Lee Ryan
 Cartwright Jayapal Sablan
 Case Jeffries San Nicolas
 Casten (IL) Johnson (TX) Sánchez
 Castor (FL) Kaptur Sarbanes
 Castro (TX) Keating Scanlon
 Chu, Judy Kelly (IL) Schakowsky
 Cicilline Kelly (PA) Schiff
 Cisneros Kennedy Schneider
 Clark (MA) Khanna Schrader
 Clay Kildee Schrier
 Cline Kilmer Schweikert
 Clyburn Kim Scott (VA)
 Collins (NY) King (IA) Scott, David
 Correa King (NY) Sensenbrenner
 Costa Kirkpatrick Serrano
 Courtney Krishnamoorthi Kuster (NH)
 Cox (CA) Lamb Sewell (AL)
 Craig Langevin Shalala
 Crist Sherman (WA) Sherman
 Crow Larson (CT) Sherrill
 Cuellar Larson (CT) Sires
 Davids (KS) Lawrence Slotkin
 Davidson (OH) Lawson (FL) Smith (MO)
 Davis (CA) Lee (NV) Smith (NE)
 Davis, Danny K. Levin (CA) Smith (NJ)
 Dean Levin (MI) Smith (WA)
 DeFazio Lewis Soto
 DeGette Lieu, Ted Spanberger
 DeLauro Lipinski Spano
 DelBene Loeb sack Speier
 Delgado Lofgren Stanton
 Demings Lowenthal Steube
 DeSaulnier Lowey Stevens
 Deutch Luján Stivers
 Diaz-Balart Luria Stuzzo
 Dingell Malinowski Swalwell (CA)
 Doggett Maloney, Carolyn B. Takano
 Doyle, Michael F. Maloney, Sean Thompson (CA)
 Dunn Marshall Thompson (PA)
 Engel Mast Titus
 Escobar Matsui Tonko
 Eshoo McAdams Torres (CA)
 Espaillat McBath Torres Small
 Evans McClintock (NM)
 Ferguson McCollum Trahan
 Finkenauer McGovern Trone
 Fitzpatrick McNeerney Underwood
 Fleischmann Meeks Upton
 Fletcher Meng Van Drew
 Flores Miller Vargas
 Fortenberry Morelle Veasey
 Foster Moulton Vela
 Frankel Mucarsel-Powell Velázquez
 Gallego Murphy Vislosky
 Garamendi Nadler Walden
 Garcia (IL) Napolitano Waltz
 Garcia (TX) Neal Wasserman
 Gianforte Norcross Schultz
 Gibbs O'Halleran Watkins
 Gohmert Palazzo Weber (TX)
 Golden Pallone Welch
 Gomez Palmer Wexton
 Gonzalez (OH) Panetta Wild
 Gonzalez (TX) Pappas Wilson (FL)
 González-Colón Pascarell Yarmuth
 (PR) Payne Young
 Gottheimer Perry Zeldin

NOES—173

Adams Bacon Bishop (UT)
 Aderholt Baird Blunt Rochester
 Allen Balderson Bost
 Amash Banks Boyle, Brendan
 Amodei Barr F.
 Armstrong Bass Brady
 Arrington Bergman Brooks (AL)
 Babin Biggs Brooks (IN)

Buchanan Herrera Beutler Omar
 Buck Hice (GA) Pence
 Bucshon Holding Porter
 Budd Hollingsworth Posey
 Burchett Hudson Pressley
 Burgess Huizenga Price (NC)
 Butterfield Hunter Ratcliffe
 Byrne Hurd (TX) Reschenthaler
 Calvert Johnson (GA) Rice (SC)
 Carson (IN) Johnson (OH) Roby
 Carter (GA) Johnson (SD) Rodgers (WA)
 Carter (TX) Jordan Roe, David P.
 Chabot Joyce (OH) Rogers (AL)
 Clarke (NY) Joyce (PA) Rogers (KY)
 Cleaver Katko Rose, John W.
 Cloud Keller Rouzer
 Cohen Kelly (MS) Ruppersberger
 Cole Kind Rush
 Collins (GA) Kinzinger Rutherford
 Comer Kustoff (TN) Scott, Austin
 Conaway LaHood Shimkus
 Connolly LaMalfa Simpson
 Cook Lamborn Smucker
 Cooper Latta Stauber
 Crawford Lee (CA) Stefanik
 Cummings Lesko Steil
 Cunningham Long Stewart
 Curtis Loudermilk Taylor
 Davis, Rodney Lucas Thompson (MS)
 DesJarlais Luetkemeyer Thornberry
 Duffy Lynch Timmons
 Duncan Marchant Tipton
 Emmer Massie Tlaib
 Estes McCaul Turner
 Foxx (NC) McEachin Wagner
 Fulcher McHenry Walberg
 Gallagher McKinley Walker
 Gooden Meadows Walorski
 Gosar Meuser Waters
 Granger Mitchell Watson Coleman
 Graves (GA) Moolenaar Webster (FL)
 Graves (LA) Mooney (WV) Wenstrup
 Graves (MO) Moore Westerman
 Grothman Mullin Williams
 Guest Neguse Wilson (SC)
 Guthrie Newhouse Wittman
 Hagedorn Norman Womack
 Harris Nunes Woodall
 Hartzler Ocasio-Cortez Wright
 Hern, Kevin Olson Yoho

NOT VOTING—13

Cheney Higgins (LA) Perlmutter
 Crenshaw Hill (AR) Plaskett
 Fudge Johnson (LA) Radewagen
 Gabbard McCarthy
 Gaetz Norton

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1500

Ms. WATERS, Messrs. JOHNSON of Georgia and BUTTERFIELD, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. CUMMINGS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. PERRY changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 183, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

AYES—241

Adams Garcia (TX) Omar
 Aguilar Golden Pallone
 Allred Gomez Panetta
 Amash Gonzalez (TX) Pappas
 Axne Gottheimer Pascrell
 Barragán Green, Al (TX) Payne
 Bass Grijalva Peters
 Beatty Haaland Peterson
 Bera Harder (CA) Phillips
 Beyer Hastings Pingree
 Bilirakis Hayes Pocan
 Bishop (GA) Heck Porter
 Blumenauer Higgins (NY) Pressley
 Blunt Rochester Hill (CA) Price (NC)
 Bonamici Himes Quigley
 Boyle, Brendan Horn, Kendra S. Raskin
 F. Horsford Reschenthaler
 Brindisi Houlihan Rice (NY)
 Brown (MD) Hoyer Richmond
 Brownley (CA) Huffman Rose (NY)
 Bustos Jackson Lee Rouda
 Butterfield Jayapal Roybal-Allard
 Carbajal Carballo Ruiz
 Cárdenas Johnson (GA) Ruppersberger
 Carson (IN) Johnson (TX) Rush
 Cartwright Kaptur Sablan
 Case Keating San Nicolas
 Casten (IL) Kelly (IL) Sánchez
 Castor (FL) Kennedy Sarbanes
 Castro (TX) Khanna Scanlon
 Chu, Judy Kildee Schakowsky
 Cicilline Kilmer Schiff
 Cisneros Kim Schneider
 Clark (MA) Kind Schrader
 Clay Kirkpatrick Schrier
 Cleaver Krishnamoorthi Schweikert
 Clyburn Kuster (NH) Scott (VA)
 Cohen Lamb Scott, David
 Cole Langevin Serrano
 Connolly Larsen (WA) Sewell (AL)
 Cooper Larson (CT) Shalala
 Correa Lawrence Sherman
 Costa Lee (CA) Sherrill
 Courtney Lee (NV) Sires
 Cox (CA) Levin (CA) Slotkin
 Craig Levin (MI) Smith (NJ)
 Crist Lewis Smith (WA) Smith (WA)
 Crow Lieu, Ted Spanberger
 Cuellar Lipinski Speier
 Cummings Loeb sack Stanton
 Cunningham Lofgren Stevens
 Davids (KS) Lowenthal Suozzi
 Davis (CA) Lowey Swalwell (CA)
 Davis, Danny K. Luján Takano
 Dean Lynch Thompson (CA)
 DeFazio Malinowski Thompson (MS)
 DeGette Maloney, Titus
 DeLauro Carolyn B. Tlaib
 DelBene Maloney, Sean Tonko
 Delgado Matsui Torres (CA)
 Demings McAdams Torres Small
 DeSaulnier McBath (NM)
 Deutch McCaul Trahan
 Dingell McCollum Trone
 Doggett McEachin Underwood
 Doyle, Michael F. McGovern Van Drew
 Engle McNeerney Vargas
 Escobar Meeks Veasey
 Eshoo Meng Vela
 Espaillat Moore Velázquez
 Evans Morelle Vislosky
 Finkenauer Moulton Wagner
 Fitzpatrick Mucarsel-Powell Wasserman
 Fletcher Murphy Schultz
 Fortenberry Nadler Waters
 Foster Napolitano Watson Coleman
 Frankel Neal Welch
 Gallego Neguse Wexton
 Garamendi Norcross Wild
 Garcia (IL) O'Halleran Wilson (FL)
 Garcia (TX) Ocasio-Cortez Yarmuth

NOES—183

Abraham Baird Brady
 Aderholt Balderson Brooks (AL)
 Allen Banks Brooks (IN)
 Amodei Barr Buchanan
 Armstrong Bergman Buck
 Arrington Biggs Bucshon
 Babin Bishop (UT) Budd
 Bacon Bost Burchett

Burgess	Holding	Rice (SC)	[Roll No. 453]	Crawford	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Byrne	Hollingsworth	Riggelman		Curtis	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Calvert	Hudson	Roby	AYES—236	Davidson (OH)	Joyce (PA)	Rooney (FL)
Carter (GA)	Huizenga	Rodgers (WA)		Davis, Rodney	Katko	Rose, John W.
Carter (TX)	Hunter	Roe, David P.	Adams	DesJarlais	Keller	Rouzer
Chabot	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)	Aguliar	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Roy
Cline	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)	Allred	Duffy	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
Cloud	Johnson (SD)	Rooney (FL)	Axne	Duncan	King (IA)	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rose, John W.	Haaland	Dunn	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Joyce (OH)	Rouzer	Harder (CA)	Emmer	Kinzinger	Sensenbrenner
Comer	Joyce (PA)	Roy	Hastings	Estes	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
Conaway	Katko	Rutherford	Hayes	Ferguson	LaHood	Shimkus
Cook	Keller	Rutherford	Heck	Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa	Simpson
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Scalise	Higgins (NY)	Fleischmann	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Curtis	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin	Hill (CA)	Flores	Latta	Smith (NE)
Davidson (OH)	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner	Himes	Fortenberry	Lesko	Spano
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Shimkus	Horn, Kendra S.	Foxx (NC)	Long	Staubert
DesJarlais	Kinzinger	Simpson	Horsford	Fulcher	Loudermilk	Staubert
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (MO)	Houlihan	Gallagher	Lucas	Stefanik
Duffy	LaHood	Smith (NE)	Hoyer	Gianforte	Lucas	Steil
Duncan	LaMalfa	Spano	Huffman	Gibbs	Marchant	Steube
Dunn	Lamborn	Staubert	Jackson Lee	Gohmert	Marshall	Stewart
Emmer	Latta	Stefanik	Jayapal	Gonzalez (OH)	Massie	Stivers
Estes	Lesko	Steil	Jeffries	González-Colón	Mast	Taylor
Ferguson	Long	Steube	Johnson (GA)	(PR)	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Fleischmann	Loudermilk	Stewart	Johnson (TX)	Gooden	McClintock	Thornberry
Flores	Lucas	Stivers	Kaptur	Gosar	McHenry	Timmons
Foxx (NC)	Luetkemeyer	Taylor	Keating	Granger	McKinley	Tipton
Fulcher	Luria	Thompson (PA)	Kelly (IL)	Graves (GA)	Meadows	Turner
Gallagher	Marchant	Thornberry	Khanna	Graves (LA)	Meuser	Upton
Gianforte	Marshall	Timmons	Kildee	Graves (MO)	Miller	Wagner
Gibbs	Massie	Tipton	Kilmer	Green (TN)	Mitchell	Walberg
Gohmert	Mast	Turner	Kim	Griffith	Moolenaar	Walden
Gonzalez (OH)	McClintock	Turner	Kind	Grothman	Mooney (WV)	Walker
González-Colón	McHenry	Upton	Kirkpatrick	Guest	Mullin	Walorski
(PR)	McKinley	Walberg	Krishnamoorthi	Guthrie	Newhouse	Waltz
Gooden	Meadows	Walden	Kuster (NH)	Hagedorn	Norman	Watkins
Gosar	Meuser	Walker	Lamb	Harris	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Granger	Miller	Walorski	Langevin	Hartzler	Olson	Webster (FL)
Graves (GA)	Mitchell	Waltz	Larsen (WA)	Hern, Kevin	Palazzo	Wenstrup
Graves (LA)	Moolenaar	Watkins	Larson (CT)	Herrera Beutler	Palmer	Westerman
Graves (MO)	Mooney (WV)	Weber (TX)	Lawrence	Hice (GA)	Pence	Williams
Green (TN)	Mullin	Webster (FL)	Lawson (FL)	Hill (AR)	Perry	Wilson (SC)
Griffith	Newhouse	Wenstrup	Lee (CA)	Holding	Ratcliffe	Wittman
Grothman	Norman	Westerman	Lee (NV)	Hollingsworth	Reed	Womack
Guest	Nunes	Williams	Levin (CA)	Hudson	Reschenthaler	Woodall
Guthrie	Olson	Wilson (SC)	Levin (MI)	Huizenga	Rice (SC)	Wright
Hagedorn	Palazzo	Wittman	Lewis	Hunter	Riggleman	Yoho
Harris	Palmer	Womack	Lieu, Ted	Hurd (TX)	Roby	Young
Hartzler	Pence	Woodall	Lipinski	Johnson (OH)	Rodgers (WA)	Zeldin
Hern, Kevin	Perry	Wright	Loeb	Johnson (SD)	Roe, David P.	
Herrera Beutler	Posey	Yoho	Loeb			
Hice (GA)	Ratcliffe	Young	Lofgren			
Hill (AR)	Reed	Zeldin	Lowenthal			

NOT VOTING—14

Cheney	Higgins (LA)	Plaskett
Crenshaw	Johnson (LA)	Radewagen
Fudge	McCarthy	Radewagen
Gabbard	Norton	Vela
Gaetz	Perlmutter	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1504

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 189, not voting 13, as follows:

NOES—189

Abraham	Bergman	Byrne
Aderholt	Biggs	Calvert
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Carter (GA)
Amash	Bost	Carter (TX)
Amodei	Brady	Chabot
Armstrong	Brooks (AL)	Cline
Arrington	Brooks (IN)	Cloud
Babin	Buchanan	Cole
Bacon	Buck	Collins (GA)
Baird	Bucshon	Collins (NY)
Balderson	Budd	Comer
Banks	Burchett	Conaway
Barr	Burgess	Cook

NOT VOTING—13

Cheney	Higgins (LA)	Plaskett
Crenshaw	Johnson (LA)	Radewagen
Fudge	McCarthy	Vela
Gabbard	Norton	
Gaetz	Perlmutter	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1509

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR.

BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16 . . . INDEPENDENT STUDY ON EXTENSION OF MINUTEMAN III INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES.

(a) INDEPENDENT STUDY.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall seek to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to conduct a study on extending the life of Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles to 2050.

(2) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise

made available for fiscal year 2020 for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, not more than 90 percent may be obligated or expended until the date on which the Secretary submits the study under paragraph (1) to the congressional defense committees pursuant to subsection (d).

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study under subsection (a)(1) shall include the following:

(1) A comparison of the costs through 2050 of—

(A) extending the life of Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles; and

(B) delaying the ground-based strategic deterrent program.

(2) An analysis of opportunities to incorporate technologies into the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile program as part of a service life extension program that could also be incorporated in the future ground-based strategic deterrent program, including, at a minimum, opportunities to increase the resilience against adversary missile defenses.

(3) An analysis of the benefits and risks of incorporating sensors and nondestructive testing methods and technologies to reduce destructive testing requirements and increase the service life and number of Minuteman III missiles through 2050.

(4) An analysis and validation of the methods used to estimate the operational service life of Minuteman II and Minuteman III motors, taking into account the test and launch experience of motors retired after the operational service life of such motors in the rocket systems launch program.

(5) An analysis of the risks and benefits of alternative methods of estimating the operational service life of Minuteman III motors, such as those methods based on fundamental physical and chemical processes and non-destructive measurements of individual motor properties.

(c) SUBMISSION TO DOD.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the federally funded research and development center shall submit to the Secretary a report containing the study conducted under subsection (a)(1).

(d) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees the study under subsection (a)(1), without change.

(e) FORM.—The study under subsection (a)(1) shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

□ 1515

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I would first begin by extending my congratulations to the chair and the committee for taking a hard look at this legislation to better meet the needs of the military and the taxpayer in long-term, stable, careful military policy. I think they have made tremendous strides. I would like to try to make it just a tiny bit better.

Mr. Chair, we are looking at a Minuteman III extension on a land-based intercontinental ballistic missile system, and I am proposing that we have a study as to whether or not we could be better served by simply extending

the life of the existing system as opposed to new development.

Frankly, there needs to be more attention by this Congress, and I appreciate the attention that the committee has given.

The ICBM is the leg of the triad that raises the most questions. There has been a RAND study on the future of the ICBM force that found that a new alternative is very likely to cost two or three times more than incremental modernization.

We are careening toward a \$1.3 trillion or more investment in nuclear weapons that, frankly, do not help us for most of our national security challenges that we face now, weapons that we simply can't afford and can't afford to use.

I think by trying to right-size the work that we are doing and by taking a hard look at this element with a study on extending the life, it is a reasonable, responsible, cost-effective effort. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chair, this amendment's language is so wrong that it was resoundingly rejected in the Armed Services Committee by a voice vote. It is very basic and easy to understand as to why it was rejected.

This missile, and it relates to a missile upon which there is a nuclear warhead, was put on the ground in 1973. Richard Nixon was President of the United States. The year before these were put in the ground, in December of that year, was the last time we were on the Moon, in 1972. This was just at the end of the Apollo program. This is technology that is incredibly outdated.

If you think about the Apollo program and the Moon launch, you think, well, the next technology is the space shuttle. That launched in 1981, almost a decade after these were put in the ground. Even the space shuttle is retired, yet he wants to resurrect these.

This is as ridiculous as saying, "We are going to go to the Moon again. Let's go to the museum and pull out the Apollo mooncrafts. Let's just jiggle them up again and put them up into space."

It is not going to work. This is absolutely irresponsible, but it is not really about just trying to extend this life, because this has been studied before. This would be a study of a restudy of a restudy of a restudy.

In addition, this is not only a study. This delays the program.

Everyone wonders why nuclear weapons cost so much. They cost so much because we delay and delay and delay. This will be another one of those that would just continue the prospects of our having a decaying of our nuclear deterrent and, in addition to that, increased costs as a result of increased delay.

I know Mr. BLUMENAUER has been a very strong advocate against nuclear weapons. I understand his interest in trying to prohibit and thwart our efforts to modernize nuclear weapons, but if you look at what our adversaries are doing, what China is doing, what Russia is doing, it is absolutely irresponsible to say that a Richard Nixon-era missile that is in the ground, that has been there since we were last on the Moon, should just be refurbished and put back in the ground and expect that we are going to be safe.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished chair of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, three quick points.

First of all, Richard Nixon era or not, I think we all agree that the missile right now is working. I certainly hope it is since we are relying on it as a key part of our nuclear deterrent.

We have a lot of weapons systems. I mean, I am surprised that the B-52 bomber is still functional, but it is.

To imply that somehow because it is old, by definition, it doesn't work, I hope that is not true. In fact, I know it is not true because the current missile works perfectly fine and is a more than adequate deterrent.

Second, the studies that have been done were trying to figure out if we could get away with keeping this missile for the entire projected 80-year lifespan of its replacement. The studies have come back and said, no, it probably will not last 80 years. We have not studied whether or not it could last another 25 or another 50.

That is the purpose of this amendment. That would save us money.

Look, we need a nuclear deterrent. I don't believe the gentleman from Oregon—certainly, I don't—supports getting rid of our nuclear weapons. The question is, how many do we need? What does the deterrent look like? What makes sense?

It is clear that this missile works now. If we did this study, it is quite reasonable to presume that it would work another 10, 20, 30 years from now. Then that money could be used for other defense priorities.

This is to answer that question, which is very important.

I will skip the third point.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 20 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, all I was going to say is that the voice vote in our committee was not overwhelming. I am the one who called the voice vote, and it was my sense that the amendment was agreed to in the committee, but it was not overwhelming. There was a large number of members of the Armed Services Committee who supported the proposal that Mr. BLUMENAUER is now making.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chair, we should turn to the experts when we talk about how long this can be extended. This amendment would try to take this Richard Nixon-era missile to 2050. General Hyten, who is the person who is charged with having expertise with this, came before us March 28, 2019. This year, he said all studies have been done. This cannot be extended.

The only reason this amendment is here is to try to delay doing what we need to do and what the experts say, which is not refurbish this missile but move forward with replacement.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, look, the Minuteman III has been a great deterrent and a great source of security for this country, but it is 46 years old. It was put in the ground when I was in college, and I can't even remember what I was doing in college.

It has already been extended three times.

As Mr. TURNER said, the testimony in our committee said that we have studied this, and the conclusion was more study and more delay was not cost-effective.

Look at the reality of the situation. If we move into a new system, we have to have the infrastructure to make that move so the system can be seamless going from place to place.

If we pause in that reconstruction of infrastructure, what we do is stop the construction. Then, we have to start up again, which is why the cost continues to increase.

There are parts of Minuteman III that are no longer being produced in the private sector, so the engineers at the Air Force logistics centers have to rejigger from old parts a new part. In fact, the blueprints in some cases are so old, they are not readable anymore.

We have to move forward. This amendment stops us from modernizing our efforts. The GBSB has to move forward.

Let's face it: The only reason it is not moving forward right now is because it doesn't have a cute name like Minuteman III. But it is our future. If we want something in our future, we cannot tolerate more delays. This amendment for another study does nothing more than delay what we can actually come up with, the new generation of what we need to defend this country.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining?

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, my colleague has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio has 1 minute remaining and has the right to close.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 15 seconds to reassure my good friend from Utah that the Minuteman missile doesn't have to remember what it was doing in the past. It simply has to launch.

To the notion that it is a Nixon-era weapon, we are flying B-52s, which are not just Lyndon Johnson but those are of the Kennedy era.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), my good friend.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chair, I want to engage in a discussion because it is extremely important here.

I thank my good friend, Mr. TURNER, for raising some issues. Indeed, we might be better off going to the museum and getting the Apollo because the current Moon launch system isn't working too well, well over budget and well delayed. But the issue at hand has to do with these missiles.

There is clarity that this can be delayed. In one of our hearings, General Clark said it can be refurbished once again.

Other hearings have provided information that the key here is the command and control system, which is indeed antiquated and which indeed must be refurbished and rebuilt. We ought to spend our time on that.

This amendment does not delay the ground-based system. What it does is it gives us the information so that we can make an informed decision about when to engage and spend the \$100 billion to \$150 billion on the new ground-based missile system.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, did my friend from California not completely exhaust the time allotted?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chair, if you are around here long enough, your mind can go in 1-minute sections, and I was right on the 1 minute and 15. I will try to close very quickly on this in the next few seconds.

Mr. Chair, this amendment doesn't stop the ground-based system from going forward. It simply gives us, the decisionmakers, the opportunity to make a very informed decision about when we must renew this system.

There is clear evidence, clear discussion in various areas, that an additional period of time is available before we initiate and go full bore into the new ground-based system. Let's get information. Let's get knowledge.

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, it seems to me the studies that have been conducted make it clear that it makes

no cost sense to try to extend the life of these missiles that have been in place for so long.

I think what is really at stake here is whether the three legs of the triad upon which our defense has depended for so many decades are to be renewed, modernized, and remain credible.

Each leg of that triad, the submarines, the air leg, and the missiles that we are talking about now, have unique characteristics. It is the three of them working together that has been so successful in making sure that our country has been protected and that no nuclear weapon has been used since the end of World War II.

It is essential to modernize the land leg base of our triad to make sure that it stays credible, modern, and safe. That is why this amendment should be rejected.

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

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

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following new section:

SEC. 31. INDEPENDENT STUDY ON THE W80-4 NUCLEAR WARHEAD LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM.

(a) INDEPENDENT STUDY.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall seek to enter into an agreement with a federally funded research and development center to conduct a study on the W80-4 nuclear warhead life extension program.

(2) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2020 for the W80-4 nuclear warhead life extension program, not more than \$713,551,000 may be obligated or expended until the date on which the Administrator submits the study under paragraph (1) to the congressional defense committees pursuant to subsection (d).

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study under section (a)(1) shall include the following:

(1) An explanation of the unexpected increase in cost of the W80-4 nuclear warhead life extension program.

(2) An analysis of—

(A) the future costs of the program; and

(B) schedule requirements.

(3) An analysis of the impacts on other programs as a result of the additional funding for W80-4, including—

(A) life-extension programs;
 (B) infrastructure programs; and
 (C) research, development, test, and evaluation programs.

(4) An analysis of the impacts that a delay of the program will have on other programs due to—

(A) technical or management challenges; and

(B) changes in requirements for the program.

(c) SUBMISSION TO NNSA.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the federally funded research and development center shall submit to the Administrator a report containing the study conducted under subsection (a)(1).

(d) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the congressional defense committees the study under subsection (a)(1), without change.

(e) FORM.—The study under subsection (a) shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment here that would deal with a study on the cost-effectiveness of the W80-4 Life Extension Program.

We have been having these debates over the years before the committee on this issue of nuclear weapons. I am deeply troubled that we really haven't done a deep dive on the floor of the House in terms of the path we have been on.

□ 1530

I have settled, in the past, for trying to have some studies to determine whether or not what we are doing going forward is actually cost-effective.

In this case, the father of this device, former Secretary of Defense Bill Perry, has argued that there is scant justification for spending tens of billions of dollars on new weapons. General Mattis has stated numerous times that he is not sold on the LRSO.

I simply want to make sure that we know what we are getting into, what the costs are, in terms of some of the increases that are going forward.

We need to do a better job of our oversight, our debate. These weapons have not been used, as the gentleman said, since the end of World War II. It is not at all clear that we needed to have the volume of weapons we had, the number of delivery systems. In fact, there is strong argument that we could have done a better job, or just as good a job, of deterrence with less. And there have been a whole host of problems in the past in terms of mismanagement, accident that we have narrowly avoided disaster.

I think this is a small step forward, and I would respectfully request that the study be approved.

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, we are blazing along on the timeline of nuclear weapons and missile development where we had a missile that was last placed in the ground in 1973 during Richard Nixon's second term, after he was elected to a second term. We now have a 1980 Jimmy Carter-era warhead.

The analogy of the B-52 doesn't apply to this technology. The B-52 is a plane that has been in continuous flight. We are not talking about a plane that has been put in a hangar since Jimmy Carter. These are items that we don't use.

Nuclear weapons are there as a deterrent to deter our adversaries. The only way we can deter our adversaries is to have them believe that any aggression against us would be matched with such overwhelming force that it would be at their great risk.

To the extent that we allow our nuclear deterrent to degrade, which we have with Nixon-era missiles and Carter-era weapons, we lessen our overall security. Now, this is—again, it sounds like just a study. It is not really a study. It is a study of a study of a restudy of a restudy. This has been studied so much, in fact, it is on a bipartisan basis that this W-84 warhead needs to be refurbished, needs to be redone.

Even the Obama administration had an analysis of all alternatives and concluded that the air-launched cruise missile and its warhead could not be sustained and had already experienced reduced survivability. Even the Obama administration said, Don't do this. They said, Move forward.

Now, once again, this is not about a study. This is about stopping the ongoing efforts of a program. This is about holding moneys back so that we don't modernize our nuclear weapons. Again, China is moving forward; Russia is moving forward. But here we are, on the floor of Congress, trying to stop our ability to match and meet those who might wish to do us harm.

This amendment needs to be defeated. This is an ancient 1980s Carter-era warhead. Even the Obama administration agrees it needs to be replaced. We should not jeopardize its funding. Every time we do this, every time we stop and say, Let's study this, our costs go up and our risks go higher and our security gets lower.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is a little bit smaller than what the gentleman from Ohio implied. We are stopping the funding of

this program. Actually, what we are stopping is the additional \$185 million request that NNSA and the President requested in this budget on top of this. The missile would continue to be funded.

This is a concern we had in committee. We talked about it and we let it go.

But they have not really told us what they are going to do with this additional \$185 million. And we have concerns, in addition to the concerns that Mr. BLUMENAUER raised about the efficacy of the program, about whether or not they are going to be able to execute this \$185 million and what their exact timeline is for the program. In fact, the Air Force recently said that they were delaying by a year or two certain steps in the development of this missile while saying they were also going to be able to still meet the ultimate deadline for deployment.

But the specific \$185 million that is expensed is an amount that was asked for in addition to what had originally been planned for FY20. We do not have an adequate explanation, in my view, and in Mr. BLUMENAUER's view, from DOD as to why they want that additional \$185 million, and that is the purpose of this. It is not studying the entire missile. It is saying, why are you accelerating the program and asking for this additional money? So I support this amendment.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that, in January of this year, the independent Office of Cost Estimating and Program Evaluation, which is part of the Department of Energy's NNSA, provided a report and an objective analysis of this program. Everything that they reported was that the program remains on budget as expected for the first production unit by fiscal year 2025.

I think what has happened is that they have a greater opportunity, a greater need, to spend more money from 2019 to 2020 than they originally planned. Now, that can occur for several reasons.

Number one, a program can start to move a little faster so you can make good use of money. Unfortunately, what sometimes happens is once you start looking into some of these very old warheads, you discover problems that need some resources in order to deal with those problems.

Now, we can't really talk on the floor about the specific concerns with any particular warhead today because of classification. But the key point is, the overall funding program has remained consistent and perfectly within the guidelines of what was planned originally.

Again, I am afraid that this amendment, like the last one, is delayed by study. We can study things to death,

but we have not done what we should to renew the three legs of the triad and the weapons which constitute our nuclear deterrence, and upon which our security depends. We have basically reached the point where we have no margin for error. We have to move ahead with submarines, we have to move ahead with the new bomber, we have to move ahead with the Minuteman III replacement, and we have to move ahead with the warhead replacement, not only to make sure they work, but to make sure the people around them are safe. That is the crucial point.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, with enormous respect to my colleagues who are opposed to this amendment, I think this amendment makes enormous sense. It is \$185 million of additional money that has been requested in just the last couple of months to move this program forward.

We ought to be very careful here because the NNSA is only 50 percent sure that it is a \$12 billion program. That is on the upside, not on the downside. So we are talking about something very expensive.

It is unfortunate that we have divided this extraordinarily important debate about the future of our nuclear systems into 5-minute segments. This ought to be a 5-hour debate on the floor. I see my colleagues nodding their head.

A fundamental question is being asked here about where we are going with our nuclear enterprises. We do know this: We are in the midst of a three-party nuclear arms race. And this one is going to be extremely dangerous because the weapons are bigger; they are safer, to be sure, but they are more likely to explode; and, finally, they are going to be delivered by stealth technology.

Sad, but true, we need a 5-hour debate on this entire thing.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there are people who don't like nuclear weapons. I don't like nuclear weapons either, but I don't like nuclear weapons in the hands of other people. And, yes, there are those who say that we are in the middle of an arms race. But the reality is that we are sitting this one out. We are not in the arms race.

When we are debating on the House floor about a warhead from the Carter era and a missile from the Nixon era and we can't even talk about moving forward on funding, there is no race here. We are sitting this out. But our adversaries are racing, and I am concerned about what they are doing. That is why this is important that this be defeated.

But another aspect of this that is incredibly important is that this calls for an independent study. Independent: That is saying they don't trust the study that happened before. The study

that happened before was the Obama administration. I think their answer was correct: We need to not study this and we need to move forward.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, let me just make three points.

First and foremost, anybody who thinks that we are standing still and defenseless is not in the real world. We are spending billions of dollars on nuclear weapons and delivery systems. And, in fact, we are relying on a delivery system from the Kennedy era with the B-52. So I say to the gentleman, don't tell me that we cannot move these items forward.

Second, the gentleman does not have a good fix in terms of what is happening with the cost increases. This study is required to be able to have the additional money. If we can do the appropriate study and it makes sense, the money is there. But this is a step towards accountability and it is long, long overdue, and I hope we can start now approving this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MS. FRANKEL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. —. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR SHORTER- OR INTERMEDIATE-RANGE GROUND LAUNCHED BALLISTIC OR CRUISE MISSILE SYSTEMS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Secretary of State Mike Pompeo's February 1, 2019, announcement of the decision of the United States to withdraw from the INF Treaty, without proper consultation with Congress, is a serious breach of Congress's proper constitutional role as a co-equal branch of government;

(2) United States withdrawal from the INF Treaty will free Russia to deploy greater quantities of the SSC-8 missile to the detriment of United States national security and that of our allies in Europe and the Indo-Pacific region;

(3) the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) alliance makes critical contributions to United States national security, and the failure to weigh the concerns of NATO allies risks weakening the joint resolve necessary to counter Russia's aggressive behavior;

(4) as opposed to withdrawing from the INF Treaty, the United States should continue to advance other diplomatic, economic, and military measures outlined in the "Trump Administration INF Treaty Integrated Strategy" to resolve the concerns related to Russia's violation of the INF Treaty and to reach agreement on measures to ensure the INF Treaty's future viability; and

(5) further, in lieu of withdrawing from the INF Treaty, the United States should look at options to expand arms control treaties to include China in an effort to limit its short- and intermediate-range missiles.

(b) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2020 may be made available for the research, development, testing, evaluation, procurement, or deployment of a United States shorter- or intermediate-range ground launched ballistic or cruise missile system with a range between 500 and 5,500 kilometers until the following has been submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress:

(1) A report from the Secretary of Defense, jointly with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, that includes—

(A) a detailed diplomatic proposal for negotiating an agreement to obtain the strategic stability benefits of the INF Treaty;

(B) an assessment of the implications, in terms of the military threat to the United States and its allies in Europe and the Indo-Pacific region, of Russian deployment of intermediate-range cruise and ballistic missiles without restriction;

(C) identification of what types of technologies and programs the United States would need to pursue to offset the additional Russian capabilities, and at what cost;

(D) identification of what mission requirements will be met by INF Treaty-type systems; and

(E) details regarding ramifications of a collapse of the INF Treaty on the ability to generate consensus among States Parties to the NPT Treaty ahead of the 2020 NPT Review Conference, and assesses the degree to which Russia will use the United States unilateral withdrawal to sow discord within the NATO alliance.

(2) A copy or copies of at least one Memorandum of Understanding from a NATO or Indo-Pacific ally that commits it to host deployment of any such ballistic or cruise missile system on its own territory, and in the case of deployment on the European continent, has the concurrence of the North Atlantic Council.

(3) An unedited copy of an analysis of alternatives conducted by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation that considers other ballistic or cruise missile systems, to include sea- and air-launched missiles, that could be deployed to meet current capability gaps due to INF Treaty restrictions, and further to include cost, schedule, and operational considerations.

(c) FORM.—The documents required by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize the use of funds described in subsection (b) for the research, development, testing, evaluation, procurement, or deployment of INF

Treaty-type systems in the United States or its territories.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) INF TREATY.—The term “INF Treaty” means the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, together with the Memorandum of Understanding and Two Protocols, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

(3) NPT TREATY.—The term “NPT Treaty” means the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, signed at Washington July 1, 1968.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Chairman, I think there are a few of us here in Congress who are old enough to remember a time when we actually did nuclear bomb drills in school. It probably would have been a futile action had there been a real attack.

And although nuclear warfare is still an existential threat to all of us and our allies around the world, it has been arms control that has let us go about our lives daily without that worry of nuclear war: agreements like the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, known as the INF Treaty, signed in 1987 between the United States and the Soviet Union, which led to the elimination of thousands of United States and Russian nuclear missiles.

In recent years, it has become apparent that Russia has been violating this treaty. And in response, in February, the Trump administration announced its withdrawal to the consternation of our European friends, giving both the United States and Russia freedom to produce more nuclear weapons.

And it is the general consensus of the arms control community that we should be working with Russia to bring them back into compliance instead of adding to our nuclear arsenal and sidestepping NATO.

□ 1545

Once again, this administration is alienating allies who don't want to be targets for Russian attacks. The NATO Secretary General said, clearly: We do not intend to deploy new land-based nuclear missiles in Europe.

In recent testimony before Congress, General Paul Selva, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated: There are no military requirements that we cannot currently satisfy due to our compliance with the INF Treaty.

In other words, the world has enough nuclear weapons to destroy civilization.

It is clear that our withdrawal from INF has been driven by extreme elements in our administration who have made their careers out of destroying arms control agreements.

To stop this nuclear escalation, my amendment would prohibit funding for missile systems noncompliant with the INF Treaty unless the Defense Department demonstrates an ally has agreed to host the INF missile and that we have exhausted all other diplomatic options.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to prevent a dangerous and costly nuclear arms race. Enough is enough.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting Chair. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a dangerous amendment. The Trump administration withdrew from the INF Treaty because Russia had been cheating on this treaty for years. The only country that was in compliance with the INF Treaty was the United States, and we were handcuffing ourselves by putting limitations on our ability to respond to threats from Russia or China since we were the only country in the world complying with it.

China was not a signatory to the INF Treaty. This was, like was said, signed 32 years ago. China was not the military power that it is today. It was not a party to this treaty.

Going forward, I would love to see some kind of treaty between the U.S. and Russia and China, but that is not in the works if this amendment is passed. This ignores China.

China has more missiles in the Pacific region than anyone else in the world. They have more, certainly, than the United States. So that is another flaw with this amendment.

Russia has been cheating on this, and to say we are going to comply with the terms of the treaty regardless of what Russia does is to reward them for their cheating.

One other key point that makes this a dangerous amendment is because it would prevent the testing necessary for the growth of our missile defense program. The INF Treaty that this would put us back into—in a backdoor kind of way—prohibits testing or deployment of missiles with the range of 500 to 5,500 kilometers. Those are the kinds of tests that we need to be able to do to test our missile defense systems.

The Department of Defense stated, just a couple of days ago:

Land-based missiles required to support ballistic missile defense system flight testing also have ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers. Loss of target missile capability would likely prohibit upcoming missile defense flight tests requiring such target missiles.

And they go on to say:

This will limit the warfighter. It will limit our missile defense capabilities.

That is a dangerous thing.

There is some dispute over whether allies like Israel would be included in this ban of test vehicles. I will leave that for another discussion, but it is a serious issue.

It would certainly prohibit our testing of our missile defense systems between the range of 500 to 5,500 kilometers. That would cripple our growth of missile defense for the future. That doesn't make the world a safer place. It certainly doesn't make the United States a safer place.

So, for all of those reasons, Mr. Chairman, this is a bad amendment, and I would urge that we reject it and vote “no.”

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Chair, let me just respond by saying, according to the Department of Defense, there is nothing in this amendment that would impact missile defense test systems.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support this amendment.

There has been some misinformation out there about what this amendment would actually do, so let me just clear up a few things.

This measure is a prohibition on the United States deploying a short- or intermediate-range ground-launched ballistic or cruise missile system—just the United States. It has nothing to do with any other country.

We want to prevent an arms race. We want to push back on the President's careless and reckless approach to Russia.

The INF Treaty has been a cornerstone of arms control for 30 years. Yes, we are clear about the threat Russia poses. Yes, Russia has violated this treaty again and again, which threatens transatlantic security and stability. This is no surprise, coming from Vladimir Putin.

But we have to use every diplomatic tool at our disposal to try to salvage the treaty. Instead, the administration followed Putin's lead and walked away, and now Russia will feel totally unconstrained to start another arms race.

So I know that the relationship with Putin and all kinds of things that Putin does, we have to be very, very wary about it, and I just think what the gentlewoman is doing is a commonsense approach to this.

The United States can go back at any time and change our policy. And when it comes to Russia and Putin, we don't trust them. Trust and verify.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I would like to inquire how much time both sides have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 2 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Florida has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I am going to make a brief statement and then yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

First, let me say that this doesn't just put us back in the INF, which would be bad enough. This puts us in a worse posture than the INF. This amendment is more stringent on our ability to develop our defensive capabilities than the INF would be.

Specifically, the INF has an exemption for interceptors; this does not. So we can't do interceptor tests. We could have under INF, but we can't under this amendment.

And, also, there is an exception for ballistic missiles without warheads for testing our defenses. That is in INF; it is not in this amendment. This is worse than the INF, which is bad enough.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, this is very basic. You cannot have a treaty with yourself. You must have a treaty with someone else. If that other person steps out of the treaty, you no longer have a treaty.

Russia stepped out of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty. The North Atlantic Council all came together and confirmed it. At the last NATO summit, every one of our allies confirmed it. The treaty is dead.

To have a treaty, now, where the other side has stepped out and it is only us that is left and say, by statute, we are going to shackle ourselves so that we are going to stay there has no reflection on reality.

Their violating the treaties aren't minor violations of the treaty. They have developed, tested, and deployed a weapon that violates the treaty. That means that they are once again deploying nuclear weapons, nuclear weapons for which we don't have a response.

Our response doesn't necessarily have to be go field one. We can continue diplomacy. But legislation is not diplomacy. By legislation, we are going to say that the United States shall forever, as long as the legislation stays in, be tied to a treaty that the person on the other side already left and deployed missiles that are pointed at our assets, our military people, our men and women in uniform, and our allies. This is folly.

Now, the Missile Defense Agency, by the way, issued a statement that says this affects our cooperation with Israel and our interceptor research with them.

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

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chair, oh, my, we definitely need 5 hours. This is extraordinarily important. In fact, it is the United States that terminated its role in the INF Treaty when President

Trump pulled out of the treaty. Presumably, Russia is still in, although they are clearly violating the treaty. We lost whatever leverage there may have been.

We are now in the midst of, what I said a moment ago, one more stage of a nuclear arms race. All of us better take a deep breath here and begin some serious negotiations, because this time it is extraordinarily dangerous.

In addition to that, please understand that our allies on whose land these missiles may be placed are not in agreement that they should be placed there, and so there really is no plan for the deployment, let alone exactly how these missiles would be done.

By the way, we clearly have alternative ways of delivering nuclear weapons: short-range, long-range, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and most every other way except no longer in a briefcase or in a projectile, fortunately.

So it is not harmful to delay this. It is not harmful to make sure that our allies are in sync with us as to how they may be deployed.

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 15 seconds remaining.

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Chairman, let me just say this.

The Department of Defense says that nothing in this amendment would impact missile defense cooperation with Israel.

I just want to end by saying: Enough is enough. Diplomacy, not more nuclear weapons.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following new section:

SEC. 31. FUNDING FOR LOW-ENRICHED URANIUM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated by this title for defense nuclear nonproliferation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4701, for low-enriched uranium research and development is hereby increased by \$20,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated by this title for atomic energy defense activities, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4701, for Federal salaries and expenses is hereby reduced by \$20,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment funds ongoing efforts to assess the viability of using low-enriched uranium fuel in naval reactors, including those in aircraft carriers and submarines, something this Congress has supported for many years now.

The United States has demonstrated strong leadership to minimize, and wherever possible all but eliminate, the use of highly enriched uranium for civilian purposes. Doing so reduces the risk of nuclear terrorism and makes clear that the accumulation of HEU is solely for nuclear weapons purposes, undercutting any nation's argument that they need it for anything else.

Using low-enriched uranium, or LEU, in naval reactor fuel can bring significant national security benefits with respect to nuclear nonproliferation, lower security costs, and put naval reactor research and development at the cutting edge of science. Pursuing the development of LEU fuel offers the opportunity to achieve transformational progress on fuel technology.

Additionally, unless an alternative using low-enriched uranium fuel is developed in the coming decades, the United States will have to resume production of bomb-grade uranium for the first time since 1992, ultimately undermining U.S. nonproliferation efforts.

Using LEU for naval reactors is not a pipe dream. France's nuclear Navy already has converted from using HEU to using LEU fuel for its vessels. We must evaluate the feasibility of a similar transition for the U.S. Navy and take into account the potential benefits to the U.S. and international security of setting a norm of using LEU instead of nuclear bomb-grade material.

□ 1600

As America confronts the threat of nuclear terrorism and as countries continue to enrich uranium for naval purposes, the imperative to reduce the use of HEU will become increasingly important over the next several decades.

As such, as I said, Congress has sought to advance these efforts in a bipartisan, bicameral way over the last several years by evaluating the potential of utilizing LEU fuel in reactors for U.S. Navy aircraft carriers and submarines.

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

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

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, I would like to point out that there have been multiple studies done on this.

In 2014, the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy pointed out the negative impacts that low-enriched uranium would have on the capability of the Navy.

In 2016, another report, and I remind the folks here in the Chamber that this report was specific about saying the negative impacts that low-enriched uranium will have on the capability of our United States Navy.

In 2018, letters from both the Director of Naval Reactors, Admiral Caldwell, and from the Secretary of the Navy, Richard Spencer, all stated the negative impact that low-enriched uranium would have on the capability of the Navy.

We look, too, at the dollars that are being proposed to offset this. The \$20 million reduction in the National Nuclear Security Administration would reduce salaries in that area by 15 percent.

According to NNSA, this reduction would likely require a reduction in force to achieve this staffing level. They will let people go if this money is transferred to another study, a study that has been done multiple times in the past with the same outcomes, that this would have a harmful effect on the National Nuclear Security Administration.

They also say that the amendment would negate recently implemented improvements in oversight and accountability and slow down the execution of critical nuclear security and safety programs.

It would also affect weapons modernization and nuclear nonproliferation efforts. The same thing the gentleman from Rhode Island said that this bill is meant to address, it actually takes money away from the efforts that NNSA is putting forward.

It also would inhibit physical security, cybersecurity, and environmental remediation programs.

Not only has this study been done multiple times, but it would take money away from the critical elements that are being proposed that this study would seek to find out. Again, the conclusions have already been reached. The impact of LEU on the Nation's naval capability has already been identified.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, let me say that we can't fear the future. We must invest in research and development.

I want to point out that the then-chair, the Naval Reactors Director, Admiral Richardson, testified before the House Armed Services Committee. He

said, with current technology, "the potential exists that we could develop an advanced fuel system that might increase uranium loading and make low-enriched uranium possible while still meeting some very rigorous performance requirements for naval reactors on nuclear-powered warships."

To address the concerns of my colleague, I want to mention that this House has already included \$20 million for this research in the Energy and Water appropriations package that passed the House on June 19, which also included a \$15 million increase to NNSA Federal salaries and expenses over fiscal year 2019.

These spending levels have already been set by the House. This amendment simply matches the authorization level with the House-passed appropriations level.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, I remind the gentleman from Rhode Island that this is the National Defense Authorization Act. It is not another appropriations bill. This is specific to the use of these dollars here for these purposes specifically.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mrs. LURIA).

Mrs. LURIA. Mr. Chair, as a Navy veteran, I believe in focusing our limited resources toward efforts that will make our forces more effective, reliable, and efficient.

I oppose this amendment that would decrease the National Nuclear Security Administration's budget by \$20 million and allocate the money to a program to develop low-enriched uranium fuel for submarines and aircraft carriers.

Drawing on my 20-year Navy experience in the supervision and operation of naval nuclear propulsion systems, it makes little sense to divert these resources. Our highly enriched uranium reactor design has successfully powered our submarine fleet, delivering a critical leg of our nuclear deterrent and our aircraft carriers, providing our unique sustained forward presence capability for nearly seven decades. There is no need for this amendment.

Top Navy leadership and the Secretary of Energy clearly state that a low-enriched uranium design for naval nuclear propulsion "would result in a reactor design that is inherently less capable, more expensive, and unlikely to support current life-of-ship submarine reactors."

Meanwhile, Admiral James Caldwell, Director of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program, says that investing in LEU would negatively impact reactor endurance, reactor size, and ship costs, and its success is "not assured."

I have no doubt that we could eventually develop a reactor design using LEU, but would it continue to meet our operational and strategic defense needs? No. It would make our platforms inherently less capable, less operationally available, and more ex-

pensive to operate. In turn, it would require more of these assets to accomplish the same objectives.

If the genesis behind this amendment is to advance issues of nonproliferation, it makes little sense to draw down the budget of the very agency that is tasked with the security of nuclear weapons and nuclear fuel.

I will conclude as I began. We need to commit our limited resources where they are most efficiently used to support our operational forces and our national defense. These dollars are best spent on the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), who is the House's only nuclear physicist.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today as the only Ph.D. physicist in the U.S. Congress. During my career, I have designed and led the construction of giant particle accelerators and other nuclear equipment, led high-risk and successful R&D programs, and designed equipment using classified neutron transport codes.

Because of its importance to national security and nuclear nonproliferation, I have studied at length the question of minimizing the use of highly enriched uranium in naval propulsion reactors. I received numerous individual and highly technical classified briefings, examined reactor core specifications, and visited the naval nuclear fuel fabrication facility in Virginia.

I believe that continuing the research supported by this amendment is worth pursuing for the reasons given by my colleague.

Several factors must be dealt with in determining the practicality of utilizing LEU in naval propulsion reactors, including the total energy and power deliverable by the core, the volume of the reactor, the enrichment level of the fuel, reactivity limits, and the heat transfer area required for a given power level.

It is complicated, but a 2016 report by the JASON scientific advisory board concluded that using an optimized LEU design instead of the existing HEU design could result in a significantly more compact core. This would be a true operational advantage and one that we should not give up by abandoning this R&D program that has been going on for years.

I close by pointing out that I am not alone in this. This is not only about optimizing submarine performance. As

pointed out by 35 Nobel Prize-winning scientists, it is crucial for non-proliferation that we set a good example for the rest of the world and not use weapons-grade uranium for applications where it is not required. Countries like France and others do not use weapons-grade uranium in their submarines and in carriers. We should set an example and do likewise.

This R&D program will enable that possibility by continuing it for the next decade.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise today as the only PhD Physicist in Congress. During my career I have design and led the construction of giant particle accelerators and other nuclear equipment, led high-risk and successful R and D programs, and designed equipment using classified neutron transport codes.

Because of its importance to National Security and Nuclear NonProliferation, I have studied at length the question of minimizing the use of HEU in our naval propulsion reactors.

I received numerous individual and highly technical classified briefings, examined reactor core specifications, and visited the naval nuclear fuel fabrication facility in Virginia.

I believe that the research supported by this amendment is worth pursuing, for the reasons given by my colleague.

The reason is simple, that HEU is one of the most dangerous substances known to man, because it can be used to make a simple, gun-type design nuclear bomb with a multi-kiloton yield.

This is not true of LEU—low-enriched, non-weapons grade uranium.

This distinction is important for the enforcement of Nuclear Nonproliferation. Since the detection of even minute amounts of HEU can and has been used as clear evidence of a weapons program in a nation that has allegedly committed to only peaceful uses of atomic energy based on LEU.

Which is why the elimination of globally held stockpiles has been a U.S. policy objective for over 40 years, and recently supported by a letter from 35 Nobel Prize winners.

But let's talk about the physics and reactor systems engineering.

Several factors must be dealt with in determining the practicality of utilizing LEU in naval propulsion reactors, including total energy and power deliverable by the core, volume of the reactor, and enrichment level of the fuel, reactivity limits, and the heat transfer area required for a given power level.

A 2016 report by the JASON Scientific Advisory Board concluded that, that using the existing HEU design, in order achieve the same total deliverable energy using LEU, the core would have to be approximately 4.5 times larger.

This does not mean, however, that you would need a reactor system with 4.5 times the volume, since most propulsion components scale with the power of the reactor, which would be unchanged in the conversion from HEU to LEU.

The purpose of the R and D funding in this amendment is to develop and qualify a fuel element and reactor design the will result in a much more compact overall design.

Although the exact improvement factor is classified and has been redacted in the public version of the JASON report.

If the R and D program succeeds, it will verify the feasibility of using LEU in Naval reactors with smaller or no performance compromise.

The independent JASON scientific review committee gave this R and D program a positive outlook.

In a July 2016 report to Congress, the Office of Naval Reactors stated that, "The advanced LEU fuel system concept has the potential to satisfy the energy requirements of an aircraft carrier without affecting the number of refuelings."

This would massively reduce U.S. consumption of Weapons Grade Uranium.

The situation is more nuanced for submarines.

The Virginia-class replacement propulsion plant is being targeted by this R and D program, with a decision time for transition to LEU of about 10 years from now.

But such progress over the next two decades can only happen if we continue aggressively pursuing the R and D now.

As the JASON report stated, "If a decision is made soon to proceed with ELE-LEU development, then by the time the design of the Virginia-replacement propulsion plant is being solidified in the 2030 time frame, NNPP will have a good idea of whether ELE-LEU will succeed. . . . [T]hen the Navy's final HEU core might be built as early as 2040."

If any of my colleagues would like to continue this conversation in a classified setting, I would be more than happy to answer any questions.

I urge my colleagues to join me and vote yes on this critical amendment.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, in conclusion, I want to point to the 2016 report that assessed that additional refuelings would increase Navy fleet operating costs by several billion dollars a year.

Mr. Chair, as we are looking to rebuild the Navy, that means ships that will not get built. That will mean less operating capability. That will mean ships that need to be at dock for longer periods of time for maintenance and for refueling.

A larger submarine reactor core, which is what DOD says would be needed for LEU, requires a larger submarine, and it makes those submarines less capable and less efficient.

It also requires massive redesigns, so it interrupts existing submarine construction programs.

All of those things have significant impacts on the capability of the Navy.

Take the Virginia-class submarine reactor, which operates on a 33-year ship expectancy. That would cut that by one-third, which means it would have to come back and be refueled again.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 476, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KILDEE). The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 5 consisting of amendment Nos. 20, 37, 38, 40, 43, 47, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, and 165, printed in part B of House Report 116-143, offered by Mr. SMITH of Washington:

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12 . UNITED STATES ACTIONS RELATING TO RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS FOR FEDERAL OFFICE.

(a) PROHIBITION ON TRANSACTIONS RELATING TO NEW RUSSIAN SOVEREIGN DEBT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall issue regulations prohibiting United States persons from engaging in transactions with, providing financing for, or in any other way dealing in Russian sovereign debt that is issued on or after the date that is 180 days after such date of enactment.

(2) RUSSIAN SOVEREIGN DEBT DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "Russian sovereign debt" means—

(A) bonds issued by the Russian Central Bank, the Russian National Wealth Fund, the Russian Federal Treasury, or agents or affiliates of any such institution, with a maturity of more than 14 days;

(B) new foreign exchange swap agreements with the Russian Central Bank, the Russian National Wealth Fund, or the Russian Federal Treasury, the duration of which agreement is longer than 14 days; and

(C) any other financial instrument, the duration or maturity of which is more than 14 days, that the President determines represents the sovereign debt of Russia.

(3) REQUIREMENT TO PROMPTLY PUBLISH GUIDANCE.—The President shall concurrently publish guidance on the implementation of the regulations issued pursuant to paragraph (1).

(b) DETERMINATION OF RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS FOR FEDERAL OFFICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after an election for Federal office, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the National Security Agency, and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, shall—

(A) determine whether or not the Government of Russia, or any person acting as an agent of or on behalf of that government, knowingly engaged in interference in the election; and

(B) submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report on that determination, including an identification of the government or person that interfered in the election if the Director determines that interference did occur.

(2) ADDITIONAL REPORTING.—If the Director of National Intelligence determines and reports under paragraph (1) that neither the Government of Russia nor any person acting as an agent of or on behalf of that government knowingly engaged in interference in an election for Federal office, and the Director subsequently determines that such government, or such a person, did engage in such interference, the Director shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report on the subsequent determination not later than 30 days after making that determination.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by paragraph (1) or (2) shall be submitted in

unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(c) **LIFTING THE PROHIBITION ON TRANSACTIONS RELATING TO NEW RUSSIAN SOVEREIGN DEBT.**—The President shall immediately suspend the prohibition on transactions relating to Russian sovereign debt required under subsection (a) if, no later than 90 days after the date on which a report required under subsection (b) is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership and no later than 120 days after the most recent election for Federal office, whichever is sooner—

(1) the Director of National Intelligence has in its report required under subsection (b) affirmatively determined that neither the Government of Russia, nor any person acting as an agent of or on behalf of that government, has knowingly engaged in interference in the most recent election for Federal office; and

(2) Congress has passed a joint resolution certifying the determination of the Director of National Intelligence.

(d) **REIMPOSING THE PROHIBITION ON TRANSACTIONS RELATING TO NEW RUSSIAN SOVEREIGN DEBT.**—The President shall immediately reimpose the prohibition on transactions relating to Russian sovereign debt required under subsection (a) if, after 90 days following the date on which a report required under subsection (b) is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership or 120 days following the most recent election for Federal office, whichever is sooner—

(1) the Director of National Intelligence, in the report required under subsection (b), has not affirmatively determined that neither the Government of Russia, nor any person acting as an agent of or on behalf of that government, has knowingly engaged in interference in the most recent election for Federal office; or

(2) Congress has failed to pass a joint resolution certifying the determination of the Director of National Intelligence in its report required under subsection (b) that neither the Government of Russia, nor any person acting as an agent of or on behalf of that government, has knowingly engaged in interference in the most recent Federal election.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

(2) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees and leadership” means—

(A) the appropriate congressional committees;

(B) the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate; and

(C) the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(3) **ELECTIONS FOR FEDERAL OFFICE.**—The term “elections for Federal office” has the meaning given such term in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.), except that such term does not include a special election.

(4) **INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS FOR FEDERAL OFFICE.**—The term “interference”, with respect to an election for Federal office:

(A) Means any of the following actions of the government of a foreign country, or any person acting as an agent of or on behalf of such a government, undertaken with the intent to influence the election:

(i) Obtaining unauthorized access to election and campaign infrastructure or related systems or data and releasing such data or modifying such infrastructure, systems, or data.

(ii) Blocking or degrading otherwise legitimate and authorized access to election and campaign infrastructure or related systems or data.

(iii) Contributions or expenditures for advertising, including on the internet.

(iv) Using social or traditional media to spread significant amounts of false information to individuals in the United States.

(B) Does not include communications clearly attributable to news and media outlets which are publicly and explicitly either controlled or in large part funded by the government of a foreign country.

(5) **KNOWINGLY.**—The term “knowingly”, with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(6) **PERSON.**—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(7) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 606. ANNUAL REPORTS ON APPROVAL OF EMPLOYMENT OR COMPENSATION OF RETIRED GENERAL OR FLAG OFFICERS BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS FOR EMOLUMENTS CLAUSE PURPOSES.

(a) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Section 908 of title 37, United States Code is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) **ANNUAL REPORTS ON APPROVALS FOR RETIRED GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS.**—(1) Not later than January 31 each year, the Secretaries of the military departments shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees and Members of Congress a report on each approval under subsection (b) for employment or compensation described in subsection (a) for a retired member of the armed forces in general or flag officer grade that was issued during the preceding year. The report shall be posted on a publicly available Internet website of the Department of Defense no later than 30 days after it has been submitted to Congress.

“(2) In this subsection, the appropriate committees and Members of Congress are—

“(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

“(C) the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate; and

“(D) the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.”.

(b) **SCOPE OF FIRST REPORT.**—The first report submitted pursuant to subsection (c) of section 908 of title 37, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a) of this section), after the date of the enactment of this Act shall cover the five-year period ending with the year before the year in which such report is submitted.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. AGUILAR OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 530. STUDY REGARDING SCREENING INDIVIDUALS WHO SEEK TO ENLIST IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall study the feasibility of, in background investigations and security and suitability screenings of individuals who seek to enlist in the Armed Forces—

(1) screening for white nationalists and individuals with ties to white nationalist organizations; and

(2) using the following resources of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

(A) The Tattoo and Graffiti Identification Program.

(B) The National Gang Intelligence Center.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit an unclassified report in writing to the congressional defense committees containing conclusions of the Secretary regarding the study under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 550c. EFFECTIVE DATE OF RULE REGARDING PAYDAY LENDING PROTECTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Sections 1041.4 through 1041.6, 1041.10, and 1041.12(b)(1) through (3) in the final rule published on November 17, 2017 by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (82 F.R. 54472) related to Mandatory Underwriting Provisions shall go into effect on August 19, 2019, with regards to servicemembers, veterans and surviving spouses.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “servicemember” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The terms “veteran” and “surviving spouse” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MS. OCASIO-CORTEZ OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle B of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3. FUNDING FOR DETONATION CHAMBERS IN VIEQUES, PUERTO RICO.

(a) **INCREASE.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4301 for environmental restoration, Navy, line 060, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for the purchase, deployment, and operation of a closed detonation chambers of the dimensions necessary to achieve a substantial reduction in open air burning and open air detonation that will bring the practice of open air burning and open air detonation to the lowest practicable level, is hereby increased by \$10,000,000.

(b) **OFFSET.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4301 for Operations and Maintenance,

as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, line 460, Office of the Secretary of Defense for Admin & SRVWIDE Activities is hereby reduced by \$10,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title XI, add the following new section:

SEC. 11. REVIEW OF STANDARD OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM.

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, categorize public safety telecommunicators as a protective service occupation under the Standard Occupational Classification System.

AMENDMENT NO. 147 OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY OF NEBRASKA

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SUPPORTING THE RETURN AND REPARTRITION OF RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC MINORITIES IN IRAQ TO THEIR ANCESTRAL HOMELANDS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Nineveh Plain and the wider region have been the ancestral homeland of Assyrian Chaldean Syriac Christians, Yazidis, Shabak, and other religious and ethnic minorities, where they lived for centuries until the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) overran and occupied the area in 2014;

(2) in 2016, then-Secretary of State John Kerry announced, “In my judgment Daesh is responsible for genocide against groups in areas under its control, including Yezidis, Christians, and Shia Muslims. Daesh is genocidal by self-proclamation, by ideology, and by actions—in what it says, what it believes, and what it does. Daesh is also responsible for crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing directed at these same groups and in some cases also against Sunni Muslims, Kurds, and other minorities.”;

(3) these atrocities were undertaken with the specific intent to bring about the eradication and displacement of Christians, Yazidis, and other communities and the destruction of their cultural heritage, in violation of the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide signed by the United States on December 11, 1948;

(4) in 2016, the House of Representatives passed H. Con. Res. 75 expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the atrocities perpetrated by ISIS against religious and ethnic minorities in Iraq and Syria include war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide;

(5) through joint efforts of the United States and 79 allies and partners, ISIS has been territorially defeated in Iraq and Syria;

(6) in July 2018, under the direction of Vice President Pence, the Genocide Recovery and Persecution Response Program partnered with the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and local faith and community leaders to rapidly and directly deliver aid to persecuted communities, beginning with Iraq;

(7) Christians in Iraq once numbered over 1.5 million in 2003 and have dwindled to less than 200,000 today;

(8) armed militia groups linked to Iran, operating systematically in Sinjar and the Nineveh Plains, have harassed and intimidated religious and ethnic minorities thereby destabilizing northern Iraq and preventing local and indigenous minorities to return to their homelands;

(9) Iraqi religious minorities have faced challenges in integrating into the Iraqi Security Forces and Kurdish Peshmerga;

(10) over 500 acres of productive agricultural lands in eastern Nineveh Governate

have been burned in cases of arson in May 2019 alone, destroying significant wheat and barley cultivation areas;

(11) these agricultural resources are critical to northern Iraq’s livelihood, especially that of minority populations, and continued crop arson prevents safe and prosperous return of minority populations as well as complicates stabilization efforts; and

(12) facilitating the success of communities in Sinjar and the Nineveh Plains requires a commitment from international, Iraqi, Kurdish, and local authorities, in partnership with local faith leaders, to promote the safety and security of all people, especially religious and ethnic minorities.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it should remain a policy priority of the United States, working with international partners, the Government of Iraq, the Kurdistan Regional Government, and local populations, to support the safe return of displaced indigenous people of the Nineveh Plain and Sinjar to their ancestral homeland;

(2) it should be a policy priority of the Government of Iraq, the Kurdish Regional Government, the United States, and the international community to guarantee the restoration of fundamental human rights, including property rights, to genocide victims, and to see that ethnic and religious pluralism survives in Iraq;

(3) Iraqi Security Forces and the Kurdish Peshmerga should work to more fully integrate all communities, including religious minority communities, to counter current and future terrorist threats; and

(4) the United States, working with international allies and partners, should continue to lead coordination of efforts to provide for the safe return and future security of religious minorities in the Nineveh Plain and Sinjar.

AMENDMENT NO. 148 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle E of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16. MODIFICATIONS TO REQUIRED TESTING BY MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY OF GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE ELEMENT OF BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM.

Section 1689 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2631; 10 U.S.C. 2431 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “, when possible,”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “, including the use of threat-representative countermeasures” before the period;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (8);

(3) by striking subsection (d);

(4) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d); and

(5) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by striking the last sentence.

AMENDMENT NO. 149 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER OF ILLINOIS

Page 65, line 3, strike “90 days” and insert “180 days”.

Page 65, line 6, before the period at the end, insert the following: “and receives approval for such termination from the committees”.

Page 65, line 10, insert “to multiple Federal agencies” before “known”.

AMENDMENT NO. 150 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle E of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16. INDEPENDENT STUDY ON IMPACTS OF MISSILE DEFENSE DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall seek to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study on the impacts of the development and deployment of long-range missile defenses of the United States on the security of the United States as a whole.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study under subsection (a) shall—

(1) consider whether security benefits obtained by the deployment of long-range missile defenses of the United States are undermined or counterbalanced by adverse reactions of potential adversaries, including both rogue states and near-peer adversaries; and

(2) consider the effectiveness of the long-range missile defense efforts of the United States to deter the development of ballistic missiles, in particular by both rogue states and near-peer adversaries.

(c) SUBMISSION.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees the study under subsection (a), without change.

(d) FORM.—The study shall be submitted under subsection (c) in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 151 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EUROPEAN INVESTMENTS IN NATIONAL SECURITY.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is central to United States-European defense matters; and

(2) military cooperation and coordination in Europe among NATO member countries should complement NATO efforts and not detract from NATO military system interoperability and burden sharing among NATO allies.

AMENDMENT NO. 152 OFFERED BY MS. FRANKEL OF FLORIDA

Page 904, after line 10, insert the following section:

SEC. 1614. INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WOMEN AND VIOLENT EXTREMISM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the head of any element of the intelligence community the Director determines appropriate, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an intelligence assessment on the relationship between women and violent extremism and terrorism, including an assessment of—

(1) the historical trends and current state of women’s varied roles in all aspects of violent extremism and terrorism, including as recruiters, sympathizers, perpetrators, and combatants, as well as peace-builders and preventers;

(2) how women’s roles in all aspects of violent extremism and terrorism are likely to change in the near- and medium-term;

(3) the extent to which the unequal status of women affects the ability of armed combatants and terrorist groups to enlist or conscript women as combatants and perpetrators of violence;

(4) how terrorist groups violate the rights of women and girls, including child, early, and forced marriage, abduction, sexual violence, and human trafficking, and the extent

to which such violations contribute to the spread of conflict and terrorist activities; and

(5) opportunities to address the security risk posed by female extremists and leverage the roles of women in counterterrorism efforts.

(b) CLASSIFICATION.—The assessment required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Armed Services, of the Senate; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Armed Services, of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 153 OFFERED BY MR. GAETZ OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 898. REPORT AND STRATEGY ON TERMINATED FOREIGN CONTRACTS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on contracts performed in foreign countries for which the contract was terminated for convenience because of actions taken by the government of, or an entity located in, the foreign country that impeded the ability of the contractor to perform the contract. Such report shall include, for each contract so terminated—

- (1) the specific contract type;
- (2) the good or service that is the subject of the contract;
- (3) the contracting entity within the Department of Defense;
- (4) the annual and total value of the contract;
- (5) the foreign countries involved in implementing the contract;
- (6) an identification of the government of, or entity located in, the foreign country that impeded the ability of the contractor to perform the contract;
- (7) the rationale, if any, for impeding the ability of the contractor to perform the contract, and an analysis of whether the rationale contradicted and requirements of the Federal Acquisition Regulation;
- (8) the increased costs incurred by the Department of Defense because of the termination; and
- (9) any additional information, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) STRATEGY.—The Secretary of Defense, in collaboration with the Secretary of State, shall develop a strategy and accompanying guidelines for contractors and other Federal Government employees involved in the performance of Department of Defense contracts in foreign countries to ensure such contracts are not subject to interference, contract meddling, or favoritism by government of, or an entity located in, the foreign country. Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the strategy and accompanying guidelines.

AMENDMENT NO. 154 OFFERED BY MR. GAETZ OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle J of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 597. RECOMMENDING THAT THE PRESIDENT GRANT LIEUTENANT COLONEL RICHARD COLE, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE (RET.), AN HONORARY AND POSTHUMOUS PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF COLONEL.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Richard E. Cole (in this section referred to as “Cole”) graduated from Steele High School in Dayton, Ohio, and completed two years at Ohio University before enlisting in the Army Air Corps in November, 1940.

(2) Cole completed pilot training and was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in July, 1941.

(3) On April 18, 1942, the United States conducted air raids on Tokyo led by Lieutenant Colonel James “Jimmy” Doolittle, which later became known as “the Doolittle Raid”.

(4) Cole flew in the Doolittle Raid as Lieutenant Colonel Doolittle’s co-pilot in aircraft number 1.

(5) For their outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States, the Doolittle Raiders, including Cole, were awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 2014.

(b) RECOMMENDATION OF HONORARY PROMOTION FOR RICHARD E. COLE.—Pursuant to section 1563 of title 10, United States Code, Congress recommends that the President grant Lieutenant Colonel Richard E. Cole, United States Air Force (retired), an honorary and posthumous promotion to the grade of colonel.

(c) ADDITIONAL BENEFITS NOT TO ACCRUE.—The advancement of Richard E. Cole on the retired list of the Air Force under subsection (b) shall not affect the retired pay or other benefits from the United States to which Richard E. Cole would have been entitled based upon his military service, or affect any benefits to which any other person may become entitled based on such military service.

AMENDMENT NO. 155 OFFERED BY MR. GALLAGHER OF WISCONSIN

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . REPORT ON ZTE COMPLIANCE WITH SUPERSIDING SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND SUPERSIDING ORDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the compliance of Zhongxing Telecommunications Equipment Corporation (ZTE Corporation) and ZTE Kangxun Telecommunications Ltd. (ZTE Kangxun) (collectively, “ZTE”) with the Superseding Settlement Agreement and Superseding Order reached with the Department of Commerce on June 8, 2018.

(b) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form and publicly accessible, but may include a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 156 OFFERED BY MR. GALLAGHER OF WISCONSIN

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR NATIONAL SECURITY INNOVATION CAPITAL.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, for Defense Innovation Unit (DIU) Prototyping is hereby increased by \$75,000,000 (to be used in support of national security innovation capital).

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in di-

vision D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, advanced component development and prototypes, advanced innovative technologies, line 096 (PE 0604250D8Z) is hereby reduced by \$75,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 157 OFFERED BY MR. GALLAGHER OF WISCONSIN

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1262. LIMITATION ON REMOVAL OF HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO. LTD. FROM ENTITY LIST OF BUREAU OF INDUSTRY AND SECURITY.

The Secretary of Commerce may not remove Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd. (in this section referred to as “Huawei”) from the entity list maintained by the Bureau of Industry and Security and set forth in Supplement No. 4 to part 744 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, until the Secretary certifies to Congress that—

- (1) neither Huawei nor any senior officers of Huawei have engaged in actions in violation of sanctions imposed by the United States or the United Nations in the 5-year period preceding the certification;
- (2) Huawei has not engaged in theft of United States intellectual property in that 5-year period;
- (3) Huawei does not pose an ongoing threat to United States telecommunications systems or critical infrastructure; and
- (4) Huawei does not pose a threat to critical infrastructure of allies of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 158 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO OF ARIZONA

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 520. REPORT ON NATIONAL GUARD AND UNITED STATES NORTHERN COMMAND CAPACITY TO MEET HOMELAND DEFENSE AND SECURITY INCIDENTS.

Not later than September 30, 2020, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall, in consultation with the Commander of United States Northern Command, submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

- (1) A clarification of the roles and missions, structure, capabilities, and training of the National Guard and the United States Northern Command, and an identification of emerging gaps and shortfalls in light of current homeland security threats to our country.
- (2) A list of the resources that each State and Territory National Guard has at its disposal that are available to respond to a homeland defense or security incident, with particular focus on a multi-State electromagnetic pulse event.
- (3) The readiness and resourcing status of forces listed pursuant to paragraph (2).
- (4) The current strengths and areas of improvement in working with State and Federal interagency partners.
- (5) The current assessments that address National Guard readiness and resourcing of regular United States Northern Command forces postured to respond to homeland defense and security incidents.
- (6) A roadmap to 2040 that addresses readiness across the spectrum of long-range emerging threats facing the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 159 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO OF ARIZONA

Strike section 852 and insert the following:
SEC. 852. ASSURED SECURITY AGAINST INTRUSION ON UNITED STATES MILITARY NETWORKS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense shall

only award contracts for the procurement of telecommunications equipment and services for national security installations in territories of the United States located in the Pacific Ocean to allowed contractors.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to contracts for the procurement of telecommunications equipment and services that—

(1) do not process or carry any information about the operations of the Armed Forces of the United States or otherwise concern the national security of the United States; or

(2) cannot route or redirect user data traffic or permit visibility into any user data or packets that such services or facilities transmit or otherwise handle.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the restriction of subsection (a) upon a written determination that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States and either—

(1) a contractor that is not an allowed contractor would not have the ability to track, record, listen, or otherwise access data or voice communications of the Department of Defense through the provision of the telecommunications equipment or services; or

(2) a qualified allowed contractor is not available to perform the contract at a fair and reasonable price.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ALLOWED CONTRACTOR.—The term “allowed contractor” means an entity (including any affiliates or subsidiaries) that is a contractor or subcontractor (at any tier)—

(A) for which the principal place of business of such entity is located in the United States or in a foreign country that is not an adversary of the United States; and

(B) that does not have significant connections, including ownership interests in, or joint ventures with, any entity identified in paragraph (f)(3) of section 889 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232; 132 Stat. 1918; 41 U.S.C. 3901 note).

(2) NATIONAL SECURITY INSTALLATION.—The term “national security installation” means any facility operated by the Department of Defense.

AMENDMENT NO. 160 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI OF CALIFORNIA

Page 891, after line 14, insert the following:
SEC. 1609. DEMONSTRATION OF BACKUP AND COMPLEMENTARY POSITIONING, NAVIGATION, AND TIMING CAPABILITIES OF GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM.

Effective on June 1, 2019, section 1606 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91; 131 Stat. 1725) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “the date that is 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “December 31, 2020”; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “December 31, 2020”.

AMENDMENT NO. 161 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle A of title XXXV, insert the following:

SEC. 35 . MILITARY TO MARINER PROGRAM.

(a) CREDENTIALING SUPPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard operates, in coordination with one another and with the United States Committee on the Marine Transportation System, and in consultation with the Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee, shall identify all training and experience within each of the Armed Forces that may qualify for merchant mariner

credentialing, and submit a list of all identified training and experience to the United States Coast Guard National Maritime Center for a determination of whether such training and experience counts for credentialing purposes.

(b) REVIEW OF APPLICABLE SERVICE.—The United States Coast Guard Commandant shall make a determination of whether training and experience counts for credentialing purposes, as described in subsection (a), not later than 6 months after the date on which the United States Coast Guard National Maritime Center receives a submission under subsection (a) identifying a training or experience and requesting such a determination.

(c) FEES AND SERVICES.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard operates, with respect to the applicable services in their respective departments, shall—

(1) take all necessary and appropriate actions to provide for the waiver of fees through the National Maritime Center license evaluation, issuance, and examination for members of the Armed Forces on active duty, if a waiver is authorized and appropriate, and, if a waiver is not granted, take all necessary and appropriate actions to provide for the payment of fees for members of the Armed Forces on active duty by the applicable service to the fullest extent permitted by law;

(2) direct the Armed Forces to take all necessary and appropriate actions to provide for Transportation Worker Identification Credential cards for members of the Armed Forces on active duty pursuing or possessing a mariner credential, such as implementation of an equal exchange process for active duty service members at no or minimal cost;

(3) ensure that members of the Armed Forces who are to be discharged or released from active duty and who request certification or verification of sea service be provided such certification or verification no later than one month after discharge or release;

(4) ensure the Armed Forces have developed, or continue to operate, as appropriate, the online resource known as Credentialing Opportunities On-Line to support separating members of the Armed Forces who are seeking information and assistance on merchant mariner credentialing; and

(5) not later than one year after the date of enactment of this section, take all necessary and appropriate actions to review and implement service-related medical certifications to merchant mariner credential requirements.

(d) ADVANCING MILITARY TO MARINER WITHIN THE EMPLOYER AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard operates shall have direct hiring authority to employ separated members of the Armed Forces with valid merchant mariner licenses or sea service experience in support of United States national maritime needs, including the Army Corps of Engineers.

(2) APPOINTMENTS OF RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—Except in the case of positions in the Senior Executive Service, the requirements of section 3326(b) of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to the hiring of a separated member of the Armed Forces under paragraph (1).

(e) SEPARATED MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES.—In this section, the term “separated member of the Armed Forces” means an individual who—

(1) is retiring or is retired as a member of the Armed Forces;

(2) is voluntarily separating or voluntarily separated from the Armed Forces at the end of enlistment or service obligation; or

(3) is administratively separating or has administratively separated from the Armed Forces with an honorable or general discharge characterization.

AMENDMENT NO. 162 OFFERED BY MS. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

Page 662, line 25, after “commanders” insert the following: “and the effects on preparedness to provide support to States and territories in connection with natural disasters, threats, and emergencies”.

AMENDMENT NO. 163 OFFERED BY MS. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

At the end of subtitle B of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3 . COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP OF VIEQUES AND CULEBRA, PUERTO RICO.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Defense should explore all avenues and alternatives to expedite the ongoing cleanup and environmental restoration process in the former military training sites located on the island-municipalities of Vieques and Culebra, Puerto Rico;

(2) the Department of Defense should work with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Government of Puerto Rico to ensure the decontamination process is conducted in a manner that causes the least possible intrusion on the lives of island residents and minimizes public health risks; and

(3) the Federal Government should collaborate with local and private stakeholders to effectively address economic challenges and opportunities in Vieques, Culebra, and the adjacent communities of the former United States Naval Station Roosevelt Roads.

(b) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study and submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the status of the Federal cleanup and decontamination process in the island-municipalities of Vieques and Culebra, Puerto Rico. The study shall include a comprehensive analysis of the following:

(1) The pace of ongoing cleanup and environmental restoration efforts in the former military training sites in Vieques and Culebra.

(2) Potential challenges and alternatives to accelerate the completion of such efforts, including their associated costs and any impact they might have on the public health and safety of island residents.

AMENDMENT NO. 164 OFFERED BY MS. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

At the end of subtitle B of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10 . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COUNTERDRUG ACTIVITIES IN THE TRANSIT ZONE AND CARIBBEAN BASIN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) combating transnational criminal organizations and illicit narcotics trafficking across the transit zone and the Caribbean basin, particularly in and around Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands, is critical to the national security of the United States;

(2) the Department of Defense should work with the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of State, and other relevant Federal, State, local, and international partners to improve surveillance capabilities and maximize the effectiveness of counterdrug operations in the region; and

(3) the Secretary of Defense should, to the greatest extent possible, ensure United States Northern Command and United States Southern Command have the necessary assets to support and increase counter-drug activities within their respective areas of operations in the transit zone and the Caribbean basin.

AMENDMENT NO. 165 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR OF ARIZONA

Page 408, line 7, strike "and".

Page 408, line 10, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

Page 408, after line 10, insert the following new subparagraph:

(C) ensure that the United States will eliminate dependency on rare earth materials from China by fiscal year 2025.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for including my amendment in the en bloc. This amendment is cosponsored by Chairwoman WATERS.

Russia interfered in our election. To date, our sanctions have been illusory. A few individuals have been told they can't get visas to visit the United States. They will never see Disneyland.

This amendment provides real, serious sanctions on the Russian state by saying that no U.S. person can make additional purchases of Russian sovereign debt.

It provides a mechanism for removing these sanctions. If the administration concludes that Russia goes just one election cycle without interfering in our election, and if Congress agrees with that conclusion, then these sanctions are lifted.

Finally, the amendment narrowly defines interference in our elections. It makes it plain that if Russian television wants to editorialize or Putin wants to put out a press release, that is fine. Rather, it is interference in our election where Russia interferes with voter tabulation or voter registration processes, where Russia steals information for the purpose of influencing our election, or where Russian hackers use false flag communications pretending to be American spokesmen when they are not.

We need a serious mechanism to punish Russia for what they did in prior elections and to deter them from interfering in our future elections. This amendment does that, and I am pleased to include it in the en bloc.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me time and including my amendment in the en bloc.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the en bloc package. I thank Chairman SMITH

and Ranking Member THORNBERRY for their assistance on my amendment and thank the Rules Committee for recognizing the importance of this issue.

My amendment sends a clear signal to the European Union on the importance of the primacy of NATO over our shared defense interests.

As some European capitals push for the formation of a European Union army, my amendment expresses the importance of NATO centrality over our defense policy architecture and the necessity of military system interoperability and burden-sharing efforts among NATO allies.

We all know that increases in European military capability must be made by our European allies to comply with their NATO obligations. Investments underway in the form of the PESCO pact and the European Defense Fund can risk system interoperability and present divergent spending priorities within our alliance. EU defense investments should take place under the NATO umbrella to ensure accountability and the guarantee of U.S. influence.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues again for their support of this amendment.

□ 1615

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), my fellow Washingtonian.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this package.

My amendment in this package would help curb the corrupt influence of foreign money in our politics.

The Emoluments Clause of the Constitution already requires retired military officers who want to work for a foreign government to first receive permission from their service in the State Department and to disclose the nature of their work. My amendment would make the approved activities available to Congress and to the public.

We still have a long way to go to constrain foreign influence peddling and corruption in Washington. We saw this with General Flynn, who concealed his work lobbying for the Turkish Government in a dispute with the United States in the 2016 Presidential election.

We trust our retired military officials to speak in the best interest of the United States, and when they are being paid to further another country's agenda, we deserve to know.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment package.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member THORNBERRY and Chairman SMITH for including my three amendments, amendments No. 162, 163, and 164, in this en bloc package.

Amendment 162 requires the Department of Defense to review the effects

on preparedness and support to States and territories in connection with natural disasters, threats, and emergencies prior to inactivating Army watercraft units.

There are four of these vessels in Puerto Rico. They were instrumental during the recovery process after Hurricane Maria and conducted several recovery missions, including delivering food and other essentials to island municipalities and the Virgin Islands.

This role should be taken into account as part of the review process prior to divesting any of the Army's watercraft systems, especially considering the multiple jurisdictions that have been recently impacted by natural disasters.

Amendment No. 163 seeks to help us speed up the Federal cleanup and decontamination process in the former military ranges on the island municipalities of Vieques and Culebra. Specifically, my amendment directs the General Accounting Office to complete a study and a report to the congressional defense committees on the status of the process, including an analysis of the pace of ongoing environmental restoration efforts and potential challenges and alternatives to accelerate their completion. This comprehensive study will allow us to explore the most effective and secure methods to complete the cleanup process in Vieques and Culebra, which is vital to improve the quality of life of island residents.

The last amendment, amendment No. 164, highlights the importance of the Department of Defense counter-drug operations in the transit zone and Caribbean basin. It expresses the sense of Congress that combating transnational organizations in the region, particularly in and around Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, is critical to national security of the United States, and that the Department of Defense shall work with the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State and other relevant partners to improve surveillance capabilities and maximize the effectiveness of counter-drug operations in the region.

That is the reason I strongly urge my colleagues to support this effort, and I thank you for including these three amendments in the en bloc package.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Chair, for 17½ years, I worked as a 911 dispatcher.

My average day consisted of handling incidents, such as coordinating police vehicle and foot pursuits, talking to suicide callers, negotiating with barricaded suspects, and talking to their victims.

One call that has stayed with me and threw me into a political world that I never wanted to be a part of, I answered a call from a little girl who was

murdered at the hands of her uncle. I was her only witness. I heard her scream. I heard her head being bashed against the wall. I heard the five shots that ultimately took her life. Her last words: "Uncle, please don't kill me. It's not my fault."

This work requires a lot of training and tough attitude to deal with critical emergencies. Unfortunately, the Federal Government currently classifies 911 dispatchers as clerical workers—secretaries. My amendment would finally recognize the critical work they do by reclassifying them as protective service occupations.

This provision costs nothing, zero, but it would bring 911 professionals, civilian workers—primarily single moms—the dignity that they deserve.

Mr. Chairman, I urge its passage.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chair, I stand today in strong support of this bipartisan amendment which includes language from the 911 SAVES Act, H.R. 1629.

Public safety telecommunicators play a pivotal role in coordinating effective responses to crises affecting our communities. By directing the urgent concerns of the public to law enforcement officials, public safety telecommunicators work to ensure emergency services are delivered where needed.

Today, there are nearly 100,000 public safety telecommunicators serving in over 6,000 call centers across the United States. Their diligence, dedication to public well-being, and steady demeanor in the presence of turmoil is needed now more than ever.

I am proud to partner with my colleague from California, a former 911 dispatcher herself, Mrs. TORRES, to ensure these dedicated public servants receive the "protective service occupations" classification from OMB which they deserve. We owe this to those who are often the first to respond to emergencies in our communities each and every day.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA).

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Torres amendment, No. 658, which recognizes the lifesaving work performed by our Nation's 911 call takers and dispatchers.

Mr. Chairman, all of the emergency activities in my own district—the police, the fire, the emergency responders—strongly support this amendment, and so I want to stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle simply stating these professionals save lives. And more than giving 911 call takers and dispatchers the recognition they deserve, it would make the standard occupational classification system more accurate and, therefore, more useful as a statistical resource.

I urge a "yes" vote, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to my amendment, No. 403, involving the Cable Ship Program.

I know that there have been some issues pointed out concerning coastal commerce, and I look forward to working through those issues as the bill gets to conference.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, again, I just want to join my colleague from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), and I look forward to working with him in the conference committee to make sure that that question is resolved.

Both of us understand the issue and, again, I look forward to a satisfactory result, which would make the real gist of the amendment move forward, which is to make sure we have cable ship capacity to protect our Nation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I don't have any more speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Congressman THORNBERRY for the time as well as his leadership, as well as the chair of the Armed Services Committee, because this is very important.

Recently, I was looking at the photos of the young men and women who hang on the wall of my office. They died in Iraq—some of them I knew; some of the families I knew, some I didn't know; some I still stay in touch with.

At this point, we have lost so much, we have given so much, it is hard to understand why further engagement is necessary. And yet, of the many injustices that remain, one, particularly, stands out.

The dark twisted ideology of ISIS decimated the religious minority communities, primarily of northern Iraq, almost 4 million persons. ISIS attempted to exterminate, to kill off Yazidis, Christians, and other minority populations.

Now, since then, the Iraqi Army, with our support and with the support of an international coalition, has fought hard and fought ISIS off. They are gone but not yet exterminated.

We have shifted substantial economic aid, but there is one more thing we should do: provide security in northern Iraq through the integration of the religious minorities into the Iraqi Government security forces, as well as the Kurdish forces.

I thank both the chair and the ranking member for their support.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I urge support of the en bloc package, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to Amendment No. 47, which directs the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to reclassify public safety telecommunications officers, also called 911 dispatchers, as a protective service occupation in the U.S. Government's Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system. This Amendment would have no direct effect on these workers' wages, benefits, or other resources; proponents of this reclassification have stated that "the benefit of reclassification is recognition and respect."

The SOC classification system is a federal statistical standard used across agencies in data collection. According to OMB, "[t]he SOC is designed exclusively for statistical purposes." Changes to the codes affect multiple data sources frequently used by policymakers, researchers, and employers, including the American Community Survey, the nation's largest household survey; the Current Population Survey (CPS), the key source of our monthly employment numbers; and the Occupational Employment Statistics (OES), the authoritative source of employment and wage information by occupation.

A standing committee at OMB, the SOC Policy Committee (SOCPC), is responsible maintaining the accuracy of these codes using well-defined principles. The SOCPC undertakes a routine revision of the codes roughly once per decade; the process spans multiple years and "involves extensive background research, periods of public comment, review of comments, and implementation of revisions." During its latest revision, which began in early 2012 and was finalized in 2018, OMB specifically rejected comments requesting it reclassify 911 dispatchers as directed in Amendment No. 47. In its response to public comments presented in the May 2014 Federal Register, the Obama Administration's OMB explained it "did not accept these recommendations based on Classification Principle 2, which states that workers are coded according to the work performed. The work performed is that of a dispatcher, not a first responder." In 2016, the previous administration's OMB declined a similar request for reclassification. Based on the principles OMB's policy committee applies to determine SOC codes, 911 telephone dispatchers are already properly and accurately classified.

Furthermore, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), in a written communication with the Education and Labor Committee on April 26, 2019, reported that the change made by H.R. 1629, a bill identical to Amendment No. 47, would "impact computer systems, training, documentation, and other processes" and that "[s]uch unplanned changes require time and resources to implement and could adversely affect other survey activities." Moreover, changes outside of the routine revision process would undermine the goal of data continuity, limiting data sources' usefulness for their key purpose of statistical analysis; create precedent for disrupting the standard SOC revision process; and undermine the SOCPC's authority as experts to apply the classification principles to determine what accuracy requires.

Public safety telecommunications officers perform critical, challenging work. They deserve our honor and gratitude for their efforts. However, considering the many alternative ways policymakers could confer “recognition and respect,” as the proponents are seeking, there is little policy justification for this Amendment’s approach to achieving that goal. In conclusion, mandating a change to a statistical code would not affect these workers’ wages, benefits, or other resources—but it would disrupt data series continuity; require significant additional work for government agencies, researchers, employers, and others; and intervene in an official, routine government data-collection and statistical process.

COMMUNICATIONS OF APRIL 26, 2019 FROM THE BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS TO THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR REGARDING H.R. 1629 (SAME AS AMENDMENT NO. 47)

QUESTIONS RELATED TO H.R. 1629

1. How will H.R. 1629 impact the current population survey and occupational employment statistics?

2. H.R. 1629 would require the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to implement a change in the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system regarding public safety telecommunications. This requirement would alter the existing process for periodically reviewing and updating the SOC, which involves extensive background research, periods of public comment, review of comments, and implementation of revisions.

Federal statistical agencies, including the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) are currently in various stages of implementing the 2018 revisions to the SOC (<https://www.bls.gov/soc/socimp.htm>), which the Office of Management and Budget released in a November 28, 2017 Federal Register notice (<https://www.bls.gov/soc/2018/soc2018final.pdf>). In particular, the Current Population Survey (CPS) and the Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) program are actively using the 2018 SOC and any changes to the SOC structure would impact computer systems, training, and documentation as well as the systems of federal and other data users downstream, such as the BLS Employment Projections (EP) program and the Employment and Training Administration’s Occupational Information Network (O*NET).

The CPS is a monthly survey with a sample of 60,000 households. CPS occupational and industry data are coded according to the most detailed level of the relevant classification system possible, accounting for factors such as disclosure concerns for small occupations and the ability to code occupations based on the detail provided by household respondents. This CPS occupational coding system closely aligns with the SOC, but provides data on about 530 occupations, compared with 820 in the full SOC. The Census Bureau is responsible for applying occupational codes. An overview of how they are implementing the 2018 SOC is outlined here <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/working-papers/2019/demo/sehswp2019-19.pdf>. Therefore, there is no guarantee that even if this change were to occur, the Census Bureau would code at that level of detail.

The OES program could make the needed changes. The data would show changes in the employment and wages for major groups affected by the change in classification.

2. Will this bill have an impact on wage class service contracts?

BLS is not involved in wage setting for service contracts. To the extent that any published BLS data are used in such wage setting, any changes to those data could impact wages.

3. Will implementing H.R. 1629 be difficult for the BLS to do?

BLS uses the SOC in several surveys. Any changes to the SOC structure would impact computer systems, training, documentation, and other processes. Such unplanned changes require time and resources to implement and could adversely affect other survey activities.

4. Are there plans for a revision of occupational classifications?

The SOC is revised periodically, with the interagency SOC Policy Committee making recommendations to OMB for changes. OMB has not officially stated when the next SOC revision will occur, although some indications are that the next SOC will be for the year 2028. If they follow past practices, OMB is likely to publish an initial Federal Register notice soliciting public comment around 2024. Detailed information on the revision process for 2018 is made available here, including a document called “Revising the Standard Occupational Classification” which provided detailed history on the revision process and guidance on submission of suggestions for changes for the 2018 SOC revision.

5. What other consequences are there if H.R. 1629 is implemented?

Implementation of H.R. 1629 would alter the existing process for periodically reviewing and updating the SOC, which involves extensive background research, periods of public comment, review of comments, and implementation of revisions.

The revision process includes solicitations of public comment in the form of Federal Register notices. During the lengthy and comprehensive SOC revision process, the SOC Policy Committee establishes interagency workgroups charged with reviewing comments received in response to Federal Register notices and providing recommendations to the SOC Policy Committee. Guided by the SOC classification principles and coding guidelines, the SOC Policy Committee reviews the recommendations from the workgroups and reaches decisions by consensus. This work process is established to ensure that the review is conducted in alignment with the 2018 SOC classification principles and coding guidelines, which are available starting on page 10 of the 2018 SOC User Guide (https://www.bls.gov/soc/2018/soc_2018_user_guide.pdf).

In response to the May 22, 2014, Federal Register notice, the SOC Policy Committee received and reviewed six comments regarding 9-1-1 dispatchers. These dockets were reviewed simultaneously by the SOC Policy Committee and grouped under docket 1-0199 Dispatchers, Public Safety Telecommunicators. The full SOC Policy Committee response to docket 1-0199 is available at: https://www.bls.gov/soc/2018/soc_responses_May_2014.htm.

In response to the July 22, 2016, Federal Register notice, the SOC Policy Committee received and reviewed over 4,000 comments regarding 9-1-1 dispatchers. The full list of comments is available here. For comments related only to 9-1-1 dispatchers, filter the subject column for “Police, Fire, and Ambulance Dispatchers.” The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) makes public comments available from <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=OMB-2016-0006-0001>.

During the revision process for 2018, a guiding classification principle was added to emphasize the importance of maintaining time series continuity, to the maximum extent possible. Modifications to the structure in intervening years may be inconsistent with this principle.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by

the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 733, insert after line 15 the following:
SEC. 1092. PAROLE IN PLACE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any alien who is a member of the Armed Forces and each spouse, widow, widower, parent, son, or daughter of that alien shall be eligible for parole in place under section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) parole in place reinforces family unity;

(2) disruption to servicemembers must be minimized, in order to faithfully execute their objectives;

(3) separation of military families must be prevented;

(4) military readiness must be the supreme objective;

(5) servicemembers are given peace of mind, relieved of the stressful burden worrying about their loved ones; and

(6) Congress reaffirms parole in place authority for the Secretary of Homeland Security.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment that would preserve parole in place for the loved ones of our Active-Duty servicemembers.

Parole in place allows military family members who have come to the United States illegally and are unable to adjust their immigration status to temporarily remain in the country.

My amendment would preserve the parole in place program and reaffirm the DHS Secretary’s authority to keep families together and to minimize disruption to our servicemembers through this vital program.

Now, under parole in place, a servicemember and their prospective spouse, widow, widower, parent, son, or daughter is eligible for temporary protection under the Immigration and Nationality Act. This program is imperative to ensuring our troops are free of the burden that their loved ones will be subjected to deportation while they dutifully serve our Nation.

The current administration is interested in scaling back the program, further waging a war against immigrants. Ending parole in place would be detrimental to the troops and the fabric of our Nation.

Regardless of military branch, all servicemembers should be granted

peace of mind that their families are safe at home while they risk their lives abroad.

Deployments are tough enough on our military families to endure, conflated with the looming shadow of deportation, the emotional toll is simply unbearable. Our troops must be consistently prepared and focused on protecting our freedoms. The least we can do is to protect their families.

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

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to codify a 2013 USCIS memo establishing parole in place for unlawful aliens, spouses, children, and parents of Active-Duty forces.

While I support the underlying rationale behind this amendment and also that policy, I cannot support this because it is too vague, broad, and ambiguous, and it does not accomplish the purpose for which it is intended. The purpose is to protect those servicemembers.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell you what this does is we don't even ask the servicemember if they want that person here. So if the person is a victim of domestic violence, escaping a spouse who is following them, there is no provision to even ask the spouse: Do you want this person to be living close to you that you are trying to escape?

It does not take into account any underlying crimes that that person may or may not have committed. Whether it is domestic violence, sexual battery, it puts the other servicemembers at risk when we don't.

Mr. Chairman, specifically, the memo provided that these relatives or anyone who has ever served in the U.S. Armed Forces for any period of time, with or without regard to whether the discharge was honorable or dishonorable, is eligible to receive parole on a categorical basis.

Mr. Chairman, we can't honor folks who have been dishonorably discharged. We are not honoring the rest of our soldiers when we honor just anyone.

□ 1630

In a 2013 meeting with the Obama administration, USCIS admitted that the servicemember is never contacted to determine whether he or she wants the unlawful aliens to receive parole in place.

It admitted there is no process in place to verify that the servicemember actually served in the Armed Forces.

The USCIS admitted that parole in place could be granted even if the servicemember was dishonorably discharged.

It admitted that the servicemember could have felony convictions and his or her immediate relatives would still be eligible for parole in place.

These felony convictions could be for domestic violence, sexual assault, all the things that we have come to despise and are trying to stamp out in our Armed Forces.

USCIS admitted that, even in cases of divorce, a servicemember's ex-spouse could be eligible for parole in place, and it admitted that unlawful alien relatives could still receive parole in place despite a past criminal record.

This amendment does not fix any of those issues and could allow a relative, even if estranged from a servicemember, to be granted parole.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chair, I wish to respond to a couple of points that my colleague has tried to make.

I want to stress that eligibility for this program does not mean finality. The Secretary of Homeland Security still retains final authority over whether parole in place will be granted.

This is a program that is administered on a case-by-case basis and not categorically. This program has been in place for 9 years.

I appreciate that my colleague has said that he agrees with the underlying policy. The underlying policy is that we want to give peace of mind to the men and women of our military who are laying their lives on the line for our country while their undocumented relatives at home may be under threat of deportation.

We want to give them the peace of mind that their families could stay, with the final decision, on a case-by-case basis, being made by the Secretary of Homeland Security. Nothing is categorically mandated in my amendment.

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

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I continue to oppose. Like I said, it is overly vague and broad. With the right words added to this, this could be something that works and that is helpful. But, in its current form, I can't support it.

Mr. Chair, I continue to ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

I have no further speakers, so when the gentleman is ready to close, I am ready to close.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close as well.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. TAKANO, my friend from California, for entering this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I do continue to oppose this amendment. But with that I just ask that he look at making it a little more finite and making it a little less vague, and with that I could support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I believe that I have answered the main concerns of the gentleman from Mississippi.

As I said, nothing in this amendment categorically says that eligibility means finality in terms of who is finally adjudicated to actually remain on a temporary basis, under temporary protected status.

What this amendment does is what the gentleman has agreed to is the underlying policy, which is a humane policy, which is a policy that furthers the national interests of our country in assuring the peace of mind of our military servicemembers who have family members in our country who are undocumented.

I don't think any American would begrudge someone who is putting their life on the line having the peace of mind that their family members are in this country under temporary protected status and that they are judged to have that status by the Secretary of Homeland Security on a case-by-case basis and that the Secretary remains in full control of the final decision.

Mr. 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. TAKANO).

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 B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES AT CERTAIN PROPERTIES.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds made available for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to the following properties or to an entity with an ownership interest in such property:

- (1) Trump Vineyard Estates.
- (2) Trump International Hotel & Tower, Chicago.
- (3) Mar-A-Lago Club.
- (4) Trump Grande Sunny Isles.
- (5) Trump Hollywood.
- (6) Trump Towers Sunny Isles.
- (7) Trump Plaza New Jersey.
- (8) Trump International Hotel, Las Vegas.
- (9) The Estates at Trump National.
- (10) 610 Park Avenue, New York City.
- (11) Trump International Hotel & Tower, New York.
- (12) Trump Palace.
- (13) Trump Parc.
- (14) Trump Parc East.
- (15) Trump Park Avenue.
- (16) Trump Park Residences, Yorktown.
- (17) Trump Place.
- (18) Trump Plaza, New Rochelle.
- (19) Trump Soho, New York City.
- (20) Trump Tower at City Center, Westchester.

- (21) Trump Tower, New York City.
- (22) Trump World Tower.
- (23) Trump Parc, Stamford.
- (24) Trump International Hotel and Tower, Waikiki Beach Walk.
- (25) Trump Towers, Istanbul Sisli.
- (26) Trump Ocean Club.
- (27) Trump International & Tower Hotel, Toronto.
- (28) Trump Tower at City Century City, Makati, Philippines.
- (29) Trump Tower, Mumbai.
- (30) Trump Towers, Pune.
- (31) Trump Tower, Punta Del Este, Uruguay.
- (32) Trump International Hotel & Tower, Vancouver.
- (33) 40 Wall Street, New York City.
- (34) 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York City.
- (35) Trump International Hotel, Washington
- (36) 555 California Street, San Francisco.
- (37) Trump Tower, Rio de Janeiro.
- (38) Trump International Golf Links & Hotel, Doonbeg, Ireland.
- (39) Trump National Doral, Miami.
- (40) Trump Ocean Club, Panama City, Panama.
- (41) Albemarle Estate at Trump Winery, Charlottesville, Virginia.
- (42) Trump International Golf Links, Scotland.
- (43) Trump National Golf Club, Bedminster.
- (44) Trump National Golf Club, Charlotte.
- (45) Trump National Golf Club, Colts Neck.
- (46) Trump International Golf Links, Ireland.
- (47) Trump Golf Links at Ferry Point, New York.
- (48) Trump National Golf Club, Hudson Valley.
- (49) Trump National Golf Club, Jupiter.
- (50) Trump National Golf Club, Los Angeles.
- (51) Trump International Golf Club, West Palm Beach.
- (52) Trump National Golf Club, Philadelphia.
- (53) Trump International Golf Club, Dubai.
- (54) Trump World Golf Club, Dubai.
- (55) Trump Turnberry, Scotland.
- (56) Trump National Golf Club, Potomac Falls, Virginia.
- (57) Trump National Golf Club, Westchester.

(b) WAIVER.—The President may issue a waiver to the limitation under subsection (a) for costs incurred with respect to the properties listed above if the president reimburses the Department of the Treasury for the amount of the cost associated with the expense.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, 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. Mr. Chair, the President ran for office on a promise of draining the swamp. He, in fact, personally has done exactly the opposite.

My amendment is very simple. It simply prevents the President from profiting off of his own trips to his own properties.

As you can imagine, when the President travels, he brings a large staff with him—for security, for press, for logistics, for other reasons—and then the American taxpayer ends up paying

for the meals and lodging expenses of everyone associated with that trip.

Up to this date, President Trump has spent 270 days at properties that he owns. Every time he does that, he or his family profits. That includes 99 days at Mar-a-Lago, 21 days at Trump International Hotel in D.C., 74 at Trump National Hotel Bedminster, and 59 days at Trump National Hotel Potomac.

The General Accounting Office reports that the President spends an average of 3.4 million in taxpayer dollars every time he travels just to Mar-a-Lago.

Not content to profit from the American taxpayer, the President has also, in fact, raised prices at his properties, at Mar-a-Lago and at Trump International Hotel in D.C. So, now, taxpayers are paying even more for lodging expenses associated with his staff.

My amendment limits the use of Department of Defense funds at Trump-owned properties, and it also includes a waiver where the President can still stay at these properties; he just has to reimburse the Treasury for the amount that the taxpayer is paying for his staff to stay there.

Mr. Chair, with that, I respectfully request an “aye” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

We have had this discussion on emoluments, and I hope that my colleague saw the newspaper today. Here is the newspaper, The Washington Times, front page: “Court rejects lawsuit over Trump business. Maryland, D.C. slammed down.”

So, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals has said one of the lawsuits out there is baseless.

But there is actually more going on here. This is kind of an embarrassing amendment. I am sorry that we are even debating this. This is a blatantly political amendment.

We are supposed to be here talking about providing the equipment and the training for our men and women in uniform, so they can preserve and save and keep our country secure, and this is just an attempt to embarrass the President.

It is a political amendment. It is really not worthy of discussion in the National Defense Authorization Act, and I don't think we should be wasting our time on this. It is really not worthy of the American people either.

Let me give an example on how silly and how ridiculous this amendment is. According to the language of this amendment, if the President goes to one of these properties and stays, like Mar-a-Lago down in Florida, I guess he

could have Secret Service. They are not paid out of DOD dollars. They are paid out of Homeland Security dollars. But he couldn't take the people with him who carry the nuclear football or the communications people who keep him in touch with the command and control of our nuclear enterprise if, God forbid, there was some kind of crisis or emergency.

This has not been thought out. It is totally ridiculous. Who would want to put a President of the United States through that kind of jumping through hoops and obstacles to fulfill his duties as Commander in Chief?

I think it is ridiculous. It is not worthy of us.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “no” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, the gentleman across the aisle has mischaracterized this amendment.

All of his staff can still travel with him. The President just has to reimburse the cost if it is at his own property, or he can choose to stay at a Ritz Carlton or a Holiday Inn or any other commercial property that he does not own.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, ridiculous, ludicrous, absurd, all of this, right?

Well, I guess the Constitution is absurd because the Founders of the Constitution took pains to build not one but two Emoluments Clauses right into the text of the Constitution.

Article I, section 9, clause 8 says that no one who comes to work in this room, nor the President of the United States, can collect any present emolument—which means any payment—office or title of any kind whatever—the most absolute, categorical language you will find in the Constitution—of any kind whatever from a foreign prince, king, or government, without the consent of Congress.

That is number one.

Then, number two, in the domestic Emoluments Clause, the Founders wrote in that the President was limited to his salary, which could be neither increased nor decreased by this.

My friend is waving the newspaper, and I can't wait to get to refute his point. He is going to have to read a little more deeply into judicial opinions if he is going to cite them on the floor of the House of Representatives, because this decision was simply that Maryland and the District of Columbia, whose attorneys general came forward to say that the President's receipt of emoluments at the Trump Hotel was damaging local business, did not have standing; and the court said it is up to Congress to decide this because they didn't have standing, as States, to hear it.

It was not on the merits of the case, if you go back and look. It was about whether they had standing to bring it.

We have got the standing because the Constitution of the United States says

that we are the ones whose consent is required before the President can decide to get rich in office.

The Founders wrote a Constitution where the President and everybody in this room is supposed to be 100 percent loyal and faithful to the people of the United States of America, not to foreign governments.

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

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RASKIN. This President spent 270 days at Trump-owned properties.

Think about that for a second. What if Barack Obama had not only taken the press corps and the government with him to Martha's Vineyard, but made everybody stay at the Obama Hotel and he directed the government to spend taxpayer moneys at the Obama Hotel in Martha's Vineyard?

There would be a revolution over on that side of the aisle.

That is what is happening right here. Every time that President Trump goes to Mar-a-Lago, they are spending \$60,000, estimated by the GAO, every weekend that they take government resources down there. And we pay it.

It is wrong, and it is against the Constitution.

Mr. Chair, I am totally in favor of this amendment.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I will make one brief comment and then yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Ohio.

The President isn't in this to get rich. He has given up his salary.

Mr. Chair, with that, I would like to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, since the beginning of this year, so much of our time in this Chamber has been used to move one messaging bill after another.

Many of these bills are thinly-veiled attacks on the President, but this amendment goes above and beyond.

Under this amendment, the Department of Defense is prohibited from staying at any property owned by President Trump or his family.

To be clear, this is not a prohibition on the Department of Defense utilizing facilities owned by any President; this amendment is about Donald Trump, President Donald Trump. It explicitly names the President over 50 times. Fifty times in this amendment the President is named.

This amendment says the DOD can't do for President Trump what it does for every President in the past: facilitate Presidential travel.

This is a new low. In 2016, the GAO found the Department of Defense spent more than \$2.8 million facilitating a 4-day trip for President Obama, which included a Florida vacation.

While the bulk of the Department of Defense's spending on Presidential travel is airfare, the Federal employees who are staffing the trip need to eat and sleep.

When you travel with President Obama, you can eat and sleep wherever is most convenient and most cost-effective, but when you travel with President Trump, you had better pack a sandwich and a sleeping bag, because you can't buy a hot meal or reserve a hotel room because everything is usually so full.

This is an unreasonable restriction on the DOD and on this administration.

The focus on who owns the facility instead of which facility meets the needs and mission of the Department is disgraceful.

A number of people travel with the President and the Cabinet, and they need the flexibility to choose the best facilities. Placing unnecessary restrictions on these choices for political motivations impedes the Department's mission.

As was just stated by my colleague from Colorado, this President donates his presidential salary to charity.

And he doesn't have time to worry about what the Department of Defense is doing because he is making America better.

□ 1645

We have the lowest unemployment in decades. We have got wages going up. We have got a strong economy.

He is working on trade deals. He is fighting for every worker out there, every farmer, every business; and I don't think he really has time; and it is about time that the other side of the aisle moves on and realizes who is the President of the United States, and the great things that are happening in this country, and not doing such juvenile tactics of restricting the Department of Defense to where they can go; because this would also include an employee of the Department of Defense not being able to use the expense account if something comes up.

He has got assets all around the world. It might be more applicable to be at a Trump facility. He has got things in Istanbul, the Philippines, all around the world, and you never know. We shouldn't tie the hands of the Department of Defense. It is up to them to make those decisions, and not for us to put ridiculous restrictions on.

So I sincerely urge defeat of this amendment for many of the reasons I simply have said. In the standards of this body, this is the lowest standard. We have gone to a new low.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, Department of Defense employees should not be staying at high-priced hotels.

I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support my friend, Mr. LIEU's amendment.

The Constitution bans the very self-dealing behavior that we are seeing

this President engage in on a regular basis. President Trump illegally profits every time he and his staff visits his properties, every time he hosts foreign and domestic officials, every time he plays golf on his golf courses, all paid for by the American taxpayers.

We are setting a dangerous precedent while those seeking influence and favor with the Trump administration merely spend more time at his properties with his name on them.

Let's take a significant step to counteract the self-dealing, corrupt behavior, by banning taxpayer funds flowing through the Department of Defense to go into the President's pockets.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I just want to add my support to this. We have added these prohibitions on three other bills that have come through here, State, and Foreign Operations; Commerce, Justice, and Science; and Financial Services and General Government.

It is in the Constitution. Moneys are not supposed to be spent there, and this is wrong. The country will go on with them staying at Hiltons or, as Mr. LIEU said, Ritz Carltons, or Holiday Inns, or even Red Roof Inns.

I just say that this is the right thing to do, and I add my name as a supporter.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. 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. TED LIEU).

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. RASKIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR EXHIBITION OF PARADE OF MILITARY FORCES AND HARDWARE FOR REVIEW BY THE PRESIDENT.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise appropriated for Fiscal Year 2020 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for any exhibition or parade of military forces and hardware, with the exception of the display of small arms and munitions appropriate for customary ceremonial honors and for the participation of military

units that perform customary ceremonial duties, for review by the President in a public or private exercise outside of authorized military operations or activities.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will save the American taxpayers millions of dollars, restore the appropriate focus of the July Fourth holiday as a universal, nonpartisan celebration of our Nation's independence, and ensure that taxpayer money is spent for public, nonpartisan purposes, not private, personal, and partisan ones.

This amendment will ban military parades and shows organized at the personal request of the President that serve no other governmental or military purpose.

What happened this last Fourth of July was a shameful, extravagant, and profligate display of quasi-monarchical pageantry which delighted the President and the political guests that he brought in on special tickets, but no one else.

This year's July Fourth celebration, at the President's insistence, featured seven flyovers of 24 different military aircraft, including B-2s, F-22s, F-35s, displays of ceremonial units, mobilization of tanks and other military equipment, all on the National Mall, an unprecedented Presidential speech in front of the Lincoln Memorial on the Fourth of July, and hundreds of thousands of dollars of fireworks that generated so much smoke that the fireworks could barely be seen by the people sitting on the Mall.

And all of that was inspired by the President's observation of a similar military display when he was in Paris for Bastille Day.

And guess who pays the price for all this? The taxpayers do. That is right. The National Park Service was forced to divert \$2.5 million in park fees to help cover the costs for this event.

The Washington Post estimated that the combined hourly rate of the seven flyovers of military aircraft, the B-2 Stealth Bomber, the F-22 Raptors, and the F-35 Lightnings, would have cost at least \$560,000 per hour. \$560,000 per hour.

The Defense Department said this week that it used money from the military services' training budgets to pay for these demonstrations ordered by the President's whim, and spent additional funds to transport the military equipment, which shut down traffic in Washington D.C. for most of the day.

Just yesterday, we learned the District of Columbia spent \$1.7 million, an amount that, combined with police expenses for the demonstrations through the weekend, has wiped out funding intended to protect the Nation's Capital.

And now the President is saying he wants to do it all over again next year

on the Fourth of July, and into the foreseeable future. We obviously cannot allow that to happen.

This amendment will save all of our money. It will depoliticize the Fourth of July, and call us back to its original, honorable purposes and the way we have always celebrated; and it will send a message to the executive branch that the Federal Government serves the people, not one person.

We have no kings here. We have no queens. We have no monarchs. We have no royal pageantry.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

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

Just like the last amendment, this is not worthy of us as a body. We should be here debating the National Defense Authorization Act; how to equip and train our men and women in uniform so they can protect our country.

This is a blatant, cheap shot against the President. It is just a political potshot, and it is really not worthy of us as a body.

This is a very poorly-written amendment, on top of all that. I think we would all agree, we shouldn't have political displays by a Commander-in-Chief, or anyone in the government, for that matter, where public dollars are involved.

But what about patriotic displays? Is there anything wrong with that?

Let me give you a couple of examples of things that would be prohibited by this poorly-written amendment.

Every year, you have the Army, Navy, and Air Force playing football against each other for the Commander's Cup. And especially when the Air Force and Navy play each other, they have these flyovers. They each have wonderful aviation capabilities, and they will do a flyover of the stadium, whether it is in Annapolis, or in my district in Colorado Springs.

This is written so broadly, you couldn't have any kind of authorized—any kind of—where's the word—exhibition. You could have no exhibition of military arms.

So if the President was attending that football game, you couldn't have the flyover. How silly is that?

Or if a President goes to a change of command down at Fort Bragg, something like that, you couldn't have the military vehicles present there that would be present normally at a change of command.

Mr. Chairman, those are just a couple of examples of how poorly written this amendment is.

So I would say, let's reject it. Let's get serious. Let's get back to the busi-

ness of talking about what our men and women in uniform need, and not take these silly potshots against the President.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, the hard-working men and women of the Armed Services certainly don't need a bunch of ceremonial pageantry paid for by the taxpayers simply because the President decides, upon a monarchical whim, that he wants to see one outside in front of the Lincoln Memorial.

The gentleman from Colorado says that this is too broadly written. On the contrary, it is very specifically written. It would still permit ceremonial displays of units that have been traditionally used at ceremonies and events, such as the Presidential Salute Battery, the Old Guard, the Fife and Drum Corps, Blue Angels, Thunderbirds, and so on.

What it will not permit is the President himself calling up for a private or public exercise outside of authorized military operations or activities, these kinds of exhibitions or parades.

So if it is traditional, if it is something that the Army and the Navy have always done, if they think that there is a legitimate governmental function for it, yeah.

But the President cannot simply snap his fingers and say I want to have some kind of display of all the military weaponry because that is what I saw when I was on the Champs Elysees, and I saw them on Bastille Day marching down the street.

We know, and he has admitted publicly, that this was the genesis of the whole thing. He saw that, and he wanted that in America.

Well, guess what? That is not how we celebrate the Fourth of July in America; and we certainly don't do it with Defense Department dollars, and we certainly don't do it with taxpayer dollars.

If the President is so generous that he gives his salary back, even though he is collecting millions of dollars from all of the government expenditures down at the Trump Hotel and the Trump golf courses, and all of the foreign governments that are spending money over at the Trump Hotel—if he is so generous, then why doesn't he pay for it himself?

The taxpayers should not have to pay for such a ludicrous display of the President's own vanity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are again reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), who is a member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I know my friend from Maryland to be a very smart person.

But I also know, I was around when—and I had a 4-year Army commitment—when we went from draft to having all-volunteer. And I said back at the time, well, this means we are going to have to spend a lot of money recruiting, encouraging people, advertising to get people to join the military.

In recent years, there has been so much anti-American sentiment, and polls are showing that it has been rising, that that does have an effect on recruiting.

I was out there, it was a fantastic—it rained. That brought the temperature down, but it was fantastic. And I have already heard about two young people who said, I saw that on television. I was thinking about the military. I am now not thinking about it; I am joining.

Now, just so you know—let's see, we spend, between the Army Active Duty and the Army Reserve, Army National Guard, Air Force Active Duty, Air Force Reserve, Air National Guard, Navy Active Duty, Navy Reserve, Marine Corps Active Duty and Marine Corps Reserve, actually \$662 million in 2015, but only \$574 million in 2017. So it had been down from where it was in 2015. But this costs the military, it is projected around \$1.2 million.

I cannot imagine a more effective use of that money for showing people what they can be a part of if they join in the defense of this country.

And, heck, when I was in the Army for 4 years, we had displays, Congressmen, Senators, they would show up, and we would have a parade for them.

It seems kind of ridiculous to say we hate this President so badly, any Member of Congress, any Senator, you can go have a parade for you, but not the President. The President can't call up and say I am coming down; how about a parade; because under the language the gentleman has read, he can't ask for anything like that.

He is the Commander in Chief of all of the military; and even in Washington's day, it was a good thing for the President to have a parade, to encourage people to build up American, pro-American sentiment.

So it is not a bad thing, it is a good thing. This was money well-spent. I can't imagine a better use of military funding. And the Park Services Director said, it was a boon for them. So it was a good use, and I would encourage a "no" vote on the amendment.

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

□ 1700

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a personal perspective.

I was raised in Washington, D.C., and I remember fondly my father and mother packing the six kids in the sta-

tion wagon with the blankets, but it was never a partisan affair. It was about Democrats and Republicans and families in our Nation.

I had hundreds and hundreds of my constituents at the Lincoln Memorial say that this was the most egregious display of personal ego they have ever seen.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, insert the following:

SEC. ____ LANDS TO BE TAKEN INTO TRUST AS PART OF THE RESERVATION OF THE LYTTON RANCHERIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Lytton Rancheria of California is a federally recognized Indian tribe that lost its homeland after its relationship to the United States was unjustly and unlawfully terminated in 1958. The Tribe was restored to Federal recognition in 1991, but the conditions of its restoration have prevented it from regaining a homeland on its original lands.

(2) Congress needs to take action to reverse historic injustices that befell the Tribe and that have prevented it from regaining a viable homeland for its people.

(3) Prior to European contact there were as many as 350,000 Indians living in what is now the State of California. By the turn of the 19th century, that number had been reduced to approximately 15,000 individuals, many of them homeless and living in scattered bands and communities.

(4) The Lytton Rancheria's original homeland was purchased by the United States in 1926 pursuant to congressional authority designed to remedy the unique tragedy that befell the Indians of California and provide them with reservations called Rancherias to be held in trust by the United States.

(5) After the Lytton Rancheria lands were purchased by the United States, the Tribe settled on the land and sustained itself for several decades by farming and ranching.

(6) By the mid-1950s, Federal Indian policy had shifted back towards a policy of terminating the Federal relationship with Indian tribes. In 1958, Congress enacted the Rancheria Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 619), which slated 41 Rancherias in California, including the Lytton Rancheria, for termination after certain conditions were met.

(7) On August 1, 1961, the Federal Government terminated its relationship with the Lytton Rancheria. This termination was illegal because the conditions for termination

under the Rancheria Act had never been met. After termination was implemented, the Tribe lost its lands and was left without any means of supporting itself.

(8) In 1987, the Tribe joined three other tribes in a lawsuit against the United States challenging the illegal termination of their Rancherias. A Stipulated Judgment in the case, *Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians of the Sugar Bowl Rancheria v. United States*, No. C-86-3660 (N.D.Cal. March 22, 1991), restored the Lytton Rancheria to its status as a federally recognized Indian tribe.

(9) The Stipulated Judgment provides that the Lytton Rancheria would have the "individual and collective status and rights" which it had prior to its termination and expressly contemplated the acquisition of trust lands for the Lytton Rancheria.

(10) The Stipulated Judgment contains provisions, included at the request of the local county governments and neighboring landowners, that prohibit the Lytton Rancheria from exercising its full Federal rights on its original homeland in the Alexander Valley.

(11) In 2000, approximately 9.5 acres of land in San Pablo, California, was placed in trust status for the Lytton Rancheria for economic development purposes.

(12) The Tribe has since acquired, from willing sellers at fair market value, property in Sonoma County near the Tribe's historic Rancheria. This property, which the Tribe holds in fee status, is suitable for a new homeland for the Tribe.

(13) On a portion of the land to be taken into trust, which portion totals approximately 124.12 acres, the Tribe plans to build housing for its members and governmental and community facilities.

(14) A portion of the land to be taken into trust is being used for viticulture, and the Tribe intends to develop more of the lands to be taken into trust for viticulture. The Tribe's investment in the ongoing viticulture operation has reinvigorated the vineyards, which are producing high-quality wines. The Tribe is operating its vineyards on a sustainable basis and is working toward certification of sustainability.

(15) No gaming shall be conducted on the lands to be taken into trust by this section.

(16) No gaming shall be conducted on any lands taken into trust on behalf of the Tribe in Sonoma County after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(17) By directing that these lands be taken into trust, the United States will ensure that the Lytton Rancheria will finally have a permanently protected homeland on which the Tribe can once again live communally and plan for future generations. This action is necessary to fully restore the Tribe to the status it had before it was wrongfully terminated in 1961.

(18) The Tribe and County of Sonoma have entered into a Memorandum of Agreement as amended in 2018 in which the County agrees to the lands in the County being taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe in consideration for commitments made by the Tribe.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) COUNTY.—The term "County" means Sonoma County, California.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) TRIBE.—The term "Tribe" means the Lytton Rancheria of California.

(c) LANDS TO BE TAKEN INTO TRUST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The land owned by the Tribe and generally depicted on the map titled "Lytton Fee Owned Property to be Taken into Trust" and dated May 1, 2015, is hereby taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe, subject to valid existing rights, contracts, and management agreements related to easements and rights-of-way.

(2) LANDS TO BE MADE PART OF THE RESERVATION.—Lands taken into trust under paragraph (1) shall be part of the Tribe's reservation and shall be administered in accordance with the laws and regulations generally applicable to property held in trust by the United States for an Indian tribe.

(d) GAMING.—

(1) LANDS TAKEN INTO TRUST UNDER THIS SECTION.—Lands taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe under subsection (c) shall not be eligible for gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(2) OTHER LANDS TAKEN INTO TRUST.—Lands taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe in Sonoma County after the date of the enactment of this Act shall not be eligible for gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(e) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAW.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Memorandum of Agreement entered into by the Tribe and the County concerning taking land in the County into trust for the benefit of the Tribe, which was approved by the County Board of Supervisors on March 10, 2015, and any addenda and supplement or amendment thereto, is not subject to review or approval of the Secretary in order to be effective, including review or approval under section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 81).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It reflects a bill that passed the House earlier this year in March by a vote of 404-21.

I first introduced this bill in the 114th Congress. It was heard by the Natural Resources Committee, reported out favorably by unanimous consent. It was then reintroduced in the next Congress by my colleague Representative Jeff Denham, and it passed the House by voice vote. Then it was reported by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs in October of 2018. The bill was reintroduced again by me this Congress, and after passage in this House, it once again was reported out favorably from the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs just a few weeks ago.

This amendment would take land owned by the Lytton Rancheria in Sonoma County in my district into trust as part of the Tribe's reservation for purposes of housing and economic development. It would permanently prohibit using these lands for casino gaming, and it would uphold a memorandum of understanding carefully negotiated between the Tribe and the County of Sonoma. It reflects an exhaustive stakeholder outreach process, extensive meetings, and negotiations between the Tribe, Sonoma County, and other local governments.

This productive relationship is illustrated by support from the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors, who have jurisdiction over the land in question, and also the nearest local public service agencies, including the Windsor Fire Protection District and Windsor

Unified School District. Even California Governor Gavin Newsom is in support of this bill. In fact, there is no elected official in the area that is impacted by this bill who is on record opposed to the bill.

So I urge adoption of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition for the process of what we are doing, not necessarily the substance of the amendment at hand.

Since this bill had first been heard in our committee, there have been new voices that have been raised by the people of Windsor, California, which is the town located adjacent to the unincorporated area of the county in which this land transfer would take place. These residents have repeatedly contacted our committee asking that their voices simply be heard.

Now, for whatever the reason was, we asked the committee to have one more hearing and allow these voices to actually be heard. For whatever reason, the majority on our committee decided to silence the voices and just ram this bill through the committee. The reason I and several others voted against it in committee and on the floor was simply because of the process that went through here.

This, as has been mentioned, is not necessarily a new amendment. It is a bill, a bill that has passed this House and is sitting over in the Senate.

It is certainly my hope that this does not portend a future in which those who make the agenda of the House consider the fact that the Democratic House will so incomparably and infrequently work with a Republican Senate that we now need to take every bill that has been passed in the House and turn it into another amendment and then attach it to the next big bill that happens to go through this process. Certainly, that is not what I think would be the best way going forward.

Now, the last reason, the process for which I do object, is simply this bill does not belong on a National Defense Authorization Act. There is no defense nexus. This is transferring of lands from one area to Native Americans.

Now, heaven knows, I have had all sorts of land issues and wildlife issues on the NDAA, but in each one of those there was a nexus to a training range, a military mission. There is no connection with this particular bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his concerns.

I won't relitigate the issue of whether the amendment is made in order. That has been decided. That is why we are here.

With respect to the gentleman's concerns about local individuals who may have expressed opposition to the bill—

and again, there is no official opposition, no local government agency, no local elected officials, but some individuals in the area have opposed the bill—I would just note, in the 115th Congress, when then-Chairman BISHOP of the Natural Resources Committee supported the bill passing out of his committee and passing on the floor, the committee report itself noted those same individual voices of opposition.

I will quote: "Lastly, the committee has received a relatively large number of communications from the residents of Windsor in opposition to the bill."

There is no new opposition to this bill. It is the same individuals, and it is the same folks who the chairman at the time, himself, noted.

So I would submit, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing new here. This bill has previously won broad bipartisan support, including from my friend from Utah, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was culled out from the en bloc amendments. I am still not entirely clear why, but I think, to the extent that it deserves to be singled out and culled out, it is because it is a model for other land-to-trust bills that we sometimes see in this body. Rarely will you find a case where a Tribe negotiated more exhaustively in good faith and produced actual agreements with local government neighbors to the standard and to the level that we see in this case.

This is a good piece of legislation broadly supported by the elected officials in the area and, in many cases, having already won the strong bipartisan support from Members in both the House and the United States Senate. I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, however one wants to spin whatever issue is here, had the Democratic majority on the committee scheduled another hearing to allow those voices to be heard, I wouldn't have objected then, nor would I have objected right now.

The sad part is this is not necessarily the best of proposals. The checkerboard pattern that is created by this amendment is something in other amendments we have tried to do, to consolidate and get rid of checkerboard patterns and not create checkerboard patterns.

But here is, still, the bottom line: This establishes a precedent—this is not a precedent. We have done it before. But it establishes the wrong approach.

The National Defense Authorization Act should be about military stuff and about the defense of this Nation. This is not even a tangible concept. This is something that has nothing to do with it. We do have a partisan Rules Committee that has decided to lure some people with partisan amendments to be

put in here, but it has nothing to do with the actual bill.

We are going through a whole lot of amendments and taking a whole lot of time on the floor. The amendments to the NDAA should have something to do with the NDAA and not just pulling wandering bills that go all over the place and deciding to shove it on it just because there is a vehicle that happens to be going through this body.

That is why I said I am not talking about the substance of the bill—although there are some questions; I would have had my questions answered had there been another hearing for the new voices that want to be heard—but it is the process that we are going through. The process here is wrong. The process the Rules Committee did was wrong.

We should not be talking about these kinds of issues and taking our time on these kinds of issues on an NDAA bill. So, as I said, my opposition is purely on process, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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 116-143 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 33 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 34 by Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

Amendment No. 44 by Mr. TED LIEU of California.

Amendment No. 45 by Mr. RASKIN of Maryland.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 264, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

AYES—164

- Adams, Amash, Barragan, Bass, Beatty, Beyer, Bishop (GA), Blumenauer, Blunt Rochester, Bonamici, Boyle, Brendan F., Butterfield, Carbajal, Carson (IN), Cartwright, Case, Casten (IL), Castor (FL), Castro (TX), Chu, Judy, Cicilline, Clark (MA), Clarke (NY), Clay, Cleaver, Cohen, Courtney, Cummings, Davis (CA), Davis, Danny K., Dean, DeFazio, DeGette, DeLauro, DelBene, DeSaulnier, Deutch, Dingell, Doggett, Doyle, Michael F., Engel, Escobar, Eshoo, Espallat, Evans, Foster, Frankel, Gallego, Garamendi, Garcia (IL), Garcia (TX), Gomez, Gonzalez (TX), Green, Al (TX), Grijalva, Harder (CA), Hastings, Hayes, Heck, Himes, Horsford, Houlihan, Huffman, Jackson Lee, Jayapal, Jeffries, Johnson (GA), Kaptur, Keating, Kelly (IL), Kennedy, Khanna, Kildee, Kilmer, Kind, Krishnamoorthi, Kuster (NH), Larsen (WA), Larson (CT), Lawrence, Lawson (FL), Lee (CA), Levin (CA), Levin (MI), Lewis, Lieu, Ted, Lofgren, Lowenthal, Lowey, Malinowski, Maloney, Carolyn B., Massie, Matsui, McCollum, McGovern, McNeerney, Meeks, Meng, Moore, Morelle, Nadler, Napolitano, Neguse, Norcross, Ocasio-Cortez, Omar, Pallone, Pappas

NOES—264

- Chabot, Cheney, Cisneros, Cline, Cloud, Clyburn, Cole, Collins (GA), Collins (NY), Comer, Conaway, Connolly, Cook, Cooper, Correa, Costa, Cox (CA), Craig, Crawford, Crenshaw, Crist, Crow, Cuellar, Cunningham, Curtis, Davids (KS), Davidson (OH), Davis, Rodney, Delgado, Demings, DesJarlais, Diaz-Balart, Duffy, Duncan, Dunn, Emmer, Estes, Ferguson

- Pascarell, Payne, Pingree, Pingree, Pocan, Porter, Pressley, Price (NC), Quigley, Raskin, Rice (NY), Richmond, Rose (NY), Roybal-Allard, Ruiz, Rush, Ryan, Sablan, Sanchez, Sarbanes, Scanlon, Schakowsky, Schiff, Schneider, Schrader, Schrier, Scott, David, Serrano, Sewell (AL), Shalala, Sires, Slotkin, Smith (WA), Soto, Speier, Swalwell (CA), Takano, Thompson (CA), Thompson (MS), Titus, Tlaib, Tonko, Torres (CA), Trahan, Trone, Vargas, Vela, Velazquez, Nadler, Wasserman, Neal, Schultz, Waters, Watson Coleman, Welch, Wild, Wilson (FL), Yarmuth

- Hill (CA), Holding, Hollingsworth, Horn, Kendra S., Hoyer, Hudson, Huizenga, Hunter, Hurd (TX), Johnson (LA), Johnson (OH), Johnson (SD), Johnson (TX), Jordan, Joyce (OH), Joyce (PA), Katko, Keller, Kelly (MS), Kelly (PA), Kim, King (IA), King (NY), Kinzinger, Kirkpatrick, Kustoff (TN), LaHood, LaMalfa, Lamb, Lamborn, Langevin, Latta, Lee (NV), Lesko, Lipinski, Loeb sack, Long, Loudermilk, Lucas, Luetkemeyer, Lujan, Luria, Lynch, Maloney, Sean, Marchant, Marshall, Mast, McAdams, McBath, McCarthy, McCaul, McClintock, McEachin, McHenry, McKinley, Meadows, Meuser, Miller, Mitchell, Moolenaar, Mooney (WV), Moulton, Mucarsel-Powell, Mullin, Murphy, Newhouse, Norman, Nunes, O'Halleran, Olson, Palazzo, Palmer, Panetta, Pence, Perry, Peters, Peterson, Phillipps, Posey, Ratcliffe, Reed, Reschenthaler, Rice (SC), Rigglesman, Roby, Rodgers (WA), Roe, David P., Rogers (AL), Rogers (KY), Rooney (FL), Rose, John W., Rouda, Rouzer, Roy, Ruppertsberger, Rutherford, Scalise, Schweikert, Scott (VA), Scott, Austin, Sensenbrenner, Sherman, Sherrill, Shimkus, Simpson, Smith (MO), Smith (NE), Smith (NJ), Smucker, Spanberger, Spano, Stanton, Stauber, Stefanik, Steil, Steube, Stevens, Stewart, Stivers, Suozzi, Taylor, Thompson (PA), Thornberry, Timmons, Tipton, Torres Small (NM), Turner, Upton, Van Drew, Veasey, Wagner, Walberg, Walden, Walker, Walorski, Waltz, Watkins, Weber (TX), Webster (FL), Wenstrup, Westerman, Wexton, Williams, Wilson (SC), Wittman, Womack, Woodall, Wright, Yoho, Young, Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

- Cardenas, Fudge, Gabbard, Higgins (LA), Norton, Perlmutter, Plaskett, Radewagen

□ 1740

Mrs. BUSTOS, Messrs. PHILLIPS, VEASEY, CORREA, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. COSTA, CISNEROS, CLYBURN, LIPINSKI, CRIST, SUOZZI, HIGGINS of New York, CROW, SCOTT of Virginia, BROWN of Maryland, and Mrs. DEMINGS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CARBAJAL, NORCROSS, and KRISHNAMOORTHY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cunningham
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón
(PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson

NOT VOTING—9

Fudge
Gabbard
Higgins (LA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1752

Ms. SHERRILL and Mr. GAETZ
changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”
So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from California (Mr. TED
LIEU) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Rice (SC)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Lipinski
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler

Norton
Perlmutter
Plaskett

Radewagen
San Nicolas
Underwood

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 223, noes 205,
answered “present” 1, not voting 9, as
follows:

[Roll No. 457]

AYES—223

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Hoyer
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Ciilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)

NOES—205

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson

Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Luján
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran

Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón
(PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Amash
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1756

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. RASKIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed

Norton
Perlmutter
Plaskett

Radewagen
San Nicolas
Underwood

Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steuwe
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (FL)
Webster (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 207, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

AYES—221

Adams Garcia (IL) Neal
 Aguilar Garcia (TX) Neguse
 Allred Golden Norcross
 Amash Gomez O'Halleran
 Axne Gonzalez (TX) Ocasio-Cortez
 Barragan Omar Gottheimer
 Bass Green, Al (TX) Pallone
 Beatty Grijalva Panetta
 Bera Haaland Pappas
 Beyler Harder (CA) Pascrell
 Bishop (GA) Hastings Payne
 Blumenauer Hayes Peters
 Blunt Rochester Heck Phillips
 Bonamici Higgins (NY) Pingree
 Boyle, Brendan Hill (CA) Pocan
 F. Himes Porter
 Brown (MD) Horn, Kendra S. Pressley
 Brownley (CA) Horsford Price (NC)
 Bustos Houlihan Quigley
 Butterfield Hoyer Raskin
 Carbajal Huffman Rice (NY)
 Cardenas Jackson Lee Richmond
 Carson (IN) Jayapal Rouda
 Cartwright Jeffries Roybal-Allard
 Case Johnson (GA) Ruiz
 Casten (IL) Johnson (TX) Ruppersberger
 Castor (FL) Kaptur Ryan
 Castro (TX) Keating Sablan
 Chu, Judy Kelly (IL) Sánchez
 Cicilline Kennedy Sarbanes
 Cisneros Khanna Scanlon
 Clark (MA) Kildee Schakowsky
 Clarke (NY) Kilmer Schiff
 Clay Kind Schneider
 Cleaver Kirkpatrick Schrader
 Clyburn Krishnamoorthi Schriener
 Cohen Kuster (NH) Scott (VA)
 Connolly Lamb Scott, David
 Cooper Langevin Serrano
 Correa Larsen (WA) Sewell (AL)
 Costa Larson (CT) Shalala
 Courtney Lawrence Sherman
 Cox (CA) Lawson (FL) Sires
 Craig Lee (CA) Smith (WA)
 Crist Lee (NV) Soto
 Crow Levin (CA) Speier
 Cuellar Levin (MI) Stanton
 Cummings Lewis Stevens
 Davids (KS) Lieu, Ted Suozzi
 Davis (CA) Lipinski Swallow (CA)
 Davis, Danny K. Loebsock Takano
 Dean Lofgren Thompson (CA)
 DeFazio Lowenthal Thompson (MS)
 DeGette Lowey Titus
 DeLauro Lujan Tlaib
 DelBene Lynch Tonko
 Delgado Malinowski Torres (CA)
 Demings Maloney Trahan
 DeSaulnier Carolyn B. Trone
 Deutch Maloney, Sean Van Drew
 Dingell Matsui Vargas
 Doggett McBath Veasey
 Doyle, Michael McCollum Vela
 F. McEachin Velázquez
 Engel McGovern Visclosky
 Escobar McNERney Wasserman
 Eshoo Meeks Schultz
 Espaillat Meng Waters
 Evans Moore Watson Coleman
 Finkenauer Morelle Welch
 Fletcher Moulton Welton
 Foster Mucarsel-Powell Wild
 Frankel Murphy Wilson (FL)
 Gallego Nadler Yarmuth
 Garamendi Napolitano

NOES—207

Abraham Bishop (UT) Carter (TX)
 Aderholt Bost Chabot
 Allen Brady Cheney
 Amodei Brindisi Cline
 Armstrong Brooks (AL) Cloud
 Arrington Brooks (IN) Cole
 Babin Buchanan Collins (GA)
 Bacon Buck Collins (NY)
 Baird Bucshon Comer
 Balderson Budd Conaway
 Banks Burchett Cook
 Barr Burgess Crawford
 Bergman Murphy Crenshaw
 Biggs Calvert Cunningham
 Bilirakis Carter (GA) Curtis

Davidson (OH) Kelly (MS) Rose (NY)
 Davis, Rodney Kelly (PA) Rose, John W.
 DesJarlais Kim Rouzer
 Diaz-Balart King (IA) Roy
 Duffy King (NY) Rutherford
 Duncan Kinzinger Scalise
 Dunn Kustoff (TN) Schweikert
 Emmer LaHood Scott, Austin
 Estes LaMalfa Sensenbrenner
 Ferguson Lamborn Sherrill
 Fitzpatrick Latta Shimkus
 Fleischmann Lesko Simpson
 Flores Long Slotkin
 Fortenberry Loudermilk Smith (MO)
 Foxx (NC) Lucas Smith (NE)
 Fulcher Luetkemeyer Smith (NJ)
 Gaetz Luria Smucker
 Gallagher Marchant Spanberger
 Gallagher Marshall Spano
 Giffords Gibbons Stauder
 Gohmert Mast Stefanik
 Gonzalez (OH) McAdams Steil
 González-Colón McCarthy (PR) Steube
 Gooden McCaul Stewart
 Gosar McClintock Stivers
 Granger McHenry Taylor
 Graves (GA) McKinley Thompson (PA)
 Graves (LA) Meadows Thornberry
 Graves (MO) Meuser Timmons
 Green (TN) Miller Tipton
 Griffith Mitchell Torres Small
 Grothman Mooney (WV) (NM)
 Guest Mullin Turner
 Guthrie Newhouse Upton
 Hagedorn Norman Wagner
 Harris Nunes Walberg
 Hartzler Olson Walden
 Hern, Kevin Palazzo Walker
 Herrera Beutler Palmer Walorski
 Hice (GA) Pence Waltz
 Hill (AR) Perry Watkins
 Holding Peterson Weber (TX)
 Hollingsworth Posey Webster (FL)
 Hudson Ratcliffe Wenstrup
 Huizenga Reed Westernman
 Hunter Reschenthaler Williams
 Hurd (TX) Rice (SC) Wilson (SC)
 Johnson (LA) Riggelman Wittman
 Johnson (OH) Roby Womack
 Johnson (SD) Rodgers (WA) Woodall
 Joyce (OH) Roe, David P. Wright
 Joyce (PA) Rogers (AL) Yoho
 Katko Rogers (KY) Young
 Keller Rooney (FL) Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Fudge Norton San Nicolas
 Gabbard Perlmutter Underwood
 Higgins (LA) Plaskett
 Jordan Radewagen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1800

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. PAPPAS
 The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III insert the following:

SEC. 3. PFAS DESIGNATION, EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS, AND PRETREATMENT STANDARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall revise the list of toxic pollutants described in paragraph (1) of section 307(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1317(a)) to add per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances to such list, and

publish such revised list, without taking into account the factors listed in such paragraph.

(b) EFFLUENT STANDARDS.—As soon as practicable after the date on which the revised list is published under subsection (a), but not later than January 1, 2022, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register effluent standards under section 307(a)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1317(a)(2)) for substances added to the list of toxic pollutants pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, in accordance with sections 301(b)(2)(A) and 304(b)(2) of such Act.

(c) PRETREATMENT STANDARDS.—Not later than January 1, 2022, the Administrator shall promulgate pretreatment standards for per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances under section 307(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1317(b)).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

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

Mr. Chair, I offer this amendment on behalf of all the children and families across our Nation who have been impacted by the harmful effects of PFAS contamination.

As of August 2017, the Department of Defense identified over 400 Active and BRAC installations in the United States where there "is a known or suspected release of PFOS/PFOA."

The Environmental Working Group estimates that 475 industrial facilities may be discharging PFAS directly into bodies of water, some of which are used as a drinking water source. It also estimates that more than 100 million Americans may be drinking PFAS-tainted water.

This should be concerning to all of us because science has linked PFAS with developmental delays for children and serious health conditions, including cancer, immune system disorders, and thyroid problems.

To date, however, the EPA has yet to act to set standards under the Clean Water Act. That is why this amendment is needed.

In my home district in New Hampshire, we are grappling with this issue in a number of communities. In the town of Merrimack, industrial pollution from a manufacturer has contaminated drinking water that thousands relied on. At Pease Air Force Base on the seacoast, PFAS chemicals have been used by the military for decades and have been detected in the surrounding environment as well as private and municipal wells.

My constituents have become far too familiar with the impacts of living in communities where these toxic chemicals are present. This is more than just a matter of tests, data sets, and parts per trillion in the abstract. The burdens of these chemicals are carried by real people. I hear their stories firsthand.

A woman who has taken an active role on the front lines of this fight and who contacted my office recently

worked at Pease Air Force Base for almost 10 years. Her son was exposed to PFAS prenatally and for 5 years while attending preschool and kindergarten by drinking water from an affected well. He was sick often as a child, and his mother has ongoing concerns about his health and immune system stemming from that early exposure. Not only is her family dealing with these physical impacts, they are dealing with the uncertainty and lingering questions about the facts and difficulty with testing and diagnosis, and they are left to wonder if and when things may get worse.

It is for reasons like this that I have been committed to advocating for families like these in my district and why I have joined the bipartisan PFAS task force to help come up with solutions.

While there are countless questions we must answer, due to the relentless work of advocates, community leaders, and concerned citizens, the all too pervasive issue of PFAS contamination has been brought to light.

The dedicated work of family, friends, and neighbors banding together to ask questions and demand answers has been critical, but it is time for much more than just that. It is time for us in Congress to take long-overdue action. It is time for us to push for stronger standards, invest in cleanup, and improve protections for those who have suffered from the effects of contamination.

Today, with the support of my colleagues, we can do just that. This amendment takes a critical step in holding polluters accountable and establishing proactive limits for PFAS discharge as we work to curtail contamination and support families who have been exposed.

By adding PFAS to the Clean Water Act's list of toxic pollutants and requiring EPA to set standards for discharges into our Nation's waters, we are providing the EPA with the additional tools it needs to tackle these toxic chemicals.

There is nothing more important than safeguarding the health and well-being of our communities.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote for the adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, if this amendment were limited to the 18 per- and polyfluorinated compounds that EPA knows about and has rendered a judgment on, we would be having a different debate. Formulations like PFOA and PFOS, for example, have been studied and have already been taken out of commercial use.

But this amendment, like others we will be debating, emotionally and politically requires severe action on an entire class of chemicals, maybe as many as 5,000 substances. It does so

without due diligence and scientific inquiry.

Nobody denies that there are real concerns and frustration in communities affected by PFAS contamination. My colleague has raised those concerns, and we certainly want to help those communities, especially those that host our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. The use of firefighting foam in those areas has caused PFAS to enter into ditches and canals and seep into groundwater formations.

But while we can and should take action to limit or even prohibit uncontrolled releases of PFAS-containing firefighting foam, we can't lose sight of why this foam is used in the first place. If you or your loved one are on a nuclear submarine that is carrying nuclear weapons under the Arctic icecap or involved in a fiery aircraft accident on the runway, you want the best firefighting foam available, not the second best.

The concern of these communities needs to be addressed, but this is not what is happening in this process.

Many of the compounds targeted by these amendments are parts of manufactured goods that when disposed of are not soluble in water.

Let me highlight a couple that have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration to be inserted into the human body as medical devices. Yes, lifesaving PFAS-related chemicals have been approved by the FDA. They are in medical devices and have been approved to be inserted into the body.

Mr. Chair, to the ranking member and to the chairman, the reason for the importance of going through regular order in the committee process is because we understand the chemicals. We deal with healthcare.

As far as lifesaving equipment, we are going to go through a couple of those. Many recognize what a stent is. This stent is there to open up arteries, and it saves lives and allows people to live a normal lifestyle.

This is one that was brought into my office a couple of weeks ago. Many more children than we would ever guess are born with holes in their heart. It is tough, but modern medicine and technology have allowed these children to lead and live normal lives.

How? Well, there is a medical device that is part of these 5,000 compounds of the PFAS community that saves these children's lives and allows the heart to repair itself, and they go on to live a normal life.

□ 1815

This is a National Defense Authorization bill, not a healthcare bill, not a chemical, science, EPA bill. So let's look at national defense.

Here is the F-16, with all the components that have per- or polyfluorinated compounds as part of the F-16 platform. Do we really want to essentially ban all these parts that would eventually go into some landfill, and they are not soluble, and create a

Superfund situation for the landfill into which they go?

We have heard a lot from municipal landfills that are disposing of legal nonsoluble items in regulated landfills. Do we really want to place farm land under the Superfund designation because a farmer used wastewater treatment sludge as a fertilizer?

That is why we must do our due diligence and go through regular order through the committee of jurisdiction.

I serve as the ranking member on the Committee on Environment and Climate Change. It is our duty to have oversight over the USEPA; it is our duty to protect our communities; and it is our responsibility not to overreact.

Chairman TONKO and I are actively engaged on this issue. As I have raised this, it is very complicated, but it is not impossible.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject these shortcuts and allow the committee process to work. That is the only way we can hope to address PFAS concerns without the significant unintended consequences this and these other amendments would create. Please vote against the amendment. Please allow bipartisan discussions to continue.

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chair, to close, I think it is critical that we give EPA the ability to set standards that are reasonable for PFAS that would protect public health.

In passing this amendment, we can ensure that our government can meet its most basic guaranty: that everyone—servicemembers, their families, and civilians, alike—can have confidence that the water we drink, the natural environment all around us, is clean and safe. This amendment will ensure EPA sets standards for these toxic pollutants to protect public health and the safety of all Americans. It is beyond time for us and Congress to act to take serious action on PFAS, and I urge adoption of this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer amendment No. 49 as the designee of Mr. KHANNA.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 1504 and insert the following:

SEC. 1504. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2020 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of

Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, as specified in the funding table in section 4302.

(b) REDUCTION.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in this section for operations and maintenance for overseas contingency operations, as specified in the funding table in section 4302, is hereby reduced by \$16,800,000,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding and commend her for her extraordinary leadership in having a purpose and a mission to our national security. Her leadership on having an authorization for the use of military force has been unsurpassed in the Congress, and I thank her. I know she will have amendments to that effect this legislation, as well.

Mr. Chair, I want to salute so many members of the Armed Services Committee, starting with Chairman SMITH, for his relentless efforts to advance this strong bipartisan defense authorization legislation which honors the values of our country, strengthens our security, and advances America's leadership in the world.

One week after our Nation celebrated the birth of our democracy, the Democratic House is proudly honoring that oath, the oath we take to support and defend the Constitution and to protect the American people. The Democratic majority is bringing forth responsible budgeting needed for safe, strong, and smart defense.

This legislation keeps America strong with vital action to improve the economic security and well-being of our servicemembers and families, including a much-needed pay raise.

It keeps America safe with critical steps to promote collaboration with our allies, harden our defenses against hostile foreign powers, and meet the challenges of the future, including the climate crisis, which is a national security issue.

And it keeps America smart by reaffirming Congress' constitutional oversight responsibility over the President's military actions, including by prohibiting funding for the deployment a new low-yield nuclear missile warheads.

We applaud Representative RO KHANNA and the many bipartisan cosponsors for their amendment to prohibit Federal funds from being used for any military force against Iran without congressional authorization.

As I rise to support the bill, I also rise to support Mr. KHANNA's amendment.

The bill—getting back to the bill—also is about family. It is about sur-

vivor benefits. It protects children at the border who are facing an appalling situation that is beyond the pale of civilized behavior.

I always say the same thing when people ask me what are the three most important issues facing the Congress. I say the same thing: the children, the children, the children.

This legislation prohibits Department of Defense funds from being used to House unaccompanied children forcibly separated from their parents or legal guardian by Customs and Border Protection near the border or a port of entry. And it creates oversight, requiring DOD to submit a certification that any housing provided to unaccompanied children meets Department of Homeland Security standards, including those provided in the Flores settlement.

We must take every action we can at every opportunity we find to end this situation of the children and improve the health, safety, and well-being of the children in custody.

In coming weeks, we will advance Congresswoman ESCOBAR's legislation to bring more accountability to the Department of Homeland Security and medical care standard legislation, led by Congressman RUIZ, to ensure the health and safety of children and/or adults in custody.

We support our Members who have led visits to the Border Patrol stations to find the facts and who are leading the battle cry of action on behalf of America's values about what we stand for.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important legislation. Keep America strong. It is about a pay raise for our troops, survivor benefits, about protecting our children, in addition to, again, helping us honor our oath of office to protect and defend. I urge a strong bipartisan vote for this bill to uphold our values and strengthen America.

Mr. Chair, I again thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a number of speakers over the course of the last 2 days talk about that this bill provides a pay raise. I just want to clarify that it does not.

There is an existing formula which provides the military a 3.1 percent pay raise. If we do nothing, they still get a 3.1 percent pay raise.

Now, in the past, sometimes the Obama administration, for example, recommended a lower pay raise. Sometimes in Congress we have enacted a higher pay raise than the formula would require.

But the key point is 3.1 percent is what the formula is. This bill does not change that in any way. If the bill passes, if it doesn't pass, the pay raise still goes in.

I think the Speaker just indicated that she supported the amendment we are discussing now. Let's be clear. The bill before us cuts \$17 billion from the President's request. The amendment before us cuts another \$16 billion from that.

So all the folks who have come here and said it is not too much, it is not too little, it is just right, they have to vote against this amendment because this cuts an additional \$16 billion.

What is the effect of this \$16 billion? It decimates counterterrorism operations around the world. All of this cut comes from operations and maintenance within the OCO, the overseas contingency account. That means we do not do as much to fight terrorists overseas.

It hurts our ability, as another example, to train and help the Ukrainians fight the aggression that is occurring on their soil. Lots of people talk about standing up to the Russians. This amendment takes away the biggest factor in Ukraine that is helping push back against the Russian-backed insurgents. It decimates support for the Afghan security forces.

Whether you think Americans should be there or not, we are trying to help you. Afghans defend themselves. This amendment takes that away.

Real consequences in the real world, I think this amendment finally gets to where the direction of this bill is headed. Members should oppose it.

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to offer this amendment with Representatives KHANNA, DEFALZIO, OMAR, and PRESSLEY.

What this amendment would do is freeze fiscal year 2020 defense spending in the NDAA to 2019 levels by reducing the overseas contingency operations account by \$16.8 billion.

Now, by restoring defense spending to the levels authorized in last year's NDAA, this increase would be even more modest than the \$700 billion top-line figure publicly embraced by the President just 9 months ago before he reversed course and requested an outrageous \$750 billion.

Mr. Chair, just last year, the Department of Defense failed its first ever agencywide audit, something that I have long called for, along with my colleague Representative BURGESS.

I want to thank Chairman SMITH for including our bipartisan language on audit readiness to ensure that the DOD is acting to address waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon and ensure that it has a plan in place so it can pass an unqualified audit.

If the Department of Defense cannot even keep track of its current funding, it is truly outrageous that Congress would reward the Pentagon with a massive spending increase. This amendment is simply about reining in the bloated Pentagon budget.

At the minute-by-minute level, American taxpayers are already spending nearly \$2 billion a day at the fiscal

2019 NDAA enacted levels this amendment seeks to cut funding to.

The \$16.8 billion to the top-line funding level, what this amendment would do would require the fund to fund 6.8 million Head Start slots for 1 year, 1.63 million veterans receiving VA medical care for 1 year, and providing 7 million low-income children healthcare for 1 year.

Acting White House Chief of Staff Mick Mulvaney called OCO a slush fund and a sham when he served in Congress, and there is growing bipartisan support urging Congress to significantly cut OCO. That is why I urge “yes” on this critical amendment to rein in our out-of-control defense spending.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), my colleague.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Can you say “slush fund”? OCO is basically a slush fund.

The idea was, oh, we went to war—more than a decade ago—and we couldn’t anticipate the expenses, so Congress passed an overseas contingency account. It is not very well supervised by Congress, and as you heard earlier, the Pentagon can’t even account for the funds that go in there.

But now, here we are. We can certainly anticipate what is going on next year and the year after with the Pentagon. Why isn’t it going through the regular process within the Pentagon budget and with full scrutiny by the United States Congress and, God forbid, maybe even auditable? Imagine that.

The only agency of the Federal Government which is unable to pass an audit is the Pentagon.

About a decade ago, I got an amendment on the floor to require an audit, but it got taken out in a conference committee. What are they afraid of in accounting for the dollars they get? And this is the least accountable of all the dollars they get.

This is a modest reduction, and it would restore funding to the 2019 levels. You should vote for this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, if you care about our warfighters who are in theater tonight, this is the worst possible cut that we could give the Department of Defense.

This says that overseas operations, where they are actually in places like Afghanistan or Syria or Iraq, we are going to take the dollars they are using to operate and stay safe and get the job done, and we are whacking one-third off of that budget. We are taking a meat-cleaver approach, not a scalpel. This is a meat-cleaver approach.

Besides the things that the chairman mentioned that would be cut working with allies, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance would be cut, ISR.

□ 1830

When our commanders have forces going out on a patrol, those patrols want overhead observation before them, over them, behind them. That is the kind of thing directly cut by this amendment.

When the troops come back, and the equipment has to be refurbished and reset, that is cut by this amendment.

Mr. Chair, this is a very poorly thought out amendment, and I would urge everyone to vote “no.”

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, this is a modest approach that would ensure that Congress doesn’t reward the Pentagon with even more money after it failed its first agency-wide audit last year.

Recent polling shows that a majority of the public does not want defense spending increased. Nearly three-quarters of Americans would not support more of their tax dollars going to the Pentagon.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this critical amendment, and we must move forward and at least begin to control this out-of-control defense spending and support this amendment. I ask for an “aye” vote.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ).

Mr. WALTZ. Mr. Chairman, this cut to the Overseas Contingency Operations budget, to the operations and maintenance account, is an attempt to back us out of the war on terror.

We all want peace. We all want these wars to go away, but that doesn’t mean we can just wish them away, that we can just cut an account by over a third and wish these wars away like the Obama administration tried to do in Iraq.

The reality is we can either fight these wars in places like Kabul and Kandahar and Damascus and Baghdad, or this problem, particularly the terrorism problem, the extremism problem, will follow us home to places like Kansas City, San Bernardino, Orlando, New York, and others.

It is irresponsible, in the midst of a war—and I remind my colleagues that we are in the midst of a war—to tie the Pentagon’s hands by cutting these funds when we have special operators, as we speak today, as we are debating here today, in 72 countries, as we have more American servicemembers deployed overseas than the entire armies of the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada combined, ensuring a liberal world order that has ensured the greatest period of prosperity since World War II that the world has ever known.

Mr. Chair, this is an irresponsible amendment. We can have this debate over where we should be and how our servicemembers should be deployed, but to cut their funds in the middle of the war on terror and try to back us out of these wars because you disagree with them is the height of irresponsibility.

We have a moral obligation to our servicemembers overseas. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in part B of House Report 116–143.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 10 . . . MODIFICATION AND REPEAL OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO MILITARY DETENTION OF CERTAIN PERSONS.

(a) DISPOSITION.—Section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking “The disposition” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (g), the disposition”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(g) DISPOSITION OF PERSONS DETAINED IN THE UNITED STATES.—

“(1) PERSONS DETAINED PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE OR THE FISCAL YEAR 2012 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT.—In the case of a covered person who is detained in the United States, or a territory or possession of the United States, pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force or this Act, disposition under the law of war shall occur immediately upon the person coming into custody of the Federal Government and shall only mean the immediate transfer of the person for trial and proceedings by a court established under Article III of the Constitution of the United States or by an appropriate State court. Such trial and proceedings shall have all the due process as provided for under the Constitution of the United States.

“(2) PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER TO MILITARY CUSTODY.—No person detained, captured, or arrested in the United States, or a territory or possession of the United States, may be transferred to the custody of the Armed Forces for detention under the Authorization for Use of Military Force or this Act.

“(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall not be construed to authorize the detention of a person within the United States, or a territory or possession of the United States, under the Authorization for Use of Military Force or this Act.”

(b) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR MILITARY CUSTODY.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 10 U.S.C. 801 note).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1029(b) of such Act is amended by striking “applies to” and all that follows through

“any other person” and inserting “applies to any person”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

The 2012 National Defense Authorization Act authorized the President to order the indefinite detention of American citizens arrested on U.S. soil without charge or trial.

The NDAA says that:

The Afghanistan AUMF, empowers the President to detain any person who substantially supported associated forces of terrorists.

“Substantial support” and “associated forces” are not defined.

Who could this cover? An American citizen living in Michigan makes a one-time donation to a nonviolent humanitarian group. Years later, the group commits hostile acts against an ally of the U.S. Under the 2012 NDAA, if the President determines the group was associated with terrorists, the President is authorized to detain the donor indefinitely and without charge or trial.

This compromise amendment guarantees that persons arrested on U.S. soil under the Afghanistan AUMF or the NDAA will be charged for their wrongdoing and will receive a fair trial. The government will be required to tell people detained on U.S. soil the allegations against them, and the government will have to make its case before a judge, just as the Constitution requires.

President Obama pledged in signing the 2012 NDAA that he “will not authorize the indefinite military detention without trial of American citizens,” saying that to do so “would break with our most important traditions and values. . . .”

But, Americans’ constitutionally protected rights should not depend on Presidential promises or who is in charge. A free country is defined by the rule of law, not the government’s whim.

Mr. Chair, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I have no other speakers other than myself, and I reserve the right to close.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that Mr. AMASH, Ms. LEE, I, and others have worked on in previous years. It is a very simple principle.

Certainly, with the 9/11 attacks, with the terrorism threat that we face, it is very real, and we need to make sure

that our country is in a position to defend ourselves against that.

But we also need to make sure that we protect the thing that gives us our greatest strength, and that is the rule of law in our Constitution. This amendment simply says you cannot use law of war detention against people in the United States of America.

Our Article III courts have worked amazingly well throughout the history of this country. Through many conflicts and many threats, they worked very well to bring people to justice, lock them up, and protect us.

In fact, there are hundreds of terrorists right now in U.S. prisons who were prosecuted under Article III of the Constitution.

Article III and the history of the Supreme Court and other courts that have laid out the laws that give us the basic protections are essential to our liberty in this country.

We can protect ourselves and maintain our basic liberties. That is what this amendment does.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate Mr. AMASH bringing it, and I urge support.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. AMASH for yielding me time and for his leadership on this issue.

Let me also thank Chairman SMITH for his tremendous leadership of the committee and for working with us on this critical amendment, as well as so many other amendments in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Amash-Lee amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act.

This amendment guarantees that persons arrested on U.S. soil under the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force or provisions under the 2012 NDAA will receive the due process that they deserve, as required by the Constitution.

The 2012 NDAA codified worldwide detention authority that, as the ACLU said at the time, “violates the Constitution and international law because it is not limited to people captured in an actual armed conflict, as required by the laws of war.”

The Amash-Lee amendment would remedy that by repealing that provision and ensuring that we remain consistent with our fundamental values.

Mr. Chairman, we should have no doubts that our Federal criminal courts can handle international terrorism cases, and indeed they have.

The Department of Justice has charged, tried, and convicted more than 200 defendants for international terrorism crimes in these very Federal courts.

That is why I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this critical amendment. I, again, want to thank Representative AMASH and Chairman SMITH for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time remains.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, leaving these powers on the books is not only a dangerous threat to our civil liberties, but also undermines one of our strongest assets in trying suspected terrorists: Article III courts and domestic law enforcement.

Since September 11, the Federal Government has successfully prosecuted hundreds of defendants charged with crimes related to international terrorism. Our Constitution works.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues, Representative BARBARA LEE and Chairman SMITH, for joining me on this amendment. I urge all of my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, for some years now, there have been some people in the country who go around ginning up concern that Americans are going to be whisked out of their beds at night and taken to Guantanamo and left there indefinitely.

This sort of scaremongering has been used to call attention to themselves. It has been used to raise money.

As Chairman SMITH noted, we have had some debates on this issue in the past. It had kind of died down when everybody realized that 18 years after 9/11 it hadn’t happened.

Yet, there are still some out in the countryside who try to frighten people that, well, it could someday. Well, actually, it can’t.

Let me read three provisions, starting with the FY 2012 NDAA that said, “Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect existing law or authorities relating to the detention of U.S. citizens, lawful resident aliens of the United States, or any other persons who are captured or arrested in the United States.”

Now, that says nothing here affects any right of U.S. citizens or those captured or detained inside the United States. That was part of the law to begin with.

Another part of the law to begin with says, “The requirement to detain a person in military custody under this section . . . does not extend to citizens of the United States.”

Well, we passed that in 2012. There were some concerns, so we come back the very next year and have a rule of construction that has been passed and signed into law.

It says that:

Nothing in that law or in the AUMF shall be construed to deny the availability of the writ of habeas corpus or deny any constitutional rights in a court ordained or established by Article III of the Constitution for any person in the United States when detained pursuant to an AUMF and who is otherwise entitled to such writ or rights.

So, we have belts, suspenders, ropes, pretty much anything you can think of, to make sure that no one inside the

United States, no U.S. citizen's constitutional right is affected. And it hasn't been. For 18 years this has not been a problem.

So, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is not a problem now, that it is not something that we need to tinker with, especially with so many court decisions that have interpreted some of the legal issues related to detainees.

In fact, we should push back against attempted scaremongering and reject this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1845

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 476, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 6 consisting of amendment Nos. 125, 126, 131, 218, 251, 310, 382, 410, and 418, printed in part B of House Report 116-143, offered by Mr. SMITH of Washington:

AMENDMENT NO. 125 OFFERED BY MS. DEAN OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 7. FUNDING FOR CDC ATSDR PFAS HEALTH STUDY INCREMENT.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 1405 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, for the CDC ATSDR PFAS health study increment is hereby increased by \$5,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for Operation and Maintenance, Admin and Service-wide Activities, line 460, Office of the Secretary of Defense, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 126 OFFERED BY MS. DEAN OF PENNSYLVANIA

Amend section 318 to read as follows:

SEC. 318. REPLACEMENT OF FLUORINATED AQUEOUS FILM-FORMING FOAM WITH FLUORINE-FREE FIRE-FIGHTING AGENT.

(a) USE OF FLUORINE-FREE FOAM AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—Not later than January 31, 2023, the Secretary of the Navy shall publish a military specification for a fluorine-free fire-fighting agent for use at all military installations to ensure such agent is available for use by not later than December 31, 2024.

(b) PROHIBITION ON USE.—Fluorinated aqueous film-forming foam may not be used at any military installation on or after Sep-

tember 30, 2025, or before such date, if possible.

(c) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense may grant a waiver to the prohibition under subsection (b) with respect to the use of fluorinated aqueous film-forming foam at a specific military installation if the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees, by not later than 30 days prior to issuing the waiver—

(A) notice of the waiver; and

(B) certification, in writing, that the waiver is necessary for the protection of life and safety.

(2) BASIS FOR WAIVER.—Any certification submitted under paragraph (1)(B) shall document the basis for the waiver and, at a minimum, shall include the following:

(A) A detailed description of the threat justifying the waiver and a description of the imminence, urgency, and severity of such threat.

(B) An analysis of potential populations impacted by continued use of fluorinated aqueous film forming foam and why the waiver outweighs the impact to such populations.

(C) An analysis of potential economic effects, including with respect to agriculture, livestock, and water systems of continued use of fluorinated aqueous film forming foam and why the waiver outweighs such effects.

(3) LIMITATION.—A waiver under this subsection shall apply for a period that does not exceed one year. The Secretary may extend any such waiver once for an additional period that does not exceed one year.

AMENDMENT NO. 131 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL OF MICHIGAN

Page 150, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 324. PROHIBITION ON PERFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES IN MEALS READY-TO-EAT FOOD PACKAGING.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Not later than October 1, 2020, the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency shall ensure that any food contact substances that are used to assemble and package meals ready-to-eat (MREs) procured by the Defense Logistics Agency do not contain any perfluoroalkyl substances or polyfluoroalkyl substances.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PERFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCE.—The term “perfluoroalkyl substance” means a man-made chemical of which all of the carbon atoms are fully fluorinated carbon atoms.

(2) POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCE.—The term “polyfluoroalkyl substance” means a man-made chemical containing a mix of fully fluorinated carbon atoms, partially fluorinated carbon atoms, and nonfluorinated carbon atoms.

AMENDMENT NO. 218 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle B of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3. COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY ON PFAS CONTAMINATION.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of the efforts of the Department of Defense to clean up per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (in this section referred to as “PFAS”) contamination in and around military bases as well as the Department's efforts to mitigate the public health impact of the contamination.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study required by subsection (a), shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of—

(A) when the Department of Defense discovered that drinking water sources used by

members of the Armed Forces and residents of communities surrounding military bases were contaminated with PFAS;

(B) after learning that the drinking water was contaminated, when the Department of Defense notified members of the Armed Forces and residents of communities surrounding military bases that their drinking water is contaminated with PFAS;

(C) after providing such notification, how much time lapsed before those affected were given alternative sources of drinking water;

(D) the number of installations and surrounding communities currently drinking water that is contaminated with PFAS above the EPA's advisory limit;

(E) the amount of money the Department of Defense has spent on cleaning up PFAS contamination through the date of enactment of this Act;

(F) the number of sites where the Department of Defense has taken action to remediate PFAS contamination or other materials as a result of the use of firefighting foam on military bases;

(G) factors that might limit or prevent the Department of Defense from remediating PFAS contamination or other materials as a result of the use of firefighting foam on military bases;

(H) the estimated total cost of clean-up of PFAS;

(I) the cost to the Department of Defense to discontinue the use of PFAS in firefighting foam and to develop and procure viable replacements that meet military specifications; and

(J) the number of members of the Armed Forces who have been exposed to PFAS in their drinking water above the EPA's Health Advisory levels during their military service.

(2) An evaluation of what the Department of Defense could have done better to mitigate the release of PFAS contamination into the environment and expose service members.

(3) Any other elements the Comptroller General may deem necessary.

(c) RESULTS.—

(1) INTERIM BRIEFING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall provide to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Environment and Public Works of the Senate a briefing on the preliminary findings of the study required by this section.

(2) FINAL RESULTS.—The Comptroller General shall provide the final results of the study required by this section to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Environment and Public Works of the Senate at such time and in such format as is mutually agreed upon by the committees and the Comptroller General at the time of briefing under paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 251 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle B of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3. DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS CONTAINING PER- AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES OR AQUEOUS FILM-FORMING FOAM.

The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that when materials containing per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (referred to in this section as “PFAS”) or aqueous film forming foam are disposed—

(1) all incineration is conducted in a manner that eliminates PFAS while also ensuring that no PFAS is emitted into the air;

(2) all incineration is conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air

Act (42 USC 7401 et seq.), including controlling hydrogen fluoride;

(3) any materials containing PFAS that are designated for disposal are stored in accordance with the requirement under part 264 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(4) no incineration is conducted at any facility that violated the requirements of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) during the 12-month period preceding the date of disposal.

AMENDMENT NO. 310 OFFERED BY MR. PAPPAS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

At the end of subtitle B of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON USE OF PERFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES FOR LAND-BASED APPLICATIONS OF FIREFIGHTING FOAM.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—After October 1, 2023, no amount authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to procure firefighting foam that contains in excess of one part per billion of perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances.

(b) **PROHIBITION ON USE OF EXISTING STOCKS.**—Not later than October 1, 2023, the Secretary of Defense shall cease the use of firefighting foam containing in excess of one part per billion of perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances;

(c) **EXEMPTION FOR SHIPBOARD USE.**—Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to firefighting foam for use solely onboard ocean-going vessels.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “perfluoroalkyl substances” means aliphatic substances for which all of the H atoms attached to C atoms in the nonfluorinated substance from which they are notionally derived have been replaced by F atoms, except those H atoms whose substitution would modify the nature of any functional groups present.

(2) The term “polyfluoroalkyl substances” means aliphatic substances for which all H atoms attached to at least one (but not all) C atoms have been replaced by F atoms, in such a manner that they contain the perfluoroalkyl moiety C_nF_{2n+1} (for example, $C_8F_{17}CH_2CH_2OH$).

AMENDMENT NO. 382 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. AGREEMENTS TO SHARE MONITORING DATA RELATING TO PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES AND OTHER CONTAMINANTS OF CONCERN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall seek to enter into agreements with municipalities or municipal drinking water utilities located adjacent to military installations under which both the Secretary and the municipalities and utilities would share monitoring data relating to perfluoroalkyl substances, polyfluoroalkyl substances, and other emerging contaminants of concern collected at the military installation.

(b) **PUBLIC COMMUNICATION.**—An agreement under subsection (a) does not negate the responsibility of the Secretary to communicate with the public about drinking water contamination from perfluoroalkyl substances, polyfluoroalkyl substances, and other contaminants.

(c) **MILITARY INSTALLATION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “military installation” has the meaning given that term in section 2801(c) of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 410 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle B of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3. DETECTION OF PERFLUORINATED COMPOUNDS.

(a) **PERFORMANCE STANDARD FOR THE DETECTION OF PERFLUORINATED COMPOUNDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the United States Geologic Survey shall establish a performance standard for the detection of perfluorinated compounds.

(2) **EMPHASIS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In developing the performance standard under subsection (a), the Director shall emphasize the ability to detect as many perfluorinated compounds present in the environment as possible using analytical methods that are as sensitive as is feasible and practicable.

(B) **REQUIREMENT.**—In developing the performance standard under subsection (a), the Director may—

(i) develop quality assurance and quality control measures to ensure accurate sampling and testing;

(ii) develop a training program with respect to the appropriate method of sample collection and analysis of perfluorinated compounds; and

(iii) coordinate as necessary with the Administrator to develop methods to detect individual and different perfluorinated compounds simultaneously.

(b) **NATIONWIDE SAMPLING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall carry out a nationwide sampling to determine the concentration of perfluorinated compounds in estuaries, lakes, streams, springs, wells, wetlands, rivers, aquifers, and soil using the performance standard developed under subsection (a)(1).

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In carrying out the sampling under paragraph (1), the Director shall—

(A) first carry out the sampling at sources of drinking water near locations with known or suspected releases of perfluorinated compounds;

(B) when carrying out sampling of sources of drinking water under paragraph (1), carry out the sampling prior to any treatment of the water;

(C) survey for ecological exposure to perfluorinated compounds, with a priority in determining direct human exposure through drinking water; and

(D) consult with—

(i) States to determine areas that are a priority for sampling; and

(ii) the Administrator—

(I) to enhance coverage of the sampling; and

(II) to avoid unnecessary duplication.

(3) **REPORT.**—Not later than 150 days after the completion of the sampling under paragraph (1), the Director shall prepare a report describing the results of the sampling and submit the report to—

(A) the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Senators of each State in which the Director carried out the sampling; and

(D) each Member of the House of Representatives that represents a district in which the Director carried out the sampling.

(c) **DATA USAGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall provide the sampling data collected under subsection (b) to—

(A) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(B) other Federal and State regulatory agencies on request.

(2) **USAGE.**—The sampling data provided under subsection (a) shall be used to inform and enhance assessments of exposure, likely health and environmental impacts, and remediation priorities.

(d) **COLLABORATION.**—In carrying out this section, the Director shall collaborate with—

(1) appropriate Federal and State regulators;

(2) institutions of higher education;

(3) research institutions; and

(4) other expert stakeholders.

(e) **AUTHORITY FOR TRANSFER OF FUNDS.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by section 301, the Secretary of Defense may, without regard to section 2215 of title 10, United States Code, transfer not more than \$5,000,000 to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out nationwide sampling under this section. Any funds transferred under this section may not be used for any other purpose, except those specified under this section.

(f) **FUNDING.**—

(1) **INCREASE.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, Line 080, for the Detection of Perfluorinated Compounds is hereby increased by \$5,000,000.

(2) **OFFSET.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for Procurement of Wheeled and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for Bradley Program (Mod) is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) The term “Director” means the Director of the United States Geological Survey.

(3) The term “perfluorinated compound” means a perfluoroalkyl substance or a polyfluoroalkyl substance that is manmade with at least 1 fully fluorinated carbon atom.

(4) The term “fully fluorinated carbon atom” means a carbon atom on which all the hydrogen substituents have been replaced by fluorine.

(5) The term “nonfluorinated carbon atom” means a carbon atom on which no hydrogen substituents have been replaced by fluorine.

(6) The term “partially fluorinated carbon atom” means a carbon atom on which some, but not all, of the hydrogen substituents have been replaced by fluorine.

(7) The term “perfluoroalkyl substance” means a manmade chemical of which all of the carbon atoms are fully fluorinated carbon atoms.

(8) The term “polyfluoroalkyl substance” means a manmade chemical containing a mix of fully fluorinated carbon atoms, partially fluorinated carbon atoms, and nonfluorinated carbon atoms.

AMENDMENT NO. 418 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL OF MICHIGAN

Add at the end of subtitle B of title III the following new section:

SEC. ____ COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH STATES TO ADDRESS CONTAMINATION BY PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES.

(a) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon request from the Governor or chief executive of a State, the Secretary of Defense shall work expeditiously, pursuant to section 2701(d) of title

10, United States Code, to finalize a cooperative agreement, or amend an existing cooperative agreement to address testing, monitoring, removal, and remedial actions relating to the contamination or suspected contamination of drinking, surface, or ground water from PFAS originating from activities of the Department of Defense by providing the mechanism and funding for the expedited review and approval of documents of the Department related to PFAS investigations and remedial actions from an active or decommissioned military installation, including a facility of the National Guard.

(2) **MINIMUM STANDARDS.**—A cooperative agreement finalized or amended under paragraph (1) shall meet or exceed the most stringent of the following standards for PFAS in any environmental media:

(A) An enforceable State standard, in effect in that State, for drinking, surface, or ground water, as described in section 121(d)(2)(A)(ii) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9621(d)(2)(A)(ii)).

(B) An enforceable Federal standard for drinking, surface, or ground water, as described in section 121(d)(2)(A)(i) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9621(d)(2)(A)(i)).

(C) A health advisory under section 1412(b)(1)(F) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300g-1(b)(1)(F)).

(3) **OTHER AUTHORITY.**—In addition to the requirements for a cooperative agreement under paragraph (1), when otherwise authorized to expend funds for the purpose of addressing ground or surface water contaminated by a perfluorinated compound, the Secretary of Defense may, to expend those funds, enter into a grant agreement, cooperative agreement, or contract with—

(A) the local water authority with jurisdiction over the contamination site, including—

(i) a public water system (as defined in section 1401 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f)); and

(ii) a publicly owned treatment works (as defined in section 212 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1292)); or

(B) a State, local, or Tribal government.

(b) **REPORT.**—Beginning on February 1, 2020, if a cooperative agreement is not finalized or amended under subsection (a) within one year after the request from the Governor or chief executive under that subsection, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees and Members of Congress a report—

(1) explaining why the agreement has not been finalized or amended, as the case may be; and

(2) setting forth a projected timeline for finalizing or amending the agreement.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.**—The term “appropriate committees and Members of Congress” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Senators who represent a State impacted by PFAS contamination described in subsection (a)(1); and

(C) the Members of the House of Representatives who represent a district impacted by such contamination.

(2) **FULLY FLUORINATED CARBON ATOM.**—The term “fully fluorinated carbon atom” means a carbon atom on which all the hydrogen substituents have been replaced by fluorine.

(3) **PFAS.**—The term “PFAS” means perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances that are man-made chemicals with at least one fully fluorinated carbon atom.

(4) **STATE.**—The term “State” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response,

and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak on two important amendments that have been included in this en bloc.

Michigan has been hit very hard by this PFAS contamination. It is in our drinking water, groundwater, rivers, lakes, and ponds. We can't eat the fish that are being caught.

These harmful chemicals are found in way too many places, and they are discovering more contamination sites each day.

Just today, 100 new PFAS contamination sites were identified, with many sites registering PFAS levels above 100,000 parts per trillion. EPA's non-enforceable health advisory is 70 parts per trillion. And the more we test, the more we find.

There are two amendments here. I was proud to work with FRED UPTON, DAN KILDEE, and TIM WALBERG on legislation that is included in this en bloc that would require the Department of Defense to enter into cooperative agreements with States to mitigate PFAS contamination resulting from their facilities.

Unfortunately, firefighting foam was used at more than 100 military bases and has impacted them and the surrounding communities across the country. We need an all-hands-on-deck response to the growing PFAS contamination at military facilities.

Also included is a bipartisan amendment to protect our servicemembers from ever being exposed to harmful PFAS chemicals in MREs, Meal, Ready-to-Eat.

MREs are carried by our servicemembers in the field of operations or when engaged in training exercises. Our warfighters depend on MREs for their survival, so it is critical these food packages are completely safe. Currently, there is no prohibition on the use of PFAS chemicals in MREs, and they are in there.

This bipartisan amendment would proactively correct this and simply prohibit the Defense Logistics Agency from using any food contact substances with PFAS to assemble or package MREs.

I thank Chairman SMITH for including both of these amendments.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman of the committee for working with me on addressing this PFAS contamination issue.

Today, the House is taking historic action to address PFAS contamination that is hurting communities, including communities like the city of Oscoda in my district in Michigan.

At the beginning of the year, I launched the bipartisan Congressional PFAS Task Force to bring together Members of Congress who are dealing with contamination in their districts. We wanted to work together on meaningful legislation to address PFAS and to protect public health.

I am very pleased to stand here today, 6 months later, in support of these amendments. The package of amendments included in this en bloc will help address PFAS contamination and ensure people have access to safe drinking water.

Included in the package are three of my amendments.

The first would direct the U.S. Geological Survey to look for PFAS contamination around the country so we know where people are potentially exposed.

My second amendment would require the Government Accountability Office to conduct a review of the military's response to PFAS contamination and its efforts to clean it up.

Another amendment that I was proud to work on with my friend, Congresswoman DEAN from Pennsylvania, is to end the use of PFAS by the military by 2025. This will protect servicemembers from being exposed to these dangerous chemicals.

These provisions will mean fewer veterans, servicemembers, and families will face struggles like those in my district have faced. I am proud to see this come to the floor. I thank the chairman for his work on this.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak about my amendment included in en bloc No. 11.

Mr. Chair, my amendment would bestow the privilege of lying in honor in the rotunda of the United States Capitol to the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient of the Second World War.

From the beaches of Normandy, across the seas of Japan, and into the deserts of Africa, the Greatest Generation fought selflessly to protect freedom around the world. It is our duty to honor the sacrifices they made to safeguard hope and liberty for all.

The walls of this historic building have seen the most courageous members of our society. Americans from coast to coast come here to pay their respects to the heroes of our history, an ability that would not be possible without the responsibilities that fell on to our brave parents and grandparents.

We must ensure our children and grandchildren remember those who worked to secure our Nation and freed the world from tyranny.

When I started working on this, there were four. Now, there are only three

living recipients of the Medal of Honor who went above and beyond the call of duty during World War II, one of whom is a dear friend and West Virginia native, Hershel “Woody” Williams, who fought valiantly during the Battle of Iwo Jima.

In this time of deep political divide, honoring our Nation’s greatest heroes is something we can all come together and agree upon. I ask all Members to support my amendment to honor our Greatest Generation and preserve their legacy as defenders of freedom.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chair, today, I rise in support of an amendment to the underlying bill, the National Defense Authorization Act.

The NDAA is a bill that articulates our defense priorities and secures our national interests. I am very, very proud and thankful to Chairman SMITH and committee staff to have incorporated a number of provisions into this bill. Of particular importance, I am honored to have included a provision that improves privatized military housing.

I think all of us can agree that it is imperative that the Department of Defense develop a holistic solution to remedy systemic privatized military housing issues and empower servicemembers and their families.

I saw this need firsthand in my district while engaging with servicemember constituents throughout this past year. That is why I offered legislation that was included in the NDAA that enhanced transparency, communication, and accountability standards.

The core elements of this bill, the Better Military Housing Act, included a tenant bill of rights, housing advocacy, and an improved work order system.

This amendment that I am speaking about today adds two additional important provisions.

First, it authorizes an additional \$5 million for new military housing construction, utilizing the Army’s high-performance and healthy living All-American Abode design.

Second, it requires the Department of Defense to provide an accounting for the legal services available to servicemembers harmed by health or environmental hazards while living in privatized military housing.

We must continue to prioritize the health and safety and the lifestyles of our servicemembers and their families. They serve us. Let’s continue to serve them.

I thank Chairman SMITH, the committee, the professional staff, and my colleagues for their support on my amendments.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman SMITH for giving me these minutes to talk about two amendments that I have brought forth that are part of this en bloc.

First is an amendment about PFAS, which we have heard a little bit about already. It is important to understand that our military is storing and planning to destroy millions of gallons of material that contain PFAS, which is a class of chemicals that contaminate drinking water and is linked to serious health problems.

These materials must be destroyed for the sake of the health of our communities, but that needs to be done in a way that protects our environment, not in a way that causes us yet more harm.

My amendment directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that all incineration of materials containing PFAS is conducted in a manner that eliminates PFAS while also ensuring that no PFAS is emitted into the air in the process. It also sets clear guardrails for storage, byproducts, and appropriate facilities for disposal.

I thank Mr. KHANNA for cosponsoring this measure so we can protect our communities from further PFAS contamination.

The second amendment I wish to address will help us understand the universe of defense contractors that have willfully violated Federal health, safety, and labor standards that protect American workers. American people work hard to build the infrastructure necessary to keep our country safe. We have a responsibility to honor that work by paying them fairly and keeping them safe, as the law requires.

We have a responsibility to make sure that contractors taking Federal dollars are not recklessly neglecting the health, safety, and dignity of our working people. That is why this simple amendment is so necessary.

I thank Congresswoman HAALAND for cosponsoring this amendment, and I thank, again, Chairman SMITH for all of his hard work.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I want to start talking about science and jurisdiction and why it is important to go through regular order.

We just heard my colleagues talk about PFAS or PFOS or PFOA, three different things that mean three different things. What my colleagues have done is lumped them all into one category. If you eliminate one class of chemicals, you take the F-16 and you ground it. You have got Ethernet cables, fiber channel assemblies, round cable assemblies, shielded twisted pair, EMI.

This is a National Defense Authorization bill, and the Rules Committee has allowed an amendment on the National Defense Authorization bill that would ground the F-16s without doing due justice to science and the committees of jurisdiction.

There are a couple of other problems with the en bloc amendment.

Again, this amendment requires action on all PFAS, all of it. There may be 3,000 to 5,000 different permutations of this chemical. All these substances are not alike.

Also, EPA has said it knows little of the PFAS class and only has a valid tool to really identify 18 out of the 3,000 to 5,000 formulations. If EPA can only identify right now 18, how do you identify 1,500 permutations of this chemical?

Second, the amendment skirts scientific risk criteria and dismisses expert administration review, especially the provisions banning PFAS in MREs—we heard that—and containers.

According to the Food and Drug Administration, I mentioned this earlier on another amendment, this would ban substances used in assembling and packaging, which there is no known safety concern. The FDA approves packaging for food, but we are going to ban packaging for food when it is the jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration, which is not the jurisdiction of HASC.

Third, as drafted, these amendments could create confusion, overreach, and mismatched responsibility among Federal partners. The PFAS ban and the MRE language requires the Defense Logistics Agency to implement it, but MREs are sold at commercial grocery stores. So are we going to have the Defense Logistics Agency police PFAS MRE packaging in the local Piggly Wiggly or Walmart or other guns and knives stores?

□ 1900

The incineration provisions require the Secretary of Defense to administer and enforce requirements on incineration of items.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. So we have been attacking the administration of the Department of Defense saying they can’t do their job, they don’t meet the IG standards, and now we are going to put them in control of air emissions and clean air standards.

That is what this does when you allow amendments to a bill that are not germane to the underlying committee.

Last, provisions require the U.S. Geological Survey to come up with PFAS detection performance standards, instituting a nationalized sampling program at PFAS-contaminated sites and own the results. Yet the Environmental Protection Agency, which only has a minor ability to consult role, has statutory responsibility for cleanup sites. USGS will be messing around with and will be dependent upon the USGS to obtain its data.

So it is the EPA that is responsible for cleanup, but we are going to give

the U.S. Geological Survey the responsibility.

Many of these amendments are not germane to the defense authorization or have received process to ensure they don't create problems. Quality work in these areas would have followed regular order. Americans deserve that we are as careful doing our jobs as they are doing theirs. We mentioned this in the other amendment.

I am working with Chairman TONKO to address perfluorinated compounds. It is a very difficult issue. We have experts in the majority; we have experts in the minority that deal with chemicals. This is not the place to do it, and I would ask people to vote against the amendment en bloc.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of en bloc No. 6, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 476, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 7 consisting of amendment Nos. 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, and 189 printed in part B of House Report 116-143, offered by Mr. SMITH of Washington:

AMENDMENT NO. 166 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER OF NEW JERSEY

Page 686, after line 2, insert the following new subparagraph (and redesignate succeeding subparagraphs accordingly):

(L) adversary actions that threaten freedom of navigation on international waterways, including attacks on foreign ships and crews;

AMENDMENT NO. 167 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER OF NEW JERSEY

Add at the end of title XIII the following:
SEC. 13 . . . COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM ENHANCEMENT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report regarding the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (established pursuant to the Department of Defense Cooperate Threat Reduction Act (enacted as subtitle B of title XIII of the Carl Levin and Howard P. 'Buck' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (50 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.)), including recommendations to improve the implementation of such Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 168 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER OF NEW JERSEY

Page 779, line 14, insert "Hamas, Hizballah, Palestine Islamic Jihad, al-Shabaab, Islamic

Revolutionary Guard Corps" after "al Sham,".

AMENDMENT NO. 169 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER OF NEW JERSEY

Page 306, line 2, strike "or" at the end.

Page 306, line 3, strike "and" at the end and insert "or".

Page 306, after line 3, add the following new subparagraph:

(D) anti-Semitism; and

AMENDMENT NO. 170 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

Page 603, after line 5, insert the following:

SEC. 898. INDIVIDUAL ACQUISITION FOR COMMERCIAL LEASING SERVICES.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 877(c) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2019 (41 U.S.C. 3302 note) is amended by striking "2022" and inserting "2025".

(b) AUDIT.—Section 887(b)(1) of such Act is amended by striking "biennial audits" and inserting "audits every five years".

AMENDMENT NO. 171 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

At the end of subtitle I of title V, add the following:

SEC. 584. ELIGIBILITY OF VETERANS OF OPERATION END SWEEP FOR VIETNAM SERVICE MEDAL.

The Secretary of the military department concerned may, upon the application of an individual who is a veteran who participated in Operation End Sweep, award that individual the Vietnam Service Medal.

AMENDMENT NO. 172 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

At the end of subtitle D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 632. REPORT REGARDING MANAGEMENT OF MILITARY COMMISSARIES AND EXCHANGES.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding management practices of military commissaries and exchanges

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under this section shall include a cost-benefit analysis with the goals of—

(1) reducing the costs of operating military commissaries and exchanges by \$2,000,000,000 during fiscal years 2020 through 2024; and

(2) not raising costs for patrons of military commissaries and exchanges.

AMENDMENT NO. 173 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

At the end of subtitle B of title V, insert the following new sections:

SEC. 520. NATIONAL GUARD SUPPORT TO MAJOR DISASTERS.

Section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

"(C) Operations or missions authorized by the President or the Secretary of Defense to support large scale, complex, catastrophic disasters, as defined by section 311(3) of title 6, United States Code, at the request of a State governor.;" and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) With respect to operations or missions described under paragraph (2)(C), there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Defense such sums as may be necessary to carry out such operations and missions, but only if—

"(A) an emergency has been declared by the governor of the applicable State; and

"(B) the President has declared the emergency to be a major disaster for the purposes of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.".

SEC. 520a. REPORT ON METHODS TO ENHANCE DOMESTIC RESPONSE TO LARGE SCALE, COMPLEX AND CATASTROPHIC DISASTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation and coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the National Security Council, the Council of Governors, and the National Governors Association, shall submit to the congressional defense, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on their plan to establish policy and processes to implement the authority provided by the amendments made by section 520. The report shall include a detailed examination of the policy framework consistent with existing authorities, identify major statutory or policy impediments to implementation, and make recommendations for legislation as appropriate.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include a description of—

(1) the current policy and processes whereby governors can request activation of the National Guard under title 32, United States Code, as part of the response to large scale, complex, catastrophic disasters that are supported by the Federal Government and, if no formal process exists in policy, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a timeline and plan to establish such a policy, including consultation with the Council of Governors and the National Governors Association;

(2) the Secretary of Defense's assessment, informed by consultation with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the National Security Council, the Council of Governors, and the National Governors Association, regarding the sufficiency of current authorities for the reimbursement of National Guard and Reserve manpower during large scale, complex, catastrophic disasters under title 10 and title 32, United States Code, and specifically whether reimbursement authorities are sufficient to ensure that military training and readiness are not degraded to fund disaster response, or invoking them degrades the effectiveness of the Disaster Relief Fund;

(3) the Department of Defense's plan to ensure there is parallel and consistent policy in the application of the authorities granted under section 12304a of title 10, United States Code, and section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, including—

(A) a description of the disparities between benefits and protections under Federal law versus State active duty;

(B) recommended solutions to achieve parity at the Federal level; and

(C) recommended changes at the State level, if appropriate;

(4) the Department of Defense's plan to ensure there is parity of benefits and protections for military members employed as part of the response to large scale, complex, catastrophic disasters under title 32 or title 10, United States Code, and recommendations for addressing shortfalls; and

(5) a review, by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, of the current policy for, and an assessment of the sufficiency of, reimbursement authority for the use of all National Guard and Reserve, both to the Department of Defense and to the States, during large scale, complex, catastrophic disasters, including any policy and legal limitations, and cost assessment impact on Federal funding.

AMENDMENT NO. 174 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TENNESSEE

Page 380, insert after line 23 the following (and redesignate succeeding paragraphs accordingly):

(7) The availability and usage of the assistance of chaplains, houses of worship, and other spiritual resources for members of the Armed Forces who identify as religiously affiliated and have attempted suicide, have suicidal ideation, or are at risk of suicide, and metrics on the impact these resources have in assisting religiously-affiliated members who have access to and utilize them compared to religiously-affiliated members who do not.

AMENDMENT NO. 175 OFFERED BY MS. HAALAND OF NEW MEXICO

Page 699, after line 17, insert the following:

SEC. 1075. HUMAN RIGHTS IN BRAZIL.

No later than 180 days after enactment of the Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, including—

(1) an assessment of the human rights climate in Brazil and the commitment to human rights by the security forces of Brazil, including military and civilian forces;

(2) an assessment of whether Brazilian security-force units that are found to be engaged in human rights abuses may have received or purchased United States equipment and training; and

(3) if warranted, a strategy to address any found human rights abuses by the security forces of Brazil, including in the context of Brazil's newly conferred Major Non-NATO Ally status.

AMENDMENT NO. 176 OFFERED BY MS. HAALAND OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 898. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING WITH ENTITIES LACKING A SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall revise the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement to state that the policy of the Department of Defense is that the Secretary of Defense may enter into a contract only with an entity that has an employee policy penalizing instances of sexual harassment.

(b) DEBARMENT.—If an entity that does not have an employee policy penalizing instances of sexual harassment seeks to enter into a contract with the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense shall initiate a debarment proceeding in accordance with procedures in the Federal Acquisition Regulation against such entity.

AMENDMENT NO. 177 OFFERED BY MR. HAGEDORN OF MINNESOTA

Add at the end of subtitle F of title VIII the following:

SEC. 882. ACCELERATED PAYMENTS APPLICABLE TO CONTRACTS WITH CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS UNDER THE PROMPT PAYMENT ACT.

Section 3903(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting “except as provided in paragraphs (10) and (11),” before “30 days”;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking “and”;

(3) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(10) for a prime contractor (as defined in section 8701(5) of title 41) that is a small business concern (as defined under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)), to the fullest extent permitted by law, require

that the head of an agency establish an accelerated payment date with a goal of 15 days after a proper invoice for the amount due is received if a specific payment date is not established by contract; and

“(11) for a prime contractor (as defined in section 8701(5) of title 41) that subcontracts with a small business concern (as defined under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)), to the fullest extent permitted by law, require that the head of an agency establish an accelerated payment date with a goal of 15 days after a proper invoice for the amount due is received if—

“(A) a specific payment date is not established by contract; and

“(B) such prime contractor agrees to make payments to such subcontractor in accordance with such accelerated payment date, to the maximum extent practicable, without any further consideration from or fees charged to such subcontractor.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 178 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 831. REPORTING ON EXPENSES INCURRED FOR INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS.

(a) REPORTING ON INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS.—Section 2372 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the second sentence of subsection (a), by striking “shall be reported” and all that follows through “indirect costs.” and inserting the following: “shall be reported—

“(1) independently from other allowable indirect costs; and

“(2) annually by the contractor to the Defense Technical Information Center, who shall give access to the information to the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, the Director of the Defense Contract Audit Agency, and the Director of the Defense Management Audit Agency.”.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than March 31, 2020, and biennially thereafter, the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, in coordination with the Director of the Defense Contract Management Agency, the Director of the Defense Contract Audit Agency, and the Defense Technical Information Center, shall submit to the congressional defense committees aggregate cost data on the independent research and development programs of the contractor. The report shall include—

“(1) an analysis of such programs completed during the two-year period preceding the date of the report, including the extent to which such programs align with the modernization priorities of the most recent national defense strategy (as described by section 113 of this title);

“(2) an estimate of the extent to which such programs produced, or sought to produce, disruptive technologies or incremental technologies;

“(3) with respect to each contractor subject to the reporting requirement under subsection (a)—

“(A) a comparison of the total amount of independent research and development costs submitted for reimbursement under the annual incurred cost proposal of such contractor and the amount reported to the Defense Technical Information Center; and

“(B) a summary of any issues relating to the ownership or distribution of intellectual property rights raised by such contractor relating to an independent research and development program of such contractor.”.

(c) REPORT TO GAO.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Comptroller Gen-

eral of the United States the first such report required under subsection (f) of section 2372 of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), so that the Comptroller General may perform a review of the information provided in the report.

AMENDMENT NO. 179 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 831. REPORTING ON EXPENSES INCURRED FOR BID AND PROPOSAL COSTS.

Section 2372a(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking “shall be reported” and all that follows through “indirect costs.” and inserting the following: “shall be reported—

“(1) independently from other allowable indirect costs; and

“(2) annually by the contractor to the Director of the Defense Contract Audit Agency, who shall give access to the information to the Principal Director for Defense Pricing and Contracting.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 180 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 831. REPEAL OF THE DEFENSE COST ACCOUNTING STANDARDS BOARD.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 190 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 190.

AMENDMENT NO. 181 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle G of title V, insert the following new section:

SEC. 567. TRANSITION OUTREACH PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of Veterans Affairs, Labor, Education, and Homeland Security, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall establish a pilot program through the Transition to Veterans Program Office that fosters contact between veterans and the Department of Defense.

(b) CONTACT.—The Secretary of Defense, and with respect to members of the Coast Guard, the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall direct the Military Transition Assistance Teams of the Department of Defense to contact each veteran from the Armed Forces at least twice during each of the first three months after the veteran separates from the Armed Forces to—

(1) inquire about the transition of the separated member to civilian life, including—

- (A) employment;
- (B) veterans benefits;
- (C) education;
- (D) family life; and

(2) hear concerns of the veteran regarding transition.

(c) TERMINATION.—The Secretary shall complete operation of the pilot program under this section not later than September 30, 2020.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after termination of the pilot program under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to Congress regarding such pilot program, including the following, disaggregated by armed force:

(1) The number of veterans contacted, including how many times such veterans were contacted.

(2) Information regarding the age, sex, and geographic region of contacted veterans.

(3) Concerns most frequently raised by the veterans.

(4) What benefits the contacted veterans have received, and an estimate of the cost to the Federal Government for such benefits.

(5) How many contacted veterans are employed or have sought employment, including what fields of employment.

(6) How many contacted veterans are enrolled or have sought to enroll in a course of education, including what fields of study.

(7) Recommendations for legislation to improve the long-term effectiveness of TAP and the well-being of veterans.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “armed force” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term “TAP” means the Transition Assistance Program under sections 1142 and 1144 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The term “veteran” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 182 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the appropriate place in subtitle E of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12 . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE ENDURING UNITED STATES COMMITMENT TO THE FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States has strong and enduring interests in the security and prosperity of Oceania and the Western Pacific region, including close relationships with the countries of Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia, with whom the United States shares Compacts of Free Association;

(2) the United States and the Freely Associated States share values including democracy and human rights, as well as mutual interest in a free, open and prosperous Indo-Pacific region;

(3) the United States should expand support to the Freely Associated States on issues of concern, including climate change mitigation, protection of the marine environment and maritime law enforcement;

(4) the United States should expeditiously begin negotiations on the renewal of the Compacts of Free Association and conclude such negotiations prior to the expiration of the current compacts in 2023 and 2024; and

(5) the United States honors the service of the men and women of the Freely Associated States who serve in the United States Armed Forces.

AMENDMENT NO. 183 OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5 . INCLUSION OF INFORMATION ON FREE CREDIT MONITORING IN ANNUAL FINANCIAL LITERACY BRIEFING.

The Secretary of each military department shall ensure that the annual financial literacy education briefing provided to servicemembers includes information on the availability of free credit monitoring services pursuant to section 605A(k) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c-1(k)).

AMENDMENT NO. 184 OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle H of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10 . INTEROPERABILITY OF COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AND ADJACENT JURISDICTIONS.

Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Department of Defense Fire and Emergency Services Working Group shall submit to the congress-

sional defense committees a report that includes—

(1) an identification of all military installations that provide emergency services to areas outside of their installations, make them aware of the Amtrak Passenger Train 501 Derailment in DuPont, Washington, and determine the effectiveness of the communications system between that military installation and the adjacent jurisdictions; and

(2) an implementation plan to address any deficiencies with interoperability caused by the incompatibility between the Department of Defense communications system and that of adjacent civilian agencies.

AMENDMENT NO. 185 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 10 . SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL MARITIME HERITAGE GRANTS PROGRAM.

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense may contribute up to \$5,000,000 to support the National Maritime Heritage Grants Program established under section 308703 of title 54, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 186 OFFERED BY MS. HILL OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 898. DOMESTIC PRODUCTION OF SMALL UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS.

The Secretary of Defense shall take such action as necessary to strengthen the domestic production of small unmanned aircraft systems (as defined in section 331 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-95; 49 U.S.C. 44802 note)), as described under Presidential Determination No. 2019-13 of June 10, 2019.

AMENDMENT NO. 187 OFFERED BY MR. HOLLINGSWORTH OF INDIANA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON INCREASING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN BIOPRINTING AND FABRICATION IN AUSTERE MILITARY ENVIRONMENTS.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Defense Health Agency should take appropriate actions to increase efforts focused on research and development in the areas of bioprinting and fabrication in austere military environments.

AMENDMENT NO. 188 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

At the appropriate place in title VI, insert the following:

SEC. 6 . REDUCTIONS ON ACCOUNT OF EARNINGS FROM WORK PERFORMED WHILE ENTITLED TO AN ANNUITY SUPPLEMENT.

Section 8421a of title 5, United States Code, is amended in subsection (c)—

(1) by striking “full-time as an air traffic control instructor” and inserting “as an air traffic control instructor, or supervisor thereof;” and

(2) by inserting “or supervisor” after “an instructor”.

AMENDMENT NO. 189 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 345. INSPECTOR GENERAL AUDIT OF CERTAIN COMMERCIAL DEPOT MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS.

The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall conduct an audit of each military department and Defense Agency (as defined in section 101 of title 10, United

States Code), as applicable, to determine if there has been any excess profit or cost escalation with respect to any sole-source contracts relating to commercial depot maintenance (including contracts for parts, supplies, equipment, and maintenance services).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Washington for yielding.

I was pleased to offer an amendment to H.R. 2500 to expand the liberal consideration standard given by discharge review boards and boards for the correction of military records to victims of military sexual trauma, to survivors of intimate partner violence and domestic abuse.

Members of the Armed Forces who were victims of intimate partner violence have sometimes received less than honorable discharges because of behavior caused by their underlying trauma. This discharge status may exclude them from receiving veterans benefits, including services to help address their trauma.

Less than honorable discharge statuses are associated with higher rates of homelessness and suicide. Simply put, these discharge statuses are retraumatizing, and survivors deserve better.

My amendment would have ensured victims of intimate partner violence receive the same liberal consideration standard as other victims of sexual assault in the Armed Forces. All survivors should be believed and treated with compassion, regardless of the violence they experienced.

I appreciate the willingness of the House Armed Services Committee staff to work with my team to try to get this provision included in the House NDAA. Unfortunately, due to budgetary rules, we were unable to find a path forward. A provision that mirrors my amendment was included in the Senate NDAA, thanks to the tremendous leadership of Senators GILLIBRAND and ERNST.

Chairman SMITH, when the House and Senate conferences our two bills, will you work with the Senate to see this provision included in the final conference bill?

I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New Hampshire for her leadership on this issue, and I agree that it is a very important issue.

Absolutely, we will work with the Senate to do our best to address it once we get to conference, and, again, I thank the gentlewoman for her work on this.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his response.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend, the distinguished ranking member, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, for years, books and articles have been written suggesting that significant research had been done at U.S. Government facilities, including Fort Detrick and Plum Island, to turn ticks and other insects into bioweapons. Now, a new book, "Bitten: The Secret History of Lyme Disease and Biological Weapons," by Kris Newby, includes interviews with Dr. Willy Burgdorfer, the researcher who is credited with discovering Lyme disease. It turns out Dr. Burgdorfer was also a bioweapons specialist.

The interviews combined with access to Dr. Burgdorfer's lab files reveal that he and other bioweapons specialists stuffed ticks with pathogens to cause severe disability, disease, even death to potential enemies.

With Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases exploding in the United States, with an estimated 300,000 to 427,000 new cases each year and 10 to 20 percent of all patients suffering from chronic Lyme disease, I believe Americans have a right to know whether any of this is true.

If true, what were the parameters of the program?

Who ordered it?

Was there any accidental release anywhere or at any time of any of the diseased ticks?

Were any ticks released by design?

In the book, there is some talk of that happening at or near Richmond, Virginia. Can any of this information help current-day researchers—and this is most important of all—help current-day researchers find a way to mitigate and maybe even cure these diseases?

It should be noted for the record that it was President Richard Nixon in 1969 who ordered the end to all bioweapons research, but we know that there were tick farms at Plum Island and Fort Detrick, like I said earlier, and other places where this research was done.

We need to know. I encourage Members to read this book if they get the time, "Bitten: The Secret History of Lyme Disease and Biological Weapons." Again, it may offer some clues as to how we combat this terrible epidemic of Lyme disease in the United States.

My amendment tasks the DoD Inspector General to ask the hard questions and report back. The millions of people suffering from Lyme and other tick-borne diseases deserve to know the truth.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND), a member of the committee.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment requiring reporting

on human rights in Brazil in light of the Bolsonaro administration's dangerous actions.

President Bolsonaro has said he wants to strip constitutional land rights from Brazil's indigenous people. He has openly stated that indigenous people should have been exterminated.

His threats go beyond words. Bolsonaro's administration has already begun infringing upon the rights of indigenous people and other vulnerable groups.

Despite this alarming behavior, President Trump named Brazil a major non-NATO ally. Congress can and must use its authority to direct and block funds and conduct oversight.

The Bolsonaro administration must understand that increased U.S. cooperation is conditional upon respect for the rights of the people of Brazil, including indigenous people, Afro-Brazilians, women, and LGBTQ communities.

Congress is watching, and we must demand accountability.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise to support my amendment, which prohibits the Department of Defense from contracting with companies that do not have a sexual harassment policy.

Now more than ever, people are empowered to speak up and change the culture in the workplace. Congress, the Department of Defense, and many other workplaces have or are implementing policies to hold perpetrators accountable. We must demand the same from those who do business with our government.

In fiscal year 2017, the Department of Defense spent \$320 billion on contractors. If these contractors are going to receive Federal dollars, they should be subject to the same accountability.

My amendment will ensure that contractors have sexual harassment policies in place prior to signing on the dotted line. All workers must be protected in the workplace, especially when they are working to protect our country.

I urge my colleagues to support workers and pass this amendment and pass the en bloc package.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, on July 4, a 6.4 magnitude earthquake hit Ridgecrest, California. A day later, our Ridgecrest community experienced a 7.1 magnitude earthquake.

To put that in perspective, the Northridge quake that, 20 years ago, severely cost 60 lives and others and crippled Los Angeles was less than that.

People felt this throughout southern California, but the epicenter of these earthquakes was located on the Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake.

Hundreds of aftershocks have already occurred and are still occurring.

The Navy announced that, due to earthquake-related damage, China Lake was not mission capable and that nonessential personnel had to be evacuated. This is significant because China Lake, along with neighboring installations, form a cornerstone of our national defense architecture that integrates all operational domains: air, land, sea, space, and cyberspace.

The men and women who work here help test and develop the technology needed to equip our warfighters with the very best weapons and tools to ensure our military remains second to none.

Now, my amendment, which I offered with Congressman COOK, was included in the en bloc package. It would authorize \$100 million to help address China Lake's most immediate needs, and it requires the Department of Defense to develop a plan by October 1 to assess, repair, and modernize the infrastructure and facilities at China Lake and other installations in the R-2508 Special Use Airspace Complex that was damaged by the earthquakes.

The extent of this damage is still being assessed, but we need to ensure that we are not only repairing this important base to address the threats facing our Nation today, but in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear to my constituents in Ridgecrest, in Kern County, this amendment is just an initial step in helping China Lake and the communities I represent impacted by these earthquakes make sure they recover.

Over the coming days, weeks, and months, I ask my colleagues in this Chamber and the U.S. Senate to join with me to ensure Ridgecrest, China Lake, and all communities impacted by earthquakes and natural disasters have our full support and are provided the resources they need to quickly rebuild and get back to normal.

I also ask my colleagues to join me in thanking all the local first responders, the local, State, and Federal emergency response officials who have worked nonstop over the past several days to ensure our constituents affected in Ridgecrest were safe, have food and water and a place to sleep.

Finally, I also want to thank the thousands of residents across our communities for their help, their actions, and their prayers for their neighbors in need.

It is said adversity does not build character; it reveals it. Earthquakes can shake our foundations, but the residents of Ridgecrest should hold their heads high. In this time of adversity, their true character has shown and is an inspiration to all of us.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 1915

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SMITH, Ranking Member THORNBERRY, and all the Armed Services Committee members for all their hard work on this bill.

I rise in support of the en bloc package, which contains four amendments I have introduced.

Mr. Chair, Iran has engaged in reckless conduct, destabilizing the region, with their attacks on allied tankers near the Strait of Hormuz and with the support of terrorist organizations, including Hezbollah and Hamas. We must remain vigilant with Iran.

My amendment ensures that the Defense Department reports on threats to freedom of navigation on all international waterways.

My second amendment directs the Defense and State Departments to send recommendations to Congress to improve the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. This will help eliminate nuclear material and prevent proliferation.

My third amendment prohibits funds and support from going to foreign terrorist organizations, including Hamas, Hezbollah, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, al-Shabaab, and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, by adding these to the prohibited list in section 1224 of this bill. We must stop terrorism in its tracks.

Finally, brave Americans of every background have served in our Armed Forces, including Jewish American veterans who fought Nazis in World War II.

My fourth amendment requires the Defense Department to question whether our Active Duty servicemembers have experienced anti-Semitism while bravely serving our country.

Mr. Chair, I urge support for this bipartisan en bloc package of amendments.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman of the full committee, and I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Today I rise in support of Mr. ROSE's amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act. This amendment, which I cosponsored, takes the necessary steps to target bad actors responsible for the illegal trafficking of fentanyl into the United States.

Across Arkansas, heartbroken families have told me their stories time and time again about how the opioid crisis has claimed the lives of their loved ones.

According to the CDC, in 2017, more than 130 Americans lost their lives to opioid abuse each day, nearly half of those deaths attributable to fentanyl.

We have a responsibility to stem the tide of this crisis. Targeting the source of the world's largest producers and distributors of fentanyl will begin to stop the flow of these drugs.

Mr. Chair, I am grateful to Mr. ROSE for this effort, which complements

work that I have been doing over the past year with my friend, Senator TOM COTTON, to fight this plague.

Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member for yielding, and I urge a "yes" vote on this en bloc package.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this en bloc package, and I would also like to speak in favor of en bloc package No. 10, which includes four of my amendments.

The first would mandate that the President provide Congress with a copy of National Security Presidential Memorandums related to military operations in cyberspace.

Congress has a vital role to play in ensuring that offensive cyber operations do not inadvertently undermine stability in cyberspace. Unfortunately, the White House has continuously stymied our efforts and attempts to conduct this constitutionally-protected oversight, refusing to provide important policy documents that took effect nearly a year ago.

Ironically, I have largely supported the administration's more forward-leaning posture, but regardless of my feelings towards the underlying strategy, it is unacceptable that the White House continues to stonewall our attempts to oversee sensitive operations. This amendment will stop that obstruction.

A second amendment ensures that new software acquisition pathways will include cybersecurity metrics. I strongly support updating how the Pentagon buys software, but it is important that we have explicit measures of the security of the code that we are buying.

Now, I hope that this amendment will both drive the adoption of metrics related to common software weaknesses and lead to broader changes, such as increased use of type-safe programming languages.

Finally, this package includes two amendments related to our Special Operations Forces.

The first extends by 3 years a relatively new irregular warfare authority, which is designed to address threats in the gray zone below the level of armed conflict in order to gauge its use and effectiveness.

The second would strengthen requirements that the Department notify Congress before exercising a counterterrorism authority referred to as 127 Echo. This authority has proven its worth over the last decade, but I believe that we must continue to improve our rigorous oversight to ensure appropriate use.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this en bloc package and my amendments in en bloc package No. 10.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished

gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGGLEMAN).

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment, which directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan for a pilot program to train skilled technicians for placement in the defense industrial base, including critical shipbuilding skills such as welding, metrology, quality assurance, machining, and additive manufacturing.

Mr. Chair, I would like to begin by thanking my friends, colleagues, and fellow Virginians, Representatives LURIA, WITTMAN, MCEACHIN, and BEYER, for their partnership on this amendment.

Our Nation's defense industrial base is a critical aspect of our Nation's national security and economic prosperity. We must continue to adapt this industry to respond to the emerging challenges and global realities that face our country. One such challenge is training a workforce that can maintain the required tools and products our Armed Forces need.

The Defense Industrial Base report to the President dated October 2018 stated: "Without concerted action that provides both a ready workforce and continuously-charged pipeline of new employees, the U.S. will not be able to maintain the large, vibrant, and diverse machine tools sector needed."

This amendment helps the Department of Defense close the gap in our Nation's workforce that threatens our global competitiveness and military capabilities. It will help America modernize its workforce and create a pipeline of new employees who support our security apparatus.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SMITH for yielding.

I rise today to speak about two amendments in this en bloc package that are critical to the Nation's security and good governance.

The first is a bipartisan amendment that addresses the need for oversight and accountability in our national security infrastructure. This bipartisan amendment directs the IG to audit DOD departments and agencies to determine if excess profit and cost escalation on sole-source contracts has taken place. This is important not only for our bases and maintenance, but it impacts our Nation's readiness.

While we understand that contractors and suppliers need to make a profit, that doesn't mean that our taxpayer dollars should go to fund excess profits and escalations that are well outside of the norm.

This good governance is reasonable and helps us to ensure our Nation's security while being good stewards of the taxpayer dollars.

The second amendment in this en bloc package addresses our Nation's security in a different way: that of the air traffic controllers, who pay into their retirement throughout their career until they are forced to retire at the age of 56, many of whom are our Nation's veterans.

Right now, we are experiencing a severe shortage of air traffic controllers across this Nation, and retired air traffic controllers are some of the most qualified supervisors and trainers. However, under current law, all FERS retirees either must work under 1.5 days per week or full-time, otherwise, they lose their Federal retirement.

This amendment allows all retirees to simply retain their hard-earned retirement dollars that they have paid in, so we can train the next generation of air traffic controllers.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman and ranking member for including my amendments in these en bloc amendments.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple. It requires the Secretary of the Navy to create a report regarding the feasibility of doing maintenance work on naval vessels at shipyards other than shipyards in the vessel's home port.

Currently, the Navy has a tremendous maintenance backlog, but under current law, there are certain restrictions that limit where naval vessels can undertake maintenance repair. Unless these restrictions are lifted, the Navy's backlog will only increase exponentially.

At the same time, there are fully qualified shipyards in the rest of the United States, including the Great Lakes region, Gulf Coast, and Alaska, that can perform repair work for certain types of naval vessels. Yards such as Fraser Shipyards in Superior, Wisconsin, have the capacity and skills to do this work. They just need the chance.

I know Fraser Shipyards and others are dedicated to the national security mission of the United States and would be an efficient and competent service provider, and I am certain Fraser Shipyards and others within the Great Lakes do not stand alone in this process.

Although these vessels may not be homeported in these regions of the country, it should be within the Secretary's discretion to decide what types of vessels could be sent to such shipyards to help with the Navy's maintenance backlog. This could include noncombatant vessels, vessels with minimal crews, or other vessels that only need limited periods of time in shipyards for the repair work.

The opportunity to create additional geographic repair centers presents the United States Navy an opportunity to diversify their industrial base, create resiliency, and improve our military readiness.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Congressman DUFFY and Congressman COX for cosponsoring this amendment, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support the en bloc amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers on this en bloc package, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the en bloc package, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 476, I offer amendments en bloc as the designee for Mr. SMITH of Washington.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 8 consisting of amendment Nos. 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, and 215 printed in part B of House Report 116-143, offered by Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

AMENDMENT NO. 191 OFFERED BY MR. HORSFORD OF NEVADA

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR AIR FORCE UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, basic research, University Research Initiatives, line 002 (PE 0601103F) is hereby increased by \$5,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for operation and maintenance, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, operating forces, Special Operations Command Theater Forces, line 100 is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 192 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 882. POSTWARD EXPLANATIONS FOR UNSUCCESSFUL OFFERORS FOR CERTAIN CONTRACTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be revised to require that with respect to an offer for a task order or delivery order in an amount greater than the simplified acquisition threshold (as defined in section 134 of title 41, United States Code) and less than or equal to \$3,500,000 issued under an indefinite delivery-indefinite quantity contract, the contracting officer for such contract shall, upon written

request from an unsuccessful offeror, provide a brief explanation as to why such offeror was unsuccessful that includes a summary of the rationale for the award and an evaluation of the significant weak or deficient factors in the offeror's offer.

AMENDMENT NO. 193 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 606. CONTINUED ENTITLEMENTS WHILE A MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES PARTICIPATES IN A CAREER INTERMISSION PROGRAM.

Section 710(h) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(3) the entitlement of the member and of the survivors of the member to all death benefits under the provisions of chapter 75 of this title;

“(4) the provision of all travel and transportation allowances for the survivors of deceased members to attend burial ceremonies under section 481f of title 37; and

“(5) the eligibility of the member for general benefits as provided in part II of title 38.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 194 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN OF PENNSYLVANIA

Add at the end of subtitle G of title XII the following:

SEC. 1268. REPORT ON IMPLICATIONS OF CHINESE MILITARY PRESENCE IN DJIBOUTI.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a comprehensive strategy to address security concerns posed by the Chinese People's Liberation Army Support Base in Djibouti to United States military installations and logistics chains in sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the potential military, intelligence, and logistical threats facing key regional United States military infrastructure, supply chains, and staging grounds due to the proximity of major Chinese military assets in Djibouti.

(2) An assessment of the efforts taken by Camp Lemonnier to improve aviation safety in the aftermath of the recent Chinese military targeting of American flight crews with military-grade lasers.

(3) An assessment of Djibouti's Chinese-held public debt and the strategic vulnerabilities such may present if China moves to claim the Port of Djibouti or other key logistical assets in repayment.

(4) A description of the specific operational challenges facing United States military and supply chains in the Horn of Africa and the Middle East in the event that access to the strategically significant Port of Djibouti becomes limited or lost in its entirety, as well as a comprehensive contingency strategy to maintain full operational capacity in AFRICOM and CENTCOM through other ports and transport hubs.

(5) An identification of measures to mitigate risk of escalation between United States and Chinese military assets in Djibouti.

(6) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 195 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28 . . . REPORT ON CAPACITY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO PROVIDE SURVIVORS OF NATURAL DISASTERS WITH EMERGENCY SHORT-TERM HOUSING.

Not later than 220 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report analyzing the capacity of the Department of Defense to provide survivors of natural disasters with emergency short-term housing.

AMENDMENT NO. 196 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

At the appropriate place in subtitle G of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12 . . . REPORT ON EFFORTS TO COMBAT BOKO HARAM IN NIGERIA AND THE LAKE CHAD BASIN.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the ongoing violence and the systematic gross human rights violations against the people of Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin carried out by Boko Haram;

(2) expresses its support for the people of Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin who wish to live in a peaceful, economically prosperous, and democratic region; and

(3) calls on the President to support Nigerian, Lake Chad Basin, and international community efforts to ensure accountability for crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram against the people of Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin, particularly the young girls kidnapped from Chibok and other internally displaced persons affected by the actions of Boko Haram.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General shall jointly submit to Congress a report on efforts to combat Boko Haram in Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A description of initiatives undertaken by the Department of Defense to assist the Government of Nigeria and countries in the Lake Chad Basin to develop capacities to deploy special forces to combat Boko Haram.

(B) A description of United States activities to enhance the capacity of Nigeria and countries in the Lake Chad Basin to investigate and prosecute human rights violations perpetrated against the people of Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin by Boko Haram, al-Qaeda affiliates, and other terrorist organizations, in order to promote respect for rule of law in Nigeria and the Lake Chad Basin.

AMENDMENT NO. 197 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12 . . . BRIEFING ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAM TO PROTECT UNITED STATES STUDENTS AGAINST FOREIGN AGENTS.

Not later than 240 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the program described in section 1277 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91), including an assessment on whether the program is beneficial to students interning, working part time, or in a program that will result in employment post-graduation with Department of Defense components and contractors.

AMENDMENT NO. 198 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle A of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5 . . . REPORT ON RATE OF MATERNAL MORTALITY AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, and with respect to members of the Coast Guard, the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall submit to Congress a report on the rate of maternal mortality among members of the Armed Forces and the dependents of such members.

AMENDMENT NO. 199 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle A of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16 . . . REPORT ON SPACE DEBRIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 240 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the risks posed by man-made space debris in low-earth orbit, including—

(1) recommendations with respect to the remediation of such risks; and

(2) outlines of plans to reduce the incident of such space debris.

(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 200 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle C of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16 . . . REPORT ON CYBERSECURITY TRAINING PROGRAMS.

Not later than 240 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that accounts for all of the efforts, programs, initiatives, and investments of the Department of Defense to train elementary, secondary, and postsecondary students in fields related to cybersecurity, cyber defense, and cyber operations. The report shall—

(1) include information on the metrics used to evaluate such efforts, programs, initiatives, and investments, and identify overlaps or redundancies across the various efforts, programs, initiatives, and investments; and

(2) address how the Department leverages such efforts, programs, initiatives, and investments in the recruitment and retention of both the civilian and military cyberworkforces.

AMENDMENT NO. 201 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 7 . . . INCREASED COLLABORATION WITH NIH TO COMBAT TRIPLE NEGATIVE BREAST CANCER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Office of Health of the Department of Defense shall work in collaboration with the National Institutes of Health to—

(1) identify specific genetic and molecular targets and biomarkers for triple negative breast cancer; and

(2) provide information useful in biomarker selection, drug discovery, and clinical trials design that will enable both—

(A) triple negative breast cancer patients to be identified earlier in the progression of their disease; and

(B) the development of multiple targeted therapies for the disease.

(b) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 1405 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the corresponding funding tables in division D, is hereby increased by \$10,000,000 to carry out subsection (a).

(c) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide is hereby reduced by \$10,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 202 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 7 . . . FUNDING FOR POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER.

(a) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 1405 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the corresponding funding table in such division, is hereby increased by \$2,500,000 for post-traumatic stress disorder.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide is hereby reduced by \$2,500,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 203 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 560b. SPEECH DISORDERS OF CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN.

(a) TESTING.—The Superintendent of a military service academy shall provide testing for speech disorders to incoming cadets or midshipmen under the jurisdiction of that Superintendent.

(b) NO EFFECT ON ADMISSION.—The testing under subsection (a) may not have any effect on admission to a military service academy.

(c) RESULTS.—The Superintendent shall provide each cadet or midshipman under the jurisdiction of that Superintendent the result of the testing under subsection (a) and a list of warfare unrestricted line officer positions and occupation specialists that require successful performance on the speech test.

(d) THERAPY.—The Superintendent shall furnish speech therapy to a cadet or midshipman under the jurisdiction of that Superintendent at the election of the cadet or midshipman.

(e) RETAKING.—A cadet or midshipman whose testing indicate a speech disorder or impediment may elect to retake the testing once each academic year while enrolled at the military service academy.

AMENDMENT NO. 204 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

In section 235(a)(2)—
(1) in subparagraph (H), strike “and” at the end;
(2) redesignate subparagraph (I) as subparagraph (J); and
(3) insert after subparagraph (H), the following new subparagraph (I):
(I) opportunities and risks; and

AMENDMENT NO. 205 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL
OF WASHINGTON

Page 379, after line 2, insert the following new subsection:

(h) FUNDING.—

(1) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for operation and maintenance, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, administrative and service-wide activities, Office of the Secretary of Defense, line 460 is hereby increased by \$5,000,000 (with the amount of such increase to be made available for the Defense Suicide Prevention Office and National Guard suicide prevention pilot program under this section).

(2) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for procurement, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for shipbuilding and conversion, Navy, ship to shore connector, line 024 is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

Page 379, line 3, strike “(h)” and insert “(i)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 206 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL
OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 898. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING WITH PERSONS WITH WILLFUL OR REPEATED VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938.

The head of a Federal department or agency (as defined in section 102 of title 40, United States Code) shall initiate a debarment proceeding with respect to a person for whom information regarding a willful or repeated violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) as determined by a disposition described under subsection (c)(1) of section 2313 of title 41, United States Code, is included in the database established under subsection (a) of such section.

AMENDMENT NO. 207 OFFERED BY MR. JEFFRIES
OF NEW YORK

Page 817, after line 21, insert the following:
“(30) An assessment of the nature of Chinese military relations with Russia, including what strategic objectives China and Russia share and are acting on, and on what objectives they misalign.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 208 OFFERED BY MS. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS

Page 145, lines 23 through 24, strike “ as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate” and insert “on an annual basis”.

AMENDMENT NO. 209 OFFERED BY MS. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS

Page 365, line 10, insert before the period the following: “, in a manner that addresses the need for cultural competence and diversity among such mental health providers”.

AMENDMENT NO. 210 OFFERED BY MS. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28 . . . INSTALLATION OF CARBON MONOXIDE DETECTORS IN MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING.

Section 2821 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) The Secretary concerned shall provide for the installation and maintenance of an appropriate number of carbon monoxide detectors in each unit of military family housing under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 211 OFFERED BY MR. JOYCE OF
PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle G of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28 . . . REPORT ON PROJECTS AWAITING APPROVAL FROM THE REALTY GOVERNANCE BOARD.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report describing the projects that, as of the date of the report, are awaiting approval from the Realty Governance Board. Such report shall include—

- (1) a list of projects awaiting evaluation for a Major Land Acquisition Waiver; and
- (2) an assessment of the impact a project described in paragraph (1) would have on the security of physical assets and personnel at the military installation requesting the Major Land Acquisition Waiver.

AMENDMENT NO. 212 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR OF
OHIO

Insert after section 554 the following new section:

SEC. 5 . . . INCLUSION OF COAST GUARD IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STARBASE PROGRAM.

Section 2193b of title 10, United States Code, is further amended—

- (1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating” after “military departments”; and
- (2) in subsection (f), by striking “and the Secretaries of the military departments” and inserting “, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating”.

AMENDMENT NO. 213 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING
OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . . MEANINGFUL INCLUSION OF AFGHAN WOMEN IN PEACE NEGOTIATIONS.

As part of any activities of the Department of Defense relating to the ongoing peace process in Afghanistan, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall seek to ensure the meaningful participation of Afghan women in that process in a manner consistent with the Women, Peace, and Security Act of 2017 (22 U.S.C. 2152j et seq.), including through advocacy for the inclusion of Afghan women leaders in ongoing and future negotiations to end the conflict in Afghanistan.

AMENDMENT NO. 214 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING
OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of subtitle D of title X, add the following:

SEC. . . ESTABLISHING A COORDINATOR FOR ISIS DETAINEE ISSUES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, acting through the Secretary of State, shall designate an existing official within the Department of State to serve as senior-level coordinator to coordinate, in conjunction with the lead and other relevant agencies, all matters for the United States Government relating to the long-term disposition of Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) foreign terrorist fighter detainees, including all matters in connection with—

(1) repatriation, transfer, prosecution, and intelligence-gathering;

(2) coordinating a whole-of-government approach with other countries and international organizations, including INTERPOL, to ensure secure chains of custody and locations of ISIS foreign terrorist fighter detainees;

(3) coordinating technical and evidentiary assistance to foreign countries to aid in the successful prosecution of ISIS foreign terrorist fighter detainees; and

(4) all multilateral and international engagements led by the Department of State and other agencies that are related to the current and future handling, detention, and prosecution of ISIS foreign terrorist fighter detainees.

(b) RETENTION OF AUTHORITY.—The appointment of a senior-level coordinator pursuant to subsection (a) shall not deprive any agency of any authority to independently perform functions of that agency.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once each year thereafter through January 21, 2021, the individual designated under subsection (a) shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed report regarding high-value ISIS detainees that the coordinator reasonably determines to be subject to criminal prosecution in the United States.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(A) A detailed description of the facilities where ISIS foreign terrorist fighter detainees described in paragraph (1) are being held.

(B) An analysis of all United States efforts to prosecute ISIS foreign terrorist fighter detainees described in paragraph (1) and the outcomes of such efforts. Any information, the disclosure of which may violate Department of Justice policy or law, relating to a prosecution or investigation may be withheld from a report under paragraph (1).

(C) A detailed description of any option to expedite prosecution of any ISIS foreign terrorist fighter detainee described in paragraph (1), including in a court of competent jurisdiction outside of the United States.

(D) An analysis of factors on the ground in Syria and Iraq that may result in the unintended release of ISIS foreign terrorist fighter detainees described in paragraph (1), and an assessment of any measures available to mitigate such releases.

(E) A detailed description of all multilateral and other international efforts or proposals that would assist in the prosecution of ISIS foreign terrorist fighter detainees described in paragraph (1).

(F) An analysis of all efforts between the United States and partner countries within the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS or other countries to share intelligence or evidence that may aid in the prosecution of members of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria and associated forces, and any legal obstacles that may hinder such efforts.

(G) An analysis of the manner in which the United States Government communicates on such proposals and efforts to the families of United States citizens believed to be a victim of a criminal act by an ISIS foreign terrorist fighter detainee.

(3) FORM.—The report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term "ISIS foreign terrorist fighter detainee" means a detained individual—

(A) who allegedly fought for or supported the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS); and

(B) who is a national of a country other than Iraq or Syria.

(e) SUNSET.—The requirements under this section shall sunset on January 21, 2021.

AMENDMENT NO. 215 OFFERED BY MS. KELLY OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle H of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. REPORT ON TRAINING AND SUPPORT AVAILABLE TO MILITARY SPOUSES.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes a description of the following:

(1) Financial literacy programs currently designed specifically for military spouses.

(2) Programs designed to educate spouses and service members about the risks of multi-level marketing.

(3) Efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of financial literacy programs.

(4) The number of counseling sessions requested by military spouses at Family Support Centers in the previous 5 years.

(b) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall be made available on a publicly accessible website of the Department of Defense.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman of the committee and I also thank the designee for yielding me this time.

I am pleased to introduce two amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act that deal with PFAS contamination issues.

The first amendment, amendment 125, provides an additional \$5 million for the nationwide Centers for Disease Control and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry PFAS health study, authorizing a total of \$15 million for this critical research.

We know that PFAS chemicals are linked to devastating health consequences and are present in 99 percent of Americans, but many questions remain unanswered. This study will help get the answers our constituents deserve and the solutions we need.

□ 1930

I thank Representatives KILDEE, FITZPATRICK, UPTON, PAPPAS, BOYLE,

ROUDA, and others for cosponsoring this amendment.

The second amendment, Amendment No. 126, phases out the Department of Defense's use of AFFF firefighting foam by 2025, reducing PFAS contamination and protecting our communities.

The amendment also substantially limits the Department of Defense's ability to use waivers from 6 years to 1 year. Currently, the Department of Defense can use waivers that allow the use of AFFF firefighting foam up to 2035, almost a decade longer than this phaseout provision would allow.

I thank, again, Representatives KILDEE and PAPPAS for supporting this amendment.

I also thank Chairman SMITH and his extraordinary staff for working with me on these critically important issues.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have no speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON).

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, few things are as patriotic—as American—as serving our Nation in the United States Armed Forces. My amendment, amendment No. 17, would ensure that noncitizens defending our country receive the resources they need to pursue the citizenship they have earned.

Specifically, my amendment will modify the pre-separation counseling checklist administered to servicemembers to provide them an opportunity to request further information regarding expedited naturalization.

Throughout history, many legal permanent residents have demonstrated their commitment to the United States by volunteering to serve their adopted country by putting on the uniform and joining the United States Armed Forces. Unfortunately, we have all seen reports that there may be thousands of deported U.S. veterans because they failed to apply for citizenship for a variety of reasons. Deporting these patriotic veterans does not reflect our American values.

As a country that honors our veterans, we need to take the appropriate steps to ensure that those who volunteered to serve are not deported because they were unaware of the benefits available to them.

My amendment provides a safety net that ensures noncitizen servicemembers who defended our country are aware of these benefits.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment No. 14 allows veterans who are enrolled in their respective service's Wounded Warrior program to continue their enrollment in the Military Adaptive Sports Program for an additional year after separation.

Currently, once a servicemember separates from the U.S. Armed Forces,

they no longer qualify for their respective service's Wounded Warrior program. My amendment would change this by extending eligibility for an additional year during their transition to civilian life.

It is reported that veterans, in their first year after separating from uniformed service, sadly, experience suicide rates at approximately two times higher than the overall veteran suicide rate. This is even higher for wounded veterans. My amendment looks to combat this devastating statistic by providing veterans with continued physical, psychological, and social rehabilitation during the first year of transition.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment package.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote yes on a bipartisan amendment to address the opioid crisis that affects our servicemembers so severely. And I thank my fellow Pennsylvanian and friend, BRIAN FITZPATRICK, for joining me in tackling this issue.

This amendment would establish a partnership between the Department of Defense and academic health centers to work on three key areas:

One, focused research on reducing our servicemembers' dependency on opioids;

Two, the development of new methods of pain management and mental health strategies; and

Three, partnerships with industry that would advance technologies for wounded servicemembers that will improve their day-to-day lives.

The opioid epidemic is not and cannot be a bipartisan issue. It hits communities all across the country, regardless of ethnicity, race, or socioeconomic status. But the epidemic is spreading to our servicemembers at an alarming rate.

Our servicemembers have unique challenges. Studies show that 15 percent of servicemembers use opioids following injuries while deployed, which is almost four times the civilian average of 4 percent. As a result, addiction is higher among servicemembers than in the civilian population and is rising. Over a 3-year period, the percentage of misuse nearly tripled. That is why this amendment is so critical.

Our servicemembers protect all of us and we can protect them by passing this amendment and curtailing the devastating addictions of our American heroes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment codifying the Boots to Business program and authorizing it for 5 years.

The men and women who ably serve our Nation with honor deserve our support as they transition from military to civilian life. Many of our servicemembers have the temperament, drive, and skills to excel in small business. They excel as small-business owners and as entrepreneurs, but they often-times lack the industry-specific experience to turn their dreams into reality.

The Boots to Business program helps bridge this gap by offering exiting servicemembers and military spouses a 2-day in-person course on business ownership, followed by more in-depth instruction through an 8-week online course.

Since the program launched in 2013, more than 50,000 veterans have participated.

Earlier this week, the House Small Business Committee held a hearing on veteran entrepreneurship. We had the chance to hear from veterans who turned their careers as small-business owners successfully after benefiting from the programming and training provided by the Boots to Business program.

Codifying this important program is a bipartisan effort, and I urge my colleagues to join us in support of the Boots to Business program and more opportunities for our veterans.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. STANTON). The gentlewoman from Oklahoma has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER).

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Representative HORN for allowing me to speak on these issues.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment supports small businesses by directing the Secretary of the Navy to adhere to competitive procedures whenever possible. This will not only make it easier for smaller contractors to compete on an even playing field with billion-dollar corporations, but it is also good governance.

Approximately 2,000 businesses provide support to the military and defense sectors in Washington State. In the last 3 years, businesses were awarded nearly \$15 billion in related contracts.

Our small businesses, many of which are owned by veterans, are a driving

force in our economy, especially in Washington State. By ensuring contracts are awarded on a competitive basis, we can save the Federal Government millions of dollars in acquisition and sustainment costs.

Also, for NDAA, I partnered with my friend and colleague, Representative RICK LARSEN, to ensure communities facing the greatest risk of fire have equitable access to firefighting and emergency equipment.

Two Federal programs, the Firefighter Property Program and the Federal Excess Personal Property Program, transfer excess Department of Defense property to the U.S. Forest Service, which then provides it to States for use in firefighting. This property includes trucks, tools, hoses, vehicles, and aircraft parts, as well as protective clothing.

However, these programs do not currently distribute equipment based on need or risk, but rather on a first-come, first-served basis. This bill will allow for need to be taken into consideration when this equipment is available so that we can improve firefighting and emergency service capabilities where they are needed most.

Lastly, I thank my colleague, Representative STIVERS, for partnering with me to ensure that the Secretary of Defense is conducting research on the reproductive health of female servicemembers and making that research public. With our military forces diversifying, it is important that we address issues identified for improvement in that research.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support the en bloc package, as well as the NDAA upon final passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today to voice my support for my three amendments to H.R. 2500, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020.

My first amendment requires an annual update of the climate vulnerability and risk assessment tool by the Secretary of Defense. This tool will play a critical role in measuring the impact of climate change on our defense infrastructure, therefore we must ensure that it is routinely updated to reflect a rapidly changing climate.

My second amendment ensures that cultural competence and diversity are integrated in the recruitment and retention efforts of mental health providers for our active duty service members. It is essential that these providers reflect the diversity of our troops and are culturally competent in their treatment services.

My third amendment mandates the installation and maintenance of carbon monoxide detectors in all military family housing units. This will ensure that our armed services families are protected against the risk of carbon monoxide poisoning in their own homes.

I urge my colleagues to support these amendments.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by

the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. HORN).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 476, as the designee of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 9 consisting of amendment Nos. 216, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, and 238 printed in part B of House Report 116-143, offered by Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

AMENDMENT NO. 216 OFFERED BY MR. KHANNA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following:

SEC. 3121. AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS FOR DENUCLEARIZATION OF DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF NORTH KOREA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 3101 and available as specified in the funding table in section 4701 for defense nuclear nonproliferation is hereby increased by \$10,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available to develop and prepare to implement a comprehensive, long-term monitoring and verification program for activities related to the phased denuclearization of the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea, in coordination with relevant international partners and organizations.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by this title and available as specified in the funding table in section 4701 for weapons activities for stockpile services, production support is hereby reduced by \$10,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 219 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 567. TRAINING PROGRAM REGARDING DISINFORMATION CAMPAIGNS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than September 30, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a program for training members of the Armed Forces and employees of the Department of Defense regarding the threat of disinformation campaigns specifically targeted at such individuals and the families of such individuals.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than October 30, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees regarding the program under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 220 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, insert the following:

SEC. 28 . LEAD-BASED PAINT TESTING AND REPORTING.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE POLICY ON LEAD TESTING ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a policy under which—

(A) a qualified individual may access a military installation for the purpose of conducting lead testing on the installation, subject to the approval of the Secretary; and

(B) the results of any lead testing conducted on a military installation shall be transmitted—

(i) in the case of a military installation located inside the United States, to—

(I) the civil engineer of the installation;

(II) the housing management office of the installation;

(III) the public health organization on the installation;

(IV) the major subordinate command of the Armed Force with jurisdiction over the installation; and

(V) if required by law, any relevant Federal, State, and local agencies; and

(ii) in the case of a military installation located outside the United States, to the civil engineer or commander of the installation who shall transmit those results to the major subordinate command of the Armed Force with jurisdiction over the installation.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) UNITED STATES.—The term “United States” has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(B) QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—The term “qualified individual” means an individual who is certified by the Environmental Protection Agency or by a State as—

(i) a lead-based paint inspector; or

(ii) a lead-based paint risk assessor.

(b) ANNUAL REPORTING ON LEAD-BASED PAINT IN MILITARY HOUSING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“**SEC. 2869a. ANNUAL REPORTING ON LEAD-BASED PAINT IN MILITARY HOUSING.**

“(a) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that sets forth, with respect to military housing under the jurisdiction of each Secretary of a military department for the calendar year preceding the year in which the report is submitted, the following:

“(A) A certification that indicates whether the military housing under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned is in compliance with the requirements respecting lead-based paint, lead-based paint activities, and lead-based paint hazards described in section 408 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2688).

“(B) A detailed summary of the data, disaggregated by military department, used in making the certification under subparagraph (A).

“(C) The total number of military housing units under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned that were inspected for lead-based paint in accordance with the requirements described in subparagraph (A).

“(D) The total number of military housing units under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned that were not inspected for lead-based paint.

“(E) The total number of military housing units that were found to contain lead-based paint in the course of the inspections described in subparagraph (C).

“(F) A description of any abatement efforts with respect to lead-based paint conducted regarding the military housing units described in subparagraph (E).

“(2) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall publish each report submitted under paragraph (1) on a publicly available website of the Department of Defense.

“(b) MILITARY HOUSING DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘military housing’ includes military family housing and military unaccompanied housing (as such term is defined in section 2871 of this title).”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter

is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2869a. Annual reporting on lead-based paint in military housing”.

AMENDMENT NO. 221 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . REPORT ON SAUDI LED COALITION STRIKES IN YEMEN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for two years, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the number of civilian casualties caused by the Saudi led coalition in Yemen, including an assessment of the coalition members’ willingness and ability to prevent civilian casualties.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—Each such report shall also contain information relating to whether—

(1) coalition members followed the norms and practices the United States military employs to avoid civilian casualties and ensure proportionality; and

(2) strikes executed by coalition members are in compliance with the United States’ interpretation of the laws governing armed conflict and proportionality.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 222 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle A of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16 . STUDY ON LEVERAGING DIVERSE COMMERCIAL SATELLITE REMOTE SENSING CAPABILITIES.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall conduct a study on the status of the transition from the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency to the National Reconnaissance Office of the leadership role in acquiring commercial satellite remote sensing data on behalf of the Department of Defense and the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)).

(b) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall study—

(1) commercial geospatial intelligence requirements for the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency and the combatant commands;

(2) plans of the National Reconnaissance Office to meet the requirements specified in paragraph (1) through the acquisition of both medium- and high-resolution data from multiple commercial providers; and

(3) plans of the National Reconnaissance Office to further develop such programs with commercial companies to continue to support, while also expanding, adoption by the geospatial intelligence user community of the Department of Defense.

(c) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select

Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report on the study conducted under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 223 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER OF WASHINGTON

At the end of title XI, add the following:
SEC. 1113. ASSESSMENT OF ACCELERATED PROMOTION PROGRAM SUSPENSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall enter into an agreement with a Federally funded research and development center with relevant expertise to conduct an assessment of the impacts resulting from the Navy’s suspension in 2016 of the Accelerated Promotion Program (in this section referred to as the “APP”).

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An identification of the employees who were hired at the four public shipyards between January 23, 2016, and December 22, 2016, covering the period in which APP was suspended, and who would have otherwise been eligible for APP had the program been in effect at the time they were hired.

(2) An assessment for each employee identified in paragraph (1) to determine the difference between wages earned from the date of hire to the date on which the wage data would be collected and the wages which would have been earned during this same period should that employee have participated in APP from the date of hire and been promoted according to the average promotion timeframe for participants hired in the five-year period prior to the suspension.

(3) An assessment for each employee identified in paragraph (1) to determine at what grade and step each effected employee would be at on October 1, 2020, had that employee been promoted according to the average promotion timeframe for participants hired in the five-year period prior to the suspension.

(4) An evaluation of existing authorities available to the Secretary to determine whether the Secretary can take measures using those authorities to provide the pay difference and corresponding interest, at a rate of the federal short-term interest rate plus 3 percent, to each effected employee identified in paragraph (2) and directly promote the employee to the grade and step identified in paragraph (3).

(c) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results of the evaluation by not later than June 1, 2020, and shall provide interim briefings upon request.

AMENDMENT NO. 224 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Page 817, line 21, before the period at the end, insert the following:

“(30) An assessment of—

“(A) China’s expansion of its surveillance state;

“(B) any correlation of such expansion with its oppression of its citizens and its threat to United States national security interests around the world; and

“(C) an overview of the extent to which such surveillance corresponds to the overall respect, or lack thereof, for human rights.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 225 OFFERED BY MR. KINZINGER OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle C of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 1 . PROVISIONS RELATING TO RC-26B MANNED INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE AIRCRAFT.

(a) LIMITATION OF FUNDS.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2020 for the Air Force may be obligated

or expended to retire, divest, realign, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, or prepare to retire, divest, realign, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, any RC-26B aircraft until a period of 60 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that—

(1) technologies or platforms other than the RC-26B aircraft provide capacity and capabilities equivalent to the capacity and capabilities of the RC-26B aircraft; and

(2) the capacity and capabilities of such other technologies or platforms meet the requirements of combatant commanders with respect to indications and warning, intelligence preparation of the operational environment, and direct support for kinetic and non-kinetic operations.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to individual RC-26 aircraft that the Secretary of the Air Force determines, on a case-by-case basis, to be no longer mission capable because of mishaps or other damage.

(c) FUNDING FOR RC-26B MANNED INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE PLATFORM.—

(1) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for operation and maintenance, as specified in the corresponding funding table in 4301, for operation and maintenance, Air National Guard, the Secretary of the Air Force may transfer up to \$15,000,000 for the purposes of the RC-26B manned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platform.

(2) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 421 for military personnel, as specified in the corresponding funding table in 4401, the Secretary of the Air Force may transfer up to \$16,000,000 from military personnel, Air National Guard for personnel who operate and maintain the RC-26B manned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platform.

(d) MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may enter into one or more Memorandum of Agreement with other Federal entities for the purposes of assisting with the missions and activities of such entities.

(e) AIR FORCE REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to congressional defense committees a report detailing the manner in which the Secretary would provide manned and unmanned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance mission support or manned and unmanned incident awareness and assessment mission support to military and non-military entities in the event the RC-26B is divested. The Secretary shall include a determination regarding whether or not this support would be commensurate with that which the RC-26B is able to provide. The Secretary, in consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall also contact and survey the support requirements of other Federal agencies and provide an assessment for potential opportunities to enter into one or more Memorandum of Agreements with such agencies for the purposes of assisting with the missions and activities of such entities, such as domestic or, subject to legal authorities, foreign operations, including but not limited to situational awareness, damage assessment, evacuation monitoring, search and rescue, chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear assessment, hydrographic survey, dynamic ground coordination, and cyberspace incident response.

AMENDMENT NO. 226 OFFERED BY MR. KRISHNAMOORTHY OF ILLINOIS

Page 387, after line 15, insert the following:

SEC. 729. STUDY ON READINESS CONTRACTS AND THE PREVENTION OF DRUG SHORTAGES.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on the effectiveness of readiness contracts managed by the Customer Pharmacy Operations Center of the Defense Logistics Agency in meeting the military's drug supply needs. The study shall include an analysis of how the contractual approach to manage drug shortages for military health care can be a model for responding to drug shortages in the civilian health care market in the United States.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall consult with—

- (1) the Secretary of Veterans Affairs;
- (2) the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration; and
- (3) physician organizations, drug manufacturers, pharmacy benefit management organizations, and such other entities as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study under subsection (a) and any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary relating to such study.

AMENDMENT NO. 227 OFFERED BY MR. KRISHNAMOORTHY OF ILLINOIS

In section 2815, relating to Assessment of Hazards in Department of Defense Housing, after “biocides,” (page 1008, line 22) insert “carbon monoxide.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 228 OFFERED BY MR. KRISHNAMOORTHY OF ILLINOIS

Page 189, line 12, strike “organizations” and insert “organizations, including workforce development organizations.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 229 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 530. ADVICE AND COUNSEL OF TRAUMA EXPERTS IN REVIEW BY BOARDS FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS AND DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARDS OF CERTAIN CLAIMS.

(a) BOARDS FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS.—Section 1552(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) by inserting “(1)” after “(g)”;
- (2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) If a board established under subsection (a)(1) is reviewing a claim described in subsection (h), the board shall seek advice and counsel in the review from a psychiatrist, psychologist, or social worker with training on mental health issues associated with post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury or other trauma as specified in the current edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders published by the American Psychiatric Association.

“(3) If a board established under subsection (a)(1) is reviewing a claim in which sexual trauma, intimate partner violence, or spousal abuse is claimed, the board shall seek advice and counsel in the review from an expert in trauma specific to sexual assault, intimate partner violence, or spousal abuse, as applicable.”.

(b) DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARDS.—Section 1553(d)(1) of such title is amended—

- (1) by inserting “(A)” after “(1)”;
- (2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) In the case of a former member described in paragraph (3)(B) who claims that the former member's post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury as de-

scribed in that paragraph in based in whole or in part on sexual trauma, intimate partner violence, or spousal abuse, a board established under this section to review the former member's discharge or dismissal shall seek advice and counsel in the review from a psychiatrist, psychologist, or social worker with training on mental health issues associated with post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury or other trauma as specified in the current edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders published by the American Psychiatric Association.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 230 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 530. TRAINING OF MEMBERS OF BOARDS FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS AND DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARDS ON SEXUAL TRAUMA, INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE, SPOUSAL ABUSE, AND RELATED MATTERS.

(a) BOARDS FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS.—The curriculum of training for members of boards for the correction of military records under section 534(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (10 U.S.C. 1552 note) shall include training on each of the following:

- (1) Sexual trauma.
- (2) Intimate partner violence.
- (3) Spousal abuse.
- (4) The various responses of individuals to trauma.

(b) DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Secretary concerned shall develop and provide training for members of discharge review boards under section 1553 of title 10, United States Code, that are under the jurisdiction of such Secretary on each of the following:

- (A) Sexual trauma.
- (B) Intimate partner violence.
- (C) Spousal abuse.
- (D) The various responses of individuals to trauma.

(2) UNIFORMITY OF TRAINING.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly ensure that the training developed and provided pursuant to this subsection is, to the extent practicable, uniform.

(3) SECRETARY CONCERNED DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “Secretary concerned” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(9) of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 231 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Insert after section 543 the following new section:

SEC. 5. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ON REGISTRATION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OF CIVIL PROTECTION ORDERS APPLICABLE TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ASSIGNED TO SUCH INSTALLATIONS AND CERTAIN OTHER INDIVIDUALS.

(a) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, establish policies and procedures for the registration at military installations of any civil protection orders described in subsection (b), including the duties and responsibilities of commanders of installations in the registration process.

(b) CIVIL PROTECTION ORDERS.—A civil protection order described in this subsection is any civil protective order as follows:

- (1) A civil protection order against a member of the Armed Forces assigned to the installation concerned.
- (2) A civil protection order against a civilian employee employed at the installation concerned.

(3) A civil protection order against the civilian spouse or intimate partner of a member of the Armed Forces on active duty and assigned to the installation concerned, or of a civilian employee described in paragraph (2), which order provides for the protection of such member or employee.

(c) PARTICULAR ELEMENTS.—The policies and procedures required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A requirement for notice between and among the commander, military law enforcement elements, and military criminal investigative elements of an installation when a member of the Armed Forces assigned to such installation, a civilian employee employed at such installation, a civilian spouse or intimate partner of a member assigned to such installation, or a civilian spouse or intimate partner of a civilian employee employed at such installation becomes subject to a civil protection order.

(2) A statement of policy that failure to register a civil protection order may not be a justification for the lack of enforcement of such order by military law enforcement and other applicable personnel who have knowledge of such order.

(d) LETTER.—As soon as practicable after establishing the policies and procedures required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a letter that includes the following:

(1) A detailed description of the policies and procedures.

(2) A certification by the Secretary that the policies and procedures have been implemented on each military installation.

AMENDMENT NO. 232 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28 . IMPROVED RECORDING AND MAINTAINING OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REAL PROPERTY DATA.

(a) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment shall submit to Congress a report evaluating service-level best practices for recording and maintaining real property data.

(b) ISSUANCE OF GUIDANCE.—Not later than 300 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment shall issue service-wide guidance on the recording and collection of real property data based on the best practices described in the report.

AMENDMENT NO. 233 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. . STRENGTHENING CIVILIAN AND MILITARY PARTNERSHIPS TO RESPOND TO DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than one year after the enactment of this legislation, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on partnerships between military installations and civilian domestic and sexual violence response organizations, including—

(1) a review of memoranda of understanding between such installations and such response organizations,

(2) descriptions of the services provided pursuant to such partnerships,

(3) a review of the central plan, if any, of each service regarding such partnerships, and

(4) recommendations on increasing and improving such partnerships.

(b) CIVILIAN DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE RESPONSE ORGANIZATION.—In this sec-

tion, the term “civilian domestic and sexual violence response organization” includes a rape crisis center, domestic violence shelter, civilian law enforcement, local government group, civilian sexual assault nurse examiner, civilian medical service provider, veterans service organization, faith-based organization, or Federally qualified health center.

AMENDMENT NO. 234 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA OF CALIFORNIA

SEC. . SANTA YNEZ BAND OF CHUMASH INDIANS LAND AFFIRMATION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians Land Affirmation Act of 2019”.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On October 13, 2017, the General Council of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians voted to approve the Memorandum of Agreement between the County of Santa Barbara and the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians regarding the approximately 1,427.28 acres of land, commonly known as Camp 4, and authorized the Tribal Chairman to sign the Memorandum of Agreement.

(2) On October 31, 2017, the Board of Supervisors for the County of Santa Barbara approved the Memorandum of Agreement on Camp 4 and authorized the Chair to sign the Memorandum of Agreement.

(3) The Secretary of the Interior approved the Memorandum of Agreement pursuant to section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 81).

(c) LAND TO BE TAKEN INTO TRUST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The approximately 1,427.28 acres of land in Santa Barbara County, CA described in paragraph (3), is hereby taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe, subject to valid existing rights, contracts, and management agreements related to easements and rights-of-way.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) ADMINISTRATION.—The land described in paragraph (3) shall be a part of the Santa Ynez Indian Reservation and administered in accordance with the laws and regulations generally applicable to the land held in trust by the United States for an Indian tribe.

(B) EFFECT.—For purposes of certain California State laws (including the California Land Conservation Act of 1965, Government Code Section 51200, et seq.), placing the land described in paragraph (3) into trust shall remove any restrictions on the property pursuant to California Government Code Section 51295 or any other provision of such Act.

(3) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF LANDS TRANSFERRED.—The lands to be taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this Act are described as follows:

Legal Land Description/Site Location: Real property in the unincorporated area of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described as follows: PARCEL 1: (APN: 141-121-51 AND PORTION OF APN 141-140-10) LOTS 9 THROUGH 18, INCLUSIVE, OF TRACT 18, IN THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP SHOWING THE SUBDIVISIONS OF THE CANADA DE LOS PINOS OR COLLEGE RANCHO, FILED IN RACK 3, AS MAP 4 IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY. THIS LEGAL IS MADE PURSUANT TO THAT CERTAIN CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 2001 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 01-105580 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS. PARCEL 2: (PORTION OF APN: 141-140-10) LOTS 1 THROUGH 12, INCLUSIVE, OF TRACT 24, IN THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP SHOWING THE SUBDIVISIONS OF THE CANADA DE LOS PINOS OR COLLEGE RANCHO,

FILED IN RACK 3, AS MAP 4 IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY. THIS LEGAL IS MADE PURSUANT TO THAT CERTAIN CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 2001 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 01-105581 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS. PARCEL 3: (PORTIONS OF APNS: 141-230-23 AND 141-140-10) LOTS 19 AND 20 OF TRACT 18 AND THAT PORTION OF LOTS 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, AND 15 THROUGH 20, INCLUSIVE, OF TRACT 16, IN THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP SHOWING THE SUBDIVISIONS OF THE CANADA DE LOS PINOS OR COLLEGE RANCHO, FILED IN RACK 3, AS MAP 4 IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, THAT LIES NORTHEASTERLY OF THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF THE LAND GRANTED TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA BY AN EXECUTOR'S DEED RECORDED APRIL 2, 1968 IN BOOK 2227, PAGE 136 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY. THIS LEGAL IS MADE PURSUANT TO THAT CERTAIN CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 2001 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 01-105582 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS. PARCEL 4: (APN: 141-240-02 AND PORTION OF APN: 141-140-10) LOTS 1 THROUGH 12, INCLUSIVE, OF TRACT 25, IN THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP SHOWING THE SUBDIVISIONS OF THE CANADA DE LOS PINOS OR COLLEGE RANCHO, FILED IN RACK 3, AS MAP 4 IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY. THIS LEGAL IS MADE PURSUANT TO THAT CERTAIN CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 2001 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 01-105583 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS. PARCEL 5: (PORTION OF APN: 141-230-23) THAT PORTION OF LOTS 3 AND 6 OF TRACT 16, IN THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP SHOWING THE SUBDIVISIONS OF THE CANADA DE LOS PINOS OR COLLEGE RANCHO, FILED IN RACK 3, AS MAP 4 IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, THAT LIES NORTHEASTERLY OF THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF THE LAND GRANTED TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA BY AN EXECUTOR'S DEED RECORDED APRIL 2, 1968 IN BOOK 2227, PAGE 136 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY. THIS LEGAL IS MADE PURSUANT TO THAT CERTAIN CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 2001 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 01-105584 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

(4) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall—

(A) enlarge, impair, or otherwise affect any right or claim of the Tribe to any land or interest in land that is in existence before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) affect any water right of the Tribe in existence before the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(C) terminate or limit any access in any way to any right-of-way or right-of-use issued, granted, or permitted before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(5) RESTRICTED USE OF TRANSFERRED LANDS.—The Tribe may not conduct, on the land described in paragraph (3) taken into trust for the Tribe pursuant to this section, gaming activities—

(A) as a matter of claimed inherent authority; or

(B) under any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) and regulations promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission under that Act.

(6) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this subsection:

(A) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(B) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians.

AMENDMENT NO. 235 OFFERED BY MR. LAMB OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. MUSCULOSKELETAL INJURY PREVENTION RESEARCH.

(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a program on musculoskeletal injury prevention research to identify risk factors for musculoskeletal injuries among members of the Armed Forces and to create a better understanding for adaptive bone formation during initial entry military training.

(b) FUNDING.—

(1) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army, applied research, medical technology, line 040 (PE 0602787A) is hereby increased by \$4,800,000 (with the amount of such increase to be made available to carry out the program on musculoskeletal injury prevention research under subsection (a)).

(2) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for procurement, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for shipbuilding and conversion, Navy, ship to shore connector, line 024 is hereby reduced by \$4,800,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 236 OFFERED BY MR. LAMB OF PENNSYLVANIA

Insert after section 713 the following new section:

SEC. 713A. DEMONSTRATION OF INTEROPERABILITY MILESTONES.

(a) MILESTONES.—

(1) EVALUATION.—To demonstrate increasing levels of interoperability, functionality, and seamless health care within the electronic health record systems of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Office shall seek to enter into an agreement with an independent entity to conduct an evaluation of the following use cases of such systems:

(A) By not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, whether a clinician of the Department of Defense can access and meaningfully interact with a complete veteran patient health record from a military medical treatment facility.

(B) By not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, whether a clinician of the Department of Veterans Affairs can access and meaningfully interact with a complete patient health record of a member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty from a medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(C) By not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, whether a clinician in the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs can access and meaningfully interact with the data elements of the health record of a veteran patient or member of the Armed Forces which are generated when the veteran patient or member of the Armed Forces receives health care from a community care provider of the Department of Veterans Affairs or a TRICARE provider of the Department of Defense

(D) By not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, whether a community care provider of the Department of the Veterans Affairs and a TRICARE provider on a Health Information Exchange-supported electronic health record can access a veteran and active-duty member patient health record from the provider's system.

(E) By not later than two years after the enactment of this Act, and subsequently after each significant implementation wave, an assessment of interoperability between the legacy electronic health record systems and the future electronic health record systems of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense.

(F) By not later than two years after the enactment of this Act, and subsequently after each significant implementation wave, an assessment of the use of interoperable content between the legacy electronic health record systems and the future electronic health record systems of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense.

(2) SUBMISSION.—The Office shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the evaluation, methodology for testing, and findings for each milestone demonstration under paragraph (1) by not later than the date specified under such paragraph.

(b) SYSTEM CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT.—The Office shall—

(1) maintain the common configuration baseline for the electronic health record systems of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

(2) continually evaluate the state of configuration, the impacts on interoperability, and shall promote the enhancement of such electronic health records systems.

(c) REGULAR CLINICAL CONSULTATION.—The Office shall convene at least annually a clinical workshop to include clinical staff from the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Coast Guard, community providers, and other leading clinical experts to assess the state of clinical use of the electronic health record systems and whether the systems are meeting clinical and patient needs. The clinical workshop shall make recommendations to the Office on the need for any improvements or concerns with the electronic health record systems.

(d) CLINICIAN AND PATIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY.—Beginning October 1, 2021, on at least a biannual basis, the Office shall undertake a clinician and patient satisfaction survey regarding clinical use and patient experience with the electronic health record systems of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(e) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than September 30, 2020, and annually thereafter, the Office shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on—

(1) the state of the configuration baseline under subsection (b) and any activities which decremented or enhanced the state of configuration; and

(2) the activities, assessments and recommendations of the clinical workshop under subsection (c) and the response of the Office to the workshop recommendations and any action plans to implement the recommendations.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the following:

(A) The congressional defense committees.

(B) The Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(2) The term “configuration baseline” means a fixed reference in the development cycle or an agreed-upon specification of a product at a point in time. It serves as a doc-

umented basis for defining incremental change in all aspects of an information technology product.

(3) The term “interoperability” means the ability of different information systems, devices, or applications to connect in a coordinated and secure manner, within and across organizational boundaries, across the complete spectrum of care, including all applicable care settings, and with relevant stakeholders, including the person whose information is being shared, to access, exchange, integrate, and use computable data regardless of the data's origin or destination or the applications employed, and without additional intervention by the end user, including—

(A) the capability to reliably exchange information without error;

(B) the ability to interpret and to make effective use of the information so exchanged; and

(C) the ability for information that can be used to advance patient care to move between health care entities, regardless of the technology platform in place or the location where care was provided.

(4) The term “meaningfully interact” means that information can be viewed, consumed, acted upon, and edited in a clinical setting to facilitate high quality clinical decision making in a clinical setting.

(5) The term “Office” means the office established by section 1635(b) of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of Public Law 110-181; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note).

(6) The term “seamless health care” means health care which is optimized through access by patients and clinicians to integrated, relevant, and complete information about the patient's clinical experiences, social and environmental determinants of health, and health trends over time in order to enable patients and clinicians to move from task to task and encounter to encounter, within and across organizational boundaries, such that high-quality decisions may be formed easily and complete plans of care may be carried out smoothly.

(7) The term “TRICARE program” has the meaning given that term in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 237 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

At the end of subtitle E of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16. REPORT AND BRIEFING ON MULTI-OBJECT KILL VEHICLE.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report, and shall provide to such committees a briefing, on the potential need for a multi-object kill vehicle in future architecture of the ballistic missile defense system. Such report and briefing shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the technology readiness level of needed components and the operational system for the multi-object kill vehicle.

(2) An assessment of the costs and a comprehensive development and testing schedule to deploy the multi-object kill vehicle by 2025.

(3) An assessment of whether the multi-object kill vehicle was considered in the redesigned kill vehicle program re-baseline as a replacement for future ground-based mid-course defense system kill vehicles.

(4) A concept of operations with respect to how a multi-object kill vehicle capability could be employed and how such capability compares to alternative ground-based mid-course defense system interceptors.

AMENDMENT NO. 238 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN
OF COLORADO

In section 355, strike subsection (c) and insert the following:

(c) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated in this Act for fiscal year 2020 shall be available to enter into a global household goods contract until the date that is 30 days after later of the following dates:

(A) The date on which the Commander of United States Transportation Command provides to the congressional defense committees a briefing on—

(i) the business case analysis required by subsection (b); and

(ii) the proposed structure and meeting schedule for the advisory group established under subsection (a).

(B) The date on which the Comptroller General of the United States submits to the congressional defense committees the report required by paragraph (2).

(2) GAO REPORT.—Not later than February 15, 2020, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on a comprehensive study conducted by the Comptroller General that includes—

(A) an analysis of the effects that the outsourcing of the management and oversight of the movement of household goods to a private entity or entities would have on members of the Armed Forces and their families;

(B) a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis; and

(C) recommendations for changes to the strategy of the Department of Defense for the defense personal property program.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment that includes my amendment to reestablish the Commission on Wartime Contracting.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, I can say with great confidence that the Commission on Wartime Contracting has been a solid and a reliable partner in congressional oversight of military spending.

From 2008 to 2011, the Commission on Wartime Contracting held 25 hearings and issued 8 reports on critical oversight on issues including contingency contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan and embassy security in those countries.

The bottom line is that the Commission on Wartime Contracting found tens of billions of dollars in waste, fraud, and abuse, and recommended ways to improve our overseas contingency contracting process.

Despite the Commission's mandate having ended in 2011, today we continue to expend billions of reconstruction dollars overseas with little assurance that taxpayers or our sons and

daughters in uniform are getting the full benefit of those expenditures. In fact, in many cases, we know that they are not. As the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction recently noted, many of our projects there are of questionable value or are at serious risk of failure and require continued, sustained oversight.

Reauthorization of the Commission on Wartime Contracting will provide additional oversight to help us avoid the wasteful mistakes of the past.

In closing, I thank Chairman SMITH, Ranking Member THORNBERRY, and the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) for supporting my amendment.

□ 1945

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I have no speakers here at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I am honored to stand to propose an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act, which is an opportunity to improve the security of the American people and modernize defense policy to meet the demands of emerging security threats.

For the first time in years, House Democrats finally have the chance to voice our priorities for national defense. That is why I am happy to introduce this amendment, which will increase by \$5 million the Air Force University Research Initiatives.

This program provides Department of Defense grants to competing universities, including those in Nevada like the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and the Desert Research Institute, and gives our best and brightest minds the opportunity to do the research necessary to develop advanced defense technology.

Throughout U.S. history, it has been our continued research and innovation that has secured America as the world's greatest power. My amendment transfers money from Special Operations Command theater forces, which is already robustly funded, and, instead, invests in the wars of the future.

As security threats advance and change with weapons of modern war, we must remember that innovation and development made us number one. We must invest in programs that prepare our servicemembers to respond to the threats of the 21st century.

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

Mr. Chair, the last speaker made a comment that this is the first time in many years that House Democrats have an opportunity to put their priorities on a defense bill. I realize the gentleman is new to this body, but that statement is simply not true.

Last year, the House Armed Services Committee reported the bill to the

floor by a vote of 60–2. There were more Democratic amendments made in order under the Rules Committee last year on the floor than there were Republican amendments. The bill passed the House with 351 votes.

It has been a hallmark of the Armed Services Committee to work in a collaborative way and to give every member of the committee and, ultimately, of the House the opportunity to make an imprint on the nature of this bill.

The reason I have to take a moment is just to contrast that with what has happened this year. Both the vote coming out of committee and the fact that of the contested amendments—in other words, of those amendments where there was some disagreement, some debate, and a potential vote. There were about 60 Democratic amendments, and there was exactly one Republican amendment.

That limits the ability of the minority to shape the outcome of the final bill. So the gentleman's statement has led me to want to emphasize the difference this year versus prior years. I think it is too bad, but I hope that at some point in this process, we can return to that collaborative process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I think he is absolutely right in the first half, and absolutely wrong in the second half.

I would disagree with my colleague's comments that Democrats have not had an opportunity to contribute to the process. We have in the past. We worked in a bipartisan way.

It is, however, not true that this year everything is different. Something was different, but not what I believe the ranking member said. That is that we did include a large number of Republican provisions, certainly in committee by the amendment process, and on the floor.

The one sort of stark number here is, on the floor, we have not had a large number of Republican amendments. There are a couple of reasons for that. Number one, we have, I think, 15 or 16 en bloc packages, and there are a large number of Republican amendments contained in that en bloc package.

But as far as standalone amendments, there are a couple of problems. One, traditionally, and this has happened to us as well, we had a lot of our more controversial amendments, unless the majority party—at the time, the Republicans—thought it was to their advantage to have us vote on something that made us look bad, then they would let it in. Otherwise, they wouldn't.

We kind of did the same thing. If there were amendments that we didn't want, we didn't keep them. We did allow for Republican priorities.

The reason, however, that there are fewer Republican amendments than in

the past is because, for a long time, it has been the minority party's plan this year to not support this bill. This is not a new thing. This has been a debate.

As I mentioned yesterday, the reason for that was purely partisan. And it is traditional. I have been working as a legislator long enough to know that when Members are in the minority, they want the majority party to fail. So whatever bill they are bringing up, the minority tries to defeat it to gain leverage.

The Armed Services Committee has traditionally been different from that. We don't do that on this bill. We work together in a collaborative process to create the bill.

But this year, the minority party decided to treat the defense bill like every other bill: We are in the minority. We want the bill to fail.

The evidence of that is that I have worked with a lot of Members to try to get amendments straightened out in Rules. On one in particular, we worked with Representative STEFANIK.

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

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, she didn't like the way we did it, so she wanted to fix it. It had to do with the Under Secretary for Intelligence and the title. It is kind of irrelevant what it was, but we worked with her, and we got it solved.

We had it ready to go, and she pulled it today. She said she didn't want to do it.

As I understand it, the reason was that she didn't want to feel obligated to vote for the bill because we had cooperated and worked with her. Well, how obnoxious of us to do that.

The games that are being played here are not primarily being played by us.

Let me say to this body that I am 100 percent committed to maintaining the bipartisanship of this committee, and what happened this year won't change that at all.

I will say, in the past, the Republicans have not been as kind. We had a Member who voted against the bill in committee a few years back. He found out the next year that he got nothing in the bill because voting against the bill was not allowed. We had a lot of Members vote against it this year. I am not going to do that. We are going to keep working together.

I want everyone listening to know that we on the Democratic side are not the ones being partisan in this bill.

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

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the comments of Chairman SMITH about the bipartisan contributions in the past, and that was the primary point I wanted to make.

I do disagree with him about one key point. It was certainly never my inten-

tion, and I do not believe the intention of any member of the Armed Services Committee, to oppose this bill from the beginning.

As a matter of fact, as I indicated yesterday, for many of us, it was a very challenging decision on how to vote with the bill coming out of committee, not because there weren't serious, substantive disagreements—there were—but there was hope that it was possible to bridge those disagreements so that there could be some bend on both sides to get to our traditional sort of bipartisan vote on the floor.

What definitely changed and is unprecedented is to have one substantive, contested Republican amendment allowed on the floor—one—versus 60 Democratic amendments. Those numbers speak for themselves. There has been, other than the one amendment on low yield—Mr. TURNER yet to come—no other opportunity by Republicans on a contested issue.

There have been en blocs, Republican and Democratic, absolutely. That is the way it is every year. But as far as standalone debates where it is contested, there has been one opportunity for Republicans to improve this bill. That has been disheartening because it makes it much more difficult for people on this side of the aisle to get to where we can support this bill.

I share the chairman's commitment. This is not about us. This is about the troops. Our commitment is to work through every step of whatever it takes to get to a point that we can do good by the men and women who serve. That is the objective here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chair, the amendment that I offer aims to expand the Department of Defense's authority to work with the Coast Guard on youth science, technology, engineering, and math programs.

For several years, I have worked closely with the U.S. Coast Guard to engage on youth STEM programs. Earlier this year, the Coast Guard came to me and acknowledged that to continue our efforts, they needed new authority and advice. The specialties these dedicated public maritime servants rely upon daily is rooted in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, yet they do not have the authority to engage beyond volunteer status in their communities to build special capabilities in young people for the future.

Meanwhile, the Department of Defense offers excellent examples of the benefits of such programming and holds the respective experience in successful applications, such as the STARBASE program.

Now more than ever, the future of our country, our very prosperity and security, depends on an effective and

inclusive STEM education-reliant workforce. That begins with our youth.

Basic STEM concepts are best learned at an earlier age and are central prerequisites for career technical training, advanced college-level and graduate study, and success in various workplaces.

Given the Coast Guard's mission of coastal defense, maritime law enforcement, and maritime operations, the Coast Guard, too, has a vested interest to advance STEM youth exposure.

With my amendment, we can invest in the future of America's youth and the Coast Guard itself by expanding the Department of Defense's ability to work with the Coast Guard on youth STEM programming to transfer know-how. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support the en bloc package, as well as the NDAA upon final passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 476, I offer amendments en bloc as the designee of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

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

Amendments en bloc No. 10 consisting of amendment Nos. 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, and 264, printed in part B of House Report 116-143, offered by Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

AMENDMENT NO. 239 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 392, line 6, strike "and".

Page 392, line 16, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

Page 392, after line 16, insert the following:

(H) cybersecurity metrics of the software to be acquired, such as metrics relating to the density of vulnerabilities within the code, the time from vulnerability identification to patch availability, the existence of common weaknesses within the code, and other cybersecurity metrics based on widely-recognized standards and industry best practices, are generated and made available to the Department of Defense and the congressional defense committees.

AMENDMENT NO. 240 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN OF RHODE ISLAND

At the end of subtitle C of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1633. NATIONAL SECURITY PRESIDENTIAL MEMORANDUMS RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OPERATIONS IN CYBERSPACE.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall provide the congressional defense committees with a copy of all National Security

Presidential Memorandums relating to Department of Defense operations in cyberspace.

AMENDMENT NO. 241 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN OF RHODE ISLAND

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR SUPPORT OF SPECIAL OPERATIONS FOR IRREGULAR WARFARE.

Section 1202(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91; 131 Stat. 1639) is amended by striking “2020” and inserting “2023”.

AMENDMENT NO. 242 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN OF RHODE ISLAND

At the end of subtitle D of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10 . MODIFICATION OF SUPPORT OF SPECIAL OPERATIONS TO COMBAT TERRORISM.

Section 127e of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “authorized” before “ongoing”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “and a description of the authorized ongoing operation” before the period at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D);

(C) by striking subparagraphs (B) and inserting the following new subparagraphs after subparagraph (A):

“(B) A description of the foreign forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals engaged in supporting or facilitating the authorized ongoing operation who will receive the funds provided under this section.

“(C) A detailed description of the support provided or to be provided to the recipient of the funds.”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(E) A detailed description of the legal and operational authorities related to the authorized ongoing operation, including relevant executive orders issued by the Secretary of Defense and combatant commanders related to the authorized ongoing operation, including an identification of operational activities United States Special Operations Forces are authorized to conduct under such executive orders.

“(F) The duration for which the support is expected to be provided and an identification of the timeframe in which the provision of support will be reviewed by the combatant commander for a determination regarding the necessity of continuation of support.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 243 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle H of title X insert the following:

SEC. . CHINESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE STUDIES WITHIN THE DEFENSE LANGUAGE AND NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION OFFICE.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for operation and maintenance, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for operation and maintenance, Defense-Wide, Defense Human Resources Activity, line 220 is hereby increased by \$13,404,000 (with the amount of such increase to be made available for Chinese language and culture studies within the Defense Language and National Security Education Office).

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for procurement, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section

4101, for other procurement, Army, Installation Info Infrastructure MOD Program, line 63 is hereby reduced by \$13,404,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 244 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

Page 724, line 18, insert “, universities,” after “agencies”.

Page 724, line 24, insert before the semicolon the following: “, and by providing such best practices with grantees and universities at the time of awarding such grants or entering into research contracts”.

Page 724, after line 24, insert the following new subclause (and redesignate the subsequent subclauses accordingly):

(VI) a remediation plan for grantees and universities to mitigate the risks regarding such threats before research grants or contracts are cancelled because of such threats;

AMENDMENT NO. 245 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 10 . MODIFICATION OF PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR CHINESE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS AT CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

Section 1091(b) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232; 132 Stat. 1997) is amended—

(1) by striking “None of the funds” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) TRANSITION PLAN.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop a transition plan for each institution of higher education subject to the limitation under paragraph (1). Under the transition plan, the institution may regain eligibility to receive funds from the Department of Defense for Chinese language training by developing an independent Chinese language program with no connection to a Confucius Institute.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 246 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE OF MICHIGAN

Page 733, after line 15, insert the following:

SEC. 1092. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES ON PROGRESS OF GENDER INTEGRATION IMPLEMENTATION IN THE ARMED FORCES.

The Secretary of Defense shall direct each component of the Armed Forces to share lessons learned and best practices on the progress of their gender integration implementation plans and to communicate strategically that progress with other components of the Armed Forces as well as the general public, as recommended by the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services.

AMENDMENT NO. 247 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle H of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10 . STRATEGIES FOR RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES.

The Secretary of each of the military departments shall—

(1) examine successful strategies in use by foreign military services to recruit and retain women; and

(2) consider potential best practices for implementation in the United States Armed Forces, as recommended by the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services.

AMENDMENT NO. 248 OFFERED BY MRS. LEE OF NEVADA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 729. UPDATE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REGULATIONS, INSTRUCTIONS, AND OTHER GUIDANCE TO INCLUDE GAMBLING DISORDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, shall update all regulations, instructions, and other guidance of the Department of Defense and the military departments with respect to behavioral health to explicitly include gambling disorder. In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall implement the recommendations of the Comptroller General of the United States numbered 2 through 6 in the report by the Comptroller General titled “Military Personnel: DOD and the Coast Guard Need to Screen for Gambling Disorder Addiction and Update Guidance” (numbered GAO-17-114).

(b) MILITARY DEPARTMENTS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “military departments” has the meaning given that term in section 101(8) of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 249 OFFERED BY MRS. LEE OF NEVADA

Page 353, line 19, strike “LEADERSHIP OF”.

Page 353, line 23, insert “(a) LEADERSHIP.” before “Subsection”.

Page 356, after line 15, add the following:

(b) AUTHORITY.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Office shall carry out decision making authority delegated to the office by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with respect to the definition, coordination, and management of functional, technical, and programmatic activities that are jointly used, carried out, and shared by the Departments.”.

(c) PURPOSES.—Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of such section is by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(C) To develop and implement a comprehensive interoperability strategy, including pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 or other provision of law requiring such strategy.

“(D) To pursue the highest level of interoperability (as defined in section 713 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020) for the delivery of health care by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

“(E) To accelerate the exchange of health care information between the Departments in order to support the delivery of health care by both Departments.

“(F) To collect the operational and strategic requirements of the Departments relating to the strategy under subsection (a) and communicate such requirements and activities to the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology of the Department of Health and Human Services for the purpose of implementing title IV of the 21st Century Cures Act (division A of Public Law 114-255), and the amendments made by that title, and other objectives of the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology.

“(G) To plan for and effectuate the broadest possible implementation of standards, specifically with respect to the Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources standard or successor standard, the evolution of such standards, and the obsolescence of such standards.

“(H) To actively engage with national and international health standards setting organizations, including by taking membership in such organizations, to ensure that standards established by such organizations meet the needs of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs pursuant to the strategy under subsection (a), and

oversee and approve adoption of and mapping to such standards by the Departments.

“(I) To express the content and format of health data of the Departments using a common language to improve the exchange of data between the Departments and with the private sector, and to ensure that clinicians of both Departments have access to integrated, computable, comprehensive health records of patients.

“(J) To inform each Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense and the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Veterans Affairs of any activities of the Office affecting or relevant to cybersecurity.”

(d) **RESOURCES AND STAFFING.**—Subsection (g) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including the assignment of clinical or technical personnel of the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs to the Office”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(3) **COST SHARING.**—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, acting through the Department of Veterans Affairs-Department of Defense Joint Executive Committee, shall enter into an agreement on cost sharing and providing resources for the operations and staffing of the Office.

“(4) **HIRING AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall delegate to the Director the authority under title 5, United States Code, regarding appointments in the competitive service to hire personnel of the Office.”

(e) **BUDGET MATTERS.**—Such section is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) **BUDGET AND CONTRACTING MATTERS.**—

“(1) **BUDGET.**—The Director may obligate and expend funds allocated to the operations of the Office.

“(2) **CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—The Director may enter into contracts to carry out this section.”

(f) **REPORTS.**—Subsection (h) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(h) **REPORTS.**—

“(1) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Not later than September 30, 2020, and each year thereafter through 2024, the Director shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and to the appropriate committees of Congress, a report on the activities of the Office during the preceding calendar year. Each report shall include the following:

“(A) A detailed description of the activities of the Office during the year covered by such report, including a detailed description of the amounts expended and the purposes for which expended.

“(B) With respect to the objectives of the strategy under paragraph (2)(C) of subsection (b), and the purposes of the Office under such subsection—

“(i) a discussion, description, and assessment of the progress made by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs during the preceding calendar year; and

“(ii) a discussion and description of the goals of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs for the following calendar year.

“(2) **QUARTERLY REPORTS.**—On a quarterly basis, the Director shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed financial summary of the activities of the Office, including the funds allocated to the Office by each Department, the expenditures made, and an assessment as to whether the

current funding is sufficient to carry out the activities of the Office.

“(3) **AVAILABILITY.**—Each report under this subsection shall be made publicly available.”

(g) **CONFORMING REPEAL.**—Section 713 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note) is repealed.

AMENDMENT NO. 250 OFFERED BY MRS. LESKO OF ARIZONA

At the end of subtitle C of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ AIR FORCE AGGRESSOR SQUADRON MODERNIZATION.

(a) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) it is critical that the Air Force has the capability to train against an advanced air adversary in order to be prepared for conflicts against a modern enemy force;

(2) in order to have this capability, Air Force must have access to an advanced adversary force prior to United States adversaries fielding a 5th-generation operational capability; and

(3) the Air Force’s plan to use low-rate initial production F-35As as aggressor aircraft reflects a recognition of the need to field a modernized aggressor fleet.

(b) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—No later than 6 months prior to the transfer of any low-rate initial production F-35 aircraft for use as aggressor aircraft, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees, and the Member of Congress and the Senators who represent bases from where aircraft may be transferred, a comprehensive plan and report on the strategy for modernizing the organic aggressor fleet.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) Potential locations for F-35A aggressor aircraft, including an analysis of installations that—

(i) have the size and availability of airspace necessary to meet flying operations requirements;

(ii) have sufficient capacity and availability of range space;

(iii) are capable of hosting advanced-threat training exercises; and

(iv) meet or require minimal addition to the environmental requirements associated with the basing action.

(B) An analysis of the potential cost and benefits of expanding aggressor squadrons currently operating 18 Primary Assigned Aircraft (PAA) to a level of 24 PAA each.

(C) An analysis of the cost and timelines associated with modernizing the current Air Force aggressor squadrons to include upgrading aircraft’s radar, infrared search-and-track systems, radar warning receiver, tactical datalink, threat-representative jamming pods, and other upgrades necessary to provide a realistic advanced adversary threat.

(D) Any costs associated with moving the aircraft.

(E) Any jobs on the relevant military installation that may be affected by said changes.

AMENDMENT NO. 252 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 898. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON CONTRACTOR VIOLATIONS OF CERTAIN LABOR LAWS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller of the United States shall submit a report to Congress on the number of contractors—

(1) that performed a contract with the Department of Defense during the five-year period preceding the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) that have been found by the Department of Labor to have committed willful or repeat violations of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) or the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), and the nature of the violations committed.

AMENDMENT NO. 253 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle C of title II add the following new section:

SEC. 2 ____ INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR NAVAL UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.

(a) **INCREASE.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201 for Navy basic research, University Research Initiatives, line 001 (PE 0601103N) is hereby increased by \$5,000,000.

(b) **OFFSET.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for operation and maintenance, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, operating forces, Special Operations Command Theater Forces, line 100 is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 254 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 567. ASSESSMENT AND STUDY OF TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **ONE-YEAR INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TAP.**—

(1) **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the covered officials, shall enter into an agreement with an appropriate entity with experience in adult education to carry out a 1-year independent assessment of TAP, including—

(A) the effectiveness of TAP for members of each military department during the entire military life cycle;

(B) the appropriateness of the TAP career readiness standards;

(C) a review of information that is provided to the Department of Veterans Affairs under TAP, including mental health data;

(D) whether TAP effectively addresses the challenges veterans face entering the civilian workforce and in translating experience and skills from military service to the job market;

(E) whether TAP effectively addresses the challenges faced by the families of veterans making the transition to civilian life;

(F) appropriate metrics regarding TAP outcomes for members of the Armed Forces one year after separation, retirement, or discharge from the Armed Forces;

(G) what the Secretary, in consultation with the covered officials and veterans service organizations determine to be successful outcomes for TAP;

(H) whether members of the Armed Forces achieve successful outcomes for TAP, as determined under subparagraph (G);

(I) how the Secretary and the covered officials provide feedback to each other regarding such outcomes;

(J) recommendations for the Secretaries of the military departments regarding how to improve outcomes for members of the Armed Forces after separation, retirement, and discharge; and

(K) other topics the Secretary and the covered officials determine would aid members of the Armed Forces as they transition to civilian life.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the completion of the independent assessment under paragraph (1), the Secretary and the covered officials, shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives—

(A) the findings and recommendations (including recommended legislation) of the independent assessment prepared by the entity described in paragraph (1); and

(B) responses of the Secretary and the covered officials to the findings and recommendations described in subparagraph (G).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) The term “covered officials” is comprised of—

(i) the Secretary of Defense;

(ii) the Secretary of Labor;

(iii) the Administrator of the Small Business Administration; and

(iv) the Secretaries of the military departments.

(B) The term “military department” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) LONGITUDINAL STUDY ON CHANGES TO TAP.—

(1) STUDY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the Secretaries of Defense and Labor and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall conduct a five-year longitudinal study regarding TAP on three separate cohorts of members of the Armed Forces who have separated from the Armed Forces, including—

(A) a cohort that has attended TAP counseling as implemented on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) a cohort that attends TAP counseling after the Secretaries of Defense and Labor implement changes recommended in the report under subsection a(2); and

(C) a cohort that has not attended TAP counseling.

(2) PROGRESS REPORTS.—Not later than 90 days after the day that is one year after the date of the initiation of the study under paragraph (1) and annually thereafter for the three subsequent years, the Secretaries of Veterans Affairs, Defense, and Labor, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a progress report of activities under the study during the immediately preceding year.

(3) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the completion of the study under paragraph (1), the Secretaries of Veterans Affairs, Defense, and Labor, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report of final findings and recommendations based on the study.

(4) ELEMENTS.—The final report under paragraph (3) shall include information regarding the following:

(A) The percentage of each cohort that received unemployment benefits during the study.

(B) The numbers of months members of each cohort were employed during the study.

(C) Annual starting and ending salaries of members of each cohort who were employed during the study.

(D) How many members of each cohort enrolled in an institution of higher learning, as that term is defined in section 3452(f) of title 38, United States Code.

(E) The academic credit hours, degrees, and certificates obtained by members of each cohort during the study.

(F) The annual income of members of each cohort.

(G) The total household income of members of each cohort.

(H) How many members of each cohort own their principal residences.

(I) How many dependents that members of each cohort have.

(J) The percentage of each cohort that achieves a successful outcome for TAP, as determined under subsection (1)(G).

(K) Other criteria the Secretaries and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration determine appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 255 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle G of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. REPORT ON COMBATING TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS INITIATIVE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an analysis of the progress of the Department of Defense in implementing the Combating Trafficking in Persons Initiative, published in 2007 and as revised on June 21, 2019.

AMENDMENT NO. 256 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . PROHIBITION ON IN-FLIGHT REFUELING TO NON-UNITED STATES AIRCRAFT THAT ENGAGE IN HOSTILITIES IN THE ONGOING CIVIL WAR IN YEMEN.

For the two-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Department of Defense may not provide in-flight refueling pursuant to section 2342 of title 10, United States Code, or any other applicable statutory authority to non-United States aircraft that engage in hostilities in the ongoing civil war in Yemen unless and until a declaration of war or a specific statutory authorization for such use of United States Armed Forces has been enacted.

AMENDMENT NO. 257 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

Add at the end of subtitle G of title XII the following:

SEC. . UNITED STATES STRATEGY FOR LIBYA.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a strategy for Libya.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An explanation of the strategy for Libya, including a description of the ends, ways, and means inherent to the strategy.

(2) An explanation of the legal authorities supporting the strategy.

(3) A detailed description of U.S. counterterrorism and security partnerships with Libyan actors.

(4) A detailed description of Libyan security actors and an assessment of how those actors advance or undermine stability in Libya and or U.S. strategic interests in Libya.

(5) A detailed description of how Libyan security actors support or obstruct civilian authorities and U.N. led efforts towards a political settlement of the conflict.

(6) A detailed description of the military activities of external actors in Libya, including Russia, Egypt, France, Qatar, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and the United Arab Emirates, including assessments of whether those activities:

(A) have undermined progress towards stabilization, including the United Nations-led negotiations;

(B) involve United States-origin equipment and violate contractual conditions of acceptable use of such equipment; or

(C) violate or seek to violate the United Nations arms embargo on Libya imposed pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 1970 (2011).

(7) A plan to integrate the United States diplomatic, development, military, and intelligence resources necessary to implement the strategy.

(8) A detailed description of the roles of the United States Armed Forces in supporting the strategy.

(9) Any other matters as the President considers appropriate.

(c) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 258 OFFERED BY MR. LOEBSACK OF IOWA

At the end of subtitle C of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY INSTALLATION REUTILIZATION AUTHORITY FOR ARSENALS, DEPOTS AND PLANTS.

(a) ENSURING VIABILITY OF ARSENALS, DEPOTS AND PLANTS.—Section 345(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91; 10 U.S.C. 2667 note) is amended by striking “September 30, 2020” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than March 1, 2020, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes—

(1) the results of a needs assessment conducted by the Secretary to determine the logistical, information technology, and security requirements to create an internal listing service of Army assets available for lease at Arsenal's, depots and plants; and

(2) information from any previous Army assessments or inventory of real property.

AMENDMENT NO. 259 OFFERED BY MR. LOEBSACK OF IOWA

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

SEC. . STEM JOBS ACTION PLAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Jobs in science, technology, engineering, and math in addition to maintenance and manufacturing (collectively referred to in this section as “STEM”) make up a significant portion of the workforce of the Department of Defense.

(2) These jobs exist within the organic industrial base, research, development, and engineering centers, life-cycle management commands, and logistics centers of the Department.

(3) Vital to the continued support of the mission of all of the military services, the

Department needs to maintain its STEM workforce.

(4) It is known that the demographics of personnel of the Department indicate that many of the STEM personnel of the Department will be eligible to retire in the next few years.

(5) Decisive action is needed to replace STEM personnel as they retire to ensure that the military does not further suffer a skill and knowledge gap and thus a serious readiness gap.

(b) ASSESSMENTS AND PLAN OF ACTION.—The Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Secretary of each military department, shall —

(1) perform an assessment of the STEM workforce for organizations within the Department of Defense, including the numbers and types of positions and the expectations for losses due to retirements and voluntary departures;

(2) identify the types and quantities of STEM jobs needed to support future mission work;

(3) determine the shortfall between lost STEM personnel and future requirements;

(4) analyze and explain the appropriateness and impact of using reimbursable and working capital fund dollars for new STEM hires;

(5) identify a plan of action to address the STEM jobs gap, including hiring strategies and timelines for replacement of STEM employees; and

(6) deliver to Congress, not later than December 31, 2020, a report specifying such plan of action.

AMENDMENT NO. 260 OFFERED BY MR.
LOWENTHAL OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28. CONTINUED DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE USE OF HEATING, VENTILATION, AND AIR CONDITIONING SYSTEMS UTILIZING VARIABLE REFRIGERANT FLOW.

Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the Department of Defense may continue to consider and select heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems that utilize variable refrigerant flow as an option for use in Department of Defense facilities.

AMENDMENT NO. 261 OFFERED BY MR. LUCAS OF
OKLAHOMA

Page 948, line 4, strike “(b)”.

Page 948, line 9, strike “; and” and insert “,”.

Page 948, line 10, strike “paragraph (2)(C)” and insert “subsection (a)(2)(C)”.

Page 948, line 12, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 948, after line 12 insert the following:

(3) in subsection (b)(1)—
(A) by inserting after “the Secretary of Defense,” the following: “in coordination with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration,”;

(B) by inserting after “defense” the following: “and science”;

(C) by inserting after “the Department of Defense” the following: “and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration”;

(4) in subsection (b)(2)(D), by inserting after “the Secretary” the following: “or the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration”.

AMENDMENT NO. 262 OFFERED BY MR. LUJÁN OF
NEW MEXICO

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following new section:

SEC. 31. ACCOUNTING PRACTICES OF NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Energy

should ensure that each laboratory operating contractor or plant or site manager of National Nuclear Security Administration sites applies generally accepted and consistent accounting best practices for laboratory, plant, or site directed research and development.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that assesses the costs, benefits, risks, and other effects of the pilot program under section 3119 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 50 U.S.C. 2791 note).

AMENDMENT NO. 263 OFFERED BY MR. LUJÁN OF
NEW MEXICO

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. STUDY AND REPORT ON LAB-EMBEDDED ENTREPRENEURIAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) STUDY.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, in consultation with the Director of the Advanced Manufacturing Office of the Department of Energy, shall conduct a study on the feasibility and potential benefits of establishing a lab-embedded entrepreneurial fellowship program.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study under subsection (a) shall include, with respect to a lab-embedded entrepreneurial fellowship program, the following:

(1) An estimate of administrative and programmatic costs and materials, including appropriate levels of living stipends and health insurance to attract a competitive pool of applicants.

(2) An assessment of capacity for entrepreneurial fellows to use laboratory facilities and equipment.

(3) An assessment of the benefits for participants in the program through access to mentorship, education, and networking and exposure to leaders from academia, industry, government, and finance.

(4) Assessment of the benefits for the Department of Defense science and technology activities through partnerships and exchanges with program fellows.

(5) An estimate of the economic benefits created by the implementation of this program, based in part on similar entrepreneurial programs.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering shall consult with the following, as necessary:

(1) The Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

(2) The Director of Research for each military service.

(3) Relevant research facilities, including the Department of Energy National Laboratories (as defined in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801)).

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering shall submit to the designated recipients a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a). At minimum, the report shall include an explanation of the results of the study with respect to each element set forth in subsection (b).

(2) NONDUPLICATION OF EFFORTS.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering may use or add to any existing reports completed by the Department in order to meet the reporting requirement under paragraph (1).

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—The report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified

form, but may include a classified annex.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “designated recipients” means the following:

(A) The Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(B) The Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(C) The Secretary of Defense.

(D) The Secretary of Energy.

(2) The term “lab-embedded entrepreneurial fellowship program” means a competitive, two-year program in which participants (to be known as “fellows”) are selected from a pool of applicants to work in a Federal research facility where the fellows will conduct research, development, and demonstration activities, commercialize technology, and train to be entrepreneurs.

AMENDMENT NO. 264 OFFERED BY MR. LUJÁN OF
NEW MEXICO

At the end of subtitle B of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . FINDINGS, PURPOSE, AND APOLOGY.

Section 2(a)(1) of the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (Public Law 101-426; 42 U.S.C. 2210 note) is amended by inserting “, including individuals in New Mexico, Idaho, Colorado, Arizona, Utah, Texas, Wyoming, Oregon, Washington, South Dakota, North Dakota, Nevada, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “tests exposed individuals”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, I yield 8 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Oklahoma for yielding, and I thank the chairman of the full committee, Chairman SMITH, for his important leadership, collaboration, and cooperation with me on these amendments.

I also thank my colleague from Texas, Ranking Member THORNBERRY, for his support and work on these amendments and on the work of the NDAA.

I thank them both for their important work on behalf of the men and women of the United States military.

□ 2000

The Jackson Lee amendment No. 203 directs the Secretary of Defense to promulgate regulations to ensure that candidates granted admission to attend a military academy undergo screening for speech disorders and be provided the results of the screening test and a list of warfare unrestricted line officer positions and occupation specialists that require successful performance on the speech test. Academy students shall have the option of undergoing speech therapy to reduce speech disorders or impediments.

Specifically, this amendment is intended to help military academy candidates who have stuttering-related speech disorders.

Madam Chair, 5 to 10 percent of all children stutter. Boys are two to three times more likely to stutter than girls. Approximately 75 percent of children recover from stuttering, but the remaining 25 percent will experience life-long effects.

I learned about the issue of stuttering and its implications for a successful military career through the experiences of a legislative fellow currently serving in my Washington, D.C., office. He is a 2016 graduate from the United States Naval Academy with a degree in operations research and a veteran naval officer who was separated from the Navy in April 2019. His separation was not due to any fault of his own but because of the current processes of the United States Navy and the United States Naval Academy relating to speech fluency issues relating to stuttering.

Let me also say that there was an ad that we have seen on television about a young man who was confronting a doctor during World War I and World War II. It had to do with ancestry. He was insisting that he was in good health, and the doctor said no. The end of the story is they showed that he prevailed, and he went to World War I or II and even won a Purple Heart.

This Navy lieutenant's stuttering was not severe and undetectable to most individuals who engage him in conversation. He went on to secure a screening by the flight doctor. The flight doctor then administered a speech fluency test. During the test, his speech fluency did not meet naval standards, but he was an important contributor to the United States Navy.

At the time, he advised the doctor that he might not be able to do the surface war command officer that he had selected even though he wanted to be an aviator. He then went on to another discipline, surface warfare officer. Then after graduating from the United States Naval Academy with an operations research degree, he served aboard the USS *Scout*.

His captain said that he was able in every way. It was clear that he might not be able to be a surface warfare officer, but he was able.

What happened was a tragedy. He went on to seek extra care. His overall speech fluency improved. The captain decided that transferring to a different community would be the best option. That was the captain's decision.

Unfortunately, because of the speech impediment that could not be heard, he was sent to a Probationary Officer Continuation and Retention Board, the wrong board to be sent to, and a speech impediment was not considered a medical issue. Therefore, he could not go before the medical board.

This very fine African American graduate of the academy could not serve because we did not do him serv-

ice. We did not do him the kind of service that he needed to have. Unfortunately, this board was not really meant for someone who was capable, qualified, and ready. This is one where you do not have a right to appeal, if you can imagine that, and no one ever notifies you why.

I am here today to say that my amendment will, hopefully, have an impact on the many different young soldiers who want to serve.

Madam Chair, can you believe a half million dollars was spent on his education?

Let me indicate that this amendment is supported by the National Stuttering Association. The National Stuttering Association says that we support the Jackson Lee amendment No. 203 that allows for military academy candidates to have access to, and options for, undergoing speech therapy to successfully manage speech disorders or impediments so that entry into officer or occupational specialist positions in the military is possible. Military personnel who stutter can be and are effective communicators, and stuttering does not limit military career aspirations.

Jimmy Stewart became an aviator in World War II and reached the rank of brigadier general on July 23, 1959, a little later than World War II. He retired from military service on May 31, 1968.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from National Stuttering Association and the famous people who stutter.

NATIONAL STUTTERING ASSOCIATION,
New York, NY, July 11, 2019.
Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Washington, DC.

CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE: The National Stuttering Association (NSA) is the largest non-profit organization in the world dedicated to bringing hope and empowerment to children and adults who stutter, families and professionals, through support, education, advocacy, and research. We have long worked with individuals and communities to increase understanding of stuttering and to improve outcomes for people who stutter in all aspects of their lives.

Over the last several years, we have enhanced outreach efforts to raise stuttering awareness to colleges and universities, employers and the military. A recurrent theme we hear from young people and adults who stutter are barriers to employment and career success based on false assumptions about stuttering. To that end, we have developed and enhanced educational outreach programs for employers, which of course includes the military. Just last year, a stuttering support chapter was launched at Wright Patterson AFB, at the request of personnel who stutter.

We support Jackson Lee Amendment #203 that allows for military academy candidates to have access to, and options for, undergoing speech therapy to successfully manage speech disorders or impediments so that entry into Officer or Occupational Specialists positions in the military is possible. Military personnel who stutter can be, and are, effective communicators and stuttering does not have to limit military career aspiration.

Thank you for alerting us to this important act. Feel free to contact us anytime for additional support or resources.

Respectfully,

PAMELA MERTZ,
National Stuttering
Association, Board
of Directors, Em-
ployment Advocacy/
Military Support.

Famous people who stutter:

Jimmy Stewart, Charlie Sheen, Tiger Woods, Marilyn Monroe, James Earl Jones, Samuel L. Jackson, Jack Paar, Elvis Presley.

Actors, singers & entertainers:

Marc Anthony, Emily Blunt, Leon Botstein, Wayne Brady, Garret Dillahunt, Robert Donat, Sheila Fraser, Noel Gallagher, Gerald "Gerry" Goffin, Francois Goudreaux, Jason Gray, Ray Griff, Tim Gunn, Steve Harvey, John Lee Hooker.

Scatman John, Harvey Keitel, Nicole Kidman, B.B. King, Kendrick Lamar, Peggy Lipton, Doug MacLeod, Raymond Massey, John Melendez, Robert Merrill, Sam Neill, Jack Paar, Elvis Presley, Anthony Quinn, Eric Roberts.

Hrithik Roshan, Mike Rowe, Budd Schulberg, Ed Sheeran, Carly Simon, Tom Sizemore, Mel Tillis, Megan Washington, Michelle Williams, Ann Wilson, Bill Withers, Shane Yellowbird.

Sports stars:

Michael Attardi, Alex Carter, Rubin "Hurricane" Carter, Johnny Damon, Antonio Dixon, Perico Fernandez, Sophie Gustafson, Lester Hayes, Ron Harper, Bo Jackson, Tommy John, Juanfran (Juan Francisco Garcia Garcia), Ivo Karlovic, Michael Kidd-Gilchrist, Gordie Lane.

Greg Louganis, Bob Love, Kenyon Martin, Trumaine McBride, Shaquille O'Neal, Adrian Peterson, Ellis Lankster, Boyd Rankin, James Rodriguez, Mark Rubin, Bryan Rust, Bob Sanders, Sigi Schmid, Matt Slauson, George Springer, Darren Sproles.

Dave Taylor, Jermain Taylor, Ken Venturi, Herschel Walker, Bill Walton, Jeff Walz, Pat Williams, Damien Woody, Chris Zorich.

Writers, authors, producers, composers, and artists:

Jeffrey Blitz, Jorge Luis Borges, Lewis Carroll, Calvert Casey, Scott Damian, Jim Davis, Charles Darwin, Francine du Plessix Gray, Margaret Drabble, Dominic Dunne, John Gregory Dunne, Jack Eberts, Indiana Gregg, Robert A. Heinlein, Edward Hoagland.

Philip Larkin, Ann McGovern, Somerset Maugham, David Mitchell, Mike Peters, Budd Schulberg, Jane Seymour, Marc Shell, Neville Shute, Alan Rabinowitz, John Updike, Andrew Lloyd Webber.

Journalists and photographers:

P.F. Bentley, Henry Luce, Byron Pitts, John Stossel, Jeff Zeleny.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD the actual resume of Michael Pender, a graduate of Annapolis and an excellent young man.

MICHAEL PENDER

Michael Pender is a 2016 United States Naval Academy graduate and a veteran naval officer who was separated from the Navy in April 2019. His separation was not due to any fault of his own, but because of the current processes of the United States Navy and the United States Naval Academy relating to speech fluency issues related to stuttering.

Lieutenant Pender's stuttering was not severe, and undetectable to most individuals who engage him in conversation. However,

for certain career opportunities in the military it matters a great deal if someone has even a slight almost imperceptible stutter.

Michael Pender's story began with his enrollment at the Naval Academy in 2012. Mr. Pender dreamed of becoming a naval aviator from an early age. During the naval aviation screening during his junior year at Annapolis, the USNA flight doctor reviewing his medical records and USNA application and noticed that Mr. Pender had a history of speech disfluency. The flight doctor then administered a speech fluency test to Mr. Pender. During the test, Mr. Pender's speech fluency did not meet the Naval Aviation community's standards, and he was told that he was disqualified from serving as an aviator.

Mr. Pender was disappointed with the determination. At that critical juncture Mr. Pender was not informed about what careers he could qualify to fill that would not be impacted by the determination regarding his speech. He was given an opportunity to take speech therapy, which he did until his graduation.

Mr. Pender selected the only unrestricted line option left—the Surface Warfare community. At the time, Mr. Pender advised the flight doctor that the demands for speech fluency would be more of an issue as a Surface Warfare Officer. His concerns were not satisfactorily addressed nor was he provided with counseling to assist him in selecting an appropriate career following his graduation.

After graduating from the United States Naval Academy, Mr. Pender served onboard the USS *Scout* (MCM 8) in San Diego, where he began his training as a Surface Warfare Officer. After serving diligently for 18 months and qualifying in all required Surface Warfare watch-stations except for the position of Officer of the Deck, it was clear that his speech impediment would keep him from earning his Surface Warfare Officer qualification.

An Officer of the Deck is the captain's representative when the captain is not on the bridge of the ship. Officer of the Deck gives verbal orders to sailors who drive the ship. It was difficult for Mr. Pender to give orders in a timely manner without delay due to his speech impediment. Mr. Pender wanted to address the issue and sought out a speech therapist who would accept TRICare insurance to improve his speech as he pursued his Officer of the Deck qualification. His overall speech fluency improved, but not enough to give the Captain confidence to qualify Mr. Pender as Officer of the Deck. Mr. Pender and his Captain decided that transferring to a different community would be the best option.

Since stuttering is not classified as a medical issue, a Medical Board was not an option to review his case. Once he completed his education at Annapolis the options for career change within the branch was extremely limited. In 2018, after consulting with other officers, Mr. Pender's Captain and Executive Officer decided that the best course of action was to submit a redesignation package to the Probationary Officer Continuation and Retention Board (POCR), with the intention that he would re-designate into a different community. In order to start this process, Mr. Pender's Captain submitted a Surface Warfare Officer non-attainment letter to the POCR Board. In that letter, Mr. Pender's captain stated that Mr. Pender would not be able to qualify as Surface Warfare Officer, not because of a lack of aptitude or work ethic, but because of his speech impediment.

The POCR Board has the authority to reassign a Naval Officer to another Naval Community, which the Navy's method of reassigning personnel to a new job. The POCR Board got back to Mr. Pender in September

2018 stating that he would be removed from the Active Duty List and he would be retained on the Reserve Active Status list, effectively separating him from the Navy without any due process or a right to appeal the decision.

It is disappointing that he had to separate from the Navy for two reasons. First, he was not put into a position to succeed coming out of the Naval Academy. His speech impediment was a known condition at the Naval Academy, and their service selection process should have evaluated Mr. Pender's speech impediment to see if he would be successful as a Naval Aviator or a Surface Warfare Officer. Second, he should have been given a chance to serve in a restricted line community. Even if his speech impediment was not caught until he ultimately started his service as a Naval Officer, there should be a process in place where officers who cannot qualify in their respective unrestricted line communities due to conditions that are not covered for Medical Boards are given a fair chance to serve in one of the many restricted line communities. The POCR Board process should only be reserved for officers that were not able to qualify due to a lack of desire or aptitude. In conclusion, there were plenty of other communities in the Navy where Mr. Pender would have been able to serve, and it is a shame that he is separated from the Navy.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, let me also indicate that I am very glad and grateful for amendment No. 201 that adds \$10 million to research dealing with triple negative breast cancer.

Between 10 and 17 percent of female breast cancer patients have this condition, and I believe this is crucial to helping military women and others.

Amendment No. 202 deals with PTSD. We have added \$2.5 million. I am grateful for this amendment. We are recognizing that more and more young people coming out have a continuation of PTSD. Currently, there are 31.3 million people in the United States being treated for PTSD.

Let me also say that I am grateful for the seven other amendments that have been added.

Jackson Lee amendment No. 195 creates housing for disaster survivors.

No. 145 has the DOD engage in efforts to stop Boko Haram.

No. 147 has to do with recruiting students who go to the Defense National Security Education Program. It prevents them from being recruited by foreign governments.

Also, No. 148 deals with stopping a report on maternity mortality rates.

Amendment No. 149 deals with the risk posed by debris in low Earth orbit.

No. 160 deals with the idea of training in cybersecurity, cyber defense, and cyber operations for elementary, secondary, and postsecondary students.

Then, No. 620 deals with artificial intelligence education strategic opportunities and risks.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. BONAMICI). The gentlewoman has 40 seconds remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, my remaining comments are to simply say the amendment that is close to my

heart is the one dealing with this academy graduate, this Naval Academy graduate. We asked everyone to give him another chance because the only thing that he was deficient in is not in heart, soul, and willingness to serve, but it was because he had a speech impediment.

How shameful for us to deal with our young men and women like that.

I thank my colleagues for supporting this amendment. I ask for a "yes" vote on the Jackson Lee amendments and the Jackson Lee amendment that deals with the idea of making sure young people have the medical care, the service, and the ability to serve after graduating from an academy with \$500,000 invested in this young man, and all my other underlying amendments.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support them.

Madam Chair, I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member THORNBERRY for their work on this bill and their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces.

I also thank them for including in this En Bloc ten Jackson Lee Amendments.

My remarks will focus on three of the Jackson Lee Amendments and the others are addressed in my statement for the record.

Jackson Lee Amendments No. 201, No. 202, and No. 203, make important contributions to the bill.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 201 authorizes and encourages increased collaboration between the DOD and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to combat Triple Negative Breast Cancer;

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 202 authorizes \$2.5 million in increased funding to combat and treat Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder; and

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 203 directs the Secretary of Defense to promulgate regulations to ensure that candidates granted admission to attend a military academy undergo screening for speech disorders and be provided the results of the screening test and a list of warfare unrestricted line (URL) Officer positions and occupation specialists that require successful performance on the speech test. Academy students shall have the option of undergoing speech therapy to reduce speech disorders or impediments.

Specifically, Jackson Lee Amendment No. 203 is intended to help military academy candidates that have stuttering related speech disorders.

Five to ten percent of all children stutter as they develop language skills.

Boys are 2 to 3 times more likely to stutter than girls.

Approximately 75 percent of children recover from stuttering, but the remaining 25 percent will experience life-long effects of stuttering.

There are many famous and accomplished persons who stutter.

One well known person who stuttered was Jimmy Stewart a much beloved actor who also served in the Air Force during World War II.

Jimmy Stewart was a pilot during WWII and rose to the rank of Chief of Staff of the 2nd Combat Wing, 2nd Air Division of the 8th Air Force.

As a member of the Air Force Reserves Jimmy Stewart continued his military service.

On July 23, 1959, Jimmy Stewart achieved the rank of Brigadier General.

He retired from military service on May 31, 1968.

Stuttering can make it difficult to communicate with other people, which often affects a person's quality of life and interpersonal relationships.

Stuttering can also negatively influence job performance and opportunities, and treatment can come at a high financial cost.

I offer this amendment to help entrants into military academies, who may have a related stuttering speech disorder, find the right career fit for their military service after graduation.

I learned about the impact of stuttering may have on promising military careers through the experience of a remarkable young man who is currently serving as a Legislative Fellow in my Washington, D.C., office.

He is a 2016 graduate of the United States Naval Academy with a degree in Operations Research and a veteran naval officer who was separated from the Navy in April 2019.

His separation was not due to any fault of his own, but because of the current processes of the United States Navy and the United States Naval Academy relating to speech fluency issues related to stuttering.

This Navy Lieutenant's stuttering was not severe, and undetectable to most individuals who engage him in conversation.

However, for certain career opportunities in the military it matters a great deal if someone has even a slight, almost-imperceptible stutter.

His story began with his enrollment at the Naval Academy in 2012.

He dreamed of becoming a naval aviator from an early age.

During the naval aviation screening during his junior year at Annapolis, the Naval Academy flight doctor reviewing his medical records and USNA application, noticed that he had a history of speech disfluency.

The flight doctor then administered a speech fluency test to him.

During the test, his speech fluency did not meet the Naval Aviation community's standards, and he was told that he was disqualified from serving as an aviator.

He was disappointed with the determination.

At that critical juncture he was not informed regarding the career paths he was qualified to fill, notwithstanding his speech.

He was given an opportunity to take speech therapy, which he did until his graduation.

He selected another unrestricted line option left open to him—the Surface Warfare community.

At the time, he advised the flight doctor that the demands for speech fluency would be more of an issue as a Surface Warfare Officer.

After graduating from the United States Naval Academy with an Operations Research degree, he served onboard the USS Scout (MCM 8) in San Diego, where he began his training as a Surface Warfare Officer.

After serving diligently for 18 months and qualifying in all required Surface Warfare watch-stations except for the position of Officer of the Deck, it was clear that his speech impediment would keep him from earning his Surface Warfare Officer qualification.

An Officer of the Deck is the captain's representative when the captain is not on the bridge of the ship.

Officer of the Deck gives verbal orders to sailors who drive the ship.

It was difficult for him to give orders in a timely manner without delay due to his speech impediment.

He wanted to address the issue and sought out a speech therapist who would accept TRI-Care insurance to improve his speech as he pursued his Officer of the Deck qualification.

His overall speech fluency improved, but not enough to give the Captain confidence to qualify him as Officer of the Deck.

He and his Captain decided that transferring to a different community would be the best option.

Since stuttering is not classified as a medical issue, a Medical Board was not an option to review his case.

Once he completed his education at Annapolis, the options for career change within the branch were extremely limited.

In 2018, after consulting with other officers, his Captain and Executive Officer decided that the best course of action was to submit a re-designation package to the Probationary Officer Continuation and Retention Board (POCR), with the intention that he would re-designate into a different community.

To start this process, his Captain submitted a Surface Warfare Officer non-attainment letter to the POCR Board.

In that letter, his captain stated that the Lieutenant would not be able to qualify as Surface Warfare Officer, not because of a lack of aptitude or work-ethic, but because of his speech impediment.

The POCR Board has the authority to reassign a Naval Officer to another Naval Community, which is the Navy's method of reassigning personnel to a new job.

The POCR Board got back to him in September 2018, stating that he would be removed from the Active Duty List and he would be retained on the Reserve Active Status list, effectively separating him from the Navy without any due process or a right to appeal the decision.

The Medical Board findings returned in March 2019 and stated that it was the stuttering that caused the anxiety order, and stuttering is not an issue that is covered for Medical Boards.

It is disappointing that he had to separate from the Navy for two reasons.

First, he was not put into a position to succeed coming out of the Naval Academy.

His speech impediment was a known condition at the Naval Academy, and its service selection process should have evaluated his speech impediment to see if he would be successful as a Naval Aviator or a Surface Warfare Officer.

Second, he should have been given a chance to serve in a restricted line community.

Even if his speech impediment was not caught until he ultimately started his service as a Naval Officer, there should be a process in place where officers who cannot qualify in their respective unrestricted line communities due to conditions that are not covered for Medical Boards are given a fair chance to serve in one of the many restricted line communities.

The POCR Board process should only be reserved for officers that were not able to qualify due to a lack of desire or aptitude.

In conclusion, there were plenty of other communities in the Navy where he would have been able to serve, and it is a shame that he is separated from the Navy.

I, and my Staff have benefited greatly from his insights on improving the experience of military cadets as well as his commitment to public service as a Legislative Fellow in my office.

I am sure he will find success in his next endeavor and I thank him for his service to our nation.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 202 authorizes \$2.5 million in increased funding to combat and treat Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Today, 223.4 million people, which represents seventy percent of adults living in the United States, have experienced some type of traumatic event at least once in their lives.

As many as 20 percent of those who experience a traumatic event develop PTSD.

Currently, there are 31.3 million people in the United States being treated for PTSD.

An estimated 8 percent of Americans or 24.4 million people at any given time will be experiencing PTSD.

Nearly 50 percent of women and 60 percent of men will experience at least one trauma in their lifetime.

For Veterans, this may mean surviving an IED explosion or an accident during a training exercise or witnessing the death or injury of a buddy.

Among people who are victims of a severe traumatic experience like what may occur during military conflict, an estimated 60 to 80 percent will develop PTSD.

Ten to thirty percent of combat veteran's lifetime will experience PTSD at some point during their lives.

Studies estimate that 1 in every 5 military personnel returning from Iraq and Afghanistan has PTSD.

20 percent of the soldiers who've been deployed in the past 6 years have PTSD. That's over 300,000 soldiers.

17 percent of combat troops are women; 71 percent of female military personnel develop PTSD due to sexual assault within the ranks.

I thank the Chair and Ranking Member for including this Jackson Lee Amendment to combat PTSD for consideration of H.R. 2500.

This Jackson Lee Amendment provides authorization for a \$10 million increase in funding for increased collaboration with NIH to combat Triple Negative Breast Cancer.

This Jackson Lee Amendment authorizes and encourages increased collaboration between the DOD and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to combat Triple Negative Breast Cancer.

"Triple Negative Breast Cancer" is a term used to describe breast cancers whose cells do not have estrogen receptors and progesterone receptors, and do not have an excess of the "HER2" protein on their cell membrane of tumor cells.

The lack of receptors in this form of breast cancer makes commonly used test and methods to detect the disease not as effective.

This is a serious illness that affects between 10–17 percent of female breast cancer patients and this condition is more likely to cause death than the most common form of breast cancer.

Seventy percent of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will help to save lives.

TNBC disproportionately impacts younger women, African American women, Hispanic/

Latina women, and women with a “BRCA1” genetic mutation, which is also prevalent in Jewish women.

TNBC usually affects women under 50 years of age and makes up more than 30 percent of all breast cancer diagnoses in African American.

African American women are far more susceptible to this dangerous subtype than white or Hispanic women.

The collaboration between the Department of Defense and NIH to combat Triple Negative Breast Cancer can support the development of multiple targeted therapies for this devastating disease.

Triple negative breast cancer is a specific strain of breast cancer for which no targeted treatment is available.

The American Cancer Society calls this strain of breast cancer “an aggressive subtype associated with lower survival rates.”

In 2011, the Centers for Disease Control predicted that that year 26,840 black women would be diagnosed with TNBC.

The overall incidence rate of breast cancer is 10 percent lower in African American women than white women.

African American women have a five-year survival rate of 78 percent after diagnosis as compared to 90 percent for white women.

The incidence rate of breast cancer among women under 45 is higher for African American women compared to white women.

Triple Negative Breast Cancer cells account for between 13 percent and 25 percent of all breast cancer in the United States and are usually of a higher grade and size, are more aggressive and more likely to metastasize, and onset at a much younger age.

Currently, 70 percent of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

African American women are 3 times more likely to develop triple-negative breast cancer than white women.

African-American women have prevalence for TNBC of 26 percent versus 16 percent in non-African-Americans women.

African-American women are more likely to be diagnosed with larger tumors and more advanced stages of breast cancer.

Currently there is no targeted treatment for TNBC exists.

For this reason, I appreciate the support that the Armed Services Committee has shown for this amendment by including it in En Bloc No. 8, and I ask my colleagues to support this Jackson Lee Amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time, Madam Chair.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my bipartisan amendment in both the House and Senate to the National Defense Authorization Act, a necessary leap forward in combating the opioid crisis by cracking down on illegal fentanyl from China, Mexico, and other countries.

I would like to acknowledge and thank the cosponsors of this amendment, my colleagues FRENCH HILL, ANTHONY BRINDISI, BRIAN FITZPATRICK, DAVID TRONE, and CONOR LAMB.

This amendment will place sanctions on drug manufacturers that knowingly

provide fentanyl to traffickers, on transnational criminal organizations that mix fentanyl with other drugs and traffic them into the U.S., as well as financial institutions that assist these traffickers.

Critically, my amendment also authorizes new funding to U.S. law enforcement and intelligence agencies to go after fentanyl traffickers while establishing a commission on fentanyl and opioid trafficking to ensure that we make progress here.

Kids are dying in my district, in Staten Island, south Brooklyn, and New York City, and they are dying around the country because of deadly fentanyl.

We know where it is coming from. It is about time that Congress does something about it. The days when a person or a company could find safe harbor in another country, flood our streets with drugs, and face no consequences have to be over.

Madam Chair, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment. We have to get this done.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 476, I offer amendments en bloc as the designee of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

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

Amendments en bloc No. 11 consisting of amendment Nos. 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, and 290, printed in part B of House Report 116-143, offered by Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

AMENDMENT NO. 265 OFFERED BY MRS. LURIA OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 7. FINDINGS ON MUSCULOSKELETAL INJURIES.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Musculoskeletal injuries among active duty soldiers result in over 10 million limited duty days each year and account for over 70% of the medically non-deployable population, extremity injury accounts for 79% of reported trauma cases in theater, and service members experience anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injuries at 10 times the rate of the general population.

(2) Congress recognizes the important work of the Naval Advanced Medical Research Unit in Wound Care Research and encourages continued development of innovations for the Warfighter, especially regarding these tendon and ligament injuries that prevent return to duty for extended periods of time.

AMENDMENT NO. 266 OFFERED BY MRS. LURIA OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle B of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3. STUDY ON ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on how the Secretary could enter into more energy savings performance contracts (referred to in this section as “ESPCs”). In conducting the study, the Secretary shall—

(1) identify any legislative or regulatory barriers to entering into more ESPCs; and

(2) include policy proposals for how the Department of Defense could evaluate the cost savings caused by increasing energy resiliency when evaluating whether to enter into ESPCs.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the study required under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 267 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Add at the end of subtitle G of title VIII the following new section:

SEC. . REESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON WARTIME CONTRACTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby reestablished in the legislative branch under section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 230) the Commission on Wartime Contracting.

(b) AMENDMENT TO DUTIES.—Section 841(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 231) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) GENERAL DUTIES.—The Commission shall study the following matters:

“(A) Federal agency contracting funded by overseas contingency operations funds.

“(B) Federal agency contracting for the logistical support of coalition forces operating under the authority of the 2001 or 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force.

“(C) Federal agency contracting for the performance of security functions in countries where coalition forces operate under the authority of the 2001 or 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 230) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform” each place it appears and inserting “the Committee on Oversight and Reform”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “of this Act” and inserting “of the Wartime Contracting Commission Reauthorization Act of 2019”; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking “was first established” each place it appears and inserting “was reestablished by the Wartime Contracting Commission Reauthorization Act of 2019”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “On March 1, 2009” and inserting “Not later than one year after the date of enactment of the Wartime Contracting Commission Reauthorization Act of 2019”.

AMENDMENT NO. 268 OFFERED BY MR. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY OF NEW YORK

Page 283, after line 10, insert the following:
SEC. 567. INFORMATION REGARDING COUNTY VETERANS SERVICE OFFICERS.

(a) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that a member of the Armed Forces who is separating or retiring from the Armed Forces may elect to have the Department of Defense form DD-214 of the member transmitted to the appropriate county veterans service officer based on the mailing address provided by the member.

(b) DATABASE.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall maintain a database of all county veterans service officers.

(c) COUNTY VETERANS SERVICE OFFICER DEFINED.—In this section, the term “county veterans service officer” means an employee of a county government, local government, or Tribal government who is covered by section 14.629(a)(2) of title 38, Code of Federal Regulations.

AMENDMENT NO. 269 OFFERED BY MR. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 719. MAINTENANCE OF CERTAIN MEDICAL SERVICES AT MILITARY MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITIES AT SERVICE ACADEMIES.

Section 1073d of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) MAINTENANCE OF CERTAIN MEDICAL SERVICES AT SERVICE ACADEMIES.—(1) In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each military medical treatment facility located at a Service Academy (as defined in section 347 of this title) provides each covered medical service unless the Secretary determines that a civilian health care facility located not fewer than five miles from the Service Academy provides the covered medical service.

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘covered medical service’ means the following:

“(A) Emergency room services.

“(B) Orthopedic services.

“(C) General surgery services.

“(D) Ear, nose, and throat services.

“(E) Gynecological services.

“(F) Ophthalmology services.

“(G) In-patient services.

“(H) Any other medical services that the relevant Superintendent of the Service Academy determines necessary to maintain the readiness and health of the cadets or midshipmen and members of the armed forces at the Service Academy.”

AMENDMENT NO. 270 OFFERED BY MR. MAST OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle D of title VI, add the following new section:

SEC. 632. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN MORALE, WELFARE, AND RECREATION PRIVILEGES TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS ON MANDATORY HOME LEAVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1065 of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 621 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232), is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “**veterans and caregivers for veterans**” and inserting “**veterans, caregivers for veterans, and Foreign Service officers**”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection (f):

“(f) ELIGIBILITY OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS ON MANDATORY HOME LEAVE.—A Foreign Service officer on mandatory home leave may be permitted to use military lodging referred to in subsection (h).”;

(4) in subsection (h), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(5) The term ‘Foreign Service officer’ has the meaning given that term in section 103 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3903).

“(6) The term ‘mandatory home leave’ means leave under section 903 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4083).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2020, as if originally incorporated in section 621 of Public Law 115-232.

AMENDMENT NO. 271 OFFERED BY MRS. MCBATH OF GEORGIA

At the end of subtitle H of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10 . . . DEFINITION OF CURRENT MONTHLY INCOME FOR PURPOSES OF BANKRUPTCY LAWS.

Section 101(10A) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B)(i) includes any amount paid by any entity other than the debtor (or in a joint case the debtor and the debtor’s spouse), on a regular basis for the household expenses of the debtor or the debtor’s dependents (and in a joint case the debtor’s spouse if not otherwise a dependent); and

“(ii) excludes—

“(I) benefits received under the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.);

“(II) payments to victims of war crimes or crimes against humanity on account of their status as victims of such crimes;

“(III) payments to victims of international terrorism or domestic terrorism, as those terms are defined in section 2331 of title 18, on account of their status as victims of such terrorism; and

“(IV) any monthly compensation, pension, pay, annuity, or allowance paid under title 10, 37, or 38 in connection with a disability, combat-related injury or disability, or death of a member of the uniformed services, except that any retired pay excluded under this subclause shall include retired pay paid under chapter 61 of title 10 only to the extent that such retired pay exceeds the amount of retired pay to which the debtor would otherwise be entitled if retired under any provision of title 10 other than chapter 61 of that title.”

AMENDMENT NO. 272 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 7 . . . WOUNDED WARRIOR SERVICE DOG PROGRAM.

(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—Subject to the availability of appropriations provided for such purpose, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a program, to be known as the “Wounded Warrior Service Dog Program”, to award competitive grants to nonprofit organizations to assist such organizations in the planning, designing, establishing, or operating (or any combination thereof) of programs to provide assistance dogs to covered members.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The recipient of a grant under this section shall use the grant to carry out programs that provide assistance dogs to covered members who have a disability described in paragraph (2).

(2) DISABILITY.—A disability described in this paragraph is any of the following:

(A) Blindness or visual impairment.

(B) Loss of use of a limb, paralysis, or other significant mobility issues.

(C) Loss of hearing.

(D) Traumatic brain injury.

(E) Post-traumatic stress disorder.

(F) Any other disability that the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(3) TIMING OF AWARD.—The Secretary of Defense may not award a grant under this section to reimburse a recipient for costs previously incurred by the recipient in carrying out a program to provide assistance dogs to covered members unless the recipient elects for the award to be such a reimbursement.

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a nonprofit organization shall submit an application to the Secretary of Defense at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. Such application shall include—

(1) a proposal for the evaluation required by subsection (d); and

(2) a description of—

(A) the training that will be provided by the organization to covered members;

(B) the training of dogs that will serve as assistance dogs;

(C) the aftercare services that the organization will provide for such dogs and covered members;

(D) the plan for publicizing the availability of such dogs through a targeted marketing campaign to covered members;

(E) the recognized expertise of the organization in breeding and training such dogs;

(F) the commitment of the organization to humane standards for animals; and

(G) the experience of the organization with working with military medical treatment facilities; and

(3) a statement certifying that the organization—

(A) is accredited by Assistance Dogs International, the International Guide Dog Federation, or another similar widely recognized accreditation organization that the Secretaries determine has accreditation standards that meet or exceed the standards of Assistance Dogs International and the International Guide Dog Federation; or

(B) is a candidate for such accreditation or otherwise meets or exceeds such standards, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

(d) EVALUATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall require each recipient of a grant to use a portion of the funds made available through the grant to conduct an evaluation of the effectiveness of the activities carried out through the grant by such recipient.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ASSISTANCE DOG.—The term “assistance dog” means a dog specifically trained to perform physical tasks to mitigate the effects of a disability described in subsection (b)(2), except that the term does not include a dog specifically trained for comfort or personal defense.

(2) COVERED MEMBER.—The term “covered member” means a member of the Armed Forces who is—

(B) receiving medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code;

(C) in medical hold or medical holdover status; or

(D) covered under section 1202 or 1205 of title 10, United States Code.

(f) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 1405 for Other Authorizations, Defense Health Program, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, for Consolidated Health Support is hereby increased by \$11,000,000.

(g) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for Operations and Maintenance, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for Operations and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, Line 460, Office of the Secretary of Defense is hereby reduced by \$11,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 273 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY OF WEST VIRGINIA

Page 408, line 3, insert “the Secretary of Energy” after “Joint Chiefs of Staff.”

AMENDMENT NO. 274 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY OF WEST VIRGINIA

Page 408, line 7, insert “, with a focus on items that contain high concentrations of rare earth materials” after “rare earth materials”.

AMENDMENT NO. 275 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY OF WEST VIRGINIA

Page 408, line 16, insert “, including use of a sole source contract with a institution of

higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 Act (20 U.S.C. 1001)) or other entity," after "methods".

AMENDMENT NO. 276 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 520. REPORT REGARDING NATIONAL GUARD YOUTH CHALLENGE PROGRAM.

Not later than December 31, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees regarding the resources and authorities the Secretary determines necessary to identify the effects of the National Guard Youth Challenge Program on graduates of that program during the five years immediately preceding the date of the report. Such resources shall include the costs of identifying such effects beyond the 12-month, post-residential mentoring period of that program.

AMENDMENT NO. 277 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY
OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3. REDUCTION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITY WATER USE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing plan to reduce facility water use intensity, relative to the baseline of the water consumption of the facility for fiscal year 2018. The report shall include each of the following:

(1) Life-cycle cost-effective measures that will reduce water consumption by 2 percent annually through the end of fiscal year 2025.

(2) Baseline development methodology for calculating a baseline of water use intensity for fiscal year 2018, defined as gallons per gross square foot per year, that will permit all future reduction goals to be measured relative to such baseline.

(3) An identification of life-cycle cost effective water savings measures that can be implemented to achieve in Department of Defense facilities a minimum of 2 percent annual reduction in water use through 2025.

(4) A description of any barriers to implementation of a water use reduction program.

(b) WATER USE.—In this section, the term "water use" with respect to a facility includes—

(1) all water used at the facility that is obtained from public water systems or from natural freshwater sources such as lakes, streams, and aquifers, where the water is classified or permitted for human consumption; and

(2) potable water used for drinking, bathing, toilet flushing, laundry, cleaning and food services, watering of landscaping, irrigation, and process applications such as cooling towers, boilers, and fire suppression systems.

AMENDMENT NO. 278 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS
OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 8. REPORT ON REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CONSUMPTION-BASED SOLUTIONS.

(a) REPORT.—The Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the feasibility of revising the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement to include requirements relating to consumption-based solutions.

(b) CONSUMPTION-BASED SOLUTIONS DEFINED.—The term "consumption-based solutions" means any combination of hardware or equipment, software, and labor or services

that together provide a capability that is metered and billed based on actual usage and predetermined pricing per resource unit, and includes the ability to rapidly scale capacity up or down.

AMENDMENT NO. 279 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS
OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 898. FEDERAL CONTRACTOR DISCLOSURE OF UNPAID FEDERAL TAX LIABILITY.

Section 2313(c) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(9) Any unpaid Federal tax liability of the person, but only to the extent all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed with respect to the Federal tax liability."

AMENDMENT NO. 280 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS
OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 394, after line 16, insert the following:

(6) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The service acquisition executive may delegate any of the responsibilities under this subsection to a program executive officer (or equivalent).

AMENDMENT NO. 281 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS
OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 882. BRIEFING ON THE TRUSTED CAPITAL MARKETPLACE PILOT PROGRAM.

Not later than December 15, 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the progress of the Trusted Capital Marketplace pilot program (Solicitation number: CS-19-1701), to include plans for how the program will—

(1) align with critical defense requirements; and

(2) become self-sustaining.

AMENDMENT NO. 282 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS
OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle I—Stop Financing of Al-Shabaab Act
SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Stop Financing of al-Shabaab Act".

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Horn of Africa region remains integral to United States interests in Africa and the Indian Ocean region; and

(2) United States assistance and diplomatic support for the Government of Somalia and its Federal Member States must be predicated upon measurable progress toward defined benchmarks with respect to efforts to counter al-Shabaab, including the enforcement of measures to combat illicit trafficking that finances al-Shabaab.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) combat any means by which al-Shabaab obtains funding through illicit trafficking;

(2) take into consideration compliance with and enforcement of the international bans on illicit trafficking which finances al-Shabaab when providing United States assistance to any country;

(3) notify countries receiving United States security assistance which are identified by the Secretary of State or Secretary of Defense as major components of illicit trafficking routes that finance al-Shabaab, that continued assistance may depend on the full implementation of the obligations of such country to enforce as fully as possible all restrictions against such trafficking; and

(4) ensure that continued United States security assistance to Kenya, including assistance coordinated through the Kenya-United

States Liaison Office, and assistance to multilateral institutions such as the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) to combat al-Shabaab recruitment, attacks, and other operations inside Kenya also includes assistance to enable the Kenya Defense Forces to end facilitation of trafficking that funds al-Shabaab encountered by the Kenya Defense Forces.

SEC. 3. REPORT.

(a) REPORT.—Subject to subsection (b), not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the relevant Congressional committees a report including the contents described in subsection (b).

(b) CONTENTS.—Each report described in subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Information on efforts made by troop contributors to AMISOM to enforce any international bans on trafficked goods.

(2) A recommendation, including a justification for such recommendation, with respect to making certain future United States security or other assistance to any country conditional on enforcement of such international bans on illicit trafficking that finances al-Shabaab.

(3) The steps the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense have taken to encourage ending the facilitation of trafficking that finances al-Shabaab by recipients of United States security assistance.

(4) A description of the engagement of employees and contractors of the Department of State with national and regional Somali authorities, including authorities in Jubaland, to encourage such Somali authorities to implement their counter-trafficking obligations.

(5) A description of efforts taken by the governments of countries with nationals who purchase significant amounts of trafficked goods that finance al-Shabaab and a description of the steps the Secretary of State has taken to encourage such compliance.

(6) An assessment of prospective efforts to reduce the production and illicit trade of trafficked goods in Somalia, including the identification of alternative livelihoods, and means of securing income. The assessment may include recommendations from the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

(c) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "relevant Congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 283 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS
OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the appropriate place in title XII, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO MONGOLIA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States and Mongolia have a shared interest in supporting and preserving Mongolia's democracy, including Mongolia's ability to pursue an independent foreign policy, defend against threats to its sovereignty, and maintain territorial integrity;

(2) Mongolia has consistently contributed forces to support United States combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and has a strong record of troop contributions to international peacekeeping missions;

(3) as one of NATO's nine "partners across the globe", Mongolia shares the United

States' vision of a rules-based order in the strategically important Indo-Pacific region;

(4) the United States should continue to take steps to remain Mongolia's preferred security partner;

(5) defense cooperation, a strong military-to-military relationship, and increased interoperability between the United States and the armed forces of Mongolia are in the interest of the United States; and

(6) annual multilateral military exercises in Mongolia support peacekeeping and humanitarian assistance and disaster response capacity of United States partners and allies, and further United States regional objectives.

AMENDMENT NO. 284 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 1048, insert after line 20 the following:

SEC. 2875. REPORT ON LEAD SERVICE LINES AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

Not later than January 1, 2021, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that contains the following:

(1) The number of military installations at which lead service lines are connected to schools, childcare centers and facilities, buildings, and other facilities of the installation as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(2) The total number of members of the Armed Forces affected by the presence of lead service lines at military installations.

(3) Of the total number of members under paragraph (2), the number of such members with dependents.

(4) Actions, if any, undertaken by the Secretary to inform individuals affected by the presence of lead service lines at military installations of such presence.

(5) Recommendations for legislative action relating to the replacement of lead service lines at military installations.

AMENDMENT NO. 285 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 283, line 24, strike "while on active duty".

AMENDMENT NO. 286 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle B of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 520. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF SUICIDE PREVENTION AND RESILIENCE PROGRAM FOR THE RESERVE COMPONENTS.

Strike subsection (g) of section 10219 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 287 OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF WEST VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle H of title X of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 10____. HONORING LAST SURVIVING MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT OF SECOND WORLD WAR.

(a) USE OF ROTUNDA.—At the election of the individual (or next of kin of the individual), the last individual to die who was awarded the Medal of Honor for acts performed during World War II shall be permitted to lie in honor in the rotunda of the Capitol upon death.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Architect of the Capitol, under the direction and supervision of the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall take the necessary steps to implement subsection (a) upon the death of the individual described in such subsection.

AMENDMENT NO. 288 OFFERED BY MR. MITCHELL OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 898. UNIFORMITY IN APPLICATION OF MICRO-PURCHASE THRESHOLD TO CERTAIN TASK OR DELIVERY ORDERS.

Section 4106(c) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by striking "\$2,500" and inserting "the micro-purchase threshold under section 1902 of this title".

AMENDMENT NO. 289 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 387, after line 15, insert the following new section:

SEC. 729. NATIONAL CAPITAL CONSORTIUM PSYCHIATRY RESIDENCY PROGRAM.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) racial, gender, or other forms of discrimination or harassment should not be tolerated within the PRP; and

(2) that PRP leadership should—

(A) set the tone that such conduct is not acceptable;

(B) ensure that all such complaints are thoroughly investigated;

(C) ensure that violators are held accountable;

(D) ensure that victims are protected, and not retaliated against;

(E) maintain a workplace free from unlawful harassment and discrimination;

(F) conduct regular workplace climate assessments to assess the extent of discrimination or harassment in the PRP; and

(G) provide refresher training, at least annually, on acceptable standards of behavior for all involved in the PRP programs, including residents and ways to report or address discrimination, harassment, or other inappropriate behavior.

(b) PRP DEFINED.—In this section, the term "PRP" means the National Capital Consortium Psychiatry Residency Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 290 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

At the end of title XXVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 26____. REVIEW AND REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF NEW, OR MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING, DIRECT FUEL PIPELINE CONNECTIONS AT AIR NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR FORCE RESERVE INSTALLATIONS.

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, in conjunction with the Defense Logistics Agency, shall complete a review considering—

(1) the need for, and benefits of, the construction of new, or maintenance of existing, direct fuel pipeline connections at Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve installations; and

(2) the barriers, including funding needs and any inconsistent guidance and consideration of such projects by the Air Force, that may impede such projects.

(b) ELEMENTS OF REVIEW.—The review required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An analysis of the extent that the Air Force and Defense Logistics Agency have identified direct fuel pipeline projects as an effective and efficient way to enhance the ability of regular component, Air National Guard, and Air Force Reserve installations, to improve the readiness of affected units and help them to meet their mission requirements, including an assessment of how the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve facilities, across all States and territories, can leverage such connections to better support current and emerging air refueling requirements.

(2) An assessment of how direct fuel pipeline connections enhance the resiliency and efficiency of the installations and help meet existing Defense Logistics Agency require-

ments for secondary storage and other fuel requirements.

(3) A list of Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve installations that currently do not have a direct connection pipeline but have access to such a pipeline within reasonable proximity (less than five miles) to the facility.

(4) An overview and summary of the current process for considering such proposals, including the factors used to consider requests, including the weight provided to each factor and including a list of Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve installations that have sought funding for projects to create direct access to a national fuel pipeline or to maintain access to such pipelines over the last five years.

(5) A list of the total instances in the past five years in which projects for direct fuel pipeline connections have been approved for regular component, Air National Guard, or Air Force Reserve installations, including the costs of each project and the justification for such approval.

(6) A list of Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve installations with current pipeline connections that the Air Force or Defense Logistics Agency has determined should no longer be used, including—

(A) an analysis of the justifications for each such determination, such as decisions to switch from pipelines to using trucks as the primary fuel delivery method;

(B) an assessment of whether these determinations fairly weigh the costs and benefits of building or maintaining a pipeline tap as a practical primary or secondary fuel delivery method for the installation compared to railroad, barge terminal, or truck delivery; and

(C) an assessment of whether these determinations fairly consider or weigh how direct fuel pipeline connections increase security for the fuel supply by reducing the threat of interruption, enhance mission reliability by providing access to greater fuel storage capability, and the ability of such projects once completed to better support the domestic and global operations of the Air National Guard or Air Force Reserve installation.

(7) An assessment of how costs associated with each direct fuel pipeline connection project is considered by the Air Force or Defense Logistics Agency and the weight given to such costs in the final analysis.

(8) An assessment of the effectiveness or usefulness of guidance or technical assistance provided to installations requesting or proposing direct fuel pipeline connection projects and recommend ways to provide additional assistance to ensure the Air Force and Defense Logistics Agency receive the most up to date information about the costs and benefits of proposed projects from installations.

(9) An assessment of the available funding sources through the Air Force, Defense Logistics Agency, other Department of Defense entities, or other mechanisms, such as a public-private partnership or enhanced use lease, that can support direct fuel pipeline connection projects either in whole or in part.

(10) An assessment of the extent to which direct fuel pipeline connection projects have been incorporated in any comprehensive plan the Air Force has developed or will develop regarding investments needed to improve Air National Guard, Air Force Reserve, and regular component installations to meet the Department's needs.

(c) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall provide a final report to the Committees on Armed

Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives containing the results of the review required by subsection (a) and recommendations from the review on how the Air Force can better expedite and support the use of fuel pipelines at Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve installations. Such recommendations shall include options for accelerating the development and consideration of such projects where most feasible and appropriate, including whether costs savings could be obtained by including such projects as part of other related projects already authorized at an installation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chair, I currently have no speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I have no speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support the en bloc package, as well as the NDAA upon final passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Chair, this bipartisan amendment co-sponsored by Congresswoman WALORSKI will authorize \$11 million for the Wounded Warrior Service Dog Program in FY 2020, and I want to thank Chairman SMITH for including this amendment in En Bloc 11. This lifechanging program will aid our nation's veterans by awarding grants to nonprofit organizations that stand-up, operate, and provide free assistance dogs to veterans and service members with physical disabilities, PTSD, or traumatic brain injuries. Service dogs often become an integral part of a veteran or servicemember's treatment team because they provide both physical and emotional support—they can protect a veteran who is having a seizure, remind them to take medications, or even create a protective physical barrier in a crowded space.

Madam Chair, this amendment will continue to effectively expand treatment options for our veterans and service members and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendments to H.R. 2500 which are included in this En Bloc package.

My first amendment is fairly simple and direct. It would remind those in charge of the DoD's National Capital Consortium Psychiatry Residency Program—or PRP—of their responsibility to maintain an environment that is free of harassment and discrimination.

This critical program helps train professionals who are on the frontlines of addressing critical mental health needs. The Chairman and Ranking Member are both aware of the tremendous need for such providers, both in and outside, of the military. It's those concerns that are behind the inclusion of Section 717 in this bill which calls for the Defense Department to provide a strategy to recruit and retain mental health providers.

It is important that this workforce be culturally competent and diverse which is why

ensuring that this program's leadership actively work to ensure that residents are trained in an atmosphere where discrimination or harassment of any sort is not tolerated. Period.

What I do know is that tolerating a work environment that is toxic or being turned toxic because of racial or sexually derogatory statements or actions makes it harder to recruit and retain these in-demand providers and also hurt efforts to ensure a diverse mental health workforce.

Unfortunately, in 2016, a report by the program's ombudsman noted an "undercurrent" of discrimination in the PRP program and a recent report to my office, while noting improvements, still reported that offensive statements continue to be made.

Just one report of harmful statements or actions is one too many. That's the standard that we should have and that should be enforced.

This amendment simply makes clear that racial and gender-based discrimination or harassment have no place in the PRP (or elsewhere in the military for that matter) and reaffirms the need for leaders to proactively work to provide an environment where such conduct is not tolerated.

The military and the taxpayer will invest much to recruit and train these individuals. Therefore, it is important that those who participate in this demanding residency program should be able to do so in a safe and harassment free environment.

Additionally, I am pleased about the inclusion in En Bloc 11 of another amendment I offered requesting certain information from the Air Force.

Fuel is a lifeline for many of the missions that we ask our men and women in uniform to carry out. Therefore, it is critical that the Air Force and Defense Logistics Agency consider the best options for ensuring that Air Force facilities, including Air Guard and Air Reserve facilities, have a reliable and secure fuel supply.

One effective but under-utilized option are projects that help Air Guard and Air Reserve facilities tap nearby national fuel pipelines that could provide uninterrupted access to millions of gallons for jet fuel. These projects can be an effective and efficient way to help these units carry out their missions, help them to easily meet Department and Defense Logistics Agency requirements for a reliable secondary fuel supply, and help them meet current and emerging air refueling requirements, among other benefits, while also reducing the threat to fuel supplies.

Any delay or disruption to fuel supplies directly translates into a degradation of mission readiness.

And in many cases, these projects make mission and economic sense, like in my district, where we are going to build a new fuel facility less than 1 mile away from an existing fuel pipeline that would provide millions of gallons of fuel storage and reduce the need for the 400 plus trucks that currently supply the base.

According to one estimate, such a pipeline would provide access to more fuel and cost less than what it will cost to pay to truck in significantly less fuel over the next three years.

The amendment I have offered would request the Air Force provide information on how it prioritizes and considers requests to undertake such projects at Air Guard and Air Re-

serve facilities, especially for units where such projects would help improve mission readiness, among other benefits.

This would include information about the Air Guard and Air Reserve facilities where such projects could be of benefit, with an emphasis on facilities located near fuel pipelines that they currently do not access, and information about the criteria used to consider these projects and barriers such as funding that may impede such projects.

This amendment builds on an amendment I successfully offered to the FY 2020 Defense Appropriations bill when it came before the House last month to encourage the Air Force to pursue such projects.

I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for their support.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 476, I offer amendments en bloc as the designee of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

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

Amendments en bloc No. 12 consisting of amendment Nos. 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, and 316, printed in part B of House Report 116-143, offered by Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

AMENDMENT NO. 291 OFFERED BY MR. MORELLE OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following new section:

SEC. 3121. FUNDING FOR INERTIAL CONFINEMENT FUSION IGNITION AND HIGH YIELD PROGRAM.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated by this title for Weapons Activities, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4701, for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield program, facility operations and target production, is hereby increased by \$5,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated by this title for Weapons Activities, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4701, for Stockpile Services, management, technology, and production, is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 292 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN OF OKLAHOMA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 729. REPORT ON MEDICAL PROVIDERS AND MEDICAL MALPRACTICE INSURANCE.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report identifying the number of medical providers employed by the Department of Defense who, before being employed by the Department, lost medical malpractice insurance coverage by reason of the insurer dropping the coverage.

AMENDMENT NO. 293 OFFERED BY MRS. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. ____ INDEPENDENT STUDY ON THREATS TO UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY FROM DEVELOPMENT OF HYPERSONIC WEAPONS BY FOREIGN NATIONS.

(a) **INDEPENDENT STUDY.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall seek to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center under which the center will conduct a study on the development of hypersonic weapons capabilities by foreign nations and the threat posed by such capabilities to United States territory, forces and overseas bases, and allies.

(b) **ELEMENTS OF STUDY.**—The study required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) describe the hypersonic weapons capabilities in development in the People's Republic of China, the Russian Federation, and other nations;

(2) assess the proliferation risk that nations that develop hypersonic weapons capabilities might transfer this technology to other nations;

(3) attempt to describe the rationale for why each nation that is developing hypersonic weapons capabilities is undertaking such development; and

(4) examine the unique threats created to United States national security by hypersonic weapons due to both their maneuverability and speed, distinguishing between hypersonic glide vehicles delivered by rocket boosters (known as boost-glide systems) and hypersonic cruise missiles, and further distinguishing between longer-range systems that can reach United States territory and shorter or medium range systems that might be used in a regional conflict.

(c) **SUBMISSION TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the federally funded research and development center that conducts the study under subsection (a) shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a report on the results of the study in both classified and unclassified form.

(d) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense receives the report under subsection (c), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees an unaltered copy of the report in both classified and unclassified form, and any comments of the Secretary with respect to the report.

AMENDMENT NO. 294 OFFERED BY MRS. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1113. CLARIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON EXPEDITED HIRING AUTHORITY FOR POST-SECONDARY STUDENTS.

Section 3116(d)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the total number of students that the head of an agency may appoint under this section during a fiscal year may not exceed the number equal to 15 percent of the number of students that the agency head appointed during the previous fiscal year to a position at the GS-11 level, or an equivalent level, or below.”

AMENDMENT NO. 295 OFFERED BY MRS. NAPOLITANO OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle A of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ____ INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS.

(a) **INCREASE.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for Civil Military Programs is hereby increased by

\$50,000,000 (to be used in support of the National Guard Youth Challenge Program).

(b) **OFFSET.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide is hereby reduced by \$50,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 296 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 898. PILOT PROGRAM ON PAYMENT OF COSTS FOR DENIED GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE BID PROTESTS.

Section 827 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (10 U.S.C. 2304 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “direct” before “costs incurred”; and

(B) by striking “in processing” and inserting “by the Department in support of hearings to adjudicate”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “two years after the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “60 days after the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that the Department of Defense has business systems that have been independently audited and that can accurately identify the direct costs incurred by the Department of Defense in support of hearings to adjudicate covered protests”.

AMENDMENT NO. 297 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle C of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16 ____ CYBERSECURITY DEFENSE ACADEMY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **PROGRAM REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense carry out a pilot program under which the Secretary shall seek to enter into a public-private partnership with eligible cybersecurity organizations to train and place veterans as cybersecurity personnel within the Department of Defense. The public-private partnership entered into under this subsection shall be known as the “Cybersecurity Defense Academy”.

(b) **ACTIVITIES.**—The Cybersecurity Defense Academy shall provide educational courses in topics relating to cybersecurity, including the following:

- (1) Cybersecurity analysis.
- (2) Cybersecurity penetration testing.
- (3) Cybersecurity threat hunting.
- (4) Cybersecurity advanced exploitation.
- (5) Linux systems administration.
- (6) Robotics process automation analysis.

(c) **PLACEMENT OF GRADUATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a process under which an individual who has completed a course of study at the Cybersecurity Defense Academy may be placed in a cybersecurity-related position within the Department of Defense.

(2) **WAIVER OF CERTIFICATION.**—The Secretary of Defense shall waive the certification requirements set forth in Department of Defense Directives 8570 and 8140 with respect to the initial placement of an individual described in paragraph (1) if the Secretary Determines that the training provided to the individual by the Cybersecurity Defense Academy meets or exceeds the level of training required by such directives..

(d) **ELIGIBLE CYBERSECURITY ORGANIZATION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “eligible cybersecurity organization” means a non-profit or for-profit organization that—

(1) has a history of working with state and local governments;

(2) is accredited by the American National Standards Institute;

(3) has experience placing veterans in cybersecurity positions;

(4) does not charge fees to servicemembers or veterans for taking a cybersecurity course; and

(5) aligns aptitude and psychometric selection with cybersecurity career choice.

(e) **INITIAL REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date one which the 50th graduate of the Cybersecurity Defense Academy is placed in the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes the following:

(1) The number of individuals who graduated from the Cybersecurity Defense Academy.

(2) The number of such individuals who were directly placed in cybersecurity positions with employers.

(3) The efficiency and effectiveness (speed of entry and candidate selection) based on aptitude and psychometric tools utilized to allocate veterans to cybersecurity roles.

(4) The benefits or burdens of permanently establishing the Cybersecurity Defense Academy.

(5) Recommendations identifying any specific actions that should be carried out if the program under this section should become permanent.

(6) Recommendations for any changes to Department of Defense Directives 8570 and 8140.

(f) **TERMINATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the program under this section shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **CONTINUATION.**—The Secretary of Defense may continue the program after the termination date applicable under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that continuation of the program after that date is advisable and appropriate. If the Secretary determines to continue the program after that date, the Secretary shall do the following:

(A) Not later than 180 days after the date on which the report is submitted under subsection (e), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing the reasons for the determination to continue the program.

(B) The Secretary shall—

(i) establish the program throughout the Department of Defense and individual service branches;

(ii) make recommendations to the President and all committees of Congress for making the program applicable to all departments and agencies of the Federal Government;

(iii) conduct contract negotiations with companies that provide services under the program to ensure that such services are provided at a cost-effective rate; and

(iv) ensure that cybersecurity courses accredited by the American National Standards Institute are integrated into level III of the IAT, IAM, and IASE baseline certifications described in Department of Defense Directive 8570.

AMENDMENT NO. 298 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

In section 232(e)(2), strike “; and” at the end and insert “;”.

In section 232(e)(3), strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

At the end of section 232(e), add the following:

(4) the United States Naval Observatory (as described in section 8715 of title 10, United States Code).

AMENDMENT NO. 299 OFFERED BY MR.
O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

At the end of section 718, page 367, after line 20, insert the following:

(c) **REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF GUIDANCE ON OPIOID PRESCRIPTIONS FOR PAIN FROM MINOR OUTPATIENT PROCEDURES.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, acting in conjunction with the Director of the Defense Health Agency, shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the implementation and results of the Defense Health Agency's guidance on opioid prescriptions for pain from minor outpatient procedures in Guidance Report entitled "Pain Management and Opioid Safety in the Military Health System (MHS)" (DHA-PI 6025.04, issued on June 8, 2018).

AMENDMENT NO. 300 OFFERED BY MS. OMAR OF MINNESOTA

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 898. REQUIREMENT FOR CONTRACTORS TO REPORT GROSS VIOLATIONS INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HUMAN RIGHTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—A contractor performing a Department of Defense contract in a foreign country shall report possible cases of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights to the Secretary of Defense.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes—

(1) the policies and procedures in place to obtain information about possible cases of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights from contractors described in subsection (a); and

(2) the resources needed to investigate reports made pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) **GROSS VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HUMAN RIGHTS.**—The term "gross violations of internationally recognized human rights" means torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, prolonged detention without charges and trial, causing the disappearance of persons by the abduction and clandestine detention of those persons, child sexual assault, and other flagrant denial of the right to life, liberty, or the security of person.

AMENDMENT NO. 301 OFFERED BY MS. OMAR OF MINNESOTA

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO ESTABLISH ANY MILITARY INSTALLATION OR BASE FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING FOR THE PERMANENT STATIONING OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN SOMALIA.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2020 may be obligated or expended to establish any military installation or base for

the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Somalia.

AMENDMENT NO. 302 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28 . PILOT PROGRAM TO BUILD AND MONITOR USE OF SINGLE FAMILY HOMES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Army shall carry out a pilot program to build and monitor the use of not fewer than 5 single family homes for members of the Army and their families.

(b) **LOCATION.**—The Secretary of the Army shall carry out the pilot program at no less than two installations of the Army located in different climate regions of the United States as determined by the Secretary.

(c) **DESIGN.**—In building homes under the pilot program, the Secretary of the Army shall use the All-American Abode design from the suburban single-family division design by the United States Military Academy.

(d) **FUNDING INCREASE.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 2103 for Army military construction, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4601, for Military Construction, FH Con Army Family Housing P&D, is hereby increased by \$5,000,000, with the amount of such increase to be made available to carry out the pilot program.

(e) **OFFSET.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for Air Force, Line 088, Program Element 0604933F, ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION, is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 303 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5 . INFORMATION ON LEGAL SERVICES PROVIDED TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES HARMED BY HEALTH OR ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS AT MILITARY HOUSING.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the legal services that the Secretary may provide to members of the Armed Forces who have been harmed by a health or environmental hazard while living in military housing.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.**—The Secretary of the military department concerned shall make the information contained in the report submitted under subsection (a) available to members of the Armed Forces at all installations of the Department of Defense in the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 304 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28 . REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE USE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL SUPPORT AGREEMENTS.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—Not later than July 31, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing a plan to improve the collection and monitoring of information regarding the consideration and use of intergovernmental support agreements, as authorized by section 2679 of title 10, United

States Code, including information regarding the financial and nonfinancial benefits derived from the use of such agreements.

(b) **ADDITIONAL PLAN ELEMENTS.**—The plan required by subsection (a) also shall include the following:

(1) A timeline for implementation of the plan.

(2) A education and outreach component for installation commanders to improve understanding of the benefits of intergovernmental support agreements and to encourage greater use of such agreements.

(3) Proposals to standardize across all military departments the approval process for intergovernmental support agreements.

(4) Proposals to achieve efficiencies in intergovernmental support agreements based on inherent intergovernmental trust.

(5) Proposals for the development of criteria to evaluate the effectiveness of intergovernmental support agreements separate from Federal Acquisition Regulations.

AMENDMENT NO. 305 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2 . REPORT ON INNOVATION INVESTMENTS AND MANAGEMENT.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than December 31, 2019, the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the efforts of the Department of Defense to improve innovation investments and management.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include an explanation of each of the following:

(1) How incremental and disruptive innovation investments for each military department are defined.

(2) How such investments are assessed.

(3) Whether the Under Secretary has defined a science and technology management framework that—

(A) emphasizes greater use of existing flexible approaches to more quickly initiate and discontinue projects to respond to the rapid pace of innovation;

(B) incorporates acquisition stakeholders into technology development programs to ensure that they are relevant to customers; and

(C) promotes advanced prototyping of disruptive technologies within the labs so that the science and technology community can prove that these technologies work to generate demand from future acquisition programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 306 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2 . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FUTURE VERTICAL LIFT TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) As the United States enters an era of great power competition, the Army must appropriately modernize its aircraft fleet.

(2) Specifically, investments in maturation technologies to accelerate the deployment of future vertical lift programs is paramount.

(3) Technology designs and prototypes must be converted into production-ready articles for effective fielding.

(4) Congress is concerned that the Army is not adequately resourcing programs to improve pilot situational awareness, increase flight operations safety, and diminish operation and maintenance costs.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Army should to continue to invest in research, development, test, and evaluation programs to mature future vertical lift technologies.

AMENDMENT NO. 307 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA
OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle H of title V, add the following:

SEC. ____ . FULL MILITARY HONORS CEREMONY FOR CERTAIN VETERANS.

Section 1491(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The Secretary concerned shall provide full military honors (as determined by the Secretary concerned) for the funeral of a veteran who—

“(A) is first interred or first inurned in Arlington National Cemetery on or after the date of the enactment of this paragraph;

“(B) was awarded the medal of honor or the prisoner-of-war medal; and

“(C) is not entitled to full military honors by the grade of that veteran.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 308 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA
OF CALIFORNIA

Add at the appropriate place in subtitle F of title XII of division A the following:

SEC. 1258. NATO SUPPORT ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that:

(1) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which came into being through the North Atlantic Treaty, which entered into force on April 4, 1949, between the United States of America and the other founding members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, has served as a pillar of international peace and stability, a critical component of United States security, and a deterrent against adversaries and external threats.

(2) The House of Representatives affirmed in H. Res. 397, on June 27, 2017, that—

(A) NATO is one of the most successful military alliances in history, deterring the outbreak of another world war, protecting the territorial integrity of its members, and seeing the Cold War through to a peaceful conclusion;

(B) NATO remains the foundation of United States foreign policy to promote a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace;

(C) the United States is solemnly committed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty; and

(D) the House of Representatives—

(i) strongly supports the decision at the NATO Wales Summit in 2014 that each alliance member would aim to spend at least 2 percent of its nation's gross domestic product on defense by 2024;

(ii) condemns any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and democracy of any NATO ally; and

(iii) welcomes the Republic of Montenegro as the 29th member of the NATO Alliance.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to remain a member in good standing of NATO;

(2) to reject any efforts to withdraw the United States from NATO, or to indirectly withdraw from NATO by condemning or reducing contributions to NATO structures, activities, or operations, in a manner that creates a de facto withdrawal;

(3) to continue to work with NATO members to meet their 2014 Wales Defense Investment Pledge commitments; and

(4) to support robust United States funding for the European Deterrence Initiative, which increases the ability of the United States and its allies to deter and defend against Russian aggression.

(c) PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FUNDS TO WITHDRAW FROM NATO.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds are authorized to be appropriated, obligated, or expended to take any action to withdraw the

United States from the North Atlantic Treaty, done at Washington, DC on April 4, 1949, between the United States of America and the other founding members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

AMENDMENT NO. 309 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA
OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2 ____ . MODIFICATION OF DEFENSE QUANTUM INFORMATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Section 234 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “, including through coordination with—

“(A) the National Quantum Coordination Office;

“(B) the subcommittee on Quantum Information Science and the subcommittee on Economic and Security Implications of Quantum Science of the National Science and Technology Council;

“(C) the Quantum Economic Development Consortium;

“(D) the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment

“(E) the Industrial Policy office of the Department of Defense;

“(F) industry;

“(G) academic institutions; and

“(H) national laboratories;”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (5) and (8), respectively;

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraphs:

“(3) develop, in coordination with the entities listed in paragraph (2), plans for workforce development, enhancing awareness and reducing risk of cybersecurity threats, and the development of ethical guidelines for the use of quantum technology;

“(4) develop, in coordination with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, a quantum science taxonomy and requirements for technology and standards;”;

(D) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated), by striking “and” at the end;

(E) by inserting after paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraphs:

“(6) support efforts to increase the technology readiness level of quantum technologies under development in the United States;

“(7) coordinate quantum technology initiatives with allies of the United States, including by coordinating with allies through The Technical Cooperation Program; and”;

(F) in paragraph (8) (as so redesignated), by striking “meeting the long-term challenges and achieving the specific technical goals” and inserting “carrying out the program required by subsection (a)”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (E) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraphs:

“(C) A quantum technology roadmap indicating the likely timeframes for development and military deployment of quantum technologies, and likely relative national security impact of such technologies.

“(D) A description of efforts to update classification and cybersecurity practices surrounding quantum technology, including—

“(i) security processes and requirements for engagement with allied countries; and

“(ii) a plan for security-cleared workforce development.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 311 OFFERED BY MR.

PERLMUTTER OF COLORADO

Page 169, line 19, strike “2023” and insert “2022”.

Add at the end of subtitle B of title XXXI the following new section:

SEC. 31 ____ . IMPROVEMENTS TO ENERGY EMPLOYEES OCCUPATIONAL ILLNESS COMPENSATION PROGRAM ACT OF 2000.

(a) OFFICE OF OMBUDSMAN.—Section 3686 of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7385s-15) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) To provide guidance and assistance to claimants.”; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking “2019” and inserting “2020”.

(b) ADVISORY BOARD ON TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND WORKER HEALTH.—Section 3687 of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7385s-16) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) the claims adjudication process generally, including review of procedure manual changes prior to incorporation into the manual and claims for medical benefits; and

“(F) such other matters as the Secretary considers appropriate; and”;

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) by striking “The Secretary of Energy shall” and inserting “The Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Labor shall each”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Secretary of Labor shall make available to the Board the program's medical director, toxicologist, industrial hygienist and program's support contractors as requested by the Board.”;

(3) by redesignating subsections (h) and (i) as subsections (i) and (j), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

“(h) RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after submission to the Secretary of Labor of the Board's recommendations, the Secretary shall respond to the Board in writing, and post on the public Internet website of the Department of Labor, a response to the recommendations that—

“(1) includes a statement of whether the Secretary accepts or rejects the Board's recommendations;

“(2) if the Secretary accepts the board's recommendations, describes the timeline for when those recommendations will be implemented; and

“(3) if the Secretary does not accept the recommendations, describes the reasons the Secretary does not agree and provide all scientific research to the Board supporting that decision.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 312 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY OF PENNSYLVANIA

On page 918, after line 16, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

(8) An evaluation of the level of threat information sharing between the Department and the Defense Industrial Base.

AMENDMENT NO. 313 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 283, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. 567. PILOT PROGRAM TO IMPROVE INFORMATION SHARING BETWEEN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND DESIGNATED RELATIVES AND FRIENDS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES REGARDING THE EXPERIENCES AND CHALLENGES OF MILITARY SERVICE.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM DESCRIBED.—

(1) PURPOSE.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall seek to enter into an agreement with the American Red Cross to carry out a pilot program under which the American Red Cross—

(A) encourages a member of the Armed Forces, upon the enlistment or appointment of such member, to designate up to 10 persons to whom information regarding the military service of such member shall be disseminated using contact information obtained under paragraph (5); and

(B) provides such persons, within 30 days after the date on which such persons were designated under subparagraph (A), the option to elect to receive such information regarding military service; and

(2) TYPES OF INFORMATION.—The types of information to be disseminated under the pilot program to persons who elect to receive information shall include information regarding—

(A) aspects of daily life and routine experienced by members of the Armed Forces;

(B) the challenges and stresses of military service, particularly during and after deployment as part of a contingency operation;

(C) the services available to members of the Armed Forces and the dependents of such members to cope with the experiences and challenges of military service;

(D) benefits administered by the Department of Defense for members of the Armed Forces and the dependents of such members;

(E) a toll-free telephone number through which such persons who elect to receive information under the pilot program may request information regarding the program; and

(F) such other information as the Secretary of Defense determines to be appropriate.

(3) PRIVACY OF INFORMATION.—In carrying out the pilot program under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense may not disseminate information under paragraph (2) in violation of laws and regulations pertaining to the privacy of members of the Armed Forces, including requirements pursuant to—

(A) section 552a of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-191).

(4) NOTICE AND MODIFICATIONS.—In carrying out the pilot program under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall, with respect to a member of the Armed Forces—

(A) ensure that such member is notified of the ability to modify designations made by the member under paragraph (1)(A); and

(B) upon the request of a member, authorize the member to modify such designations at any time.

(5) CONTACT INFORMATION.—In making a designation under the pilot program, a member of the Armed Forces shall provide necessary contact information, specifically including an email address, to facilitate the dissemination of information regarding the military service of the member.

(6) OPT-OUT OF PROGRAM.—In carrying out the pilot program under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall, with respect to a person who has elected to receive information under such pilot program, cease disseminating such information to that person upon request of such person.

(b) SURVEY AND REPORT ON PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) SURVEY.—Not later than two years after the date on which the pilot program commences, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the American Red Cross, shall administer a survey to persons who elected to receive information under the pilot program, for the purpose of receiving feedback regarding the quality of information disseminated under this section, including whether such information appropriately reflects the military career progression of members of the Armed Forces.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than three years after the date on which the pilot program commences, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a final report on the pilot program which includes—

(A) the results of the survey administered under paragraph (1);

(B) a determination as to whether the pilot program should be made permanent; and

(C) recommendations as to modifications necessary to improve the program if made permanent.

(3) CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES DEFINED.—The term “congressional defense committees” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) TERMINATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—The pilot program shall terminate upon submission of the report required by subsection (b)(2).

AMENDMENT NO. 314 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS OF MINNESOTA

At the appropriate place in subtitle E of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12 . . . REPORT BY DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ON CERTAIN MILITARY CAPABILITIES OF CHINA AND RUSSIA.

(a) REPORT.—The Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and the appropriate congressional committees a report on the military capabilities of China and Russia.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall include, with respect to the military of China and the military of Russia, the following:

(1) An update on the presence, status, and capability of the military with respect to any national training centers similar to the Combat Training Center Program of the United States.

(2) An analysis of a readiness deployment cycle of the military, including—

(A) as compared to such a cycle of the United States; and

(B) an identification of metrics used in the national training centers of that military.

(3) A comprehensive investigation into the capability and readiness of the mechanized logistics of the army of the military, including—

(A) an analysis of field maintenance, sustainment maintenance, movement control, intermodal operations, and supply; and

(B) how such functions under subparagraph (A) interact with specific echelons of that military.

(4) An assessment of the future of mechanized army logistics of the military.

(c) NONDUPLICATION OF EFFORTS.—The Defense Intelligence Agency may make use of or add to any existing reports completed by the Agency in order to respond to the reporting requirement under subsection (a).

(d) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) may be submitted in classified form.

(e) BRIEFING.—The Director shall provide a briefing to the Secretary and the committees specified in subsection (a) on the report under such subsection.

(f) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 315 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS OF MINNESOTA

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 3 . . . REPORT ON PLAN TO DECONTAMINATE SITES FORMERLY USED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY THAT HAVE SINCE BEEN TRANSFERRED TO UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND ARE AFFECTED BY POLLUTANTS THAT ARE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, A RESULT OF ACTIVITY BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) There are numerous properties that were under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, such as former Nike missile sites, but that have been transferred to units of local government.

(2) Many of these properties may remain polluted because of activity by the Department of Defense.

(3) This pollution may inhibit the use of these properties for commercial or residential purposes.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report—

(1) specifying each covered property that may remain polluted because of activity by the Department of Defense; and

(2) containing the Secretary’s plan to decontaminate each covered property.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term “covered property” means property that was under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army and was transferred to a unit of local government before the date of the enactment of section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, but that would have triggered Federal Government notice or action under that section had the transfer occurred on or after that date.

AMENDMENT NO. 316 OFFERED BY MS. PINGREE OF MAINE

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. . . . INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES REGARDING AVAILABILITY OF SERVICES AT THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall inform members of the Armed Forces, using mechanisms available to the Secretary, of the eligibility of such members for services of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(b) INFORMATION FROM SEXUAL ASSAULT RESPONSE COORDINATORS.—The Secretary shall insure that Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and uniformed victims advocates of the Department of Defense advise members of the Armed Forces who report instances of military sexual trauma regarding the eligibility of such members for services at the Department of Veterans Affairs and that this information be included in mandatory training materials.

(c) MILITARY SEXUAL TRAUMA DEFINED.—In this section, the term “military sexual trauma” means psychological trauma described in section 1720D(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chair, I have no speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman of the committee for this opportunity.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which will require the Secretary of Defense to report on the current level of threat sharing between the Department of Defense and the defense industrial base related to cybersecurity.

Our defense industrial base faces increasing threats from our adversaries, including Russia and China. The loss of research and information to cybersecurity hacks is putting our Defense Department’s investments at risk and eroding the warfighting advantage the United States maintains over our adversaries.

In June 2018, The Washington Post reported that a contractor working with the Navy on a supersonic anti-ship missile was hacked by the Chinese Government.

In December 2018, a Defense Department Office of Inspector General audit found that the Army, Navy, and Missile Defense Agency were failing to take basic cybersecurity steps to ensure that information on America’s ballistic missile defense system won’t fall into the hands of our adversaries.

□ 2015

I commend the work that the Department has already undertaken to address this need, but more must be done.

The Department of Defense must play an active role in identifying current threats and helping to fortify the cybersecurity of our defense industrial base, which includes many small and medium-sized businesses, as well as academic institutions.

This amendment asks the Secretary of Defense to include a section within an existing report that examines the current level of threat sharing between the Department and the industrial base.

Madam Chair, I thank the committee for allowing this amendment to be included in the en bloc, and ask the committee’s indulgence in support of the amendment. I thank the chairman, again, for his willingness to allow me to speak on behalf of the amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers at this point,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chairwoman, I encourage my colleagues to support the en bloc package, as well as the NDAA upon final passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 13 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 476, I rise to offer amendments en bloc No. 13 as the designee of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

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

Amendments en bloc No. 13 consisting of amendment Nos. 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, and 342 printed in part B of House Report 116–143, offered by Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

AMENDMENT NO. 317 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 606. REPORT REGARDING TRANSITION FROM OVERSEAS HOUSING ALLOWANCE TO BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING FOR SERVICEMEMBERS IN THE TERRITORIES.

Not later than February 1, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees regarding the recommendation of the Secretary whether members of the uniformed services located in the territories of the United States and who receive the overseas housing allowance should instead receive the basic allowance for housing to ensure the most appropriate housing compensation for such members and their families.

AMENDMENT NO. 318 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. —. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF DECONFLICTION CHANNELS WITH IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the status of deconfliction channels with Iran.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:—

(1) The status of United States military-to-military deconfliction channels with Iran to prevent military and diplomatic miscalculation.

(2) The status of United States diplomatic deconfliction channels with Iran to prevent miscalculation, define ambiguities, and correct misunderstandings that could otherwise lead to unintended consequences, including unnecessary or harmful military activity.

(3) An analysis of the need and rationale for bilateral and multilateral deconfliction channels, including an assessment of recent United States experience with such channels of communication with Iran.

AMENDMENT NO. 319 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28 —. INVESTIGATION OF REPORTS OF REPRISALS RELATING TO PRIVATIZED MILITARY HOUSING AND TREATMENT AS MATERIAL BREACH.

Section 2885 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (g), as added by section 2819, the following new subsection:

“(h) INVESTIGATION OF REPORTS OF REPRISALS; TREATMENT AS MATERIAL BREACH.—(1) The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Sustainment shall investigate all reports of reprisal against a member of the armed forces for reporting an issue relating to a housing unit under this subchapter.

“(2) If the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Sustainment determines under paragraph (1) that a landlord has retaliated against a member of the armed forces for reporting an issue relating to a housing unit under this subchapter, the Assistant Secretary shall—

“(A) provide initial notice to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives as soon as practicable; and

“(B) following the initial notice under subparagraph (A), provide an update to such committees every 30 days thereafter until such time as the Assistant Secretary has taken final action with respect to the retaliation.

“(3) The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Sustainment shall carry out this subsection in coordination with the Secretary of the military department concerned.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 320 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. —. REQUIREMENT FOR ANNUAL REPORT SUMMARIZING THE OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

Section 139(h)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “, through January 31, 2021”.

AMENDMENT NO. 321 OFFERED BY MR. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2 —. INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR ARMY UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201 for Army basic research, University Research Initiatives, Line 003 (PE 0601103A) is hereby increased by \$5,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army, system development and demonstration, integrated personnel and pay system—Army (IPPS-A), Line 143 (PE 0605018A), is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 322 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 10 —. CREDIT MONITORING.

Section 605A(k) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c–1(k)) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

AMENDMENT NO. 323 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 7. DEVELOPMENT OF PARTNERSHIPS TO IMPROVE COMBAT CASUALTY CARE FOR PERSONNEL OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) PARTNERSHIPS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, through the Joint Trauma Education and Training Directorate established under section 708 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note), develop partnerships with civilian academic medical centers and large metropolitan teaching hospitals to improve combat casualty care for personnel of the Armed Forces.

(2) PARTNERSHIPS WITH LEVEL I TRAUMA CENTERS.—In carrying out partnerships under paragraph (1), trauma surgeons and physicians of the Department of Defense shall partner with level I civilian trauma centers to provide adequate training and readiness for the next generation of medical providers to treat critically injured burn patients.

(b) SUPPORT OF PARTNERSHIPS.—The Secretary of Defense shall make every effort to support partnerships under the Joint Trauma Education and Training Directorate with academic institutions that have level I civilian trauma centers, specifically those centers with a burn center, that offer burn rotations and clinical experience to provide adequate training and readiness for the next generation of medical providers to treat critically injured burn patients.

(c) LEVEL I CIVILIAN TRAUMA CENTER DEFINED.—In this section, the term “level I civilian trauma center” has the meaning given that term in section 708 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on October 1, 2020.

AMENDMENT NO. 324 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 291, after line 6, insert the following:

(5) Spouses and other dependents of members of the Armed Forces on active duty.

AMENDMENT NO. 325 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 10. WORLD LANGUAGE ADVANCEMENT AND READINESS GRANTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The national security of the United States continues to depend on language readiness, in particular among the seventeen agencies of the Intelligence Community.

(2) The levels of language proficiency required for national security necessitate long sequences of language training for personnel in the Intelligence Community and the Department of Defense.

(3) The future national security and economic well-being of the United States will depend substantially on the ability of its citizens to communicate and compete by knowing the languages and cultures of other countries.

(4) The Federal Government has an interest in ensuring that the employees of its departments and agencies with national security responsibilities are prepared to meet the challenges of this changing international environment.

(5) The Federal Government also has an interest in taking actions to alleviate the problem of American students being inadequately prepared to meet the challenges posed by increasing global interaction among nations.

(6) American elementary schools, secondary schools, colleges, and universities must place a new emphasis on improving the teaching of foreign languages, area studies,

counterproliferation studies, and other international fields to help meet those challenges.

(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

(1) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Education, may carry out a program under which the Secretary of Defense makes grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities to carry out innovative model programs providing for the establishment, improvement, or expansion of world language study for elementary school and secondary school students.

(2) DURATION.—Each grant under this section shall be awarded for a period of 3 years.

(3) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure the equitable geographic distribution of grants under this section.

(4) MATCHING REQUIREMENT FOR LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), each local educational agency that receives a grant under this section shall provide, from non-Federal sources, an amount equal to the amount of the grant (which may be provided in cash or in kind) to carry out the activities supported by the grant.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary of Defense may reduce the matching requirement under subparagraph (A) for any local educational agency that the Secretary determines does not have adequate resources to meet such requirement.

(5) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—In awarding a grant under paragraph (1) to an eligible entity that is a local educational agency, the Secretary of Defense shall support programs that—

(A) show the promise of being continued beyond the grant period;

(B) demonstrate approaches that can be disseminated to and duplicated in other local educational agencies; and

(C) may include a professional development component.

(6) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

(A) Not less than 75 percent of the funds made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year shall be used for the expansion of world language learning in elementary schools.

(B) Not less than 75 percent of the funds made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year shall be used to support instruction in world languages determined by the Secretary of Defense to be critical to the national security interests of the United States.

(C) The Secretary of Defense may reserve not more than 5 percent of funds made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year to evaluate the efficacy of programs that receive grants under paragraph (1).

(7) APPLICATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To be considered for a grant under paragraph (1), an eligible entity shall submit an application to the Secretary of Defense at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

(B) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall give special consideration to applications describing programs that—

(i) include intensive summer world language programs for professional development of world language teachers;

(ii) link nonnative English speakers in the community with the schools in order to promote two-way language learning;

(iii) promote the sequential study of a world language for students, beginning in elementary schools;

(iv) make effective use of technology, such as computer-assisted instruction, language laboratories, or distance learning, to promote world language study;

(v) promote innovative activities, such as dual language immersion, partial world language immersion, or content-based instruction; and

(vi) are carried out through a consortium comprised of the eligible entity receiving the grant, an elementary school or secondary school, and an institution of higher education (as that term is defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means the following:

(A) A local educational agency that hosts a unit of the Junior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps.

(B) A school operated by the Department of Defense Education Activity.

(2) ESEA TERMS.—The terms “elementary school”, “local educational agency” and “secondary school” have the meanings given the terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(3) WORLD LANGUAGE.—The term “world language” means—

(A) any natural language other than English, including—

(i) languages determined by the Secretary of Defense to be critical to the national security interests of the United States;

(ii) classical languages;

(iii) American sign language; and

(iv) Native American languages; and

(B) any language described in subparagraph (A) that is taught in combination with English as part of a dual language or immersion learning program.

AMENDMENT NO. 326 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new provision:

SEC. 7. PILOT PROGRAM ON PARTNERSHIPS WITH CIVILIAN ORGANIZATIONS FOR SPECIALIZED SURGICAL TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a pilot program to establish one or more partnerships with public, private, and non-profit organizations and institutions to provide short-term specialized surgical training to advance the medical skills and capabilities of military medical providers.

(b) DURATION.—The Secretary may carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) for a period of not more than three years.

(c) EVALUATION METRICS.—Before commencing the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall establish metrics to be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the pilot program.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days before the commencement of the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program.

(B) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall include a description of the pilot program, the evaluation metrics established under subsection (c), and such other matters relating to the pilot program as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the completion of the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program.

(B) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) A description of the pilot program, including the partnerships established under the pilot program as described in subsection (a).

(ii) An assessment of the effectiveness of the pilot program.

(iii) Such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Secretary considers appropriate in light of the pilot program, including recommendations for extending or making permanent the authority for the pilot program.

(e) FUNDING.—

(1) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 1405 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, for education and training is hereby increased by \$2,500,000.

(2) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 1405 for Defense Health Program, Operation and Maintenance, Private Sector Care, Office of the Secretary of Defense, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, is hereby reduced by \$2,500,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 327 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . REPORT ON CYBERSECURITY ACTIVITIES WITH TAIWAN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the following:

(1) The feasibility of establishing a high-level, interagency United States-Taiwan working group for coordinating responses to emerging issues related to cybersecurity.

(2) A discussion of the Department of Defense's current and future plans to engage with Taiwan in cybersecurity activities.

(3) A discussion of obstacles encountered in forming, executing, or implementing agreements with Taiwan for cybersecurity activities.

(4) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense determines should be included.

AMENDMENT NO. 328 OFFERED BY MISS RICE OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle B of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10 . ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF PROPOSED BORDER WALL ON VOLUME OF ILLEGAL NARCOTICS.

The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall conduct an assessment of the impact that any planned or proposed border wall construction would have on the volume of illegal narcotics entering the United States.

At the end of subtitle C of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 336. PILOT PROGRAM TO TRAIN SKILLED TECHNICIANS IN CRITICAL SHIP-BUILDING SKILLS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program to train individuals to become skilled technicians in critical shipbuilding skills such as welding, metrology, quality assurance, machining, and additive manufacturing.

(b) PARTNERSHIPS.—In carrying out the pilot program required under this section, the Secretary may partner with existing Federal or State projects relating to investment and infrastructure in training and education or workforce development, such as the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation, the Industrial Base Analysis and Sustainment program of the Department of

Defense, and the National Maritime Educational Council.

(c) TERMINATION.—The pilot program required under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2025.

(d) BRIEFINGS.—

(1) PLAN BRIEFING.—Not later than February 28, 2020, the Secretary shall provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the plan, cost estimate, and schedule for the pilot program required under this section.

(2) PROGRESS BRIEFINGS.—Not less frequently than annually during fiscal years 2020 and 2021, the Secretary shall brief the congressional defense committees on the progress of the Secretary in carrying out the pilot program.

AMENDMENT NO. 330 OFFERED BY MRS. ROBY OF ALABAMA

Page 862, line 25, strike “and” at the end. Page 863, line 2, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 863, after line 2, insert the following:

(H) programs to promote conflict prevention, management, and resolution through the meaningful participation of Afghan women in the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces by exposing Afghan women and girls to the activities of and careers available with such forces, encouraging their interest in such careers, or developing their interest and skills necessary for service in such forces; and

(I) enhancements to the recruitment programs of the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces through an aggressive program of advertising and market research targeted at prospective female recruits for such forces and at those who may influence prospective female recruits.

AMENDMENT NO. 331 OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title III of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3 . PLAN TO PHASE OUT USE OF BURN PITS.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress an implementation plan to phase out the use of the burn pits identified in the Department of Defense Open Burn Pit Report to Congress in April 2019.

AMENDMENT NO. 332 OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title III of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3 . INFORMATION RELATING TO LOCATIONS OF BURN PIT USE.

The Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and Congress a list of all locations at which open-air burn pits have been used by Secretary of Defense, for the purposes of augmenting the research, healthcare delivery, disability compensation, and other activities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

AMENDMENT NO. 333 OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 729. REPORT ON RESEARCH AND STUDIES REGARDING HEALTH EFFECTS OF BURN PITS.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed report on the status, methodology, and culmination timeline of all the research and studies being conducted to assess the health effects of burn pits.

AMENDMENT NO. 334 OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 729. TRAINING ON HEALTH EFFECTS OF BURN PITS AND OTHER AIRBORNE HAZARDS.

The Secretary of Defense shall provide mandatory training to all medical providers of the Department of Defense on the potential health effects of burn pits and other airborne hazards (such as PFAS, mold, or depleted uranium) and the early detection of such health effects.

AMENDMENT NO. 335 OFFERED BY MR. RUTHERFORD OF FLORIDA

At the end subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 567. REPORT REGARDING EFFECTIVENESS OF TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR FEMALE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 552(b)(4) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) The evaluation of the Secretary regarding the effectiveness of the Transition Assistance Program for female members of the Armed Forces.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 336 OFFERED BY MR. RUTHERFORD OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 1 . PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR LIGHT ATTACK AIRCRAFT.

(a) PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR COMBAT AIR ADVISOR SUPPORT.—Subject to subsection (b), the Commander of the United States Special Operations Command may procure light attack aircraft for Combat Air Advisor mission support.

(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—The Commander of the United States Special Operations Command may not procure light attack aircraft under subsection (a) until a period of 60 days has elapsed following the date on which the Commander certifies to the congressional defense committees that a mission capability gap and special-operations-forces-peculiar acquisition requirement exists which can be mitigated with procurement of a light attack aircraft capability.

(c) AUTHORITY TO USE OR TRANSFER FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE FOR LIGHT ATTACK AIRCRAFT EXPERIMENTS.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall use or transfer amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act for Light Attack Aircraft experiments to procure the required quantity of aircraft for—

(1) Air Combat Command's Air Ground Operations School; and

(2) Air Force Special Operations Command for Combat Air Advisor mission support in accordance with subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 337 OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Page 125, line 15, strike “undergraduate” and insert “associate, undergraduate.”.

Page 125, line 22, strike “undergraduate” and insert “associate, undergraduate.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 338 OFFERED BY MS. SCHAKOWSKY OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 898. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF PRIVATE SECURITY CONTRACTOR CONTRACTS.

(a) REPORT OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS AND TASK ORDERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT REGARDING CONTRACTS AND TASK ORDERS.—The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall compile a report of the work performed or to be performed under a covered contract during the period beginning on October 1, 2001, and ending on the last day of the month during which this Act is enacted for work performed or work to be performed in areas of contingency operations.

(2) FORM OF SUBMISSIONS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, to the maximum extent possible, but may contain a classified annex, if necessary.

(b) REPORTS ON CONTRACTS FOR WORK TO BE PERFORMED IN AREAS OF CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS AND OTHER SIGNIFICANT MILITARY OPERATIONS.—The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall submit to each specified congressional committee a report not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that contains the following information:

(1) The number of civilians performing work in areas of contingency operations under covered contracts.

(2) The total cost of such covered contracts.

(3) The total number of civilians who have been wounded or killed in performing work under such covered contracts.

(4) A description of the disciplinary actions that have been taken against persons performing work under such covered contracts by the contractor, the United States Government, or the government of any country in which the area of contingency operations is located.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED CONTRACT.—The term “covered contract” means a contract for private security entered into by the Secretary of Defense in an amount greater than \$5,000,000.

(2) CONTINGENCY OPERATION.—The term “contingency operation” has the meaning provided by section 101(a)(13) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) SPECIFIED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “specified congressional committees” means the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 339 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle H of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10 . . . INCLUSION OF CERTAIN NAMES ON THE VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL.

The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the inclusion on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in the District of Columbia the names of the seventy-four crew members of the USS Frank E. Evans killed on June 3, 1969.

AMENDMENT NO. 340 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle D of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10 . . . PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF MILITARY COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS.

Section 949d(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) In the case of any proceeding of a military commission under this chapter that is made open to the public, the military judge may order arrangements for the availability of the proceeding to be watched remotely by the public through the internet.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 341 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 8 . . . BOOTS TO BUSINESS PROGRAM.

Section 32 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657b) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) BOOTS TO BUSINESS PROGRAM.—

(1) COVERED INDIVIDUAL DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘covered individual’ means—

“(A) a member of the Armed Forces, including the National Guard or Reserves;

“(B) an individual who is participating in the Transition Assistance Program estab-

lished under section 1144 of title 10, United States Code;

“(C) an individual who—

“(i) served on active duty in any branch of the Armed Forces, including the National Guard or Reserves; and

“(ii) was discharged or released from such service under conditions other than dishonorable; and

“(D) a spouse or dependent of an individual described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).

(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—Beginning on the first October 1 after the enactment of this subsection and for the subsequent 4 fiscal years, the Administrator shall carry out a program to be known as the ‘Boots to Business Program’ to provide entrepreneurship training to covered individuals.

(3) GOALS.—The goals of the Boots to Business Program are to—

“(A) provide assistance and in-depth training to covered individuals interested in business ownership; and

“(B) provide covered individuals with the tools, skills, and knowledge necessary to identify a business opportunity, draft a business plan, identify sources of capital, connect with local resources for small business concerns, and start up a small business concern.

(4) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Boots to Business Program may include—

(i) a presentation providing exposure to the considerations involved in self-employment and ownership of a small business concern;

(ii) an online, self-study course focused on the basic skills of entrepreneurship, the language of business, and the considerations involved in self-employment and ownership of a small business concern;

(iii) an in-person classroom instruction component providing an introduction to the foundations of self employment and ownership of a small business concern; and

(iv) in-depth training delivered through online instruction, including an online course that leads to the creation of a business plan.

(B) COLLABORATION.—The Administrator may—

(i) collaborate with public and private entities to develop course curricula for the Boots to Business Program; and

(ii) modify program components in coordination with entities participating in a Warriors in Transition program, as defined in section 738(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (10 U.S.C. 1071 note).

(C) USE OF RESOURCE PARTNERS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall—

(I) ensure that Veteran Business Outreach Centers regularly participate, on a nationwide basis, in the Boots to Business Program; and

(II) to the maximum extent practicable, use a variety of other resource partners and entities in administering the Boots to Business Program.

(ii) GRANT AUTHORITY.—In carrying out clause (i), the Administrator may make grants to Veteran Business Outreach Centers, other resource partners, or other entities to carry out components of the Boots to Business Program.

(D) AVAILABILITY TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Administrator shall make available to the Secretary of Defense information regarding the Boots to Business Program, including all course materials and outreach materials related to the Boots to Business Program, for inclusion on the website of the Department of Defense relating to the Transition Assistance Program, in the Transition Assistance Program manual, and in other

relevant materials available for distribution from the Secretary of Defense.

(E) AVAILABILITY TO VETERANS AFFAIRS.—In consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Administrator shall make available for distribution and display at local facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs outreach materials regarding the Boots to Business Program which shall, at a minimum—

(i) describe the Boots to Business Program and the services provided; and

(ii) include eligibility requirements for participating in the Boots to Business Program.

(5) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection and every year thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on the performance and effectiveness of the Boots to Business Program, which may be included as part of another report submitted to such Committees by the Administrator, and which shall include—

(A) information regarding grants awarded under paragraph (4)(C);

(B) the total cost of the Boots to Business Program;

(C) the number of program participants using each component of the Boots to Business Program;

(D) the completion rates for each component of the Boots to Business Program;

(E) to the extent possible—

(i) the demographics of program participants, to include gender, age, race, relationship to military, military occupational specialty, and years of service of program participants;

(ii) the number of small business concerns formed or expanded with assistance under the Boots to Business Program;

(iii) the gross receipts of small business concerns receiving assistance under the Boots to Business Program;

(iv) the number of jobs created with assistance under the Boots to Business Program;

(v) the number of referrals to other resources and programs of the Administration;

(vi) the number of program participants receiving financial assistance under loan programs of the Administration;

(vii) the type and dollar amount of financial assistance received by program participants under any loan program of the Administration; and

(viii) results of participant satisfaction surveys, including a summary of any comments received from program participants;

(F) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Boots to Business Program in each region of the Administration during the most recent fiscal year;

(G) an assessment of additional performance outcome measures for the Boots to Business Program, as identified by the Administrator;

(H) any recommendations of the Administrator for improvement of the Boots to Business Program, which may include expansion of the types of individuals who are covered individuals;

(I) an explanation of how the Boots to Business Program has been integrated with other transition programs and related resources of the Administration and other Federal agencies; and

(J) any additional information the Administrator determines necessary.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 342 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER OF OREGON

Add at the end of subtitle A of title VI the following new section (and update the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 606. EXEMPTION FROM REPAYMENT OF VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PAY.

Section 1175a(j) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) This subsection shall not apply to a member who—

“(A) is involuntarily recalled to active duty or full-time National Guard duty; and

“(B) in the course of such duty, incurs a service-connected disability rated as total under section 1155 of title 38.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chair, I currently have no speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I have no speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chairwoman, I encourage my colleagues to support the en bloc package, as well as the NDAA upon final passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Chair, my amendment No. 337, which is included in the en bloc amendment No. 13, clarifies that students holding or expecting to receive their associate degree can apply for the Technology and National Security Fellowship.

Section 239 of H.R. 2500 creates a new Technology and National Security Fellowship program to help increase science, technology, engineering and math recruitment in our national security agencies. Those holding or expecting to receive undergraduate and graduate degrees may apply to be placed in national security-focused positions for one-year tours with pay.

In support expanding this kind of opportunity for young people to serve their country.

But why exclude otherwise qualified applicants simply because they are enrolled in an associate degree program at a community college? Over a third of students nationwide and over half of part-time students are in two-year colleges, according to the National Center for Education Statistics. In many parts of our country, including my district in the Northern Marianas, community college is the only option for students pursuing higher education. Other Defense Department programs for civilian students, such as the Science, Mathematics and Research for Transformation scholarship program, are already open to applicants from community college students. Let us include these students, too, as long as they meet program standards, and expand the selection pool of those who may serve as Technology and National Security Fellows.

I urge the adoption of my amendment, so we can be sure that the Technology and National Security Fellowship program is open to as many qualified students as possible, regardless of what type of college they happen to enroll in.

I ask my colleagues to support the en bloc amendment No. 13.

I would like to also express support for the following amendments to H.R. 2500 I cosponsored.

Amendment No. 390 offered by Representative VELÁZQUEZ of New York extends to all U.S. territories, including the Northern Mariana Islands, a provision in law that allows federal agencies to double the value of a contract awarded to a Puerto Rico business for purposes of the small business contracting goals. The amendment ensures equity and further incentivize contracting opportunities for small businesses in all the territories.

Amendment No. 182 offered by Representative HASTINGS of Florida conveys the sense of Congress that the United States should promptly begin negotiations on the renewal of the Compacts of Free Association with our trusted allies in the Pacific—the freely associated states of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Republic of Palau, and the Federated States of Micronesia.

We understand the strategic importance of these Pacific island nations that provide the U.S. exclusive military use rights covering huge swaths of land and waters in the Western Pacific. And we know what is at stake for American interests and security with growing foreign influence in the region.

The compacts will expire in a few short years. To keep America strong in the Pacific, we must move towards expeditious negotiations on renewing the compacts with our close allies so that Congress may act on approving and funding the agreements.

Amendment No. 249 offered by Representative LEE of Nevada aims to improve benefits and services to veterans through better accountability measures and coordination between the Departments of Defense (DOD) and Veterans Affairs (VA). The amendment clarifies the purpose of the interagency program office (IPO) while also directing both departments to allocate sufficient resources and authorities for the IPO. Requires annual reports on IPO activities and quarterly reports on VA and DOD funding to the IPO.

Amendment No. 63 offered by Representative BANKS of Indiana helps ensure smooth implementation of electronic health records (EHR) for servicemembers and veterans by requiring the Department of Defense, Coast Guard, and the Department of Veterans Affairs jointly develop a comprehensive enterprise interoperability strategy.

Amendment No. 236 offered by Representative LAMB of Pennsylvania also helps ensure smooth implementation of the EHR for servicemembers and veterans by setting milestones for achieving interoperability of the EHR. The amendment further requires DOD and VA to work with an independent evaluator to assess and report to Congress on whether the joint EHR is achieving those milestones.

I urge my colleagues to support these amendments.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Madam Chair, the United States' relationship with Taiwan is an indispensable component in our efforts to maintain peace and stability in Asia and across the globe.

And in today's digital age, this relationship should include a strong and robust partnership on cybersecurity.

Over the past few years, China has clearly demonstrated its capability and willingness to

conduct cyber-attacks against our country, such as the state-sponsored economic espionage that led to the indictment of Beijing-linked hackers last year.

On top of implementing strict retaliatory measures to deter this malicious behavior, we should work proactively with our allies to establish preventative defense plans that leverage cybersecurity sharing strategies.

Taiwan is uniquely positioned to partner with us on our efforts to combat Chinese cyber-attacks, and this amendment will help us move closer to enhancing our collaboration in this space so that we stay ahead of our adversaries.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 476, I rise to offer amendments en bloc No. 14 as the designee of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

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

Amendments en bloc No. 14 consisting of amendment Nos. 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, and 417 printed in part B of House Report 116-143, offered by Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

AMENDMENT NO. 343 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER OF OREGON

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. . . . NOTICE TO SEPARATING SERVICEMEMBERS OF RIGHTS UNDER THE SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

Section 105 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3915) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) INITIAL NOTICE.—” before “The Secretary concerned”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) NOTICE AFTER PERIOD OF MILITARY SERVICE.—The Secretary concerned shall ensure that a notice described in subsection (a) is provided in writing to each person not sooner than 150 days after and not later than 180 days after the date of the termination of a period of military service of that person.”

AMENDMENT NO. 344 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER OF OREGON

At the end of subtitle G of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10 . . . PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICE ANNUAL BUDGET REPORTS.

Section 132a(c)(1)(B) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “The Chief Management Officer” and inserting “(i) The Chief Management Officer”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(ii) Each report required under clause (i) shall be made publicly available on an internet website in a searchable format.”

AMENDMENT NO. 345 OFFERED BY MS. SCHRIER OFFERED BY OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle C of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. USE OF COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES FOR CVN-80 AND CVN-81 DUAL AIRCRAFT CARRIER CONTRACT.

To the extent practicable and unless otherwise required by law, the Secretary of the Navy shall ensure that competitive procedures are used with respect to any task order or delivery order issued under a dual aircraft carrier contract relating to the CVN-80 and CVN-81.

AMENDMENT NO. 346 OFFERED BY MR. AUSTIN
SCOTT OF GEORGIA

At the end of subtitle A of title V, add the following:

SEC. 505. FUNCTIONAL BADGE OR INSIGNIA UPON COMMISSION FOR CHAPLAINS.

A military chaplain shall receive a functional badge or insignia upon commission.

AMENDMENT NO. 347 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF
VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1075. REPORT REGARDING OUTSTANDING GAO RECOMMENDATIONS.

Not later than September 30, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to Congress regarding—

(1) each of the 91 priority recommendations of the Comptroller General regarding matters of Department of Defense in report GAO-19-366SP, dated March 2019, that the Secretary has not implemented by that date;

(2) an explanation for why the Secretary has not implemented such recommendations;

(3) if a reason under paragraph (2) is funding, the estimated cost for such implementation.

AMENDMENT NO. 348 OFFERED BY MS. SHALALA
OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 1. OPEN SKIES TREATY AIRCRAFT RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall ensure that any Request for Proposals for the procurement of an OC-135B aircraft under the Open Skies Treaty aircraft recapitalization program meets the requirements for full and open competition as set forth in section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, and incorporates a full competitive bidding process, to include both new production aircraft and recently manufactured low-hour, low-cycle aircraft

(b) OPEN SKIES TREATY DEFINED.—The term “Open Skies Treaty” means the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002.

AMENDMENT NO. 349 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN
OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON UNITED STATES-INDIA DEFENSE RELATIONSHIP.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States should strengthen and enhance its major defense partnership with India and work toward the following mutual security and diplomatic objectives:

(1) Expanding engagement in multilateral frameworks, including the quadrilateral dialogue among the United States, India, Japan, and Australia, to promote regional security and defend shared values and common interests in the rules-based order.

(2) Increasing the frequency and scope of exchanges between senior civilian officials and military officers of the United States and India to support the development and implementation of the major defense partnership.

(3) Exploring additional steps to implement the major defense partner designation to better facilitate interoperability, information sharing, and appropriate technology transfers.

(4) Pursuing strategic initiatives to help develop the defense capabilities of India.

(5) Conducting additional combined exercises with India in the Persian Gulf, Indian Ocean, and western Pacific regions.

(6) Furthering cooperative efforts to promote stability and security in Afghanistan.

SEC. . UNITED STATES-INDIA DEFENSE COOPERATION IN THE WESTERN INDIAN OCEAN.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report on defense cooperation between the United States and India in the Western Indian Ocean.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of military activities of the United States and India, separately, in the Western Indian Ocean.

(B) A description of military cooperation activities between the United States and India in the areas of humanitarian assistance, counterterrorism, counter piracy, maritime security, and other areas as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(C) A description of how the relevant geographic combatant commands coordinate their activities with the Indian military in the Western Indian Ocean.

(D) A description of the mechanisms in place to ensure the relevant geographic combatant commands maximize defense cooperation with India in the Western Indian Ocean.

(E) A description of how the major defense partnership with India will be utilized to enhance cooperation with India in the Western Indian Ocean.

(F) Areas of future opportunity to increase military engagement with India in the Western Indian Ocean.

(3) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “relevant congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) RELEVANT GEOGRAPHIC COMBATANT COMMANDS.—The term “relevant geographic combatant commands” means the United States Indo-Pacific Command, United States Central Command, and United States Africa Command.

(3) WESTERN INDIAN OCEAN.—The term “Western Indian Ocean” means the area in the Indian Ocean extending from the west coast of India to the east coast of Africa.

AMENDMENT NO. 350 OFFERED BY MS. SHERRILL
OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of subtitle H of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ARMY CONTRACTING COMMAND-NEW JERSEY.

It is the Sense of Congress that—

(1) Army Contracting Command-New Jersey (referred to in this section as “ACC-NJ”) plays a vital role in planning, directing, controlling, managing, and executing the full spectrum of contracting, acquisition support, and business advisory services that support major weapons, armaments, ammunition systems, information technology, and enterprise systems for the Army and other Department of Defense customers;

(2) ACC-NJ has unique expertise executing grants, cooperative agreements, and other transaction agreements central to the work at Picatinny Arsenal; and

(3) the workforce of ACC-NJ has the unmatched experience and expertise to support innovative and rapid contracting necessary to accelerate acquisition and enhance readiness for a modernizing the United States Armed Forces.

AMENDMENT NO. 351 OFFERED BY MR. SHIMKUS
OF ILLINOIS

At the appropriate place in subtitle F of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR BALTIC COUNTRIES FOR JOINT PROGRAM FOR INTEROPERABILITY AND DETERRENCE AGAINST AGGRESSION.

(a) ADDITIONAL MAJOR DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES.—Subsection (c) of section 1279D of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (22 U.S.C. 2753 note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “major” before “defense articles and services”;

(2) in paragraph (5), by inserting “major” before “defense articles and services”;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (5), as so amended, as paragraph (6); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

“(5) Intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance equipment.”

(b) FUNDING.—Subsection (f) of such section 1279D is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$100,000,000” and inserting “\$125,000,000”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) MATCHING AMOUNT.—The amount of assistance provided under subsection (a) for procurement described in subsection (b) may not exceed the aggregate amount contributed to such procurement by the Baltic nations.”

(c) EXTENSION.—Subsection (g) of such section 1279D is amended by striking “December 31, 2020” and inserting “December 31, 2021”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b) of such section 1279D is amended by inserting “major” before “defense articles and services” each place it appears.

(e) REPORT ON USE OF FUNDING AUTHORITY.—Not later than January 1, 2021, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes the following:

(1) Whether the authority to provide assistance pursuant to section 1279D was used in the previous calendar year.

(2) A description of the manner in which funds made available for assistance through such authority, if any, were used during such year.

(3) Whether alternative sources of funding exist to provide the assistance described in section 1279D.

(4) Whether any alternative authorities exist under which the Secretary can provide such assistance.

AMENDMENT NO. 352 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF
WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following new section:

SEC. 3121. CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF CERTAIN WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 234A of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2282a) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting “AND WHISTLEBLOWER” after “SAFETY”;

(2) in subsection a.—

(A) by inserting “, or who violates any applicable rule, regulation or order related to

whistleblower protections,” before “shall be subject to a civil penalty”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Secretary of Energy may carry out this section with respect to the National Nuclear Security Administration by acting through the Administrator for Nuclear Security.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“e. In this section, the term ‘whistleblower protections’ means the protections for contractors from reprisals pursuant to section 4712 of title 41, United States Code, section 211 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5851), or other provisions of Federal law affording such protections.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 353 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, add the following new section:

SEC. 3121. LIMITATION RELATING TO RECLASSIFICATION OF HIGH-LEVEL WASTE.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Energy may be obligated or expended by the Secretary of Energy to apply the interpretation of high-level radioactive waste described in the notice published by the Secretary titled “Supplemental Notice Concerning U.S. Department of Energy Interpretation of High-Level Radioactive Waste” (84 Fed. Reg. 26835), or successor notice, with respect to such waste located in the State of Washington.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in subsection (a) may be construed as an affirmation of the interpretation of high-level radioactive waste of the Secretary of Energy described in such subsection.

AMENDMENT NO. 354 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 567. PILOT PROGRAM REGARDING ONLINE APPLICATION FOR THE TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Secretary of Labor should jointly carry out a pilot program that creates a one-stop source for online applications for the purposes of assisting members of the Armed Forces and Veterans participating in the Transition Assistance Program (in this section referred to as “TAP”).

(b) **DATA SOURCES.**—The online application shall, in part, aggregate existing data from government resources and private sector under one uniform resource locator for the purpose of assisting members of the Armed Forces and veterans participating in TAP.

(c) **ELEMENTS FOR VETERANS AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.**—

(1) The online application shall be available as a mobile online application available on multiple devices (including smartphones and tablets), with responsive design, updated no less than once per year, and downloadable from the two online application stores most commonly used in the United States.

(2) The version of the online application accessible through a desktop or laptop computer shall be compatible with the most current versions of popular web browsers identified by the Secretaries.

(3) The online application shall be accessible to individuals with disabilities in accordance with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d).

(4) The online application shall generate, for each individual who uses the online application, a personalized transition data dashboard that includes the following information with regards to the location in which

the individual resides or intends to reside after separation from the Armed Forces:

(A) A current list of employment opportunities collected from employers.

(B) A current list of educational institutions.

(C) A current list of facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(D) A current list of local veterans service organizations.

(5) The dashboard under paragraph (4) shall include a list of benefits for which an individual as a veteran or separated member of the Armed Forces is eligible under the laws administered by the Secretaries, including educational assistance benefits.

(6) The dashboard under paragraph (4) shall keep track of the time remaining before the expiration of the following:

(A) Any civilian career certification waiver based on the military occupational specialty of the individual.

(B) Any active security clearance of the individual.

(7) The online application shall, to the extent practicable, match all current military occupational specialties, cross-referenced by grade, to current industries and jobs.

(8) The online application shall permit an individual to search jobs described in paragraph (4)(A) that match jobs described in paragraph (7).

(9) The online application shall alert individuals of new job opportunities relevant to the individual, based on military occupational specialty, interest, and search criteria used by the individual under paragraph (8).

(10) The online application shall permit an individual to maintain a history of job searches and submitted job applications.

(11) The online application shall include a resume generator that is compliant with industry-standard applicant tracking systems.

(12) The online application shall provide for career training through the use of learning management software, including training courses with a minimum of 100 soft skills and business courses.

(13) The online application shall include a career mentorship system, allowing individuals to communicate through text, chat, video calling, and email, with mentors who can use the online application to track the jobs mentees have applied for, the training mentees have undertaken, and any other appropriate mentorship matters.

(c) **ELEMENTS FOR EMPLOYERS.**—

(1) The online application shall include a mechanism (to be known as a “military skills translator”) with which employers may identify military occupational specialties that align with jobs offered by the employers.

(2) The online application shall include a mechanism with which employers may search for individuals seeking employment, based criteria including military occupational specialty, grade, education, civilian career category, and location.

(3) The online application shall provide online training for employers regarding what military occupational specialties relate to what jobs.

(d) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **CYBERSECURITY.**—To ensure the information of individuals and employers is protected from breaches, the Secretaries shall implement cybersecurity measures for the online application. These measures shall include the following:

(A) A security certificate produced by the online application that is updated each year of the pilot program.

(B) The online application shall be hosted by a provider the Secretaries determine to be secure and reputable.

(C) Ensuring that the online application has a live development team of dedicated en-

gineers to address immediate concerns. No more than half of such team may be based outside the United States.

(D) Regular scans of the online application, host, and server for vulnerabilities.

(E) The system must not have had a security breach within the last 3 years.

(2) **SYSTEM STABILITY.**—To ensure system stability and continuity, all elements of the online application must pass testing no less than 1 year before the online application is made available for use by individuals and employers.

(3) **PRIOR PROVIDERS BARRED.**—No entity that applies to become the provider of the online application may have served as a contractor providing database management for TAP during the 5 years preceding such online application.

(e) **ASSESSMENTS.**—

(1) **INTERIM ASSESSMENTS.**—Not later than the dates that are one and two years after the date of the commencement of the pilot program, the Secretaries shall jointly assess the pilot program.

(2) **FINAL ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than the date that is three years after the date of the commencement of the pilot program, the Secretaries shall jointly carry out a final assessment of the pilot program.

(3) **PURPOSE.**—The general objective of each assessment under this subsection shall be to determine if the online application under the pilot program assists participants in TAP accomplish the goals of TAP, accounting for the individual profiles of participants, including military experience and geographic location.

(4) **ELEMENTS.**—Each assessment shall include the following:

(A) The aggregate number of profiles created on the online application since the commencement of the pilot program.

(B) Demographic information on individuals who use the online application.

(C) The average amount time individuals, employers, and community-based services providers, use the online application each month, since the commencement of the pilot program.

(D) A ranking of most frequently-used features of the online application.

(E) A satisfaction survey of individuals who use the online application during the periods of 30 days and 180 days after separation from the Armed Forces.

(F) A report regarding the attendance of members of the Armed Forces at online and in-person TAP classes.

(f) **REPORT.**—Not later than six months after completing the final assessment under subsection (e)(2), the Secretaries shall submit a report to Congress on its findings regarding the pilot program, including recommendations for legislation.

AMENDMENT NO. 355 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. ____ REVIEW AND REPORT ON EXPERIMENTATION WITH TICKS AND INSECTS.

(a) **REVIEW.**—The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall conduct a review of whether the Department of Defense experimented with ticks and other insects regarding use as a biological weapon between the years of 1950 and 1975.

(b) **REPORT.**—If the Inspector General finds that any experiment described under subsection (a) occurred, the Inspector General shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on—

(1) the scope of such experiment; and

(2) whether any ticks or insects used in such experiment were released outside of any laboratory by accident or experiment design.

AMENDMENT NO. 356 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 898. GAO REPORT ON CONTRACTING PRACTICES OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

(a) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the contracting practices of the Corps of Engineers, with a specific focus on how the Corps of Engineers complies with and enforces the requirement to pay prevailing wages on federally financed construction jobs, as required by subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Davis-Bacon Act). The study shall consider the following:

(1) Any programs or protocols the Corps of Engineers has in place for the purpose of carrying out its Davis-Bacon Act enforcement obligations as set forth in the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(2) Any programs or protocols the Corps of Engineers has in place for the purpose of identifying and addressing independent contractor misclassification on projects subject to the Davis-Bacon Act.

(3) The frequency with which the Corps of Engineers conducts site visits on each covered project to monitor Davis-Bacon Act compliance.

(4) The frequency with which the Corps of Engineers monitors certified payroll reports submitted by contractors and subcontractors on each covered project.

(5) Whether the Corps of Engineers accepts and investigates complaints of Davis-Bacon Act violations submitted by third parties, such as contractors and workers' rights organizations.

(6) Whether the Corps of Engineers maintains a database listing all contractors and subcontractors who have, in one way or another, violated the Davis-Bacon Act and whether the Corps consults this database as part of its contract award process.

(7) The frequency, over the last five years, with which the Corps of Engineers penalized, disqualified, terminated, or moved for debarment of a contractor for Davis-Bacon Act violations.

(8) How the Corps of Engineers verifies that the contractors it hires for its projects are properly licensed.

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that summarizes the results of the study required under subsection (a), together with any recommendations for legislative or regulatory action that would improve the efforts of enforcing the requirement to pay prevailing wages on federally financed construction jobs.

AMENDMENT NO. 357 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. FUNDING FOR ANTI-TAMPER HETEROGENEOUS INTEGRATED MICROELECTRONICS.

(a) **INCREASE.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section

4201, for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, advanced technology development, defense-wide manufacturing science and technology program, line 047 (PE 0603680D8Z) is hereby increased by \$5,000,000 (with the amount of such increase to be made available for anti-tamper heterogeneous integrated microelectronics).

(b) **OFFSET.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for procurement, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for other procurement, Army, elect equip-automation, general fund enterprise business systems fam, line 114 is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 358 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

Add at the end of subtitle B of title II the following:

SEC. 241 TRUSTED SUPPLY CHAIN AND OPERATIONAL SECURITY STANDARDS FOR MICROELECTRONICS.

(a) **TRUSTED SUPPLY CHAIN AND OPERATIONAL SECURITY STANDARDS.**—

(1) **STANDARDS REQUIRED.**—Not later than January 1, 2021, the Secretary shall establish trusted supply chain and operational security standards for the purchase of microelectronics products and services by the Department.

(2) **CONSULTATION REQUIRED.**—In developing standards under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with the following:

(A) The Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(B) Suppliers of microelectronics products and services from the United States and allies and partners of the United States.

(C) Representatives of major United States industry sectors that rely on a trusted supply chain and the operational security of microelectronics products and services.

(D) Representatives of the United States insurance industry.

(3) **TIERS OF TRUST AND SECURITY AUTHORIZED.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary may establish tiers of trust and security within the supply chain and operational security standards for microelectronics products and services.

(4) **GENERAL APPLICABILITY.**—The standards established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be, to the greatest extent practicable, generally applicable to the trusted supply chain and operational security needs and use cases of the United States Government and commercial industry, such that the standards could be widely adopted by government and commercial industry.

(5) **ANNUAL REVIEW.**—Not later than October 1 of each year, the Secretary shall review the standards established pursuant to paragraph (1) and issue updates or modifications as the Secretary considers necessary or appropriate.

(b) **ENSURING ABILITY TO SELL COMMERCIALLY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall, to the greatest extent practicable, ensure that suppliers of microelectronics products for the Federal Government who meet the standards established under subsection (a) are able and incentivized to sell products commercially that are produced on the same production lines as the microelectronics products supplied to the Federal Government.

(2) **EFFECT OF REQUIREMENT AND ACQUISITIONS.**—The Secretary shall, to the greatest extent practicable, ensure that the requirements of the Department and the acquisition by the Department of microelectronics enable the success of a dual-use microelectronics industry.

(c) **MAINTAINING COMPETITION AND INNOVATION.**—The Secretary shall take such actions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate, within the Secretary's authorized activities to maintain the health of the defense industrial base, to ensure that—

(1) providers of microelectronics products and services that meet the standards established under subsection (a) are exposed to competitive market pressures to achieve competitive pricing and sustained innovation; and

(2) the industrial base of microelectronics products and services that meet the standards established under subsection (a) includes providers producing in or belonging to countries that are allies or partners of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 359 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 7. REPORT ON OPERATIONAL MEDICAL AND DENTAL PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS.

Not later than January 1, 2021, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing a discussion of the following:

(1) **Methods—**

(A) to establish joint planning assumptions for the development of operational medical and dental personnel, including establishing a definition of which personnel may be identified as "operational";

(B) to assess options to achieve joint efficiencies in medical and dental personnel requirements, including any associated risks;

(C) to apply joint planning assumptions and assess efficiencies and risks, for the purpose of determining operational medical and dental requirements;

(D) to identify and mitigate limitations in the clinical readiness metric, such as data reliability, information on reserve component providers and patient care workload performed outside of military medical treatment facilities established under section 1073d of title 10, United States Code, and the linkage between such metric and patient care and retention outcomes; and

(E) to determine which critical wartime specialties perform high-risk, high-acuity procedures and rely on perishable skill sets, for the purpose of prioritizing such specialties to which the clinical readiness metric may be expanded.

(2) **Estimates of the costs and benefits relating to—**

(A) providing additional training for medical personnel to achieve clinical readiness thresholds; and

(B) hiring additional civilian personnel in military medical treatment facilities to backfill medical providers of the Department of Defense who attend such training.

AMENDMENT NO. 360 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. BRIEFING ON USE OF BLOCKCHAIN TECHNOLOGY FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES.

(a) **BRIEFING REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the potential use of distributed ledger technology for defense purposes.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The briefing under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An explanation of how distributed ledger technology may be used by the Department of Defense to—

(A) improve cybersecurity, beginning at the hardware level, of vulnerable assets such

as energy, water and transport grids, through distributed versus centralized computing;

(B) reduce single points of failure in emergency and catastrophe decision-making by subjecting the decision to consensus validation through distributed ledger technologies;

(C) improve the efficiency of defense logistics and supply chain operations;

(D) enhance the transparency of procurement auditing; and

(E) allow innovations to be adapted by the private sector for ancillary uses.

(2) Such other information as the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering determines to be appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 361 OFFERED BY MS.

SPANBERGER OF VIRGINIA

Page 836, line 22, strike “and” at the end. Page 836, strike lines 23 through 25 and insert the following:

(3) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “during the period” and all that follows to the end and inserting “from the preceding year, including—

“(A) a list of all foreign forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals for which a determination has been made that force could legally be used under the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40), including—

“(i) the legal and factual basis for such determination; and

“(ii) a description of whether force has been used against each such foreign force, irregular force, group, or individual; and

“(B) the criteria and any changes to the criteria for designating a foreign force, irregular force, group, or individual as lawfully targetable, as a high value target, and as formally or functionally a member of a group covered under the Authorization for Use of Military Force.”; and

(4) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following: “The unclassified portion of each report shall, at a minimum, include each change made to the legal and policy frameworks during the preceding year and the legal, factual, and policy justifications for such changes, and shall be made available to the public at the same time it is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 362 OFFERED BY MS.

SPANBERGER OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle E of title V, insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ . INITIATIVE TO IMPROVE THE CAPACITY OF MILITARY CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIVE ORGANIZATIONS TO PREVENT CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish an initiative on improving the capacity of military criminal investigative organizations to prevent child sexual exploitation. Under the initiative, the Secretary shall work with an external partner to train military criminal investigative organization officials at Department of Defense installations from all military departments regarding—

(1) online investigative technology, tools, and techniques;

(2) computer forensics;

(3) complex evidentiary issues;

(4) child victim identification;

(5) child victim referral for comprehensive investigation and treatment services; and

(6) related instruction.

(b) PARTNERSHIPS AND AGREEMENTS.—Under the initiative, the Secretary shall develop partnerships and establish collaborative agreements with the following:

(1) The Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General, in better coordinating the investigative jurisdictions and law enforce-

ment authorities of the military criminal investigative organizations, and in improving the justice community’s understanding of those law enforcement authorities to enforce Federal criminal statutes.

(2) Federal criminal investigative organizations responsible for enforcement of Federal criminal statutes related to combatting child sexual exploitation, in order to ensure a streamlined process for transferring criminal investigations into child exploitation to other jurisdictions, while maintaining the integrity of the evidence already collected.

(3) A highly qualified national child protection organization or law enforcement training center with demonstrated expertise in the delivery of law enforcement training—

(A) to detect, identify, investigate, and prosecute individuals engaged in the trading or production of child pornography and the online solicitation of children; and

(B) to train military criminal investigative organization officials at Department of Defense installations from all military departments.

(4) A highly qualified national child protection organization with demonstrated expertise in the development and delivery of multidisciplinary intervention training including evidence-based forensic interviewing, victim advocacy, trauma-informed mental health services, medical services, and multidisciplinary coordination between the Department of Defense and civilian experts to improve outcomes for victims of child sexual exploitation.

(5) Children’s Advocacy Centers located in the same communities as military installations that coordinate the multidisciplinary team response and child-friendly approach to identifying, investigating, prosecuting, and intervening in child sexual exploitation cases that can partner with military installations on law enforcement, child protection, prosecution, mental health, medical, and victim advocacy to investigate sexual exploitation, help children heal from sexual exploitation, and hold offenders accountable.

(6) State and local authorities to address law enforcement capacity in communities where military installations are located, and to prevent lapses in jurisdiction that would undercut the Department’s efforts to prevent child sexual exploitation.

(7) The National Association to Protect Children and the United States Special Operations Command Care Coalition to replicate successful outcomes of the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps, as established by section 890A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 473), within military criminal investigative organizations and other Department components to combat child sexual exploitation.

(c) LOCATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out the initiative—

(A) in at least two States where there is a high density of Department network users in comparison to the overall population of the States;

(B) in at least two States where there is a high population of Department network users;

(C) in at least two States where there is a large percentage of Indian children, including children who are Alaska Native or Native Hawaiian;

(D) in at least one State with a population with fewer than 2,000,000 people;

(E) in at least one State with a population with fewer than 5,000,000 people, but not fewer than 2,000,000 people;

(F) in at least one State with a population with fewer than 10,000,000 people, but not fewer than 5,000,000; and

(G) in at least one State with a population with 10,000,000 or more people.

(2) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall ensure that the locations at which the initiative is carried out are distributed across different regions.

(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out the initiative, the Secretary shall—

(1) participate in multi-jurisdictional task forces;

(2) establish cooperative agreements to facilitate co-training and collaboration with Federal, State, and local law enforcement; and

(3) develop a streamlined process to refer child sexual abuse cases to other jurisdictions.

AMENDMENT NO. 363 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16 ____ . FUNDING FOR DEFENSE COUNTER-INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY AGENCY.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for Operation and Maintenance as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for Defense Security Service (line 320) is hereby increased by \$5,206,997, for purposes of acquiring advanced cyber threat detection sensors, hunt and response mechanisms, and commercial cyber threat intelligence to ensure Defense Industrial Base networks remain protected from nation state adversaries.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for other procurement, Air Force, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for Integrated personnel and pay system is hereby reduced by \$5,206,997.

AMENDMENT NO. 364 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 7 ____ . MODIFICATION TO REFERRALS FOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.

If the Secretary of Defense is unable to provide mental health services in a military medical treatment facility to a member of the Armed Forces within 15 days of the date on which such services are first requested by the member, the Secretary may refer the member to a provider under the TRICARE program (as that term is defined in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code) to receive such services.

AMENDMENT NO. 365 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle G of title XXVIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 28 ____ . RENAMING OF LEJEUNE HIGH SCHOOL IN HONOR OF CONGRESSMAN WALTER B. JONES.

(a) RENAMING.—The Lejeune High School at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, shall hereafter be known and designated as the “Walter B. Jones Camp Lejeune High School”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, map, regulation, map, document, paper, other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to the Walter B. Jones Camp Lejeune High School.

AMENDMENT NO. 366 OFFERED BY MR. STANTON OF ARIZONA

At the end of subtitle J of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5 . INCLUSION OF CERTAIN VETERANS ON TEMPORARY DISABILITY OR PERMANENT DISABLED RETIREMENT LISTS IN MILITARY ADAPTIVE SPORTS PROGRAMS.

(a) INCLUSION OF CERTAIN VETERANS.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 2564a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “for members of the armed forces who” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “for—

“(A) any member of the armed forces who is eligible to participate in adaptive sports because of an injury, illness, or wound incurred in the line of duty in the armed forces; and

“(B) any veteran (as defined in section 101 of title 38), during the one-year period following the veteran’s date of separation, who—

“(i) is on the Temporary Disability Retirement List or Permanently Disabled Retirement List;

“(ii) is eligible to participate in adaptive sports because of an injury, illness, or wound incurred in the line of duty in the armed forces; and

“(iii) was enrolled in the program authorized under this section prior to the veteran’s date of separation.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by inserting “and veterans” after “members”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) HEADING AMENDMENT.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“**§ 2564a. Provision of assistance for adaptive sports programs: members of the armed forces; certain veterans**”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 152 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2564a and inserting the following new item:

“2564a. Provision of assistance for adaptive sports programs: members of the armed forces; certain veterans.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 367 OFFERED BY MR. STAUBER OF MINNESOTA

Page 642, after line 21, insert the following:

SEC. 10 . REPORT ON EXPANDING NAVAL VESSEL MAINTENANCE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than May 1, 2020, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on allowing maintenance to be performed on naval vessels at shipyards other than shipyards in the vessels’ homeports.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the ability of homeport shipyards to meet the current naval vessel maintenance demands.

(2) An assessment of the ability of current homeport shipyards to meet the naval vessel maintenance demands of a 355-ship Navy.

(3) An assessment of the ability of non-homeport firms to augment repair work at homeport shipyards, which shall include—

(A) the capability and proficiency of shipyards in the Great Lakes, Gulf Coast, East Coast, West Coast, and Alaska regions to perform technical repair work on naval vessels at locations other than their homeports;

(B) the required improvements to the capability of shipyards in the Great Lakes, Gulf Coast, East Coast, West Coast, and Alaska regions to enable performance of technical repair work on naval vessels at locations other than their homeports;

(C) an identification of naval vessel types (such as noncombatant vessels or vessels that only need limited periods of time in shipyards) best suited for repair work performed by shipyards in locations other than their homeports; and

(D) the potential benefits to fleet readiness of expanding shipyard repair work to include shipyards not located at naval vessel homeports.

(4) An assessment of the benefits to the commercial shipyard industrial base of expanding repair work for naval vessels to shipyards not eligible for short-term work in accordance with section 8669a(c) of title 10, United States Code.

(c) HOMEPORT SHIPYARDS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “homeport shipyards” means shipyards associated with firms capable of being awarded short-term work at the homeport of a naval vessel in accordance with section 8669a(c) of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 417 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN OF NEW YORK

At the appropriate place in subtitle G of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. . REPORT ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEBANESE ARMED FORCES AND HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a report to Congress—

(1) identifying all military officers, commanders, advisors, officials, or other personnel with significant influence over the policies or activities of the Lebanese Armed Forces who are members of, paid by, or significantly influenced by Hizballah; and

(2) describing military activities conducted by the Lebanese Armed Forces to disarm Hizballah pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1701 (2006).

(b) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form but may have a classified annex.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chairwoman, I currently have no speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I have no speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chairwoman, I encourage my colleagues to support the en bloc package, as well as the NDAA upon final passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chair, current law requires servicemembers to participate in Transition Assistance Program (TAP) before their anticipated separation date, and more than 20,000 service members will transition into civilian life per month over the next 5 years.

As the former Chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, I have seen how vital TAP is in preparing all eligible members of the armed forces for transition to civilian life. Servicemembers currently undergo 4 hours of pre-separation counseling, 5 days of classroom-based instruction, and an optional 2-day Transition Goals, Plans, Success program. Yet, the abundant information provided in these multiple sessions can become an organizational challenge especially for servicemembers who are relocating and starting new lives.

While access and advancement in mobile technology has grown, TAP has yet to provide servicemembers with a comprehensive online application accessible through mobile application technology to assist with their transition needs after separation including a personalized profile for employment, education, benefits, mentorship, resume building, and career training. Additionally, there is currently no avenue for TAP officials to follow servicemembers’ progress in completing their TAP requirements and ensure that immediate and accurate reports are kept.

My amendment calls for a three-year pilot program through the interagency partners of the Department of Defense, Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Labor to develop an online application that would address the current shortfalls in the TAP program, consolidate online resources given to them upon separation, and provide support for the transitioning needs of servicemembers as they become veterans.

The online application that would be available as an app for smartphones or tablets and accessible through laptops or desktop computers, would create a transition data dashboard personalized to the veteran. This application would provide a resume generator, job search portal, access to career training, and mentorship and do it all based on the individual military experiences and current geographic location of the veteran.

This pilot program will ensure the valuable information provided at TAP is always at veterans’ fingertips in order to help our nation’s heroes seamlessly transition into civilian life.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chair, En Bloc amendment No. 14 includes my amendment—cosponsored by DONALD NORCROSS (D-NJ)—to require the GAO to investigate the contracting practices of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, specifically on how the agency complies with and enforces the Davis-Bacon Act to pay locally prevailing wages on federally-financed construction jobs.

Under Davis-Bacon, the government may terminate a contract if locally prevailing wages have not been paid to employees working on the project. Contracting agencies, such as the Army Corps, however, have the primary day-to-day responsibility for enforcement of the Davis-Bacon Act and its labor standards requirements. Unfortunately, I have heard persistent and credible reports that the Army Corps’ enforcement efforts are lacking, specifically at Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst, which is located in my district.

Irresponsible contractors and subcontractors often times avoid their prevailing wage obligations by engaging in two different types of misclassification: craft misclassification and independent contractor misclassification.

Craft misclassification occurs when dishonest contractors misclassify highskilled workers as general laborers or lower wage classifications in order to avoid paying the higher prevailing wage rate applicable to the high-skilled work actually performed. Independent contractor misclassification occurs when contractors misclassify employees as independent contractors to avoid paying prevailing wages in order to reduce labor costs and avoid state and federal taxes.

These practices deny workers access to critical benefits and protections, including prevailing wages, workers' compensation and unemployment insurance, and communities suffer because misclassification results in lower tax revenues for federal, state, and local governments. To top it off, the work is often substandard as it has been performed by people not properly trained for the job.

Our military installations deserve quality workmanship, not substandard facilities that could create potential hazards and diminish readiness.

In light of the intended federal investment of \$11.5 billion for military construction projects included in this underlying bill for fiscal year 2020, we need to be sure that our taxpayer dollars—and critical investment in military infrastructure—are being spent in accordance with the law and on qualified workmanship. The GAO investigation of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will help quantify the problem and hopefully usher in reform.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Chair, I would like to acknowledge that my amendment, floor amendment number 357, rules amendment number 117, included in en bloc package number 14, increases funding for the Defense-Wide Manufacturing Science and Technology program by \$5 million for anti-tamper heterogeneous integrated microelectronics.

Microelectronics support nearly all Department of Defense activities, enabling capabilities such as the global position system, radar, command and control, and communications. Ensuring secure access to leading-edge microelectronics, however, is a challenge. The changing global semiconductor industry and the sophistication of U.S. adversaries, who might target military electronic components, require us to update our domestic microelectronics security framework.

Defense-Wide Manufacturing Science and Technology is an investment mechanism that allows the Department of Defense to advance state-of-the-art, defense-essential, manufacturing capabilities through the development of technologies and processes necessary to produce defense systems. This amendment would provide additional funding resources, through the use of a public-private-partnership structured microelectronics cybersecurity center, to support anti-tamper devices, hardware security, and other evolving new concept technologies that support trusted and assured manufacturing, combined with advanced system integration and packaging technologies.

I support the rapid modernization of domestic state-of-the-art foundry operations that produce trusted microelectronics and thank the Chairman and the Committee for all their work on this amendment.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 2500, which would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress regarding the Department's progress implementing the 91 priority recommendations from the Comptroller General of the United States. I would like to thank my colleague Congresswoman BARBARA LEE for cosponsoring this amendment. I would also like to thank Chairman SMITH and the House Armed Services Committee for their work on this important legislation.

The 91 priority recommendations in GAO-19-366SP report was sent to the Department of Defense to address major challenges in nine key areas: Acquisitions and Contract

Management, Readiness, Building Capacity to Drive Enterprise-Wide Business Reform, Defense Headquarters, Health care, Cybersecurity, Infrastructure, Financial Management, and Preventing Sexual Harassment. These recommendations address challenges that affect the Department's ability to accomplish its mission.

Every Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget for the past decade has made implementing GAO's recommendations a priority to encourage DoD to save taxpayer dollars and to be more prudent with the enormous amount of resources they are provided to defend our country. As we work to strengthen our nation's Armed Forces to counter threats from our adversaries, we must ensure that DoD roots out waste, fraud, and abuse within the agency. While DoD has successfully implemented some of the recommendations made by the GAO, there is more work to be done.

Today, DoD faces new challenges in our national security with the rise of cyber crimes, international terrorism and nuclear threats. Our military has been stretched and exhausted from being involved in two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. We should be doing everything we can to ensure that DoD funds are used to strengthen our national security.

Each fiscal year, the Department is appropriated hundreds of billions of dollars and is the largest employer in the federal government. It is critical that DOD accounts for every dollar. The GAO report has 17 recommendations for financial management. GAO reports that DoD has failed to properly produce correct financial information. This is a serious problem for a Department that receives such a significant share of federal taxpayer dollars. Auditing the Pentagon and encouraging DoD to continue to implement the remaining GAO recommendations would lead to tens of billions in cost savings for taxpayers by bringing a culture of financial accountability to the Pentagon.

Madam Chair, it is imperative that DoD address and implement the GAO's remaining priority recommendations. If cost is the issue that is preventing the implementation, the required report to Congress will outline the estimated funding needed to assist DOD with the implementation.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important amendment to ensure DoD's efficient use of taxpayer dollars.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 476, I rise to offer amendments en bloc No. 15 as the designee of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

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

Amendments en bloc No. 15 consisting of amendment Nos. 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 383, 384, 385, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, and 394 printed in part B of House Report 116-143, offered by Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

AMENDMENT NO. 369 OFFERED BY MS. STEFANIK OF NEW YORK

Add at the end of subtitle E of title V the following:

SEC. 5. TREATMENT OF INFORMATION IN CATCH A SERIAL OFFENDER PROGRAM FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.

(a) EXCLUSION FROM FOIA.—Section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the "Freedom of Information Act"), shall not apply to any report for purposes of the Catch a Serial Offender Program.

(b) PRESERVATION OF RESTRICTED REPORT.—The transmittal or receipt in connection with the Catch a Serial Offender Program of a report on a sexual assault that is treated as a restricted report shall not operate to terminate its treatment or status as a restricted report.

AMENDMENT NO. 370 OFFERED BY MS. STEFANIK OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 8. MODIFICATIONS TO BUDGET DISPLAY REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH PROGRAM AND SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM.

Section 857 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232; 132 Stat. 1891) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting "Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the" before "Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering"; and

(B) by striking "a budget display" and inserting "one or more budget displays";

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "The budget display" and inserting "The budget displays"; and

(3) in subsection (d), by striking "The budget display" and inserting "The budget displays".

AMENDMENT NO. 371 OFFERED BY MR. STIVERS OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 729. ANNUAL REPORTS ON MILLENNIUM COHORT STUDY RELATING TO WOMEN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) ANNUAL REPORTS.—On an annual basis, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, and make publicly available, a report on findings of the Millennium Cohort Study relating to the gynecological and perinatal health of women members of the Armed Forces participating in the study.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—Each report under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A summary of general findings pertaining to gynecological and perinatal health, such as the diseases, disorders, and conditions that affect the functioning of reproductive systems, including regarding maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity, birth defects, developmental disorders, low birth weight, preterm birth, reduced fertility, menstrual disorders, and other health concerns.

(2) All research projects that have concluded during the year covered by the report and the outcomes of such projects.

(3) Abstracts of all ongoing projects.

(4) Abstracts of all projects that have been considered for investigation.

(c) IDENTIFICATION OF AREAS.—The Secretary shall identify—

(1) areas in which the Millennium Cohort Study can increase efforts to capture data and produce studies in the field of gynecological and perinatal health of women members of the Armed Forces; and

(2) activities that are currently underway to achieve such efforts.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(2) The term “Millennium Cohort Study” means the longitudinal study authorized under section 743 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2074) to evaluate data on the health conditions of members of the Armed Forces upon their return from deployment.

AMENDMENT NO. 372 OFFERED BY MR. SUOZZI OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____ . RADIUM TESTING AT CERTAIN LOCATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Navy shall provide for an independent third-party data quality review of all radium testing completed by contractors of the Department of the Navy at a covered location.

(b) COVERED LOCATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered location” means any location where the Secretary of the Navy is undertaking a project or activity funded through one of the following accounts of the Department of Defense:

(1) Operation and Maintenance, Environmental Restoration, Navy.

(2) Operation and Maintenance, Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites.

AMENDMENT NO. 373 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO OF CALIFORNIA

Amend section 912 to read as follows:

SEC. 912. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR CONSOLIDATION OF DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Defense Media Activity serves as a premier broadcasting and production center for America’s servicemembers and their families worldwide; and

(2) as the Department of Defense considers relocating some or all of the functions of the Defense Media Activity, Congress must have the opportunity to consider the impact and scope that such a decision would have on the Department’s ability to meet its current warfighting capabilities and ensure that the Defense Media Activity does not consolidate its facilities at the expense of satisfying its current mission requirements.

(b) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2020 or any subsequent fiscal year for the Department of Defense may be used to consolidate the Defense Media Activity until a period of 180 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits the report required under subsection (c).

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes the following:

(1) Any current or future plans to restructure, reduce, or eliminate the functions, personnel, facilities, or capabilities of the Defense Media Activity, including the timelines associated with such plans.

(2) Any modifications that have been made, or that may be made, to personnel compensation or funding accounts in preparation for, or in response to, efforts to consolidate the Defense Media Activity.

(3) Any contractual agreements that have been entered into to consolidate or explore

the consolidation of the Defense Media Activity.

(4) Any Department of Defense directives or Administration guidance relating to efforts to consolidate the Defense Media Activity, including any directives or guidance intended to inform or instruct such efforts.

(d) CONSOLIDATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “consolidate”, means any action to reduce or limit the functions, personnel, facilities, or capabilities of the Defense Media Activity, including entering into contracts or developing plans for such reduction or limitation.

AMENDMENT NO. 374 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28 . OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, AND PRESERVATION OF MARE ISLAND NAVAL CEMETERY, VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA.

(a) AUTHORITY TO ASSIST OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, AND PRESERVATION ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of Defense may provide not more than \$250,000 per fiscal year to aid in the operation, maintenance, and preservation of the Mare Island Naval Cemetery in Vallejo, California (in this section referred to as the “Cemetery”) if, within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the city of Vallejo, California, enters into an agreement with a nonprofit historical preservation organization (in this section referred to as the “organization”) to manage the day-to-day operation, maintenance, and preservation activities of the Cemetery; and

(2) the organization enters into a memorandum of agreement with the Secretary that outlines the organization’s plan and commitment to preserve the Cemetery in perpetuity.

(b) RESTRICTION ON USE OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided under subsection (a) shall only be used by the organization—

(1) for the direct operation, maintenance, and preservation of the Cemetery; and

(2) to conduct an annual audit and prepare an annual report of the organization’s activities.

(c) REDUCTION IN ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Defense may reduce the amount of assistance provided under subsection (a) for a fiscal year, or forgo the provision of assistance for a fiscal year, whenever the Secretary determines that the organization has enough operational funds to function for at least a two-year period.

(d) ANNUAL AUDIT AND REPORT.—As a condition of receiving assistance under subsection (a), the organization shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an annual report containing an audit of the organization’s financial revenues and expenditures for the previous year and describing how funds were used.

(e) OTHER FUND-RAISING.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the organization from raising additional funds to supplement the organization’s activities.

AMENDMENT NO. 376 OFFERED BY MS. TORRES SMALL OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of subtitle H of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10 . PILOT PROGRAM TO PROVIDE BROADBAND ACCESS TO MILITARY FAMILIES AND MEDICAL FACILITIES ON REMOTE AND ISOLATED BASES.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) PURPOSE.—In order to extend residential broadband internet access to the thousands of military families on military installations within the United States located in unserved rural areas, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Federal Communication Commission, shall carry out a

pilot program under which the Secretary enters into an agreement with a broadband internet provider or providers to—

(A) provide broadband internet access to military families on installations within the United States located in unserved rural areas;

(B) ensure broadband internet is accessible in military hospitals and clinics to facilitate the expeditious use of telehealth services and electronic military records integration; and

(C) enhance broadband internet access that can support of military spouse employment, transition assistance for members of the Armed Forces, and workforce development.

(2) LOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program at no fewer than three military installations located in unserved rural areas.

(3) SERVICE PROVIDER REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that broadband internet service providers considered for participation in the pilot program—

(A) use low-cost broadband technologies, such as fixed wireless technologies, which are suitable for lower population density unserved and underserved rural areas; and

(B) possess the capability to expeditiously install and connect broadband internet capabilities on remote and isolated bases.

(4) FIFTH GENERATION INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.—The pilot program under this section shall be carried out in accordance with the strategy and implementation plan required under section 233 of this Act.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the implementation of the pilot program under subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a list of the remote and isolated bases selected by the Secretary for purposes of the pilot program;

(B) an analysis of the success of the pilot program on improving access to broadband for families living on base, telehealth medicine services, and the processing of electronic health records;

(C) recommendations by the Secretary for improving, expanding, or modifying the program;

(D) recommendations from the Secretary, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Chairman of the Federal Communication Commission on aligning the pilot program with Federal rural broadband strategy and deployment efforts; and

(E) any other matters the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “broadband” means internet access providing throughput speeds of at least 25 Mbps downstream and at least 3 Mbps upstream and having no data consumption caps.

(2) The term “unserved rural areas” means those rural census blocks reported by broadband providers as lacking access to broadband on the Federal Communications Commission’s Form 477.

AMENDMENT NO. 377 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

In section 240—

(1) redesignate subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(2) insert after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

(c) LIST OF COVERED INSTITUTIONS.—The Commission, in consultation with the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Defense, shall make available a list identifying each covered institution. The list shall be made available on a publicly accessible website of the Department of Defense and the Department of Education and shall be updated not less frequently than once annually during the life of the Commission.

AMENDMENT NO. 378 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO CENTRAL AMERICA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) on—

(1) each of the individuals listed in the report provided by to Congress by the Department of State on April 3, 2019, pursuant to section 1287 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232); and

(2) each of the individuals listed in the report provided to Congress by the Department of State on May 15, 2019, pursuant to section 7019(d) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2019 (division F of Public Law 116–6).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the sanctions described in section 1263(b) of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note).

(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive the imposition of sanctions under this section if the President determines that such waiver would be in the national security interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 379 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

At the appropriate place in subtitle G of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12 . PROHIBITION RELATING TO JOINT TASK FORCE WITH GUATEMALA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to transfer or purchase vehicles for any joint task force including the Ministry of Defense or the Ministry of the Interior of Guatemala unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such ministries have made a credible commitment to use such equipment only for the uses for which they were intended.

(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 380 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2 . EFFORTS TO COUNTER MANIPULATED MEDIA CONTENT.

(a) BRIEFING REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on initiatives of the Department of Defense to identify and address, as appropriate and

as authorized in support of Department of Defense operations, manipulated media content, specifically “deepfakes”.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The briefing required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Status of efforts to develop technology to identify manipulated content impacting the national security of the United States.

(B) Challenges to detecting, labeling, and preventing foreign actors’ manipulation of images and video impacting national security.

(C) Plans to make deepfake detection technology available to the public and other Federal agencies for use in identifying manipulated media.

(D) The efforts of the Department of Defense, as appropriate, to engage academia and industry stakeholders to combat deliberately manipulated or deceptive information from state and non-state actors on social media platforms impacting operations overseas.

(E) An assessment of the ability of adversaries to generate deepfakes.

(F) Recommendations for a long-term transition partner organization.

(b) FUNDING.—

(1) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, applied research, SOF technology development, line 022 (PE 1160401BB) is hereby increased by \$5,000,000 (with the amount of such increase to be made available for Media Forensics).

(2) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, operational systems development, AF integrated personnel and pay system (AF-IPPS), line 158 (PE 0605018F) is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize an activity that will impact the privacy or civil liberties of United States persons.

AMENDMENT NO. 381 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

Page 472, line 7, insert after the period the following new sentence: “The Department of Defense must also develop policies to assist small- and medium-sized manufacturers that provide goods or services in the supply chain for the Department to adopt robust cybersecurity standards.”

Page 473, after line 10, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Director of the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership (established under section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k)) to provide education, guidance, and technical assistance to strengthen the cybersecurity of small- and medium-sized manufacturers that provide goods or services in the supply chain for the Department of Defense.

AMENDMENT NO. 383 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle D of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5 . EXPANSION OF PRE-REFERRAL MATTERS REVIEWABLE BY MILITARY JUDGES AND MILITARY MAGISTRATES IN THE INTEREST OF EFFICIENCY IN MILITARY JUSTICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 830a of title 10, United States Code (article

30a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

(1) The President shall prescribe regulations for matters relating to proceedings conducted before referral of charges and specifications to court-martial for trial, including the following:

(A) Pre-referral investigative subpoenas.

(B) Pre-referral warrants or orders for electronic communications.

(C) Pre-referral matters referred by an appellate court.

(D) Pre-referral matters under subsection (c) or (e) of section 806b of this title (article 6b).

(E) Pre-referral matters relating to the following:

(i) Pre-trial confinement of an accused.

(ii) The accused’s mental capacity.

(iii) A request for an individual military counsel.

(2) In addition to the matters specified in paragraph (1), the regulations prescribed under that paragraph shall—

(A) set forth the matters that a military judge may rule upon in such proceedings;

(B) include procedures for the review of such rulings; and

(C) include appropriate limitations to ensure that proceedings under this section extend only to matters that would be subject to consideration by a military judge in a general or special court-martial.

(b) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) HEADING AMENDMENT.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“§ 830A. Art. 30a. proceedings conducted before referral”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter VI of chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended by striking the item relating to section 830 (article 30a) and inserting the following new item:

“830a. 30a. Proceedings conducted before referral.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 384 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5 . PRESERVATION OF RECOURSE TO RESTRICTED REPORT ON SEXUAL ASSAULT FOR VICTIMS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT BEING INVESTIGATED FOLLOWING CERTAIN VICTIM OR THIRD-PARTY COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a policy that allows a member of the Armed Forces who is the victim of a sexual assault that is or may be investigated as a result of a communication described in subsection (b) to elect to have the member’s reporting on such sexual assault be treated as a Restricted Report without regard to the party initiating or receiving such communication.

(b) COMMUNICATION.—A communication described in this subsection is a communication on a sexual assault as follows:

(1) By the member concerned to a member of the Armed Forces in the chain of command of such member, whether a commissioned officer or a non-commissioned officer.

(2) By the member concerned to military law enforcement personnel or personnel of a military criminal investigation organization (MCIO).

(3) By any individual other than the member concerned.

AMENDMENT NO. 385 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle D of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. TRAINING FOR COMMANDERS IN THE ARMED FORCES ON THEIR ROLE IN ALL STAGES OF MILITARY JUSTICE IN CONNECTION WITH SEXUAL ASSAULT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The training provided commanders in the Armed Forces shall include comprehensive training on the role of commanders in all stages of military justice in connection with sexual assaults by members of the Armed Forces against other members of the Armed Forces.

(b) **ELEMENTS TO BE COVERED.**—The training provided pursuant to subsection (a) shall include training on the following:

(1) The role of commanders in each stage of the military justice process in connection with sexual assault committed by a member of the Armed Forces against another member, including investigation and prosecution.

(2) The role of commanders in assuring that victims in sexual assault described in paragraph (1) are informed of, and have the opportunity to obtain, assistance available for victims of sexual assault by law.

(3) The role of commanders in assuring that victims in sexual assault described in paragraph (1) are afforded the due process rights and protections available to victims by law.

(4) The role of commanders in preventing retaliation against victims, their family members, witnesses, first responders, and bystanders for their complaints, statements, testimony, and status in connection with sexual assault described in paragraph (1), including the role of commanders in ensuring that subordinates in the command are aware of their responsibilities in preventing such retaliation.

(5) The role of commanders in establishing and maintaining a healthy command climate in connection with reporting on sexual assault described in paragraph (1) and in the response of the commander, subordinates in the command, and other personnel in the command to such sexual assault, such reporting, and the military justice process in connection with such sexual assault.

(6) Any other matters on the role of commanders in connection with sexual assault described in paragraph (1) that the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate for purposes of this section.

(c) INCORPORATION OF BEST PRACTICES.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The training provided pursuant to subsection (a) shall incorporate best practices on all matters covered by the training.

(2) **IDENTIFICATION OF BEST PRACTICES.**—The Secretaries of the military departments shall, acting through the training and doctrine commands of the Armed Forces, undertake from time to time surveys and other reviews of the matters covered by the training provided pursuant to subsection (a) in order to identify and incorporate into such training the most current practicable best practices on such matters.

(d) **UNIFORMITY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the training provided pursuant to subsection (a) is, to the extent practicable, uniform across the Armed Forces.

AMENDMENT NO. 387 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ OF NEW YORK

Page 430, strike line 19 through line 24 and insert the following:

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than February 1, 2022, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees which shall include the number of contracts awarded on the basis of competition restricted to Program Participants in the program established under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)) to small business concerns that are Native Hawaiian Organizations (as defined in paragraph (15) of such

section (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(15))) or economically disadvantaged Indian tribes (or a wholly owned business entity of such a tribe) (as defined in paragraph (13) of such section (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(13))) or that exceed the dollar amount under paragraph (1)(D) of such section.

AMENDMENT NO. 388 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ OF NEW YORK

Page 586, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 587, line 2, and insert the following:

(a) PERMANENT AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) **REPEAL OF EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.**—Section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended by striking subsection (j).

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress the small business strategy required under section 2283 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretary of Defense shall notify the Law Revision Counsel of the House of Representatives of the submission of the strategy so that the Law Revision Counsel may execute the amendment made by paragraph (1).

Page 589, after line 8, insert the following:

(f) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until September 30, 2021, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the Mentor-Protege Program established under section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) that describes—

(1) each mentor-protege agreement entered into under such section, disaggregated by the type of disadvantaged small business concern (as defined in subsection (o) of such section) receiving assistance pursuant to such an agreement;

(2) the type of assistance provided to protege firms (as defined in subsection (o) of such section) under each such agreement;

(3) the benefits provided to mentor firms (as defined in subsection (o) of such section) under each such agreement; and

(4) the progress of protege firms under each such agreement with respect to competing for Federal prime contracts and subcontracts.

AMENDMENT NO. 389 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 882. SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTING CREDIT FOR SUBCONTRACTORS THAT ARE PUERTO RICO BUSINESSES.

Section 15(x)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(x)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “, or a prime contractor awards a subcontract (at any tier) to a subcontractor that is a Puerto Rico business,” after “Puerto Rico business”;

(2) by inserting “or subcontract” after “the contract”; and

(3) by striking “subsection (g)(1)(A)(i)” and inserting “subsection (g)(1)(A)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 390 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle F of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 882. SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTING CREDIT FOR CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESSES LOCATED IN UNITED STATES TERRITORIES.

Section 15(x) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(x)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting “AND COVERED TERRITORY BUSINESSES” after “PUERTO RICO BUSINESSES”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or a covered territory business” after “Puerto Rico business”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **COVERED TERRITORY BUSINESS DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term ‘covered territory business’ means a small business concern that has its principal office located in one of the following:

“(A) The United States Virgin Islands.

“(B) American Samoa.

“(C) Guam.

“(D) The Northern Mariana Islands.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 391 OFFERED BY MRS. WAGNER OF MISSOURI

At the appropriate place in subtitle A of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12. MULTINATIONAL REGIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION CENTER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a briefing on the utility and feasibility of establishing a multinational regional security education center, including as a satellite entity of the Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies that is located in a member country of the Association for Southeast Asian Nations, to offer year-round training and educational courses to Southeast Asian and Indo-Pacific civilian and military security personnel to enhance engagement of territorial and maritime security, transnational and asymmetric threats, and defense sector governance in the Indo-Pacific region. Training may also include English-language training, human rights training, rule of law and legal studies, security governance and institution-building courses, and budget and procurement training.

(b) **ELEMENTS OF BRIEFING.**—The briefing required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the objectives for establishing a multinational regional security center in the region;

(2) the utility and feasibility of establishing such a center, including the benefits and challenges of doing so;

(3) the resources required;

(4) whether alternative centers and programs exist to provide the training and objectives specified in this provision; and

(5) the manner in which such a center would improve and strengthen cooperation with partner countries of the Association for Southeast Asian Nations.

AMENDMENT NO. 392 OFFERED BY MRS. WAGNER OF MISSOURI

At the appropriate place in subtitle A of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12. TRAINING FOR PARTICIPANTS IN PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Any foreign person participating in professional military education programs authorized pursuant to section 541 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347) from funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall also be required to participate in human rights training.

AMENDMENT NO. 393 OFFERED BY MR. WALDEN OF OREGON

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 520. TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO USE AIR FORCE RESERVE COMPONENT PERSONNEL TO PROVIDE TRAINING AND INSTRUCTION REGARDING PILOT TRAINING.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During fiscal year 2020, the Secretary of the Air Force may authorize personnel described in paragraph (2) to provide training and instruction regarding pilot training to the following:

(A) Members of the Armed Forces on active duty.

(B) Members of foreign military forces who are in the United States.

(2) PERSONNEL.—The personnel described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Members of the reserve components of the Air Force on active Guard and Reserve duty (as that term is defined in section 101(d) of title 10, United States Code) who are not otherwise authorized to conduct the training described in paragraph (1) due to the limitations in section 12310 of title 10, United States Code.

(B) Members of the Air Force who are military technicians (dual status) who are not otherwise authorized to conduct the training described in paragraph (1) due to the limitations in section 10216 of title 10, United States Code, and section 709(a) of title 32, United States Code.

(3) LIMITATION.—Not more than 50 members described in paragraph (2) may provide training and instruction under the authority in paragraph (1) at any one time.

(4) FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT.—Members of the uniformed services described in paragraph (2) who provide training and instruction pursuant to the authority in paragraph (1) shall be covered by the Federal Tort Claims Act for purposes of any claim arising from the employment of such individuals under that authority.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth a plan to eliminate shortages in the number of pilot instructors within the Air Force using authorities available to the Secretary under current law.

AMENDMENT NO. 394 OFFERED BY MRS.
WALORSKI OF INDIANA

Page 733, after line 15, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1092. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MILITARY WORKING DOGS AND SOLDIER HANDLERS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the 341st Training Squadron, 37th Training Wing at Lackland Air Force Base provides highly trained military working dogs to the Department of Defense and other government agencies;

(2) in 2010, the operational needs of the Army for military working dogs increased without an increase in resources to train a sufficient number of dogs for the detection of improvised explosive devices at the 341st Training Squadron;

(3) the Army initiated the tactical explosive detection dog program in August 2010 as a nontraditional military working dog program to train and field improvised explosive device detection dogs for use in Afghanistan as part of Operation Enduring Freedom;

(4) the tactical explosive detection dog program was created to reduce casualties from improvised explosive devices in response to an increase in the use of asymmetric weapons by the enemy;

(5) the tactical explosive detection dogs were a unique subset of military working dogs because the Army selected and trained soldiers from deploying units to serve as temporary handlers for only the duration of deployment to Operation Enduring Freedom;

(6) the tactical explosive detection dogs and their soldier handlers, like other military working dog and handler teams, formed

strong bonds while training for combat and performing extremely dangerous improvised explosive device detection missions in service to the United States;

(7) the tactical explosive detection dog program was a nontraditional military working dog program that terminated in February 2014;

(8) at the termination of the tactical explosive detection dog program in February 2014, neither United States law nor Department of Defense policy established an adoption order priority, and Department of Defense policy only provided that military working dogs be adopted by former handlers, law enforcement agencies, and other persons capable of humanely caring for the animals;

(9) an August 2016 report to Congress by the Air Force entitled “Tactical Explosive Detector Dog (TEDD) Adoption Report” concluded that the Army had a limited transition window for the disposition of tactical explosive detection dogs and the lack of a formal comprehensive plan contributed to the disorganized disposition process for the tactical explosive detection dogs;

(10) the August 2016 report stated that, in 2014, the Army disposed of 229 tactical explosive detection dogs;

(11) 40 tactical explosive detection dogs were adopted by handlers, 47 dogs were adopted by private individuals, 70 dogs were transferred to Army units, 17 dogs were transferred to other government agencies, 46 dogs were transferred to law enforcement agencies, and 9 dogs were deceased;

(12) the disposition of tactical explosive detection dogs was poorly executed, proper procedures outlined in Department of Defense policy were ignored, and, as a result, the former soldier handlers were not provided the opportunity to adopt their tactical explosive detection dogs;

(13) the Army should have deliberately planned for the disposition of the tactical explosive detection dogs and provided appropriate time to review and consider adoption applications to mitigate handler and civilian adoption issues;

(14) section 342(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92; 129 Stat. 793) amended section 2583(c) of title 10, United States Code, to modify the list of persons authorized to adopt a military animal and prioritize the list with preference, respectively, to former handlers, other persons capable of humanely caring for the animal, and law enforcement agencies;

(15) since 2000, Congress has passed legislation that protects military working dogs, promotes their welfare, and recognizes the needs of their veteran handlers;

(16) Congress continues to provide oversight of military working dogs to prevent a reoccurrence of the disposition issues that affected tactical explosive detection dogs;

(17) former soldier handlers should be reunited with their tactical explosive detection dogs;

(18) congressional recognition of the military service of tactical explosive detection dogs and their former soldier handlers is a small measure of gratitude this legislative body can convey;

(19) over 4 years have passed since the termination of the tactical explosive detection dog program;

(20) Congressman Walter B. Jones has been a long-time advocate for military working dogs and their handlers;

(21) Congressman Walter B. Jones has worked to ensure that handlers are given priority when their military working dogs reach retirement;

(22) Congressman Walter B. Jones was a strong proponent of the Wounded Warrior Service Dog program, which is a valuable

program that helps wounded members of the Armed Forces manage and recover from post-traumatic stress;

(23) the advocacy of Congressman Walter B. Jones for military working dogs is well known throughout the nonprofiting community that supports military working dogs;

(24) Congressman Walter B. Jones worked with the Department of Defense and the Senate to update the language in the Air Force Manual on Military Working Dogs to clarify that military working dogs are not equipment and to indicate the true level of appreciation and respect the Department of Defense has for these valuable members of the military team;

(25) Congressman Walter B. Jones was the chief legislative sponsor of the Military Working Dog Teams Monument, which was built with no taxpayer dollars but through corporate and private donations; and

(26) with the support of Congressman Walter B. Jones, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) authorized the Burnam Foundation to design, fund, build, and maintain the Military Working Dog Teams National Monument.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress to—

(1) recognize the efforts of Congressman Walter B. Jones to promote military working dogs as unsung heroes on the battlefield and in helping wounded warriors recover from physical and mental injuries;

(2) recognize the service of military working dogs and soldier handlers from the tactical explosive detection dog program;

(3) acknowledge that not all tactical explosive detection dogs were adopted by their former soldier handlers;

(4) encourage the Army and other government agencies, including law enforcement agencies, with former tactical explosive detection dogs to prioritize adoption to former tactical explosive detection dog handlers; and

(5) honor the sacrifices made by tactical explosive detection dogs and their soldier handlers in combat.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chairwoman, I currently have no speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO).

Mr. SPANO. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member THORNBERRY for including amendment No. 341 in the en bloc package.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of amendment No. 341. This bipartisan amendment introduced by Representative SCHNEIDER and me will fully authorize the Boots to Business program, which ensures that our veterans and their spouses receive essential education on how to start and grow their own small businesses.

In the same way that we give our troops the tools that they need for service, we must also prepare our veterans for civilian life. This program has received broad support from many

of our veterans, and I strongly encourage my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to come together in support of this bipartisan amendment and give our veterans the training that they deserve.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chairwoman, I have no speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Chairwoman, I encourage my colleagues to support the en bloc package, as well as the NDAA upon final passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 476, I offer amendments en bloc No. 16.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 16 consisting of amendment Nos. 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 419, 420, 422, 426, 427, and 431 printed in part B of House Report 116–143, offered by Mr. SMITH of Washington:

AMENDMENT NO. 395 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle H of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. INCREASE IN ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for Department of Defense Education Activity, line 410 is hereby increased by \$10,000,000 (with the amount of such increase to be made available for support to local educational agencies that serve military communities and families).

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for procurement, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for shipbuilding and conversion, Navy, ship to shore connector, line 024 is hereby reduced by \$10,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 396 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 293, after line 16, insert the following:

(D) An assessment of the pilot program's minority outreach efforts, participation outcomes, and participation rates for individuals specified under subsection (a).

Page 293, line 17, strike "(D)" and insert "(E)".

AMENDMENT NO. 397 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 96, line 18, strike "and" at the end.

Page 96, line 24, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

Page 96, after line 24, insert the following new paragraph:

(4) ensure that emerging technologies procured and used by the military will be tested, as applicable, for algorithmic bias and discriminatory outcomes.

AMENDMENT NO. 398 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

Page 765, line 12, strike "and".

Page 765, line 16, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 765, after line 16, add the following:

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(9) MONITORING AND EVALUATION MEASURES RELATING TO ASFF.—A description of the monitoring and evaluation measures that the Department of Defense and the Government of Afghanistan are taking to ensure that funds of the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund provided to the Government of Afghanistan as direct government-to-government assistance are not subject to waste, fraud, or abuse."

AMENDMENT NO. 399 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

Page 868, after line 11, insert the following:

(e) ADDITIONAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall include in the materials submitted in support of the budget for fiscal year 2021 that is submitted by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, each of the following:

(1) The amount of funding provided in fiscal year 2019 through the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund to the Government of Afghanistan in the form of direct government-to-government assistance or on-budget assistance for the purposes of supporting any entity of such government, including the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces, the Afghan Ministry of Interior, or the Afghan Ministry of Defense.

(2) The amount of funding provided and anticipated to be provided, as of the date of the submission of the materials, in fiscal year 2020 through such Fund in such form.

(3) To the extent the amount described in paragraph (2) exceeds the amount described in paragraph (1), an explanation as to the reason why the such amount is greater and the specific entities and purposes that were supported by such increase.

AMENDMENT NO. 400 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

At the end of subtitle H of title V, add the following:

SEC. 580a. ASSISTANCE FOR DEPLOYMENT-RELATED SUPPORT OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDERGOING DEPLOYMENT AND THEIR FAMILIES BEYOND THE YELLOW RIBBON RE-INTEGRATION PROGRAM.

Section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (k) and (l) as subsections (l) and (m), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsection (k):

"(k) SUPPORT BEYOND PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide funds to States, Territories, and government entities to carry out programs, and other activities as the Secretary considers appropriate, that provide deployment cycle information, services, and referrals to members of the armed forces, and their families, throughout the deployment cycle. Such programs may include the provision of access to outreach services, including the following:

"(1) Employment counseling.

"(2) Behavioral health counseling.

"(3) Suicide prevention.

"(4) Housing advocacy.

"(5) Financial counseling.

"(6) Referrals for the receipt of other related services."

AMENDMENT NO. 401 OFFERED BY MS. WEXTON OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle B of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 1614. REPORT ON POTENTIAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION MILITARY TRANSITION PROGRAM.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report assessing the feasibility of establishing a Defense Intelligence Polygraph Examination Military Transition Program for members of the Armed Forces transitioning to civilian employment.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A review of the feasibility of establishing a program in the Department of Defense under which members of the Armed Forces with an active top secret security clearance that provides for access to sensitive compartmented information and a current counterintelligence scope polygraph examination can be provided an opportunity to obtain an expanded scope polygraph (ESP) if the member receives a written offer of employment, subject to suitability or security vetting, with an element of the intelligence community or a contractor of such an element.

(2) The cost to the Department of Defense for implementing such program and whether such cost could be shared by other departments or agencies of the Federal Government or the private sector.

(3) The factors the Department needs to consider in determining whether such program would be viable.

(4) The obstacles that exist in implementing such program.

(5) Whether such a program could increase workforce diversity in the intelligence community.

(6) Whether such a program could increase or decrease retention among members of the Armed Forces serving in defense intelligence roles.

(7) Whether any changes are required to be made to policies of the Department or to Federal law to implement such a program.

(8) Identification of the current average length of time in the intelligence community to investigate and adjudicate an initial and a periodic update top secret security clearance that provides for access to sensitive compartmented information and conduct an expanded scope polygraph.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 402 OFFERED BY MS. WILD OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 7. PARTNERSHIPS WITH ACADEMIC HEALTH CENTERS.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs shall establish a University Affiliated Research Center and partner with Academic Health Centers to focus on the unique challenges wounded members of the Armed Forces experience. In carrying out this section, the Assistant Secretary shall emphasize research that reduces dependency on opioids, develops novel pain management and mental health strategies, and leverages

partnerships with industry and medical device manufacturers to advance promising technologies for wounded members.

AMENDMENT NO. 403 OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN
OF VIRGINIA

At the end of title XXXV, add the following new subtitle:

Subtitle C—Cable Security Fleet

SEC. 3521. ESTABLISHMENT OF CABLE SECURITY FLEET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting before chapter 533 the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 532—CABLE SECURITY FLEET

“Sec.

“53201. Definitions.

“53202. Establishment of the Cable Security Fleet.

“53203. Award of operating agreements.

“53204. Effectiveness of operating agreements.

“53205. Obligations and rights under operating agreements.

“53206. Payments.

“53207. National security requirements.

“53208. Regulatory relief.

“53209. Authorization of appropriations.

“§ 53201. Definitions

“In this chapter:

“(1) CABLE SERVICES.—The term ‘cable services’ means the installation, maintenance, or repair of submarine cables and related equipment, and related cable vessel operations.

“(2) CABLE VESSEL.—The term ‘cable vessel’ means a vessel—

“(A) classed as a cable ship or cable vessel by, and designed in accordance with the rules of, the American Bureau of Shipping, or another classification society accepted by the Secretary; and

“(B) capable of installing, maintaining, and repairing submarine cables.

“(3) CABLE FLEET.—The term ‘Cable Fleet’ means the Cable Security Fleet established under section 53202(a).

“(4) CONTINGENCY AGREEMENT.—The term ‘Contingency Agreement’ means the agreement required by section 53207.

“(5) CONTRACTOR.—The term ‘Contractor’ means an owner or operator of a vessel that enters into an Operating Agreement for a cable vessel with the Secretary under section 53203.

“(6) FISCAL YEAR.—The term ‘fiscal year’ means any annual period beginning on October 1 and ending on September 30.

“(7) OPERATING AGENCY.—The term ‘Operating Agency’ means that agency or component of the Department of Defense so designated by the Secretary of Defense under this chapter.

“(8) OPERATING AGREEMENT OR AGREEMENT.—The terms ‘Operating Agreement’ or ‘Agreement’ mean the agreement required by section 53203.

“(9) PERSON.—The term ‘person’ includes corporations, partnerships, and associations existing under or authorized by the laws of the United States, or any State, Territory, District, or possession thereof, or of any foreign country.

“(10) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Transportation.

“(11) UNITED STATES.—The term ‘United States’ includes the States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

“(12) UNITED STATES CITIZEN TRUST.—

“(A) Subject to paragraph (C), the term ‘United States citizen trust’ means a trust that is qualified under this paragraph.

“(B) A trust is qualified under this paragraph with respect to a vessel only if—

“(i) it was created under the laws of a state of the United States;

“(ii) each of the trustees is a citizen of the United States; and

“(iii) the application for documentation of the vessel under chapter 121 of this title includes the affidavit of each trustee stating that the trustee is not aware of any reason involving a beneficiary of the trust that is not a citizen of the United States, or involving any other person that is not a citizen of the United States, as a result of which the beneficiary or other person would hold more than 25 percent of the aggregate power to influence, or limit the exercise of the authority of, the trustee with respect to matters involving any ownership or operation of the vessel that may adversely affect the interests of the United States.

“(C) If any person that is not a citizen of the United States has authority to direct, or participate in directing, the trustee for a trust in matters involving any ownership or operation of the vessel that may adversely affect the interests of the United States or in removing a trustee for a trust without cause, either directly or indirectly through the control of another person, the trust is not qualified under this paragraph unless the trust instrument provides that persons who are not citizens of the United States may not hold more than 25 percent of the aggregate authority to direct or remove a trustee.

“(D) This paragraph shall not be considered to prohibit a person who is not a citizen of the United States from holding more than 25 percent of the beneficial interest in a trust.

“§ 53202. Establishment of the Cable Security Fleet

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) The Secretary, in consultation with the Operating Agency, shall establish a fleet of active, commercially viable, cable vessels to meet national security requirements. The fleet shall consist of privately owned, United States-documented cable vessels for which there are in effect Operating Agreements under this chapter, and shall be known as the Cable Security Fleet.

“(2) The Fleet described under this section shall include two vessels.

“(b) VESSEL ELIGIBILITY.—A cable vessel is eligible to be included in the Fleet if—

“(1) the vessel meets the requirements of paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (c);

“(2) the vessel is operated (or in the case of a vessel to be constructed, will be operated) in commercial service providing cable services;

“(3) the vessel is 40 years of age or less on the date the vessel is included in the Fleet;

“(4) the vessel is—

“(A) determined by the Operating Agency to be suitable for engaging in cable services by the United States in the interest of national security; and

“(B) determined by the Secretary to be commercially viable, whether independently or taking any payments which are the consequence of participation in the Cable Fleet into account; and

“(5) the vessel—

“(A) is a United States-documented vessel; or

“(B) is not a United States-documented vessel, but—

“(i) the owner of the vessel has demonstrated an intent to have the vessel documented under chapter 121 of this title if it is included in the Cable Fleet; and

“(ii) at the time an Operating Agreement is entered into under this chapter, the vessel is eligible for documentation under chapter 121 of this title.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS REGARDING CITIZENSHIP OF OWNERS AND OPERATORS.—

“(1) VESSELS OWNED AND OPERATED BY SECTION 50501 CITIZENS.—A vessel meets the re-

quirements of this paragraph if, during the period of an Operating Agreement under this chapter that applies to the vessel, the vessel will be owned and operated by one or more persons that are citizens of the United States under section 50501 of this title.

“(2) VESSELS OWNED BY A SECTION 50501 CITIZEN, OR UNITED STATES CITIZEN TRUST, AND CHARTERED TO A DOCUMENTATION CITIZEN.—A vessel meets the requirements of this paragraph if—

“(A) during the period of an Operating Agreement under this chapter that applies to the vessel, the vessel will be—

“(i) owned by a person that is a citizen of the United States under section 50501 of this title or that is a United States citizen trust; and

“(ii) demise chartered to and operated by a person—

“(I) that is eligible to document the vessel under chapter 121 of this title;

“(II) the chairman of the board of directors, chief executive officer, and a majority of the members of the board of directors of which are citizens of the United States under section 50501 of this title, and are appointed and subject to removal only upon approval by the Secretary; and

“(III) that certifies to the Secretary that there are no treaties, statutes, regulations, or other laws that would prohibit the Contractor for the vessel from performing its obligations under an Operating Agreement under this chapter;

“(B) in the case of a vessel that will be demise chartered to a person that is owned or controlled by another person that is not a citizen of the United States under section 50501 of this title, the other person enters into an agreement with the Secretary not to influence the operation of the vessel in a manner that will adversely affect the interests of the United States; and

“(C) the Secretary and the Operating Agency notify the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives that they concur, and have reviewed the certification required under subparagraph (A)(ii)(III) and determined that there are no legal, operational, or other impediments that would prohibit the Contractor for the vessel from performing its obligations under an Operating Agreement under this chapter.

“(3) VESSEL OWNED AND OPERATED BY A DEFENSE CONTRACTOR.—A vessel meets the requirements of this paragraph if—

“(A) during the period of an Operating Agreement under this chapter that applies to the vessel, the vessel will be owned and operated by a person that—

“(i) is eligible to document a vessel under chapter 121 of this title;

“(ii) operates or manages other United States-documented vessels for the Secretary of Defense, or charters other vessels to the Secretary of Defense;

“(iii) has entered into a special security agreement for purposes of this paragraph with the Secretary of Defense;

“(iv) makes the certification described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii)(III); and

“(v) in the case of a vessel described in paragraph (2)(B), enters into an agreement referred to in that paragraph; and

“(B) the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense notify the Committee on Armed Services and Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives that they have reviewed the certification required by subparagraph (A)(iv) and determined that there are no other legal, operational, or other impediments that would prohibit the Contractor for

the vessel from performing its obligations under an Operating Agreement under this chapter.

“(4) VESSEL OWNED BY A DOCUMENTATION CITIZEN AND CHARTERED TO A SECTION 50501 CITIZEN.—A vessel meets the requirements of this paragraph if, during the period of an Operating Agreement under this chapter that applies to the vessel, the vessel will be—

“(A) owned by a person that is eligible to document a vessel under chapter 121 of this title; and

“(B) demise chartered to a person that is a citizen of the United States under section 50501 of this title.

“(d) VESSEL STANDARDS.—

“(1) CERTIFICATE OF INSPECTION.—A cable vessel which the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating determines meets the criteria of subsection (b) of this section but which, on the date of enactment of the Act, is not documented under chapter 121 of this title, shall be eligible for a certificate of inspection if that Secretary determines that—

“(A) the vessel is classed by, and designed in accordance with the rules of, the American Bureau of Shipping, or another classification society accepted by that Secretary;

“(B) the vessel complies with applicable international agreements and associated guidelines, as determined by the country in which the vessel was documented immediately before becoming documented under chapter 121; and

“(C) that country has not been identified by that Secretary as inadequately enforcing international vessel regulations as to that vessel.

“(2) CONTINUED ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTIFICATE.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to a vessel after any date on which the vessel fails to comply with the applicable international agreements and associated guidelines referred to in paragraph (1)(B).

“(3) RELIANCE ON CLASSIFICATION SOCIETY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may rely on a certification from the American Bureau of Shipping or, subject to subparagraph (B), another classification society accepted by that Secretary to establish that a vessel is in compliance with the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2).

“(B) FOREIGN CLASSIFICATION SOCIETY.—The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may accept certification from a foreign classification society under subparagraph (A) only—

“(i) to the extent that the government of the foreign country in which the society is headquartered provides access on a reciprocal basis to the American Bureau of Shipping; and

“(ii) if the foreign classification society has offices and maintains records in the United States.

“(e) WAIVER OF AGE REGISTRATION.—The Secretary, in conjunction with the Operating Agency, may waive the application of the age restriction under subsection (b)(3) if they jointly determine that the waiver—

“(1) is in the national interest;

“(2) the subject cable vessel and any associated operating network is and will continue to be economically viable; and

“(3) is necessary due to the lack of availability of other vessels and operators that comply with the requirements of this chapter.

“§ 53203. Award of operating agreements

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require, as a condition of including any vessel in the Cable Fleet, that the person that is the owner or operator of the vessel for purposes of section 53202(c) enter into an Operating Agreement with the Secretary under this section.

“(b) PROCEDURE FOR APPLICATIONS.—

“(1) ACCEPTANCE OF APPLICATIONS.—Beginning no later than 60 days after the effective date of this chapter, the Secretary shall accept applications for enrollment of vessels in the Cable Fleet.

“(2) ACTION ON APPLICATIONS.—Within 120 days after receipt of an application for enrollment of a vessel in the Cable Fleet, the Secretary shall approve the application in conjunction with the Operating Agency, and shall enter into an Operating Agreement with the applicant, or provide in writing the reason for denial of that application.

“(c) PRIORITY FOR AWARDED AGREEMENTS.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall enter into Operating Agreements with those vessels determined by the Operating Agency, in its sole discretion, to best meet the national security requirements of the United States. After consideration of national security requirements, priority shall be given to an applicant that is a United States citizen under section 50501 of this title.

“§ 53204. Effectiveness of operating agreements

“(a) EFFECTIVENESS GENERALLY.—The Secretary may enter into an Operating Agreement under this chapter for fiscal year 2021. Except as provided in subsection (d), the agreement shall be effective only for one fiscal year, but shall be renewable, subject to available appropriations, for each subsequent year.

“(b) VESSELS UNDER CHARTER TO THE UNITED STATES.—Vessels under charter to the United States are eligible to receive payments pursuant to their Operating Agreements.

“(c) TERMINATION.—

“(1) TERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.—If the Contractor with respect to an Operating Agreement materially fails to comply with the terms of the Agreement—

“(A) the Secretary shall notify the Contractor and provide a reasonable opportunity for it to comply with the Operating Agreement;

“(B) the Secretary shall terminate the Operating Agreement if the Contractor fails to achieve such compliance; and

“(C) upon such termination, any funds obligated by the Agreement shall be available to the Secretary to carry out this chapter.

“(2) EARLY TERMINATION BY A CONTRACTOR.—An Operating Agreement under this chapter shall terminate on a date specified by the Contractor if the Contractor notifies the Secretary, not fewer than 60 days prior to the effective date of the termination, that the Contractor intends to terminate the Agreement.

“(d) NONRENEWAL FOR LACK OF FUNDS.—If, by the first day of a fiscal year, sufficient funds have not been appropriated under the authority provided by this chapter for that fiscal year for all Operating Agreements, then the Secretary shall notify the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives that Operating Agreements authorized under this chapter for which sufficient funds are not available will not be renewed for that fiscal year if sufficient funds are not appropriated by the 60th day of that fiscal year. If only partial funding is appropriated by the 60th day of such fiscal year, then the Secretary, in consultation with the Operating Agency, shall select the vessels to retain under Operating Agreements, based on their determinations of which vessels are most useful for national security. In the event that no funds are appropriated, then no Operating Agreements shall be renewed and

each Contractor shall be released from its obligations under the Operating Agreement. Final payments under an Operating Agreement that is not renewed shall be made in accordance with section 53206. To the extent that sufficient funds are appropriated in a subsequent fiscal year, an Operating Agreement that has not been renewed pursuant to this subsection may be reinstated if mutually acceptable to the Secretary, in consultation with the Operating Agency, and the Contractor, provided the vessel remains eligible for participation pursuant to section 53202, without regard to subsection 53202(b)(3).

“(e) RELEASE OF VESSELS FROM OBLIGATIONS.—If funds are not appropriated for payments under an Operating Agreement under this chapter for any fiscal year by the 60th day of a fiscal year, and the Secretary, in consultation with the Operating Agency determines to not renew a Contractor's Operating Agreement for a vessel, then—

“(1) each vessel covered by the Operating Agreement that is not renewed is thereby released from any further obligation under the Operating Agreement;

“(2) the owner or operator of the vessel whose Operating Agreement was not renewed may transfer and register such vessel under a foreign registry that is acceptable to the Secretary and the Operating Agency, notwithstanding section 56101 of this title; and

“(3) if chapter 563 of this title is applicable to such vessel after registration, then the vessel is available to be requisitioned by the Secretary pursuant to chapter 563.

“§ 53205. Obligations and rights under operating agreements

“(a) OPERATION OF VESSEL.—An Operating Agreement under this chapter shall require that, during the period the vessel is operating under the Agreement, the vessel—

“(1) shall be operated in the trade for Cable Services, or under a charter to the United States; and

“(2) shall be documented under chapter 121 of this title.

“(b) ANNUAL PAYMENTS BY THE SECRETARY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An Operating Agreement under this chapter shall require, subject to the availability of appropriations, that the Secretary make payment to the Contractor in accordance with section 53206.

“(2) OPERATING AGREEMENT IS AN OBLIGATION OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.—An Operating Agreement under this chapter constitutes a contractual obligation of the United States Government to pay the amounts provided for in the Operating Agreement to the extent of actual appropriations.

“(c) DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENT.—Each vessel covered by an Operating Agreement (including an Agreement terminated under section 53204(c)(2)) shall remain documented under chapter 121 of this title, until the date the Operating Agreement would terminate according to its own terms.

“(d) NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A Contractor with respect to an Operating Agreement (including an Agreement terminated under section 53204(c)(2)) shall continue to be bound by the provisions of section 53207 until the date the Operating Agreement would terminate according to its terms.

“(2) CONTINGENCY AGREEMENT WITH OPERATING AGENCY.—All terms and conditions of a Contingency Agreement entered into under section 53207 shall remain in effect until a date the Operating Agreement would terminate according to its terms, except that the terms of such Contingency Agreement may be modified by the mutual consent of the Contractor, and the Operating Agency.

“(e) TRANSFER OF OPERATING AGREEMENTS.—Operating Agreements shall not be transferrable by the Contractor.

“(f) REPLACEMENT VESSEL.—A Contractor may replace a vessel under an Operating Agreement with another vessel that is eligible to be included in the Fleet under section 53202(b), if the Secretary and the Operating Agency jointly determine that the replacement vessel meets national security requirements and approve the replacement.

“§ 53206. Payments

“(a) ANNUAL PAYMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, subject to availability of appropriations and other provisions of this section, shall pay to the Contractor for an operating agreement, for each vessel that is covered by the operating agreement, an amount equal to \$5,000,000 for each fiscal year 2021 through 2035.

“(2) TIMING.—This amount shall be paid in equal monthly installments at the end of each month. The amount shall not be reduced except as provided by this section.

“(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED FOR PAYMENT.—As a condition of receiving payment under this section for a fiscal year for a vessel, the Contractor for the vessel shall certify that the vessel has been and will be operated in accordance with section 53205(a)(1) for 365 days in each fiscal year. Up to thirty (30) days during which the vessel is drydocked, surveyed, inspected, or repaired shall be considered days of operation for purposes of this subsection.

“(c) GENERAL LIMITATIONS.—The Secretary shall not make any payment under this chapter for a vessel with respect to any days for which the vessel is—

“(1) not operated or maintained in accordance with an Operating Agreement under this chapter; or

“(2) more than 40 years of age.

“(d) REDUCTIONS IN PAYMENTS.—With respect to payments under this chapter for a vessel covered by an Operating Agreement, the Secretary shall make a pro rata reduction for each day less than 365 in a fiscal year that the vessel is not operated in accordance with section 53205(a)(1), with days during which the vessel is drydocked or undergoing survey, inspection or repair to be considered days on which the vessel is operated as provided in subsection (b).

“§ 53207. National security requirements

“(a) CONTINGENCY AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall include in each Operating Agreement under this chapter a requirement that the Contractor enter into a Contingency Agreement with the Operating Agency. The Operating Agency shall negotiate and enter into a Contingency Agreement with each Contractor as promptly as practicable after the Contractor has entered into an Operating Agreement under this chapter.

“(b) TERMS OF CONTINGENCY AGREEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A Contingency Agreement under this section shall require that a Contractor for a vessel covered by an Operating Agreement under this chapter make the vessel, including all necessary resources to engage in Cable Services required by the Operating Agency, available upon request by the Operating Agency.

“(2) TERMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The basic terms of a Contingency Agreement shall be established (subject to subparagraph (B)) by the Operating Agency.

“(B) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The Operating Agency and a Contractor may agree to additional or modifying terms appropriate to the Contractor’s circumstances.

“(c) DEFENSE MEASURES AGAINST UNAUTHORIZED SEIZURES.—

“(1) The Contingency Agreement shall require that any vessel operating under the di-

rection of the Operating Agency operating in area that is designated by the Coast Guard as an area of high risk of piracy shall be equipped with, at a minimum, appropriate non-lethal defense measures to protect the vessel and crew from unauthorized seizure at sea.

“(2) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall jointly prescribe the non-lethal defense measures that are required under this paragraph.

“(d) PARTICIPATION AFTER EXPIRATION OF OPERATING AGREEMENT.—Except as provided by section 53205(d), the Operating Agency may not require, through a Contingency Agreement or an Operating Agreement, that a Contractor continue to participate in a Contingency Agreement after the Operating Agreement with the Contractor has expired according to its terms or is otherwise no longer in effect.

“(e) RESOURCES MADE AVAILABLE.—The resources to be made available in addition to the vessel under a Contingency Agreement shall include all equipment, personnel, supplies, management services, and other related services as the Operating Agency may determine to be necessary to provide the Cable Services required by the Operating Agency.

“(f) COMPENSATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Operating Agency shall include in each Contingency Agreement provisions under which the Operating Agency shall pay fair and reasonable compensation for use of the vessel and all Cable Services provided pursuant to this section and the Contingency Agreement.

“(2) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—Compensation under this subsection—

“(A) shall be at the rate specified in the Contingency Agreement;

“(B) shall be provided from the time that a vessel is required by the Operating Agency under the Contingency Agreement until the time it is made available by the Operating Agency available to reenter commercial service; and

“(C) shall be in addition to and shall not in any way reflect amounts payable under section 53206.

“(g) LIABILITY OF THE UNITED STATES FOR DAMAGES.—

“(1) LIMITATION ON THE LIABILITY OF THE U.S.—Except as otherwise provided by law, the Government shall not be liable for disruption of a Contractor’s commercial business or other consequential damages to a Contractor arising from the activation of the Contingency Agreement.

“(2) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.—In any action in any Federal or State court for breach of third-party contract, there shall be available as an affirmative defense that the alleged breach of contract was caused predominantly by action taken to carry out a Contingent Agreement. Such defense shall not release the party asserting it from any obligation under applicable law to mitigate damages to the greatest extent possible.

“§ 53208. Regulatory relief

“(a) APPLICABILITY OF COASTWISE LAWS.—A vessel covered by an Operating Agreement that is operating pursuant to a Contingency Agreement, shall not be subject to the coastwise laws (46 U.S.C. 55101, et seq.).

“(b) TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT.—The telecommunications and other electronic equipment on an existing vessel that is redocumented under the laws of the United States for operation under an Operating Agreement under this chapter shall be deemed to satisfy all Federal Communication Commission equipment certification requirements, if—

“(1) such equipment complies with all applicable international agreements and asso-

ciated guidelines as determined by the country in which the vessel was documented immediately before becoming documented under the laws of the United States;

“(2) that country has not been identified by the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating as inadequately enforcing international regulations as to that vessel; and

“(3) at the end of its useful life, such equipment shall be replaced with equipment that meets Federal Communication Commission equipment certification standards.

“§ 53209. Authorization of appropriations

“There are authorized to be appropriated for payments under section 53206, \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2035.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters at the beginning of subtitle V of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the item relating to chapter 533 the following new item:

“532. Cable Security Fleet 53201”.

AMENDMENT NO. 404 OFFERED BY MR. YOHO OF FLORIDA

Page 476, strike line 5 through line 12.

Page 476, line 13, strike “(c)” and insert “(b)”.

Page 476, line 16, strike “that” and insert “that—”.

Page 476, line 16, strike “the operation” and all that follows through “United States.” on line 17 and insert the following:

(1) the operation or procurement is required in the national interest of the United States;

(2) counter-UAS surrogate testing and training; or

(3) intelligence, electronic warfare, and information warfare operations, testing, analysis, and training.

Page 476, line 13, strike “(d)” and insert “(c)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 405 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

At the end of subtitle H of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10 . . . DESIGNATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STRATEGIC ARCTIC PORTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Arctic is a region of strategic importance to the national security interests of the United States and the Department of Defense must better align its presence, force posture, and capabilities to meet the growing array of challenges in the region; and

(2) although much progress has been made to increase awareness of Arctic issues and to promote increased presence in the region, additional measures, including the designation of one or more strategic Arctic ports, are needed to show the commitment of the United States to this emerging strategic choke point of future great power competition.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Commanding General of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and the Administrator of the Maritime Administration, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report evaluating potential sites for one or more strategic ports in the Arctic.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Consistent with the updated military strategy for the protection of United States national security interests in the Arctic region set forth in the report required under section 1071 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019

(Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 992), the report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an evaluation of the amount of sufficient and suitable space needed to create capacity for port and other necessary infrastructure for at least one of each of type of Navy or Coast Guard vessel, including an Arleigh Burke class destroyer of the Navy, a national security cutter, and a heavy polar ice breaker of the Coast Guard;

(B) an evaluation of the amount of sufficient and suitable space needed to create capacity for equipment and fuel storage, technological infrastructure, and civil infrastructure to support military and civilian operations, including—

- (i) aerospace warning;
- (ii) maritime surface and subsurface warning;
- (iii) maritime control and defense;
- (iv) maritime domain awareness;
- (v) homeland defense;
- (vi) defense support to civil authorities;
- (vii) humanitarian relief;
- (viii) search and rescue;
- (ix) disaster relief;
- (x) oil spill response;
- (xi) medical stabilization and evacuation; and
- (xii) meteorological measurements and forecasting;

(C) an identification of proximity and road access required to an airport designated as a commercial service airport by the Federal Aviation Administration that is capable of supporting military and civilian aircraft for operations designated in subparagraph (B);

(D) a description of the requirements, to include infrastructure and installations, communications, and logistics necessary to improve response effectiveness to support military and civilian operations described in subparagraph (B);

(E) an identification of the sites that the Secretary recommends as potential sites for designation as Department of Defense Strategic Arctic Ports;

(F) the estimated cost of sufficient construction necessary to initiate and sustain expected operations at such sites; and

(G) such other information as the Secretary deems relevant.

(c) DESIGNATION OF STRATEGIC ARCTIC PORTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the report required under subsection (b) is submitted, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Commanding General of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and the Administrator of the Maritime Administration, may designate one or more ports as Department of Defense Strategic Arctic Ports from the sites identified under subsection (b)(2)(E).

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize any additional appropriations for the Department of Defense for the establishment of any port designated pursuant to this section.

(e) ARCTIC DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Arctic” has the meaning given that term in section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111).

AMENDMENT NO. 406 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

At the end of subtitle G of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. PLAN TO INCREASE AND EXPAND COLD WEATHER TRAINING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The strategic importance of the Arctic continues to increase as the United States and other countries recognize the military and economic importance of the region. However, the operational capabilities of the

United States Armed Forces in extreme cold weather or Arctic environments have atrophied when compared to regional adversaries.

(2) The 2018 national defense strategy stated “The central challenge to U.S. prosperity and security is the reemergence of long-term, strategic competition by what the National Security Strategy classifies as revisionist powers.”

(3) The Government of the Russian Federation—

(A) has made significant military investments in the Arctic, including the creation of an Arctic Command, the Northern Fleet Joint Strategic Command;

(B) has emplaced an Air Defense Missile Regiment throughout the Arctic;

(C) has invested in the construction or refurbishment of 16 deepwater ports and 14 airfields in the region and has conducted significant military exercises.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Arctic is a region of strategic importance to the national security interests of the United States and the Department of the Army must increase and expand its cold weather training capabilities to ensure that United States Armed Forces can operate in Arctic conditions necessary to compete against a near peer adversary and to execute the national defense strategy of the United States.

(c) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army shall—

(1) conduct an assessment of cold weather training requirements in light of increased operations and vulnerability to great power competition in the Arctic; and

(2) develop a plan to increase and expand cold weather training opportunities.

(d) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the assessment and developing the plan as required under subsection (c), the Secretary shall—

(1) assess all existing cold weather training requirements to include requirements for extreme cold, or Arctic conditions;

(2) identify capability gaps in confronting adversaries in the Arctic that can be addressed by increased and improved training;

(3) make recommendations for strengthening and improving those training requirements and mitigation measures needed to address the capabilities gaps necessary to confront adversaries;

(4) assess existing cold weather training sites;

(5) consider steps necessary to increase student capacity at such sites;

(6) consider manpower and supply requirements, including cadre needed to support increased student capacity; and

(7) address any other matters the Secretary of the Army considers relevant.

(e) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives the plan required by subsection (c).

AMENDMENT NO. 407 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . CHINESE FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT IN COUNTRIES OF THE ARCTIC REGION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) China is projecting a physical presence in the Arctic through upgrading to advanced icebreakers, utilizing the Arctic Ocean more regularly through subsidizing arctic shipping, deploying unmanned ice stations, and engaging in large and sophisticated data collection efforts in countries of the Arctic re-

gion, including Iceland, Greenland, and Canada.

(2) The 2017 Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) report “Unconstrained Foreign Direct Investment: An Emerging Challenge to Arctic Security” concluded that China has been actively engaged in economies of countries of the Arctic region.

(3) The CNA report documented a pattern of strategic investment by China in the economies of countries of the Arctic region, including the United States, Canada, Greenland, Iceland, Norway, and Russia, in areas such as raw land, oil and gas, minerals, and infrastructure.

(4) Chinese investments in countries of the Arctic region are significant. For instance, Chinese foreign direct investment constituted nearly 12 percent of Greenland’s gross domestic product for the period from 2012 to 2017.

(5) China’s 2018 Arctic Policy White Paper documented the Chinese intent to create a “Polar Silk Road” in the Arctic.

(6) China’s “Polar Silk Road” is an extension of China’s Belt and Road Initiative (BRI).

(7) China is increasingly using the BRI as the impetus for increasing People’s Liberation Army deployments to regions where China has significant investments, primarily through BRI.

(8) China has demonstrated an interest in using BRI to gain military access to strategic regions.

(9) Understanding how China’s foreign direct investment in countries of the Arctic region affects such countries is critical to understanding the degree to which China is able to access the region.

(b) INDEPENDENT STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall seek to enter into a contract with a federally-funded research and development center described in paragraph (2) to complete an independent study of Chinese foreign direct investment in countries of the Arctic region, with a focus on the effects of such foreign direct investment on United States national security and near-peer competition in the Arctic region.

(2) FEDERALLY-FUNDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER DESCRIBED.—A federally-funded research and development center described in this paragraph is a federally-funded research and development center that—

(A) has access to relevant data and demonstrated data-sets regarding foreign direct investment in the Arctic region; and

(B) has access to policy experts throughout the United States and the Arctic region.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The study required by subsection (b) shall include the following:

(1) Projects in the Arctic that are directly or indirectly funded by public and private Chinese entities, to—

(A) build public infrastructure;

(B) finance of infrastructure;

(C) lease mineral and oil and gas leases;

(D) purchase real estate;

(E) extract or process, including smelting, minerals and oil and gas;

(F) engage in shipping or to own and operate or construct shipping infrastructure, including ship construction;

(G) lay undersea cables; and

(H) manufacture, own or operate telecommunications capabilities and infrastructure.

(2) An analysis the legal environment in which Chinese foreign direct investment are occurring in the United States, Russia, Canada, Greenland, Norway, and Iceland. The analysis should include—

(A) an assessment of the efficacy of mechanisms for screening foreign direct investment in the United States, Russia, Canada, Greenland, Norway, and Iceland;

(B) an assessment of the degree to which there is transparency in Chinese foreign direct investment in countries of the Arctic region;

(C) an assessment of the criteria used to assess potential Chinese foreign direct investment in countries of the Arctic region;

(D) an assessment of the efficacy of methods for monitoring approved Chinese foreign direct investment in countries of the Arctic region; and

(E) an assessment of public reporting of the decision to approve such Chinese foreign direct investment.

(3) A comparison of Chinese foreign direct investment in countries of the Arctic region to other countries with major investments in such countries, including India, Japan, South Korea, the Netherlands, and France.

(4) An assessment of the environmental impact of past Chinese investments in oil and gas, mineral, and infrastructure projects in the Arctic region, including the degree to which Chinese investors are required to comply with local environmental laws and post bonds to assure remediation if a project becomes bankrupt.

(5) A review of the 2018 Chinese Arctic Policy and other relevant public and nonpublic Chinese policy documents to determine the following:

(A) China's strategic objectives in the Arctic region from a military, economic, territorial, and political perspective.

(B) China's goals in the Arctic region with respect to its relations with the United States and Russia, including the degree to which activities of China in the region are an extension of China's strategic competition with the United States.

(C) Whether any active or planned infrastructure investments are likely to result in a regular presence of Chinese military vessels or the establishment of military bases in the Arctic region.

(D) The extent to which Chinese research activities in the Arctic region are a front for economic activities, including illegal economic espionage, intelligence gathering, and support for future Chinese military activities in the region.

(E) The degree to which Arctic littoral states are susceptible to the political and economic risks of unregulated foreign direct investment.

(F) The vulnerability of semi-autonomous regions, such as tribal lands, to Chinese foreign direct investment, including the influence of legal controls and political or economic manipulation with respect to such vulnerability.

(G) The implications of China's Arctic development and participation model with respect to forecasting China's military, economy, territorial, and political activities.

(6) Policy and legislative recommendations to enhance the position of the United States in affairs of the Arctic region, including—

(A) recommendations for how the United States would best interact with nongovernmental organizations such as the World Bank, Arctic Council, United Nations General Assembly, and International Maritime Organization;

(B) recommendation to pursue or not pursue the formation of an Arctic Development Bank and, if pursued, how to organize, fund, and operate the bank;

(C) measures the United States can take to promote regional governance and eliminate the soft-power influence from Chinese foreign direct investment, in particular, steps where the United States and Russia should cooperate; and

(D) the possibility of negotiating a regional arrangement to regulate foreign direct investment in countries of the Arctic region.

(d) REPORT TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—Not later than 720 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the federally-funded research and development center with respect to which the Secretary of Defense has entered into a contract under subsection (b) shall submit to the Secretary a report containing the study under subsections (b) and (c).

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 750 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the report under subsection (d), without change.

(f) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 408 OFFERED BY MR. MCCARTHY OF CALIFORNIA

In section 232, redesignate subsections (b) through (e) as subsections (c) through (f), respectively.

In section 232, insert after subsection (a) the following:

(b) EARTHQUAKE-DAMAGED INFRASTRUCTURE RESTORATION MASTER PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any base damaged by the July 2019 earthquakes within the R-2508 Special Use Airspace Complex (including U.S. Air Force Plant 42), the Secretary of Defense shall complete and submit to the congressional defense committees the master plan required by subsection (a), by not later than October 1, 2019. If additional funding is required to repair or improve the installations' research, development, test, evaluation, training, and related infrastructure to a modern standard as a result of damage caused by the earthquakes, the request for funding shall be made in either a disaster or supplemental appropriations request to Congress or the Secretary of Defense shall include the request for funding in the annual budget submission of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, whichever comes first. The request for additional funding may be included in both requests if appropriate.

(2) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(A) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(i) the military installations located within the R-2508 Special Use Airspace Complex, including Edwards Air Force Base, Fort Irwin, and Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, are national assets of critical importance to our country's defense system;

(ii) the R-2508 Special Use Airspace Complex is comprised of all airspace and associated land used and managed by the 412 Test Wing at Edwards Air Force Base, the National Training Center at Fort Irwin, and the Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division at China Lake, California;

(iii) the essential research, development, test, and evaluation missions conducted at Edwards Air Force Base and Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, along with the critical combat preparation training conducted at Fort Irwin, make these installations vital cornerstones within our National Defense architecture integrating all operational domains, air, land, sea, space, and cyberspace;

(iv) any damage to these military installations caused by the earthquakes and the neg-

ative impact on the installations' missions as a result are a cause for concern;

(v) the proud men and women, both in uniform and their civilian counterparts, who work at these military installations develop, test, and evaluate the best tools and impart the training needed for our warfighters, so that our military remains second to none;

(vi) in light of the earthquakes in July 2019, the Secretary of Defense should reprogram or marshal, to the fullest extent the law allows, all available resources that are necessary and appropriate to ensure—

(I) the safety and security of the base employees, both civilian and those in uniform, including those who have been evacuated;

(II) the bases are mission capable; and

(III) that all the damage caused by any earthquake is repaired and improved as expeditiously as possible.

(B) POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States, when planning or making repairs on military installations damaged by natural disasters, the current and future requirements of these military installations, as identified in the National Defense Strategy, shall, to the fullest extent practical, be made.

Page 1052, line 13, strike “Pursuant to” and insert the following:

(a) NAVY AUTHORIZATION.—Subject to subsection (c), pursuant to

Page 1052, after the table insert the following:

(b) AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—In addition to the projects authorized under subsection (a) and subject to subsection (c), pursuant to section 2802 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may carry out military construction projects, including planning and design related to military construction projects, at facilities damaged by earthquakes or other natural disasters in 2019, in the amount of \$100,000,000.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED AS A CONDITION OF AUTHORIZATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report containing a plan to carry out the military construction projects authorized by this section. The plan shall include an explanation of how each military construction project will incorporate mitigation measures that reduce the threat from natural disasters, including a list of any areas in which there is a variance from the local building requirements and an explanation of the reason for the variance. The plan shall also include a Department of Defense Form 1391 for each proposed project. The Secretary may not commence a project until the report required from the Secretary has been submitted.

(d) REVISION OF FUNDING.—

(1) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 3001(b) for military construction projects carried out under this section, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4601, is hereby increased by \$100,000,000, to be available for the purpose specified in subsection (b).

(2) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 2403 for Defense Agencies planning and design at various worldwide locations, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4601, is hereby reduced by \$40,000,000.

(3) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 2403 for Defense Agencies unspecified minor construction at various worldwide locations, as specified in the corresponding

funding table in section 4601, is hereby reduced by \$10,000,000.

(4) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 2304 for Air Force planning and design at various worldwide locations, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4601, is hereby reduced by \$20,000,000.

(5) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 2103 for Army planning and design at various worldwide locations, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4601, is hereby reduced by \$20,000,000.

(6) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 2204 for Navy planning and design at various worldwide locations, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4601, is hereby reduced by \$10,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 409 OFFERED BY MS. SHERRILL OF NEW JERSEY

Add at the end of subtitle A of title VII the following new section:

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRICARE LEAD SCREENING AND TESTING FOR CHILDREN.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 1405 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, for Undistributed, TRICARE lead level screening and testing for children, is hereby increased by \$5,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for Procurement of Wheeled and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for Bradley Program (Mod) is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 411 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28. RESTRICTIONS ON REHABILITATION OF OVER-THE-HORIZON BACKSCATTER RADAR SYSTEM RECEIVING STATION, MODOC COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) RESTRICTIONS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Air Force may not use any funds or resources of the Department of the Air Force to carry out the rehabilitation of the obsolete Over-the-Horizon Backscatter Radar System receiving station located in Modoc National Forest in the State of California

(b) EXCEPTION FOR REMOVAL OF PERIMETER FENCE.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary of the Air Force may use funds and resources of the Department of the Air Force—

(1) to remove the perimeter fence, which was treated with an arsenic-based weather-proof coating, surrounding the Over-the-Horizon Backscatter Radar System receiving station referred to in such subsection; and

(2) to carry out the mitigation of soil contamination associated with such fence.

(c) SUNSET.—The restrictions in subsection (a) shall terminate on the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021.

AMENDMENT NO. 412 OFFERED BY MRS. LURIA OF VIRGINIA

At the end of title XI, add the following (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1113. REIMBURSEMENT FOR FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL INCOME TAXES INCURRED DURING TRAVEL, TRANSPORTATION, AND RELOCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5724b of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “of employees transferred”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “employee, or by an employee and such employee’s spouse (if filing jointly), for any moving or storage” and inserting “individual, or by an individual and such individual’s spouse (if filing jointly), for any travel, transportation, or relocation”; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “employee” and inserting “individual, or the individual”;

(3) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) For purposes of this section, the term ‘travel, transportation, or relocation expenses’ means all travel, transportation, or relocation expenses reimbursed or furnished in kind pursuant to this subchapter.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 5724b and inserting the following:

“5724b. Taxes on reimbursements for travel, transportation, and relocation expenses”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to travel, transportation, or relocation expenses incurred on or after that date.

AMENDMENT NO. 413 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS OF MINNESOTA

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . REPORT ON PLAN TO TRANSFER FUNDS IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROVISION OF SUPPORT UNDER SECTION 385 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on its plan to transfer funds in connection with the provision of support under section 385 of title 10, United States Code, for fiscal year 2020.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a list of foreign assistance programs and activities that should receive support under such authority on a priority basis, including foreign assistance programs and activities of the United States Agency for International Development and the Department of State; and

(2) a justification for providing such support to such programs and activities, including as to how such programs and activities relate to the National Security Strategy and National Military Strategy.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 414 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 7. STUDY ON USE OF ROUTINE NEUROIMAGING MODALITIES IN DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT, AND PREVENTION OF BRAIN INJURY DUE TO BLAST PRESSURE EXPOSURE DURING COMBAT AND TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on the feasibility and effectiveness of the use of routine neuroimaging modalities in the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of brain injury among members of the Armed Forces due to one or more blast pressure exposures during combat and training.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives an interim report on the methods and action plan for the study under subsection (a).

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date on which the Secretary begins the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the results of such study.

AMENDMENT NO. 415 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 8. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON DEFENSE BUSINESS PROCESSES.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the use of defense business processes (as described under section 2222 of title 10, United States Code) that includes—

(1) an analysis of the extent to which the Department of Defense is developing a culture that recognizes the importance of business processes to achieving operational success;

(2) an analysis of the extent to which the Department of Defense components are implementing business process reengineering initiatives necessary to achieving improved financial management;

(3) an analysis of the quality of financial management training provided to employees of the Department; and

(4) an identification of the steps taken by the Department of the Defense to institutionalize a culture that recognizes the importance of financial management.

AMENDMENT NO. 416 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO OF NEW YORK

Page 733, after line 15, add the following new section:

SEC. 10. FUNDING LIMITATION FOR THE ERIE CANALWAY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR.

Section 810(a)(1) of the Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor Act (Public Law 106-554; 114 Stat. 2763A-303) is amended, in the second sentence, by striking “\$12,000,000” and inserting “\$14,000,000”.

AMENDMENT NO. 419 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM OF SOUTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle A of title XXVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 28. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS TO DEFENSE ACCESS ROAD RESILIENCE.

Section 210 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(a)(1) The Secretary” and all that follows through the end of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—When defense access roads are certified to the Secretary as important to the national defense by the Secretary

of Defense or such other official as the President may designate, the Secretary is authorized, out of the funds appropriated for defense access roads, to provide for—

“(A) the construction and maintenance of defense access roads (including bridges, tubes, tunnels, and culverts or other hydraulic appurtenances on those roads) to—

“(i) military reservations;
“(ii) defense industry sites;
“(iii) air or sea ports that are necessary for or are planned to be used for the deployment or sustainment of members of the Armed Forces, equipment, or supplies; or

“(iv) sources of raw materials;
“(B) the reconstruction or enhancement of, or improvements to, those roads to ensure the continued effective use of the roads, regardless of current or projected increases in mean tides, recurrent flooding, or other weather-related conditions or natural disasters; and

“(C) replacing existing highways and highway connections that are shut off from general public use by necessary closures, closures due to mean sea level fluctuation and flooding, or restrictions at—

“(i) military reservations;
“(ii) air or sea ports that are necessary for or are planned to be used for the deployment or sustainment of members of the Armed Forces, equipment, or supplies; or

“(iii) defense industry sites.”;
(2) in subsection (b), by striking “the construction and maintenance of” and inserting “construction, reconstruction, resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, and preservation of, or enhancements to,”;

(3) in subsection (c)—
(A) by striking “him” and inserting “the Secretary”;

(B) by striking “construction, maintenance, and repair work” and inserting “activities for construction, maintenance, reconstruction, enhancement, improvement, and repair”;

(C) by striking “therein” and inserting “in those areas”; and

(D) by striking “condition for such training purposes and for repairing the damage caused to such highways by the operations of men and equipment in such training.” and inserting the following: “condition for—

“(1) that training; and
“(2) repairing the damage to those highways caused by—

“(A) weather-related events, increases in mean high tide levels, recurrent flooding, or natural disasters; or

“(B) the operations of men and equipment in such training.”;

(4) in subsection (g)—
(A) by striking “he” and inserting “the Secretary”;

(B) by striking “construction which has been” and inserting “construction and other activities”; and

(C) by striking “upon his demand” and inserting “upon demand by the Secretary”; and

(5) by striking subsection (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) **REPAIR OF CERTAIN DAMAGES AND INFRASTRUCTURE.**—The funds appropriated to carry out this section may be used to pay the cost of repairing damage caused, or any infrastructure to mitigate a risk posed, to a defense access road by recurrent or projected recurrent flooding, sea level fluctuation, a natural disaster, or any other current or projected change in applicable environmental conditions, if the Secretary determines that continued access to a military installation, defense industry site, air or sea port necessary for or planned to be used for the deployment or sustainment of members of the Armed Forces, equipment, or supplies, or to a source of raw materials, has been or is projected to be impacted by those events or conditions.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 420 OFFERED BY MR. ROSE OF NEW YORK

At the end of division A, add the following:

TITLE XVII—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN TRAFFICKERS OF ILLICIT SYNTHETIC OPIOIDS

SEC. 1701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Fentanyl Sanctions Act”.

SEC. 1702. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimate that from September 2017 through September 2018 more than 48,200 people in the United States died from an opioid overdose, with synthetic opioids (excluding methadone), contributing to a record 31,900 overdose deaths. While drug overdose death estimates from methadone, semi-synthetic opioids, and heroin have decreased in recent months, overdose deaths from synthetic opioids have continued to increase.

(2) Congress and the President have taken a number of actions to combat the demand for illicit opioids in the United States, including enacting into law the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (Public Law 115-271; 132 Stat. 3894). While new statutes and regulations have reduced the rate of opioid prescriptions in recent years, fully addressing the United States opioid crisis will involve dramatically restricting the foreign supply of illicit opioids.

(3) The People’s Republic of China is the world’s largest producer of illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, and their immediate precursors. From the People’s Republic of China, those substances are shipped primarily through express consignment carriers or international mail directly to the United States, or, alternatively, shipped directly to transnational criminal organizations in Mexico, Canada, and the Caribbean.

(4) The United States and the People’s Republic of China, Mexico, and Canada have made important strides in combating the illicit flow of opioids through bilateral efforts of their respective law enforcement agencies.

(5) The objective of preventing the proliferation of illicit opioids through existing multilateral and bilateral initiatives requires additional efforts to deny illicit actors the financial means to sustain their markets and distribution networks.

(6) The implementation on May 1, 2019, of the regulations of the People’s Republic of China to schedule all fentanyl analogues as controlled substances is a major step in combating global opioid trafficking and represents a major achievement in United States-China law enforcement dialogues. However, that step will effectively fulfill the commitment that President Xi Jinping of the People’s Republic of China made to President Donald Trump at the Group of Twenty meeting in December 2018 only if the Government of the People’s Republic of China devotes sufficient resources to full implementation and strict enforcement of the new regulations. The effective enforcement of the new regulations should result in diminished trafficking of illicit fentanyl originating from the People’s Republic of China into the United States.

(7) While the Department of the Treasury used the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) to sanction the first synthetic opioid trafficking entity in April 2018, additional economic and financial sanctions policy tools are needed to help combat the flow of synthetic opioids into the United States.

SEC. 1703. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should apply economic and other financial sanctions to foreign traffickers of illicit opioids to protect the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States and the health of the people of the United States;

(2) it is imperative that the People’s Republic of China follow through on full implementation of the new regulations, adopted May 1, 2019, to treat all fentanyl analogues as controlled substances under the laws of the People’s Republic of China, including by devoting sufficient resources for implementation and strict enforcement of the new regulations; and

(3) the effective enforcement of the new regulations should result in diminished trafficking of illicit fentanyl originating from the People’s Republic of China into the United States.

SEC. 1704. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **ALIEN; NATIONAL; NATIONAL OF THE UNITED STATES.**—The terms “alien”, “national”, and “national of the United States” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees and leadership” means—

(A) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Oversight and Reform, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Speaker and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(3) **CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE; LISTED CHEMICAL.**—The terms “controlled substance”, “listed chemical”, “narcotic drug”, and “opioid” have the meanings given those terms in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

(4) **ENTITY.**—The term “entity” means a partnership, joint venture, association, corporation, organization, network, group, or subgroup, or any form of business collaboration.

(5) **FOREIGN OPIOID TRAFFICKER.**—The term “foreign opioid trafficker” means any foreign person that the President determines plays a significant role in opioid trafficking.

(6) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term “foreign person”—

(A) means—
(i) any citizen or national of a foreign country; or

(ii) any entity not organized under the laws of the United States or a jurisdiction within the United States; and

(B) does not include the government of a foreign country.

(7) **KNOWINGLY.**—The term “knowingly”, with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(8) **OPIOID TRAFFICKING.**—The term “opioid trafficking” means any illicit activity—

(A) to produce, manufacture, distribute, sell, or knowingly finance or transport illicit synthetic opioids, controlled substances that are synthetic opioids, listed chemicals that are synthetic opioids, or active pharmaceutical ingredients or chemicals that are

used in the production of controlled substances that are synthetic opioids;

(B) to attempt to carry out an activity described in subparagraph (A); or

(C) to assist, abet, conspire, or collude with other persons to carry out such an activity.

(9) PERSON.—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(10) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) any citizen or national of the United States;

(B) any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States;

(C) any entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States (including a foreign branch of such an entity); or

(D) any person located in the United States.

Subtitle A—Sanctions With Respect to Foreign Opioid Traffickers

SEC. 1711. IDENTIFICATION OF FOREIGN OPIOID TRAFFICKERS.

(a) PUBLIC REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership, in accordance with subsection (c), a report—

(A) identifying the foreign persons that the President determines are foreign opioid traffickers;

(B) detailing progress the President has made in implementing this subtitle; and

(C) providing an update on cooperative efforts with the Governments of Mexico and the People’s Republic of China with respect to combating foreign opioid traffickers.

(2) IDENTIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PERSONS.—If, at any time after submitting a report required by paragraph (1) and before the submission of the next such report, the President determines that a foreign person not identified in the report is a foreign opioid trafficker, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership an additional report containing the information required by paragraph (1) with respect to the foreign person.

(3) EXCLUSION.—The President shall not be required to include in a report under paragraph (1) or (2) any persons with respect to which the United States has imposed sanctions before the date of the report under this subtitle or any other provision of law with respect to opioid trafficking.

(4) FORM OF REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report required by paragraph (1) or (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(B) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The unclassified portion of a report required by paragraph (1) or (2) shall be made available to the public.

(b) CLASSIFIED REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership, in accordance with subsection (c), a report, in classified form—

(A) describing in detail the status of sanctions imposed under this subtitle, including the personnel and resources directed toward the imposition of such sanctions during the preceding fiscal year;

(B) providing background information with respect to persons newly identified as foreign opioid traffickers and their illicit activities;

(C) describing actions the President intends to undertake or has undertaken to implement this subtitle; and

(D) providing a strategy for identifying additional foreign opioid traffickers.

(2) EFFECT ON OTHER REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) is in addition to, and in no way delimits or restricts, the obligations to keep Congress

fully and currently informed pursuant to the provisions of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.).

(c) SUBMISSION OF REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the date that is 5 years after such date of enactment, the President shall submit the reports required by subsections (a) and (b) to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

(d) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—

(1) INTELLIGENCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a report required by subsection (a) or (b) shall not disclose the identity of any person if the Director of National Intelligence determines that such disclosure could compromise an intelligence operation, activity, source, or method of the United States.

(2) LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a report required by subsection (a) or (b) shall not disclose the identity of any person if the Attorney General, in coordination, as appropriate, with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and the head of any other appropriate Federal law enforcement agency, determines that such disclosure could reasonably be expected—

(A) to compromise the identity of a confidential source, including a State, local, or foreign agency or authority or any private institution that furnished information on a confidential basis;

(B) to jeopardize the integrity or success of an ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution;

(C) to endanger the life or physical safety of any person; or

(D) to cause substantial harm to physical property.

(3) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—If the Director of National Intelligence makes a determination under paragraph (1) or the Attorney General makes a determination under paragraph (2), the Director or the Attorney General, as the case may be, shall notify the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to authorize or compel the disclosure of information determined by the President to be law enforcement information, classified information, national security information, or other information the disclosure of which is prohibited by any other provision of law.

(e) PROVISION OF INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR REPORTS.—The Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence shall consult among themselves and provide to the President and the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy the appropriate and necessary information to enable the President to submit the reports required by subsection (a).

SEC. 1712. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL OPIOID CONTROL REGIME.

It is the sense of Congress that, in order to apply economic and other financial sanctions to foreign traffickers of illicit opioids to protect the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States—

(1) the President should instruct the Secretary of State to commence immediately diplomatic efforts, both in appropriate international fora such as the United Nations, the Group of Seven, the Group of Twenty, and bilaterally and bilaterally with partners of

the United States, to combat foreign opioid trafficking, including by working to establish a multilateral sanctions regime with respect to foreign opioid trafficking; and

(2) the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, should intensify efforts to maintain and strengthen the coalition of countries formed to combat foreign opioid trafficking.

SEC. 1713. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.

The President shall impose five or more of the sanctions described in section 1714 with respect to each foreign person that is an entity, and four or more of such sanctions with respect to each foreign person that is an individual, that—

(1) is identified as a foreign opioid trafficker in a report submitted under section 1711(a); or

(2) the President determines is owned, controlled, directed by, knowingly supplying or sourcing precursors for, or acting for or on behalf of, such a foreign opioid trafficker.

SEC. 1714. DESCRIPTION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions that may be imposed with respect to a foreign person under section 1713 are the following:

(1) LOANS FROM UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The United States Government may prohibit any United States financial institution from making loans or providing credits to the foreign person.

(2) PROHIBITIONS ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The following prohibitions may be imposed with respect to a foreign person that is a financial institution:

(A) PROHIBITION ON DESIGNATION AS PRIMARY DEALER.—Neither the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System nor the Federal Reserve Bank of New York may designate, or permit the continuation of any prior designation of, the financial institution as a primary dealer in United States Government debt instruments.

(B) PROHIBITION ON SERVICE AS A REPOSITORY OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS.—The financial institution may not serve as agent of the United States Government or serve as repository for United States Government funds.

The imposition of either sanction under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be treated as one sanction for purposes of section 1713, and the imposition of both such sanctions shall be treated as 2 sanctions for purposes of that section.

(3) PROCUREMENT BAN.—The United States Government may not procure, or enter into any contract for the procurement of, any goods or services from the foreign person.

(4) FOREIGN EXCHANGE.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transactions in foreign exchange that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and in which the foreign person has any interest.

(5) BANKING TRANSACTIONS.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transfers of credit or payments between financial institutions or by, through, or to any financial institution, to the extent that such transfers or payments are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and involve any interest of the foreign person.

(6) PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any person from—

(A) acquiring, holding, withholding, using, transferring, withdrawing, or transporting any property that is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and with respect to which the foreign person has any interest;

(B) dealing in or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to such property; or

(C) conducting any transaction involving such property.

(7) **BAN ON INVESTMENT IN EQUITY OR DEBT OF SANCTIONED PERSON.**—The President may, pursuant to such regulations or guidelines as the President may prescribe, prohibit any United States person from investing in or purchasing significant amounts of equity or debt instruments of the foreign person.

(8) **EXCLUSION OF CORPORATE OFFICERS.**—The President may direct the Secretary of State to deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security to exclude from the United States, any alien that the President determines is a corporate officer or principal of, or a shareholder with a controlling interest in, the foreign person.

(9) **SANCTIONS ON PRINCIPAL EXECUTIVE OFFICERS.**—The President may impose on the principal executive officer or officers of the foreign person, or on individuals performing similar functions and with similar authorities as such officer or officers, any of the sanctions described in paragraphs (1) through (8) that are applicable.

(b) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out subsection (a) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(c) **EXCEPTIONS.**—

(1) **INTELLIGENCE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.**—Sanctions under this section shall not apply with respect to—

(A) any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.); or

(B) any authorized intelligence or law enforcement activities of the United States.

(2) **EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.**—Sanctions under subsection (a)(8) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or other applicable international obligations.

(d) **IMPLEMENTATION; REGULATORY AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

(2) **REGULATORY AUTHORITY.**—The President shall issue such regulations, licenses, and orders as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 1715. WAIVERS.

(a) **WAIVER FOR STATE-OWNED ENTITIES IN COUNTRIES THAT COOPERATE IN MULTILATERAL ANTI-TRAFFICKING EFFORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may waive for a period of not more than 12 months the application of sanctions under this subtitle with respect to an entity that is owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a foreign government or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality of a foreign government, if, not less than 15 days before the waiver is to take effect, the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership that the foreign government is closely cooperating with the United States in efforts to prevent opioid trafficking.

(2) **CERTIFICATION.**—The President may certify under paragraph (1) that a foreign gov-

ernment is closely cooperating with the United States in efforts to prevent opioid trafficking if that government is—

(A) implementing domestic laws to schedule all fentanyl analogues as controlled substances; and

(B) doing two or more of the following:

(i) Implementing substantial improvements in regulations involving the chemical and pharmaceutical production and export of illicit opioids.

(ii) Implementing substantial improvements in judicial regulations to combat transnational criminal organizations that traffic opioids.

(iii) Increasing efforts to prosecute foreign opioid traffickers.

(iv) Increasing intelligence sharing and law enforcement cooperation with the United States with respect to opioid trafficking.

(3) **SUBSEQUENT RENEWAL OF WAIVER.**—The President may renew a waiver under paragraph (1) for subsequent periods of not more than 12 months each if, not less than 15 days before the renewal is to take effect, the Secretary of State certifies to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership that the government of the country to which the waiver applies has effectively implemented and is effectively enforcing the measures that formed the basis for the certification under paragraph (2).

(b) **WAIVERS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND ACCESS TO PRESCRIPTION MEDICATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may waive the application of sanctions under this subtitle if the President determines that the application of such sanctions would—

(A) cause a specific articulated harm or set of harms to a specific articulated national security interest or set of interests of the United States; or

(B) subject to paragraph (2), harm the access of United States persons to prescription medications.

(2) **MONITORING.**—The President shall establish a monitoring program to verify that a person that receives a waiver under paragraph (1)(B) is not trafficking illicit opioids.

(3) **NOTIFICATION.**—Not later than 15 days after making a determination under paragraph (1), the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(c) **HUMANITARIAN WAIVER.**—The President may waive, for renewable periods of 180 days, the application of the sanctions under this subtitle if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership that the waiver is necessary for the provision of humanitarian assistance.

SEC. 1716. PROCEDURES FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If a finding under this subtitle, or a prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding, is based on classified information (as defined in section 1(a) of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.)) and a court reviews the finding or the imposition of the prohibition, condition, or penalty, the President may submit such information to the court *ex parte* and *in camera*.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(1) confer or imply any right to judicial review of any finding under this subtitle, or any prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding; and

(2) limit or restrict any other practice, procedure, right, remedy, or safeguard that relates to the protection of classified information and is available to the United States in connection with any type of administrative hearing, litigation, or other proceeding.

SEC. 1717. BRIEFINGS ON IMPLEMENTATION.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Fentanyl Sanctions Act, and every 180 days thereafter until the date that is 5 years after such date of enactment, the President, acting through the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a comprehensive briefing on efforts to implement this subtitle.

SEC. 1718. INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL MATERIAL IN INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL STRATEGY REPORT.

Section 489(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9)(A) An assessment conducted by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of National Intelligence, of the extent to which any diplomatic efforts described in section 1712 of the Fentanyl Sanctions Act have been successful.

“(B) Each assessment required by subparagraph (A) shall include an identification of—

“(i) the countries the governments of which have agreed to undertake measures to apply economic or other financial sanctions to foreign traffickers of illicit opioids and a description of those measures; and

“(ii) the countries the governments of which have not agreed to measures described in clause (i), and, with respect to those countries, other measures the Secretary of State recommends that the United States take to apply economic and other financial sanctions to foreign traffickers of illicit opioids.”

Subtitle B—Commission on Combating Synthetic Opioid Trafficking

SEC. 1721. COMMISSION ON COMBATING SYNTHETIC OPIOID TRAFFICKING.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established a commission to develop a consensus on a strategic approach to combating the flow of synthetic opioids into the United States.

(2) **DESIGNATION.**—The commission established under paragraph (1) shall be known as the “Commission on Synthetic Opioid Trafficking” (in this section referred to as the “Commission”).

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **COMPOSITION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Commission shall be composed of the following members:

(i) The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

(ii) The Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

(iii) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

(iv) The Secretary of Defense.

(v) The Secretary of the Treasury.

(vi) The Secretary of State.

(vii) The Director of National Intelligence

(viii) Two members appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, one of whom shall be a Member of the Senate and one of whom shall not be.

(ix) Two members appointed by the minority leader of the Senate, one of whom shall be a Member of the Senate and one of whom shall not be.

(x) Two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be a Member of the House of Representatives and one of whom shall not be.

(xi) Two members appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be a Member of the House of Representatives and one of whom shall not be.

(B)(i) The members of the Commission who are not Members of Congress and who are appointed under clauses (viii) through (xi) of subparagraph (A) shall be individuals who are nationally recognized for expertise, knowledge, or experience in—

(I) transnational criminal organizations conducting synthetic opioid trafficking;

(II) the production, manufacturing, distribution, sale, or transportation of synthetic opioids; or

(III) relations between—

(aa) the United States; and

(bb) the People's Republic of China, Mexico, or any other country of concern with respect to trafficking in synthetic opioids.

(ii) An official who appoints members of the Commission may not appoint an individual as a member of the Commission if the individual possesses any personal or financial interest in the discharge of any of the duties of the Commission.

(iii)(I) All members of the Commission described in clause (i) shall possess an appropriate security clearance in accordance with applicable provisions of law concerning the handling of classified information.

(II) For the purpose of facilitating the activities of the Commission, the Director of National Intelligence shall expedite to the fullest degree possible the processing of security clearances that are necessary for members of the Commission.

(2) CO-CHAIRS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall have 2 co-chairs, selected from among the members of the Commission, one of whom shall be a member of the majority party and one of whom shall be a member of the minority party.

(B) SELECTION.—The individuals who serve as the co-chairs of the Commission shall be jointly agreed upon by the President, the majority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(c) DUTIES.—The duties of the Commission are as follows:

(1) To define the core objectives and priorities of the strategic approach described in subsection (a)(1).

(2) To weigh the costs and benefits of various strategic options to combat the flow of synthetic opioids from the People's Republic of China, Mexico, and other countries.

(3) To evaluate whether the options described in paragraph (2) are exclusive or complementary, the best means for executing such options, and how the United States should incorporate and implement such options within the strategic approach described in subsection (a)(1).

(4) To review and make determinations on the difficult choices present within such options, among them what norms-based regimes the United States should seek to establish to encourage the effective regulation of dangerous synthetic opioids.

(5) To report on efforts by actors in the People's Republic of China to subvert United States laws and to supply illicit synthetic opioids to persons in the United States, including up-to-date estimates of the scale of illicit synthetic opioid flows from the People's Republic of China.

(6) To report on the deficiencies in the regulation of pharmaceutical and chemical production of controlled substances and export controls with respect to such substances in the People's Republic of China and other countries that allow opioid traffickers to subvert such regulations and controls to traffic illicit opioids into the United States.

(7) To report on the scale of contaminated or counterfeit drugs originating from the People's Republic of China and India.

(8) To report on how the United States could work more effectively with provincial and local officials in the People's Republic of China and other countries to combat the illicit production of synthetic opioids.

(9) In weighing the options for defending the United States against the dangers of trafficking in synthetic opioids, to consider possible structures and authorities that need to be established, revised, or augmented within the Federal Government.

(d) FUNCTIONING OF COMMISSION.—The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), (g), (h), and (i) of section 1652 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232) shall apply to the Commission to the same extent and in the same manner as such provisions apply to the commission established under that section, except that—

(1) subsection (c)(1) of that section shall be applied and administered by substituting “30 days” for “45 days”;

(2) subsection (g)(4)(A) of that section shall be applied and administered by inserting “and the Attorney General” after “Secretary of Defense”;

(3) subsections (h)(2)(A) and (i)(1)(A) of that section shall be applied and administered by substituting “level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316” for “level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315”.

(e) TREATMENT OF INFORMATION FURNISHED TO COMMISSION.—

(1) INFORMATION RELATING TO NATIONAL SECURITY.—

(A) RESPONSIBILITY OF DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—The Director of National Intelligence shall assume responsibility for the handling and disposition of any information related to the national security of the United States that is received, considered, or used by the Commission under this section.

(B) ACCESS AFTER TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, after the termination of the Commission under subsection (g), only the members and designated staff of the appropriate congressional committees and leadership, the Director of National Intelligence (and the designees of the Director), and such other officials of the executive branch as the President may designate shall have access to information related to the national security of the United States that is received, considered, or used by the Commission.

(2) INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CONGRESS.—The Commission may obtain information from any Member, committee, or office of Congress, including information related to the national security of the United States, only with the consent of the Member, committee, or office involved and only in accordance with any applicable rules and procedures of the House of Representatives or Senate (as the case may be) governing the provision of such information by Members, committees, and offices of Congress to entities in the executive branch.

(f) REPORTS.—The Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership—

(1) not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, an initial report on the activities and recommendations of the Commission under this section; and

(2) not later than 270 days after the submission of the initial report under paragraph (1), a final report on the activities and recommendations of the Commission under this section.

(g) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission, and all the authorities of this section, shall terminate at the end of the 120-day period beginning on the date on which the final report re-

quired by subsection (f)(2) is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

(2) WINDING UP OF AFFAIRS.—The Commission may use the 120-day period described in paragraph (1) for the purposes of concluding its activities, including providing testimony to Congress concerning the final report required by subsection (f)(2) and disseminating the report.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

SEC. 1731. DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM ON USE OF INTELLIGENCE RESOURCES IN EFFORTS TO SANCTION FOREIGN OPIOID TRAFFICKERS.

(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Intelligence shall, in consultation with the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, carry out a program to allocate and enhance use of resources of the intelligence community, including intelligence collection and analysis, to assist the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration in efforts to identify and impose sanctions with respect to foreign opioid traffickers under subtitle A.

(2) FOCUS ON ILLICIT FINANCE.—To the extent practicable, efforts described in paragraph (1) shall—

(A) take into account specific illicit finance risks related to narcotics trafficking; and

(B) be developed in consultation with the Undersecretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, appropriate officials of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of the Treasury, the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, and appropriate Federal law enforcement agencies.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS ON PROGRAM.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report on the status and accomplishments of the program required by subsection (a) during the 90-day period ending on the date of the report. The first report under this paragraph shall also include a description of the amount of funds devoted by the intelligence community to the efforts described in subsection (a) during each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018.

(c) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “intelligence community” has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

SEC. 1732. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OPERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to carry out the operations and activities described in subsection (b) for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2025.

(b) OPERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES.—The operations and activities described in this subsection are the operations and activities of the Department of Defense in support of any other department or agency of the United States Government solely for purposes of carrying out this title.

(c) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts made available to carry out the operations and activities described in subsection (b) shall supplement and not supplant other amounts available to carry out the operations and activities described in subsection (b).

(d) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Amounts made available to carry out the operations

and activities described in subsection (b) may not be obligated until 15 days after the date on which the President notifies the appropriate committees of Congress of the President's intention to obligate such funds.

(e) **CONCURRENCE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.**—Operations and activities described in subsection (b) carried out with foreign persons shall be conducted with the concurrence of the Secretary of State.

SEC. 1733. TERMINATION.

The provisions of this title, and any sanctions imposed pursuant to this title, shall terminate on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1734. EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions under this title shall not include the authority or a requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(b) **GOOD DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “good” means any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

SEC. 1735. APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.

In this subtitle, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1736. FUNDING.

(a) **INCREASE.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D—

(1) the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, is hereby increased by \$5,000,000 for purposes of carrying out subtitle B (relating to the Commission on Synthetic Opioid Trafficking); and

(2) the amount authorized to be appropriated for Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide, for Counter-Narcotics Support, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, is hereby increased by \$25,000,000 for purposes of carrying out section 1732 (relating to Department of Defense operations and activities).

(b) **OFFSETS.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D—

(1) the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for Operations and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, line 310, is hereby reduced by \$14,000,000 for unjustified growth; and

(2) the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for Procurement of Wheeled and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101, for Bradley Program (Mod), is hereby reduced by \$16,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 422 OFFERED BY MR. BARR OF KENTUCKY

At the end of title X, add the following:

Subtitle I—North Korea Nuclear Sanctions

SEC. 1092. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act of 2019”.

SEC. 1093. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) On June 1, 2016, the Department of the Treasury's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network announced a Notice of Finding that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern due to its use of state-controlled financial institutions and front companies to support the proliferation and development of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and ballistic missiles.

(2) The Financial Action Task Force (FATF) has expressed serious concerns with the threat posed by North Korea's proliferation and financing of WMD, and has called on FATF members to apply effective countermeasures to protect their financial sectors from North Korean money laundering, WMD proliferation financing, and the financing of terrorism.

(3) In its February 2017 report, the U.N. Panel of Experts concluded that—

(A) North Korea continued to access the international financial system in support of illicit activities despite sanctions imposed by U.N. Security Council Resolutions 2270 (2016) and 2321 (2016);

(B) during the reporting period, no member state had reported taking actions to freeze North Korean assets; and

(C) sanctions evasion by North Korea, combined with inadequate compliance by member states, had significantly negated the impact of U.N. Security Council resolutions.

(4) In its September 2017 report, the U.N. Panel of Experts found that—

(A) North Korea continued to violate financial sanctions by using agents acting abroad on the country's behalf;

(B) foreign financial institutions provided correspondent banking services to North Korean persons and front companies for illicit purposes;

(C) foreign companies violated sanctions by maintaining links with North Korean financial institutions; and

(D) North Korea generated at least \$270 million during the reporting period through the violation of sectoral sanctions.

(5) North Korean entities engage in significant financial transactions through foreign bank accounts that are maintained by non-North Korean nationals, thereby masking account users' identity in order to access financial services.

(6) North Korea's sixth nuclear test on September 3, 2017, demonstrated an estimated explosive power more than 100 times greater than that generated by its first nuclear test in 2006.

(7) On February 23, 2018 the Department of the Treasury announced its largest-ever set of North Korea-related sanctions, with a particular focus on shipping and trading companies, and issued a maritime advisory to highlight North Korea's sanctions evasion tactics. On May 9, 2019, the United States seized a North Korean ship, the *Wise Honest*, which had previously been detained by Indonesia for carrying coal in violation of United Nations sanctions.

(8) According to the March 2019 Final Report of the U.N. Panel of Experts, “The nuclear and ballistic missile programmes of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea remain intact and the country continues to defy Security Council resolutions through a massive increase in illegal ship-to-ship transfers of petroleum products and coal. These violations render the latest United Nations sanctions ineffective by flouting the

caps on the import of petroleum products and crude oil by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as well as the coal ban, imposed in 2017 by the Security Council in response to the country's unprecedented nuclear and ballistic missile testing.”

(9) The U.N. Panel of Experts further concluded: “Financial sanctions remain some of the most poorly implemented and actively evaded measures of the sanctions regime. Individuals empowered to act as extensions of financial institutions of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea operate in at least five countries with seeming impunity.”

(10) North Korea has successfully tested short-range, submarine-launched, and intercontinental ballistic missiles, and is rapidly progressing in its development of a nuclear-armed missile that is capable of reaching United States territory.

SEC. 1094. CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN ACCOUNTS AND TRANSACTIONS AT UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) **CORRESPONDENT AND PAYABLE-THROUGH ACCOUNTS HELD BY FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations to prohibit, or impose strict conditions on, the opening or maintaining in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary finds knowingly facilitates a significant transaction or provides significant financial services for a covered person.

(2) **PENALTIES.**—

(A) **CIVIL PENALTY.**—A person who violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under this subsection shall be subject to a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed the greater of—

(i) \$250,000; or

(ii) an amount that is twice the amount of the transaction that is the basis of the violation with respect to which the penalty is imposed.

(B) **CRIMINAL PENALTY.**—A person who willfully commits, willfully attempts to commit, or willfully conspires to commit, or aids or abets in the commission of, a violation of regulations prescribed under this subsection shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$1,000,000, or if a natural person, may be imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both.

(b) **RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS BY UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations to prohibit a United States financial institution, and any person owned or controlled by a United States financial institution, from knowingly engaging in a significant transaction with or benefitting any person that the Secretary finds to be a covered person.

(2) **CIVIL PENALTY.**—A person who violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under this subsection shall be subject to a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed the greater of—

(A) \$250,000; or

(B) an amount that is twice the amount of the transaction that is the basis of the violation with respect to which the penalty is imposed.

SEC. 1095. OPPOSITION TO ASSISTANCE BY THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK.

(a) **INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—The Bretton Woods Agreements Act

(22 U.S.C. 286 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 73. OPPOSITION TO ASSISTANCE FOR ANY GOVERNMENT THAT FAILS TO IMPLEMENT SANCTIONS ON NORTH KOREA.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at the international financial institutions (as defined under section 1701(c) of the International Financial Institutions Act) to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose the provision of financial assistance to a foreign government, other than assistance to support basic human needs, if the President determines that, in the year preceding consideration of approval of such assistance, the government has knowingly failed to prevent the provision of financial services to, or freeze the funds, financial assets, and economic resources of, a person described under subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 7(2) of the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act of 2019.

“(b) WAIVER.—The President may waive subsection (a) for up to 180 days at a time with respect to a foreign government if the President reports to Congress that—

“(1) the foreign government’s failure described under (a) is due exclusively to a lack of foreign government capacity;

“(2) the foreign government is taking effective steps to prevent recurrence of such failure; or

“(3) such waiver is vital to the national security interests of the United States.”

(b) EXPORT-IMPORT BANK.—Section 2(b) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(14) PROHIBITION ON SUPPORT INVOLVING PERSONS CONNECTED WITH NORTH KOREA.—The Bank may not guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with the export of a good or service to a covered person (as defined under section 7 of the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions Act of 2019).”

SEC. 1096. TREASURY REPORTS ON COMPLIANCE, PENALTIES, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days following the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate that includes—

(A) a list of financial institutions that, in the period since the preceding report, knowingly facilitated a significant transaction or transactions or provided significant financial services for a covered person;

(B) a list of any penalties imposed under section 3 in the period since the preceding report; and

(C) a description of efforts by the Department of the Treasury in the period since the preceding report, through consultations, technical assistance, or other appropriate activities, to strengthen the capacity of financial institutions and foreign governments to prevent the provision of financial services benefitting any covered person.

(2) FORM OF REPORT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

(A) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The unclassified portion of such report shall be made available to the public and posted on the website of the Department of the Treasury.

(3) SUNSET.—The report requirement under this subsection shall terminate after the end

of the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) TESTIMONY REQUIRED.—Upon request of the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence shall testify to explain the effects of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, on North Korea’s access to illicit finance channels.

(c) INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND.—Title XVI of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262p et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1629. SUPPORT FOR CAPACITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND TO PREVENT MONEY LAUNDERING AND FINANCING OF TERRORISM.

“The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund to support the increased use of the administrative budget of the Fund for technical assistance that strengthens the capacity of Fund members to prevent money laundering and the financing of terrorism.”

(d) NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies shall include in the report required by section 1701 of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r) a description of—

(1) the activities of the International Monetary Fund in the most recently completed fiscal year to provide technical assistance that strengthens the capacity of Fund members to prevent money laundering and the financing of terrorism, and the effectiveness of the assistance; and

(2) the efficacy of efforts by the United States to support such technical assistance through the use of the Fund’s administrative budget, and the level of such support.

(e) SUNSET.—Effective on the date that is the end of the 4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, section 1629 of the International Financial Institutions Act, as added by subsection (c), is repealed.

SEC. 1097. SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION OF PROHIBITIONS AND PENALTIES.

(a) SUSPENSION.—Except for any provision of section 1098, the President may suspend, on a case-by-case basis, the application of any provision of this subtitle, or provision in an amendment made by this subtitle, with respect to an entity, individual, or transaction, for a period of not more than 180 days at a time if the President certifies to Congress that—

(1) the Government of North Korea has—
(A) committed to the verifiable suspension of North Korea’s proliferation and testing of WMD, including systems designed in whole or in part for the delivery of such weapons; and

(B) has agreed to multilateral talks including the Government of the United States, with the goal of permanently and verifiably limiting North Korea’s WMD and ballistic missile programs; or

(2) such suspension is vital to the national security interests of the United States, with an explanation of the reasons therefor.

(b) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President makes the certification described under paragraph (2)—

(A) subsection (a), section 1094, and subsections (a) and (b) of section 1096 shall cease to have any force or effect;

(B) section 73 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as added by section 4(a), shall be repealed; and

(C) section 2(b)(14) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as added by section 4(b), shall be repealed.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The certification described under this paragraph is a certification by the President to the Congress that—

(A) the Government of North Korea—

(i) has ceased to pose a significant threat to national security, with an explanation of the reasons therefor; or

(ii) is committed to, and is taking effective steps to achieving, the goal of permanently and verifiably limiting North Korea’s WMD and ballistic missile programs; or

(B) such termination is vital to the national security interests of the United States, with an explanation of the reasons therefor.

SEC. 1098. EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions authorized under this subtitle shall not include the authority or requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(b) GOOD DEFINED.—In this section, the term “good” means any article, natural or man-made substance, material, supply or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

SEC. 1099. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this subtitle:

(1) TERMS RELATED TO NORTH KOREA.—The terms “applicable Executive order”, “Government of North Korea”, “North Korea”, “North Korean person”, and “significant activities undermining cybersecurity” have the meanings given those terms, respectively, in section 3 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9202).

(2) COVERED PERSON.—The term “covered person” means the following:

(A) Any North Korean person designated under an applicable Executive order.

(B) Any North Korean person that knowingly facilitates the transfer of bulk cash or covered goods (as defined under section 1027.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations).

(C) Any North Korean financial institution.

(D) Any North Korean person employed outside of North Korea, except that the Secretary of the Treasury may waive the application of this subparagraph for a North Korean person that is not otherwise a covered person and—

(i) has been granted asylum or refugee status by the country of employment; or

(ii) is employed as essential diplomatic personnel for the Government of North Korea.

(E) Any person acting on behalf of, or at the direction of, a person described under subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(F) Any person that knowingly employs a person described under subparagraph (D).

(G) Any person that knowingly facilitates the import of goods, services, technology, or natural resources, including energy imports and minerals, or their derivatives, from North Korea.

(H) Any person that knowingly facilitates the export of goods, services, technology, or natural resources, including energy exports and minerals, or their derivatives, to North Korea, except for food, medicine, or medical supplies required for civilian humanitarian needs.

(I) Any person that knowingly invests in, or participates in a joint venture with, an entity in which the Government of North Korea participates or an entity that is created or organized under North Korean law.

(J) Any person that knowingly provides financial services, including through a subsidiary or joint venture, in North Korea.

(K) Any person that knowingly insures, registers, facilitates the registration of, or maintains insurance or a registration for, a vessel owned, controlled, commanded, or operated by a North Korean person.

(L) Any person knowingly providing specialized teaching, training, or information or providing material or technological support to a North Korean person that—

(i) may contribute to North Korea's development and proliferation of WMD, including systems designed in whole or in part for the delivery of such weapons; or

(ii) may contribute to significant activities undermining cybersecurity.

(3) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION DEFINITIONS.—

(A) **FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “financial institution” means a United States financial institution or a foreign financial institution.

(B) **FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “foreign financial institution” has the meaning given that term under section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

(C) **NORTH KOREAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “North Korean financial institution” includes—

(i) any North Korean financial institution, as defined in section 3 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9202);

(ii) any financial agency, as defined in section 5312 of title 31, United States Code, that is owned or controlled by the Government of North Korea;

(iii) any money transmitting business, as defined in section 5330(d) of title 31, United States Code, that is owned or controlled by the Government of North Korea;

(iv) any financial institution that is a joint venture between any person and the Government of North Korea; and

(v) any joint venture involving a North Korean financial institution.

(D) **UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “United States financial institution” has the meaning given the term “U.S. financial institution” under section 510.310 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

(4) **KNOWINGLY.**—The term “knowingly” with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

AMENDMENT NO. 426 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . REPORT ON HOSTILITIES INVOLVING UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall report to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives within 48 hours any incident in which United States Armed Forces are involved in an attack or hostilities, including in an offensive or defensive capacity, unless the President—

(1) reports the incident within 48 hours pursuant to section 4 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543); or

(2) has determined prior to the incident and reported pursuant to section 1264 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (50 U.S.C. 1549) that the United States Armed Forces involved in the incident would be operating under specific statutory authorization, within the meaning of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(b)).

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include, for each such incident—

(1) the statutory and operational authorities under which the United States Armed Forces were operating, including any relevant executive orders and an identification of the operational activities authorized under such executive orders;

(2) the date, location, duration, and other parties involved;

(3) a description of the United States Armed Forces involved and the mission of such Armed Forces;

(4) the numbers of any combatant casualties and civilian casualties; and

(5) any other information the President determines appropriate.

(c) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 427 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . REPORTS AND BRIEFINGS ON USE OF MILITARY FORCE AND SUPPORT OF PARTNER FORCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on specific actions taken pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.) and support for partner forces against those nations or organizations described in such law, during the preceding 180-day period.

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include, with respect to the time period for which the report was submitted, the following:

(1) A list of each nation or organization with respect to which force has been used pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force, including the legal and factual basis for the determination that authority under such law applies with respect to each such nation or organization.

(2) An intelligence assessment of the risk to the United States posed by each such nation or organization.

(3) A list of the countries in which operations were conducted pursuant such law.

(4) A list of all lethal actions in which United States Armed Forces participated, including—

(A) a delineation of whether any country in which such action occurred was or was not designated as an area of active hostilities;

(B) the number of lawfully targetable individuals injured or killed and the number of high-value targets injured or killed for each such specific instance of lethal action; and

(C) a description of the circumstances surrounding each instance of a strike taken in Somalia, Yemen, and any other country not designated an area of active hostilities that did not target a high value target.

(5) A list of each partner force supported and each country in which United States Armed Forces have commanded, coordinated, participated in the movement of, accompanied, or otherwise supported foreign forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals on operations in which such forces, groups or individuals have engaged in hostilities, either offensively or defensively, including—

(A) a delineation of instances in which such United States Armed Forces were or were not operating under the Authorization for Use of Military Force;

(B) the purpose for which the United States Armed Forces were deployed to the country in which the use of force occurred, including the program or funding authority under which such Armed Forces were operating;

(C) a determination of whether the foreign forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals against which such hostilities occurred are covered by the Authorization for Use of Military Force;

(D) a description of the United States Armed Forces involvement in such hostilities, including whether the Armed Forces—

(i) directed the operation that led to hostilities, and, if so, the objective of such operation;

(ii) accompanied the partner force at any point during the mission or operation in which the hostilities occurred;

(iii) engaged directly in combat; or

(iv) provided intelligence, reconnaissance, or surveillance, medivac, refueling, airlift, or any other type of enabling support to the partner forces during hostilities.

(6) A description of the actual and proposed contributions, including financing, equipment, training, troops, and logistical support, provided by each foreign country that participates in any international coalition with the United States to combat a nation or organization described in the Authorization for Use of Military Force.

(c) **FORM.**—The information required under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form.

(d) **OTHER REPORTS.**—If United States Armed Forces engage in hostilities, offensively or defensively, against any nation, organization, or person pursuant to statutory or constitutional authorities other than Authorization for Use of Military Force, the President shall comply with the reporting requirements under—

(1) this section to the same extent and in the same manner as if such actions had been taken under Authorization for Use of Military Force;

(2) the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.); and

(3) any other applicable provision of law.

(e) **BRIEFINGS.**—At least once during each 180-day period described in subsection (a), the President shall provide to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a briefing on the matters covered by the report required under this section for such period.

AMENDMENT 431 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle H of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10 . INSPECTION OF FACILITIES USED TO HOUSE, DETAIN, SCREEN, AND REVIEW MIGRANTS AND REFUGEES.

The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Comptroller General of the United States and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish a process under which the Comptroller General and the Inspector General of Health and Human Services, as appropriate, may be provided with access to Government-owned or Department of Defense-owned installations where there are facilities used to house, detain, screen, or review migrants, refugees, or other persons recently arriving in the United States for purposes of conducting surprise inspections of such facilities.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendments to protect our servicemembers from toxic smoke exposure and move us closer to ending the use of burn pits.

Burn pits are large fields where the military burns waste, including batteries, jet fuels, and medical waste, causing our men and women in uniform to inhale toxic chemicals, carcinogens, and particulate matter. These hazardous materials have been linked to life-threatening cancers, lung diseases, and rare illnesses.

Exposure to burn pits took the life of Jennifer Kepner, a veteran and mother of two from Cathedral City in my district, who lost her life to pancreatic cancer that her doctor believed was most probably caused by her exposure to burn pits.

Jennifer's story has become all too common. As a physician and a public health expert, I know that, when there is a high enough suspicion of harm that causes a severe enough illness, we must act.

As the co-chairman of the bipartisan Burn Pits Caucus, I am working to end the use of burn pits, educate doctors and veterans about their health effects, get exposed veterans the healthcare and benefits that they have earned and need and deserve, and do more research on the health effects of burn pit exposure.

Madam Chair, my amendments will require the Department of Defense to conduct an implementation plan to end the use of nine active burn pits continuing to threaten the health of our servicemembers stationed overseas.

In addition, my amendments will require DOD to provide a list of all locations where open-air burn pits have been used and report to Congress on its research assessing their health effects.

Finally, my amendments require the Department of Defense to train doctors on the potential health effects of burn pits, helping them catch the early warning signs of serious life-threatening illnesses before it is too late.

I would like to thank Congressman PETER WELCH for his support and commitment to protecting the health of our servicemembers and veterans, and I urge my fellow Representatives on both sides of the aisle to support these critical amendments.

As Jennifer Kepner said to me before she died:

Burn pits are the Agent Orange of our generation. We must take action before more veterans and servicemembers lose their lives.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I have no speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

My amendment, No. 401, would examine the feasibility of piloting a workforce transition program for Active-Duty servicemen and -women who are currently in counterintelligence roles to give them the opportunity to obtain additional security clearance credentials upon their separation from service.

A problem that many servicemembers in counterintelligence face upon separation from the military is that they are unable to transition their security clearances to be eligible to start work immediately for, or in support of, a Federal intelligence agency.

The wait time to transition a security clearance can take over a year, and many of these individuals are forced to consider taking a lower paying job while they wait for the process to move forward, or we lose these individuals entirely when they take jobs in the private sector outside the intelligence community.

These are members serving in roles that are in critical needs areas for our intelligence areas, such as cyberspace operations, cyber electronic warfare, and military intelligence.

Because of these difficulties, our intelligence agencies are losing out on a highly qualified and diverse talent pool whose skills and training have already been paid for by the Federal Government.

Madam Chair, my amendment would help ensure that those veterans who have service in our military's intelligence fields, can continue to use their abilities to protect our Nation well beyond their military service.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I have no speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, we have no further speakers. I urge adoption of the en bloc package, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

□ 2030

AMENDMENT NO. 217 OFFERED BY MR. KHANNA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 217 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. KHANNA. 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:

Add at the end of subtitle E of title XII the following:

SEC. 12 . . . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON NORTH KOREA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) diplomacy is essential to address the illegal nuclear program of North Korea;

(2) every effort should be made to avoid a military confrontation with North Korea, as it would pose extreme risks to—

(A) United States military personnel;

(B) noncombatants, including United States citizens and citizens of United States allies; and

(C) regional security;

(3) the United States should pursue a sustained and credible diplomatic process to achieve the denuclearization of North Korea and an end to the 69-year-long Korean War; and

(4) until such time as North Korea no longer poses a threat to the United States or United States allies, the United States should, in concert with such allies, continue to deter North Korea through credible defense and deterrence posture.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, this amendment is an historic effort of bipartisan spirit to finally have peace with North Korea after over 69 years of conflict.

Regardless of whoever is President, diplomacy is the key to the region.

The Congressional Research Service tells us that, in the first few minutes of any war in North Korea, as many as 500,000 civilians could perish, many of them Americans. And, if the conflict went nuclear, millions would perish.

No one has done more for peace in the subcontinent, in North Korea, than President Carter. President Carter went and met with Kim Jong Un's grandfather in 1994 and came up with a framework for denuclearization. He recently had a constructive conversation with President Trump, and President Trump has taken efforts to seek dialogue there.

I believe that we can have a three-part framework to reaching such an agreement that President Carter had outlined with Kim Jong Un's grandfather.

First, we need to have a nonaggression pact to assure the North Koreans that we do not have any interest in regime change and have a permanent peace. I believe, if we do that, Kim Jong Un will engage in significant denuclearization.

And we should have no relaxation of any sanctions until there is at least 90 percent denuclearization, which is achievable. And, after the denuclearization, we can have flexible sanctions with clapback provisions.

The point is, this doesn't have to be partisan. It is in our Nation's interest to seek peace. I, for one, will support the administration's efforts to seek peace, and I appreciate that this House, in a bipartisan way, will go on record saying that we need a permanent peace agreement with North Korea.

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. KHANNA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 368 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 375 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 375 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. TIPTON. 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 subtitle J of title V, add the following:

SEC. 597. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE HIGH-ALTITUDE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AVIATION TRAINING SITE.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that the High-Altitude Army National Guard Aviation Training Site is the lone school of the Department of Defense where rotary-wing aviators in the Armed Forces and the militaries of foreign allies learn how to safely fly rotary-wing aircraft in mountainous, high-altitude environments.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that military aviation training in Colorado, including the training conducted at the High-Altitude Army National Guard Aviation Training Site, is critical to the national security of the United States and the readiness of the Armed Forces.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this important issue.

Just so everyone will know, HAATS stands for the High-Altitude Army Aviation Training Site. There is only one such site in the United States, and that is in the mountains of western Colorado, and it happens to be in Representative TIPTON's district.

A lot of the people who train there with rotary aircraft come from Fort Carson, which is in my district. I know there is interest from other members of the Colorado delegation. They have had legislation that would designate nearby areas, or even that area, as a wilderness site.

But I want to talk about the importance of this to the Army. This is high-altitude training. So, for rotary wing pilots who are going to be going to places like Afghanistan, this is a unique training opportunity.

The high altitude, the change of weather, the mountainous conditions, and the valleys and hills and mountain peaks really make for an amazing training experience. And it has saved lives.

I know Representative TIPTON is going to have one story. I will give another.

Just in this last couple of months, a couple of skiers from Vail were lost, and there was a search and rescue effort that was undertaken. With the help of helicopter pilots who had been trained, who were in the Army Na-

tional Guard, I believe, they were able to find those skiers and rescue them without loss of life or injury, even, and it was a great success story.

That high-altitude training site has led to many lives being saved, so it is an asset for our country. It is a gem; it is a jewel; and it must be protected at all costs.

Madam Chair, I appreciate Representative TIPTON's leadership on this issue.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, I do have the privilege and the honor to be able to represent Colorado's vast Third Congressional District, which is home to the High-Altitude Army National Guard Aviation Training Site, also known as HAATS. It is located in Gypsum, Colorado.

HAATS is under the U.S. Department of Defense's organization, and it is a lone school that teaches rotary wing aviators in the Armed Forces, in the military, and also those of our foreign allies to learn how to be able to fly safely with rotary wing aircraft in mountainous, high-altitude environments.

I have had the opportunity to be able to hear from military officials and many servicemen and -women, both retired and active, along with their families, who praise the lifesaving training conducted at HAATS.

There are numerous examples of how the elite training provided at HAATS has benefited our men and women in uniform when it comes to military aviation. I would like to share one of those examples this evening.

In Afghanistan's Helmand province, a HAATS graduate conducting an emergency medical evacuation mission in treacherous conditions was faced with the challenge of dealing with fine brown talcum powder, which was damaging the engine's aircraft. He was able, through his training in management power techniques garnered at HAATS, to actually safely land the aircraft and successfully remove wounded soldiers and medics out of the area, which was extremely hazardous.

Madam Chair, my amendment is a sense of Congress whereby Congress recognizes that the military aviation training in Colorado, including the training conducted at HAATS, is critical to the national security of the United States and to the readiness of the Armed Forces.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, while I do not oppose the amendment, I would like to take advantage of the time in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I appreciate that my colleague from the Third Congressional District, Mr. TIPTON, is highlighting a program that is so deeply valued by the entire Colorado delegation, myself included.

HAATS, as was just mentioned, offers unique training for rotary wing pilots in power management at high altitudes. It is the only Department of Defense aviation school that teaches pilots this skill outside of the classroom. Students come from all over the world to receive this incredible training.

As more skiers, hikers, and rock climbers visit Colorado, there are more instances where outdoor enthusiasts may need to be rescued and evacuated. And, because of the work done at HAATS, evacuations can happen in some of the most unforgiving terrain on Earth.

Of course, as my distinguished colleague mentioned, HAATS also provides the training for our military aviators to simulate real-world combat scenarios to be prepared to support our men and women in uniform.

I know I speak for the entire Colorado delegation when I say that the work done at HAATS is critically important, and we are proud to have such a renowned training facility headquartered in Colorado in the Third Congressional District, as my colleague mentioned, which borders my own beautiful congressional district, the Second.

It is also for those reasons I would just say that I do believe it is important, as cosponsors of wilderness legislation, that we work to ensure that the bills that we pursue don't adversely affect current or future military transit and training in Colorado.

I would like to address the comment made by my colleague from Colorado Springs, the distinguished gentleman, to say that the good news is my bill that I have introduced, the CORE Act, with Senator BENNET does not adversely affect current or future military transit and training in Colorado, nor does it impact HAATS.

Years have been spent working constructively with representatives from the Colorado National Guard, HAATS, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the U.S. Army, the U.S. Air Force, the FAA, and relevant land management agencies to ensure that that bill in particular would allow for continued and future military training and transit in Colorado, so that is why I am excited that that bill is making its way to the floor.

Again, I appreciate my colleague's dedication to ensuring that the mission of HAATS is protected. I certainly share that dedication, and I look forward to continuing to support this program that brings so much pride to our State, alongside my colleague, Mr. TIPTON.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, I appreciate the kind comments from my colleague out of Colorado in support of something that is fundamentally important to our Nation's security and also to be able to help citizens who may be in treacherous conditions in the high altitudes of Colorado and our other Western States.

Madam Chair, I do encourage our colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TIPTON. 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. 386 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 386 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. TURNER. 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:

Strike section 1646 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 1646. CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEPLOYMENT OF LOW-YIELD BALLISTIC MISSILE WARHEAD.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall certify to the congressional defense committees whether—

(1) the Secretary determines that the deployment of low-yield ballistic missile warheads is in the best interests of the national security of the United States; and

(2) the Secretary has an alternative to the W76-2 low-yield ballistic missile warhead that—

(A) may be deployed as of the date of the certification; and

(B) provides at least the same level of proportional response capability as the W76-2 low-yield ballistic missile warhead deployed on submarine-launched ballistic missiles.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Chair, this is an amendment that would strike section 1646 of the bill and replace it with a determination by the Secretary of Defense as to a certification of need.

Madam Chair, this provision is a unilateral nuclear disarmament provision.

Now, the chairman has said repeatedly this is not a unilateral nuclear disarmament, but let's break down those words.

It is unilateral because it only applies to us. There is no one else. It is nuclear because it applies to a nuclear weapon. And it is disarmament because it requires the pulling of a nuclear weapon that is scheduled for deployment.

What we currently have in this bill is a requirement that the W76-2, which is a low-yield nuclear weapon that is currently headed for our submarines, be pulled and not be deployed, a weapon that our Department of Defense has determined that we needed and, in fact, last year, on a bipartisan basis, was funded and approved for deployment.

But now we are going to reverse course because now Congress is going to decide, for unilateral nuclear disarmament, to reach out and start pulling back nuclear weapons that are there to defend us.

Let's talk just for a moment as to why we need this.

Russia has adopted a new nuclear doctrine that is called escalate to deescalate. They actually believe that the first use of nuclear weapons is something that can deescalate a fight as opposed to escalate it. They have deployed low-yield nuclear weapons, and they have even practiced scenarios where they use low-yield believing that, because we have, usually, larger yield, bigger weapons, that we would be less likely to respond.

In fact, the BBC did a documentary where they began a scenario of an attack by Russia against the United States where it is a low-yield nuke against one of our aircraft carriers, and the assumption being we wouldn't answer back with a very large nuke.

The problem here that we have is that this is a step to reduce our nuclear arsenal which is there for one reason and one reason only, and that is to deter our adversaries so that they never think of using nuclear weapons.

This provision would take this unilateral nuclear disarmament out. It would put back in the bill a provision that requires the Secretary of State to determine that it is needed, and we would instead look to their determination, not the random determination of Congress.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First of all, if you were to say "unilateral nuclear disarmament" to most people, I think, if you look at the plain language of the words, what that would say is we are going to universally nuclear disarm all nuclear weapons. That is what unilateral nuclear disarmament would mean. So that is not what we are doing here.

Again, we literally have thousands of nuclear weapons. What we are doing here is trying to decide whether or not we want to deploy one in a different form, which is a smaller yield.

So we are not—let me assure my colleagues again—getting rid of all of our nuclear weapons and unilaterally disarming from nuclear weapons. We are not doing that.

□ 2045

This is one weapon with a small yield.

The other thing that is worth noting; there is actually no evidence that the Russians have decided that they are going to use a low-yield nuclear weapon

on first without any new clear provocation.

I have had this debate with a number of different people. There have been various conversations about this; just like we have had various conversations about a wide range of scenarios. But it is not at all clear that Russia has decided to launch a nuclear weapon.

I believe that the purpose of a nuclear arsenal is deterrence; and we ought to find a clear message. In fact, I find this debate, which we have been having for a while, very dangerous because what we are saying to the Russians is there is a scenario under which they can use a nuclear weapon and we won't respond, and I don't think that should ever be true.

We should say a nuclear weapon is a red line. You step across it, we will respond.

It is also very untrue—this debate has said, Well, gosh, if they do a low yield, we have no option but to hit them with something 10 times as large.

We have a wide range of yields on our nuclear weapons, a wide range of options in terms of where and when we could respond.

But what introducing a low-yield nuclear weapon does is we take the Russian mutterings about doing an escalate to de-escalate and say, yeah, we are with you. This could happen.

Former Secretary of State George Shultz, a Republican, is the one who has been most critical of deployment of this weapon, because, as he correctly states, when we start talking about low-yield nuclear weapons, you start making nuclear war acceptable.

That is why deployment of this weapon is such a mistake. It takes us down the road of saying, we can have a manageable nuclear war. No. Make it clear to the Russians, if they start a nuclear war, we can't promise that our response is going to be proportional, but we can promise that we will respond.

This is a mistake. But we are not unilaterally nuclear disarming.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Chair, this is unilateral nuclear disarmament because we get nothing from the other side. I mean, if you are against this nuclear weapon, put a provision in this bill that says I strongly encourage the United States to negotiate with Russia that we both get rid of these nuclear weapons.

I don't like nuclear weapons. I am just more concerned about the ones that are in the hands of the other guys than the ones that are in our hands.

Now, what is weird about this is that the determination by the chairman that we need to pull this weapon back after, again, bipartisan support for this weapon being deployed; is it because this weapon is dangerous? No.

Is it because our adversaries have it? Well, adversaries do have it.

Do we have it in other forms? Yes.

But yet, instead of those who are charged with our military policy deciding it, they want to decide it.

Now, again, this should be decided by treaty. We should require that the other side get rid of theirs if we are going to get rid of ours.

But the other aspect is, this is not just musings about Russia saying escalate to de-escalate. That is their nuclear weapons policy, and we have to be very concerned as to how that policy affects their calculus.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), a member of the committee.

Mr. MOULTON. Madam Chair, I rise to oppose this amendment.

Now, I do not question my colleague from Ohio's commitment to our national security. He and I have worked together on this committee for several years.

But I do think that this amendment would be a grave strategic mistake. I oppose the development of these low-yield weapons for three distinct reasons:

One, they increase the chance of miscalculation by our enemies;

Two, they are a waste of taxpayer money for a capability that we already possess; and

Three, they weaken our national defense as a consequence.

The fundamental strength of our nuclear deterrence lies in the fact that our nuclear weapons are so catastrophically damaging that nobody would dare attack us or even threaten our allies with a nuclear weapon.

Lowering the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons by signaling to our enemies that our response might not be catastrophic for them makes it more likely that our enemies will use nukes against us and our allies in the first place. It plays into Russia's dangerous new escalate to de-escalate doctrine.

Nobody should question the resolve of the United States of America to respond with overwhelming force if strategic weapons are used. Developing these low-yield weapons does just that. It questions that resolve, and that weakens our national defense.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Chair, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TURNER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, if I may inquire, who has the right to close on this one?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has the right to close.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I just have my close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The provision that this amendment seeks to modify in the bill is a provision that Vladimir Putin would love. I can't imagine what it must be like

when, in Moscow, they begin to tell Vladimir Putin that the United States Congress is looking to pass a law to limit our nuclear weapons arsenal; that we are going to look to pass a law to actually remove weapons that are scheduled for deployment; to remove weapons that Russia has; to remove weapons that are intended to change Russia's calculus, so that when they look to threaten our country, they know that we have the ability to respond to both proportionately.

And it is not a new weapon. There are other forms of low-yield nuclear weapons that we have. It is just this one that is being objected to.

By the way, the money has been spent. This weapon is on its way. This is not a destabilizing weapon. This is a weapon that keeps us safe.

Now, the concern with this, of course, once we begin unilateral nuclear disarmament—it is unilateral because we get nothing for it. Our other side is doing nothing. Nuclear because it is a weapon; disarmament because we are taking an armament out—is then when do we stop?

If Congress decides to do this, that we have the ability to just start pulling weapons, then is the nuclear triad at risk, Madam Chair?

Do we go pull our ICBMs?

Do we say that we shouldn't have this weapon or that weapon?

Shouldn't we be looking to those who actually have the expertise in understanding what our adversaries are doing; what our strategy is; what our nuclear weapons capabilities are and our adversaries' nuclear weapons capabilities; how those compare; what their procedures have been, and how they have been deploying?

All those should figure in to the expertise, not random decisions to pull nuclear weapons here on the Congressional floor.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

There is nothing random about this decision; and I do find the gentleman's argument interesting. I suppose Congress should just sort of shut down and say, Pentagon, whatever you want, you have got. We are not going to say anything about it.

I really disagree with that aspect of the gentleman's argument; that because the Pentagon has decided to deploy this weapon, Congress should have no say in it.

We are not doing this randomly. We are not doing this arbitrarily. This is actually a debate that has gone on for a number of years as to whether or not to deploy this weapon. I will grant you there are arguments on both sides of it, but the notion that we are like, on a whim, making this decision is ridiculous.

As I said, there are many former national security experts, including former Secretary of State George Shultz, who thinks that this weapon will destabilize and make us less safe.

And let's remember, we have had a nuclear deterrent for almost 75 years now. And for all of those 75 years, we have not put a low-yield nuclear weapon on one of our submarines. We haven't done it. We have had a very strong deterrent.

What I would say to Mr. Putin is, No, we are not going to deploy every single weapon system that we have ever thought of because that wouldn't be very smart. But we have thousands of nuclear weapons. And as Mr. MOULTON said quite clearly, we need to make it clear, we will have an overwhelming response to any use of nuclear weapons. That is what will deter them. That is what will stop a nuclear war from starting.

When we start to have that situation where it goes back and forth, and we say, Well, we can have a manageable nuclear war, that is the danger that leads people to oppose this weapon. I urge opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TURNER. 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 Ohio will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 421 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 423 OFFERED BY MR. KHANNA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 423 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Mr. KHANNA. 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 subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . PROHIBITION OF UNAUTHORIZED MILITARY FORCE IN OR AGAINST IRAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The acquisition by the Government of Iran of a nuclear weapon would pose a grave threat to international peace and stability and the national security of the United States and United States allies, including Israel.

(2) The Government of Iran is a leading state sponsor of terrorism, continues to materially support the regime of Bashar al-Assad, and is responsible for ongoing gross violations of the human rights of the people of Iran.

(3) Article I of the United States Constitution requires the President to obtain authorization from Congress before engaging in war with Iran.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF CURRENT LAW.—Nothing in the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note), the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note), or any other provision of law enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act may be construed

to provide authorization for the use of military force against Iran.

(C) PROHIBITION OF UNAUTHORIZED MILITARY FORCE IN OR AGAINST IRAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (1), no Federal funds may be used for any use of military force in or against Iran unless Congress has—

(A) declared war; or

(B) enacted specific statutory authorization for such use of military force after the date of the enactment of this Act that meets the requirements of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

(2) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) shall not apply to a use of military force that is consistent with section (2)(c) of the War Powers Resolution.

(d) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—(1) Nothing in this section may be construed to prevent the President from using necessary and appropriate force to defend United States allies and partners if Congress enacts specific statutory authorization for such use of force consistent with the requirements of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

(2) Nothing in this Act may be construed to relieve the executive branch of restrictions on the use of force, reporting, or consultation requirements set forth in the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

(3) Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize the use of military force.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, this will be the most important foreign policy vote in the United States Congress. This bipartisan amendment makes it clear that the Congress appropriates zero funding for any offensive war in Iran or another war by choice.

The Supreme Court has made it clear that when Congress limits funding for a war, Congress' power, not the executive power, is at its peak. And when this amendment passes, it will be a clear statement for Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle that this country is tired of endless wars; that we do not want another war in the Middle East.

I will make one final point before I yield to my colleagues. The other side, and people will argue, that this may limit our ability to respond to an attack on the United States or our allies. That is a patent lie.

Nothing in this amendment limits the President of the United States from doing anything that he needs to do to defend the United States of America or our allies as he is authorized under the War Powers Act.

What this will prevent is another trillion-dollar war in the Middle East. Frankly, what it will prevent is what this President promised the American people not to do, to get into another endless, costly war in the Middle East.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), the bipartisan cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and for our work together on this issue.

Madam Chair, I represent the district in this Congress that has the highest concentration of active duty military. If my constituents are called to war with Iran, they will go without hesitation or question. They will fight and win decisive victory, and I am incredibly proud of them.

But if they must deploy the patriotism to go downrange and win this war, we should at least have the courage to vote for it or vote against it, every darn one of us.

And if my war-hungry colleagues, some of whom have already suggested that we invade Venezuela, North Korea, and probably a few other countries before lunchtime tomorrow; if they are so certain of their case against Iran, let them bring their authorization to use military force against Iran to this very floor.

Let them make the case to Congress and to the American people. Let them show the military families in my district what their loved ones will fight for and die for. If we do that, then I think we serve the country well.

My constituents are doing their part, and I think it is about time Congress does our part and speak to these critical matters of war and peace.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this unfortunate and dangerous amendment which is a propaganda win for the Iranian regime and the Houthi allies. It takes legitimate options off the table; shows America divided in the face of mounting Iranian threats; and makes our Nation less safe.

We all agree that, under Article I of the Constitution, only Congress possesses the authority to declare war. The administration's measured response to Iran's shooting down of our U.S. military asset in international airspace shows that the President is not looking for war with Iran.

But this amendment goes much farther in prohibiting unauthorized war with the number one state sponsor of terror. It uses the power of the purse to preclude any use of force whatsoever against Iran unless it is previously authorized by Congress or provoked by an attack on the United States or our Armed Forces.

□ 2100

Think about what that means. What can our military do if Iran attacks American civilians or our regional allies like Israel and Jordan or strategic international shipping through the Straits of Hormuz?

Under this reckless amendment, the answer is: Absolutely nothing. The U.S. military cannot fire a single shot until after the successful completion of a bicameral legislation process that enacts a law authorizing the use of force. All of us here today know how long that could take.

This will tie our military's hands at a perilous time. We need Iran and its terrorist proxies to think twice before they attack Americans, our friends, or our interests.

This amendment is an unprecedented attempt to micromanage the powers claimed by every Commander in Chief, Democrat and Republican, since the War Powers Resolution was enacted over President Nixon's veto in 1973. In fact, the effect of this misguided amendment is far more restrictive than the War Powers Resolution itself.

This is absolutely not the time to play politics with our national security. Iran's saber rattling and provocation is not going to go away anytime soon.

I would like to quote from a July 8 letter from Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. He says:

The Department strongly opposes this amendment. If U.S. citizens, diplomatic facilities in the region, or other national interests are threatened or attacked, we must be able to respond promptly and in an appropriate fashion.

And he says:

At a time when Iran is engaging in escalating military provocations demonstrated most recently by the shooting down of the U.S. unmanned aerial vehicle, it is attacking allied shipping.

They shot a missile at our U.S. Embassy in Iraq. This amendment could only embolden Iran to further provocations.

Bottom line, this amendment will give comfort to our enemy who has the blood of Americans on their hands—from the Marine barracks bombing to the Iraq war—and who continues to hold American hostages to this day. This is a pro-Iran, pro-Houthi amendment.

I was in the White House when the President made his decision and exercised restraint to not escalate this war, but this, I believe, is an ill-proposed amendment.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, we are going to have eight more speakers because this was such a collaborative effort, so I hope the speakers will limit themselves to 1 minute or less so we can get everyone in.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), our distinguished chair, who did more to bring this amendment together than anyone.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I want to make it absolutely clear, in all the scenarios that the gentleman on the other side just pointed out, the President has the absolute right of self-defense.

As Mr. KHANNA made clear in his opening remarks, the right of self-defense—if we were attacked in the way

that Congressman MCCAUL described, the President has the absolute right to defend the United States.

What this amendment says, basically it is counter to the gentleman's argument. The gentleman's argument basically is that Congress should get out of the way. Under no circumstances should Congress have any say in the use of the United States military.

I think that is wrong. I think we have a role to play. The President should not be allowed to start a war anytime, anywhere, but he can absolutely defend the United States in accordance with the War Powers Resolution.

All this says, that if it isn't a matter of self-defense, if the President has decided, as we decided in Iraq, that we are going to launch a war for preemptive reasons or because of many of the things the gentleman pointed out that Iran does, if we are going to start a war because of that, then we in the United States Congress should uphold our constitutional duty and have the right to vote on it. I think that is appropriate.

Unless Members are in favor of Congress getting totally out of having any say in this, Members need to support this amendment.

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

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN), who is a colonel in the Army, was a colonel in the Army, and was helpful from day one in crafting this.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment, which is the product of hard work from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The administration does not have authorization to take military action in or against Iran and must come to Congress for that authority, and this amendment makes that crystal clear.

Many members of the administration have been trying to make a case for a war with Iran for months, if not years, going so far as to try to speciously tie Iran to al-Qaida and claim the 2001 AUMF passed in the aftermath of the attack on 9/11 might authorize war against Iran.

Congress must reassert our constitutional authority.

There is no question that Iran is a bad actor and they have been for a long time, but if the administration believes that armed conflict is the way to keep us safe, then the administration must make the case to Congress and the American people, because it will be their sons and daughters who will be on the front lines of that brutal war.

We cannot be a Congress or a nation that accepts going to war on a whim as the status quo. I firmly believe it is time for Congress to repeal and replace the 2001 AUMF, but until we can do that, we must pass this amendment now.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I have only myself to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), who led 100-plus Members in a letter opposing the war with Iran.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Chair, I would like to thank Mr. SMITH and Mr. KHANNA for their leadership on this amendment and just express my disappointment at the statements made by my friend, Mr. MCCAUL.

I never imagined that an amendment that essentially restated congressional authority as detailed in the Constitution would ever get characterized as a propaganda win for Iran, as a pro-Iran thing; and I would remind my friend, Mr. MCCAUL, that, yes, the President stepped away from a military conflict that might have been justified as an act of self-defense.

I am not in the practice of praising the President on this floor, but he took a prudent course a few weeks ago. There is absolutely no guarantee he will do so again.

This amendment does one simple thing. It is not unprecedented. Its precedent is the United States Constitution, which vests war-making authority when it is not in self-defense, as Mr. SMITH points out, exclusively in the Congress. Now, we may or may not like that idea, but it is the principle that we swore to uphold.

And I would just remind the Chamber that, every time we allow a Democratic or a Republican President to go to war without an authorization in this Chamber, we shirk our constitutional duty. We fail to back our warfighters with the full and robust voice of the United States Government.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), my good friend who has led this bill in the House that prevents funding for a war with Iran.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague, Mr. KHANNA, for yielding.

I rise in strong support of amendment 423, and I want to thank all of the Members who have worked so hard on this.

I am proud to have written legislation in early April of this year, the Prevention of Unconstitutional War with Iran Act, which enjoys 79 cosponsors and prohibits the President from using any funding appropriated by Congress to take military action in or against Iran without authorization from Congress. This amendment mirrors and complements that legislation by prohibiting the use of any funding in this year's NDAA to carry out unauthorized military attacks against Iran.

It is very important to have this amendment on the floor because the Trump administration seems determined to provoke military confrontation with Iran, and the President and his hawkish advisers have publicly stated that they don't need authorization from Congress to carry out preemptive attacks.

They are wrong. The U.S. Constitution is clear. Article I, Section 8 gives

Congress the sole authority to declare war, allowing the American people to decide, through their Representatives in Congress, whether military action is in the best interest of the country.

We carry no grief for Iran, not one of us, but this amendment should pass.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to heed the gavel.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), a veteran who was in four tours of duty and fought against the Iranians in his second tour in Iraq.

Mr. MOULTON. Madam Chair, colleagues, this vote is about several things.

It is about war with Iran. The President and John Bolton have manufactured a crisis by withdrawing America from the Iran nuclear deal with no alternative, and Iran has a strategic advantage over us now that they did not have before under the deal.

This vote is about the Authorization for Use of Military Force passed almost 20 years ago that does not authorize war with Iran. We do not underestimate the Iranian threat. It is real, it is significant, but that does not make going to war now legal or necessary.

But most of all, this vote is about the Constitution and our duty to uphold it. It is the Commander in Chief's job to strengthen our national security, not weaken it, as he has done, and it is Congress' job to decide when we send young Americans to war.

The oath that we all took to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States is the same oath, word-for-word, that I took as a Marine officer.

Our troops are upholding that oath. They are doing their jobs. It is time for us in Congress to do ours.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

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

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW), a leading veteran voice, who has been helpful in getting many veterans groups on board with this.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I rise today to support this amendment to reassert Congress' constitutional role in authorizing the use of military force.

As a former Army Ranger, I learned firsthand that when politicians talk tough in this town, real people get hurt.

It was an honor to serve our country in Iraq and Afghanistan, but I also witnessed the consequences of sending Americans into harm's way without defined goals and a clear exit strategy.

The most solemn responsibility of Congress is the decision to authorize the use of military force. It is a responsibility that our Founders reserved for Congress because we are directly and daily accountable to those who have to fight our wars: our sons, daughters, mothers, and fathers.

I urge my colleagues to join me in reasserting Congress' role in deciding when to use military force by voting "yes" on this amendment. It is time to fulfill our constitutional duty.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, no one respects the Constitution more than I do. We have Article I authorities.

There is a reason why the Founding Fathers put Article I first, because that is the American people over the imperial presidency.

Why are we debating such an important issue, matters of war and peace, which is what my committee argues day in and day out on the Foreign Affairs Committee—well, first of all, it is part of the NDAA. But why are we arguing this at 9:15 at night, in the darkness of night and not the sunlight of day?

This is a dangerous amendment. It is a preemptive use of the AUMF.

We have not engaged in hostile forces, combat forces in Iran. We have not engaged in hostilities. That is when the War Powers Resolution kicks in, notification to the Congress, and then Congress debates the Authorization for Use of Military Force.

I have been in this body for eight terms. That is how the process works. You don't handcuff the President, the Commander in Chief. You don't handcuff him in advance of any preparation for dealing with state-sponsored terror.

This is just wrong.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), who has an important bill clarifying the 2001-2002 AUMF.

□ 2115

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, the amendment before us is about our responsibility to protect the American people. It is about our values.

Do we believe the President acting on his own should be able to put our troops in harm's way and put us at risk of another horrific war with zero input from the American people's elected representatives in Congress? Or do we want to make clear that we are going to do our job, the job our constituents elected us to do, follow the Constitution, and prevent a reckless attack on Iran?

This isn't about being a Democrat or a Republican. As a Member of the people's House, colleagues should support this amendment to prevent an unauthorized attack on Iran and make it clear that this Congress has not authorized the use of military force, in line with my bipartisan AUMF Clarification Act.

Madam Chair, I thank Representative KHANNA for yielding.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), for her work on asserting Congress' authority over war and peace.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, it is up to Congress to prevent another costly war in the Middle East. For too long, Congress has ceded its responsibilities as a coequal branch of government when it comes to matters of war and peace.

As The New York Times recently put it: "It is long past time that the legislative branch reclaimed its central role in overseeing war waged in the name of the American people."

Madam Chair, I thank Congressman KHANNA for this amendment. He has been persistent and very clear about our role in the areas of war and peace, and it builds upon the amendment I got into the Defense appropriations bill that indicated and said that nothing in the Defense appropriations bill could be construed as authorization for the use of force in Iran.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

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

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND), one of the new leaders on HASC who has been very, very helpful on this amendment.

Ms. HAALAND. Madam Chair, this administration's reckless behavior threatens to plunge the region into chaos and our own country into another endless and costly war.

We have powerful, peaceful tools to bring other countries to the negotiating table. Under the leadership of President Obama, we used these tools successfully to neutralize Iran's nuclear program.

The President's irresponsible policies have squandered that progress and, instead, set into motion tensions that are spiraling out of control.

We have alienated our closest allies, and Iran is taking steps toward developing a nuclear weapon. This senselessness demonstrates that this administration cannot be trusted with the authority to use military force in Iran.

Madam Chair, I support this amendment.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for a closing argument.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, the people of Iran do not want war.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from California for allowing us, no matter what time of night it is, to stand on the floor and declare that the people of Iran do not want war.

The people of the United States know that the Constitution says that Congress has the right to declare war.

Madam Chair, I support this amendment, because it speaks to the Constitution and our right to declare war and to stand against war and sending our young men and women without the authority of the United States Congress.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, I am very sympathetic to the idea that Congress has neglected to fulfill its responsibilities under the Constitution in this area for many years, with Presidents of both parties and with congressional majorities of both parties.

Unfortunately, I believe that this amendment goes way too far in restricting the ability of the President to exercise his responsibilities under Article II.

I note that one of the most recent speakers referenced President Obama. It was President Obama who used force in Libya with no authorization from this Congress. As a matter of fact, every President since Truman has done so. The notion that it is either all-out war or nothing does not reflect the way the world is or has been for the last 70 years.

I also have to note that it is somewhat concerning to me that much of this amendment seems focused personally at President Trump, who is bending over backward not to use military force and has campaigned against some of the uses in the past. It does not seem to me to be appropriate.

On the substance of the amendment, we have asked senior general officers with responsibility for operations on the Joint Staff and CENTCOM to look at this language. What they tell us is that they are concerned with this language. I understand the representations that have been made, but the people who have to live under it believe it would foreclose the inherent right of self-defense at a time when we have specific, detailed, and credible threats against 65,000 military personnel in the CENTCOM region. They believe it would immediately stop purely defensive intelligence-sharing and defensive border security we are doing with partners in the region. They believe it would halt orders with options to strike back proportionally against Iran in order to limit escalation and would stop active information-related capabilities directly countering Iranian threat networks.

Furthermore, they believe that there is enough concern about this language that it would at least throw doubt on our ability to come to the defense of Israel if it were under attack from Iran, Iranian proxies, or the Iranian threat network. They believe it would cast doubt on our ability to come to the defense of a ship or vessel in the Strait of Hormuz if an ally comes under attack.

I would point out that just within the last 2 days, an allied tanker was at least threatened by Iranian boats coming through the strait.

Senior general officers at the Joint Staff and CENTCOM believe it would threaten continued Seventh Fleet interdiction efforts in the Indo-Pacific to thwart Iranian sanctions evasion.

We have a number of ways that are not war but legitimate use of force.

People who have to live under it believe this goes too far and prevents them from doing what they are doing, which gets back to what Mr. MCCAUL was talking about. That is, this is only good news for Iran and the threat that they pose.

It uses a powerful funding mechanism to tie the President's hands, and they can only be untied after the House and Senate take action. We know that we often don't move too quickly in these areas.

Again, I am sympathetic with the idea that Congress needs to stand up and do our job. We need to do it responsibly, not the kind of overreach that gives assistance to adversaries and makes our allies much more concerned about whether we will stand with them or not.

Madam Chair, I believe this amendment should be rejected, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the bipartisan amendment offered by Representatives KHANNA, GAETZ, ENGEL, SMITH (WA), BROWN, LEVIN (MI) and me, along with 80 other cosponsors, to prohibit funding for any engagement in military hostilities in or against Iran without explicit authorization by Congress.

I want to thank my good friend, Congressman KHANNA, for his leadership on this issue. I especially want to thank Armed Services Committee Chairman SMITH, Foreign Affairs Chairman ENGEL and their excellent staff, who worked tirelessly to ensure that this amendment reflected a broad, bipartisan range of concerns on how best to respond to the relentless march to war with Iran that is happening under President Trump and his bellicose advisors.

Madam Chair, our nation almost went to war with Iran just a couple of weeks ago.

Think about this. We were apparently only moments away from the president launching an attack against Iran that could have quickly snowballed out of control into a major conflict. There was no consultation with Congress. No debate on this floor. No input at all from this House whose Members represent the servicemen and women who would be put in harm's way. Let alone a vote.

Democrats don't want war with Iran. Most Republicans don't want war with Iran. The American people certainly don't want a war in Iran.

But this president was apparently about to use an AUMF passed nearly two decades ago to fumble us into another conflict in the Middle East.

I'm glad the president backed off bombing Iran. But I'm terrified about the lack of thoughtful leadership coming from the Oval Office.

We need to make clear to this administration that the president cannot use an old AUMF to initiate hostilities against Iran.

Nor can he engage in military hostilities in or against Iran without first coming to Congress and getting a specific authorization for the use of such force. Period.

It's long past time for Congress to step up to the plate and carry out its constitutional responsibilities on matters of war and peace.

I urge all my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to support this amendment.

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

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. 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. 424 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 424 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Ms. LEE 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 subtitle G of title XII, on page 842, after line 14, insert the following section:

SEC. 1268. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is repealed.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I thank our chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN, and I thank the chair of the Armed Services Committee, Chairman SMITH, for working with me and all of our members on this amendment and for making this amendment in order.

Madam Chair, I am pleased to offer this amendment along with Representatives ADAM SCHIFF, ELIOT ENGEL, JASON CROW, JOHN LEWIS, SETH MOULTON, MAX ROSE, and many, many others.

Madam Chair, this amendment is straightforward; it is timely; and it should be noncontroversial. It would immediately repeal the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force against Iraq. Repeal of the 2002 AUMF would not impact any existing military operations because it no longer serves an operational purpose.

Leaving the 2002 AUMF on the books runs the risk that it could be utilized by the executive branch for military operations that Congress never intended to authorize.

When Congress passed the 2002 AUMF prior to the invasion of Iraq, it was intended to address the perceived threat posed by the regime of Saddam Hussein as it related to the presence of weapons of mass destruction. United States military deployments and operations carried out pursuant to the 2002 AUMF, Operation Iraqi Freedom, officially concluded in 2011.

Seventeen years after the resolution's passage, the United States recognizes the sovereignty of Iraq and considers the Iraqi Government a key ally.

Both the Obama and Trump administrations have maintained that the 2002 AUMF only serves to reinforce currently existing legal authority. None of the counterterrorism operations being carried out in Iraq independently depend on the 2002 AUMF for authorization.

For these reasons, the 2002 AUMF is outdated and should no longer be on the books. Leaving it in effect risks abuse by this and any future administration.

For example, the Trump administration has claimed that the 2002 AUMF authorizes the use of force to address both "threats to" and "stemming from Iraq," and it authorizes force in "Syria or elsewhere."

Expansive interpretations such as this demonstrate why we strongly believe that the 2002 AUMF should be immediately repealed.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment to repeal the 2002 law that authorizes the use of military force "to defend the national security of the United States against the continued threat posed by Iraq."

First of all, the repeal of any AUMF does not belong in this NDAA bill. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has longstanding sole jurisdiction over declarations of war and intervention abroad. Any significant change to war-making authorities needs to be the result of deliberations and votes by the committee of jurisdiction.

There is no issue more deserving of regular order than issues related to war and peace.

Although none of us want to see the extension of any conflict beyond what is necessary, we have also learned that premature disengagement can have huge costs, such as when the prior administration's rush to withdraw U.S. troops contributed to the deadly rise of ISIS in Iraq and Syria.

While the Saddam Hussein regime was a key focus, it was not the sole focus of the 2002 AUMF. It expressly identified al-Qaida and "other international terrorist organizations, including organizations that threaten the lives and safety of the United States citizens."

Members will recall that al-Qaida in Iraq later became ISIS, a brutal transnational terrorist organization that continues to threaten American lives and interests. President Obama cited the 2002 AUMF as legal authority for his military operations against ISIS.

The current administration has stated its opposition to the repeal of the 2002 AUMF because:

It remains an important source of additional authority for military operations against ISIS in Iraq and to defend the national security interests of the United States against threats emanating from Iraq.

For those reasons, we shouldn't be repealing key counterterrorism AUMFs unless and until we have replaced them with updated authorities that clearly confront the enemies that continue to threaten our Nation, our people, and our allies. To date, we have seen no such proposal from the majority.

So for those reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in prioritizing American security by opposing this amendment.

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

□ 2130

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, the purpose of the 2002 AUMF could not have been more clear. I was here at the time. It was one of the more consequential debates we have ever had. And the purpose was clearly stated to go after Saddam Hussein because he had weapons of mass destruction and to wage war against the nation of Iraq.

If we cannot repeal that 17 years later, then Congress has truly and totally abrogated its constitutional responsibility to regulate any use of military force. There is no justification 17 years later to keep this on the books so that Presidents can use the authority as a blank check. Congress should stand up.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW), a veteran who served his country well and now is serving this body well.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I rise today to support Representative LEE's important amendment to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force, an authorization that has long outlived its intended purpose: the 2002 AUMF authorized U.S. force to overthrow Saddam Hussein's regime and enforce U.N. resolutions in Iraq. Much has changed since those days and, today, Iraq is an important partner in the fight against terrorism.

As the justification for the 2002 AUMF has ended, so, too, should this authorization. This is not an opinion I alone hold. Just today, Army Chief of Staff, a nominee for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Milley, stated that the 2001 AUMF provides all of the authorities necessary for ongoing counterterrorism operations in the region. I agree with General Milley and believe it is time to repeal this outdated authorization that no longer serves an operational purpose.

A common theme in the NDAA this year is the emphasis on increasing transparency and reasserting congressional oversight on matters of war and diplomacy.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment and demonstrate that Congress is re-

asserting its Article I authorities and responsibilities.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. FLETCHER). The gentlewoman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), an expert on national security.

Mr. MOULTON. Madam Chair, when is enough enough? The vote to go to war against Iraq in 2002 was a mistake. Congress should have been more careful, questioned the intelligence, and made sure that we exhausted every other option before we put young American lives in danger.

It is time that we stopped living off those past mistakes. Both the Obama administration and the Trump administration have maintained that the 2002 AUMF only serves to reinforce currently existing legal authority.

So it needs to end. We need to repeal it. Because keeping it in place does not support current operations, and it could be used as a legal pretext for future escalation in the Middle East that has not been authorized by Congress.

If we ever need to go to war against Iraq again, Congress has the constitutional obligation to make that decision. And we are fortunate that now that decision will be made, in part, by the generation that fought in Iraq and Afghanistan, which is coming to Congress to step in for the generation that sent us there.

So let's get rid of this mistake, clear the decks for a new generation of better, more accountable leadership, and ensure that Congress takes more careful responsibility for these decisions moving forward.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

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

Mr. McCAUL. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 425 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 425 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Ms. LEE 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 subtitle H of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE 2001 AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Authorization for Use of Military Force (referred to in this section as the "2001 AUMF") (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) was passed by Congress in 2001 after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, to authorize the use of force against those responsible for the attacks of September 11, 2001.

(2) The 2001 AUMF is one of the only modern authorizations for the use of force in the history of the United States that included no limitation in time, geography, operations, or a named enemy.

(3) The 2001 AUMF has been cited 41 times as the legal basis for the use of force in 19 countries.

(4) Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution provides Congress with the sole authority to "declare war".

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the use of the 2001 AUMF has been well beyond the scope that Congress initially intended when it was passed on September 14, 2001;

(2) nearly 18 years after the passage of the 2001 AUMF, it has served as a blank check for any President to wage war at any time and at any place; and

(3) any new authorization for the use of military force that replaces the 2001 AUMF should include—

(A) a sunset clause and timeframe within which Congress should revisit the authority provided in the new authorization for use of military force;

(B) a clear and specific expression of mission objectives, targets, and geographic scope; and

(C) reporting requirements to increase transparency and ensure proper Congressional oversight.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, first, I thank our Rules Committee chair, Mr. MCGOVERN, as well as all the members of the committee for making this amendment in order. And I also thank our chairman, Mr. SMITH, for working with us to bring this amendment forward.

I am proud to offer this amendment with Representative MAX ROSE. It is a very straightforward amendment. It simply expresses the sense of Congress that the 2001 AUMF has been utilized well beyond the scope than Congress intended, and that it is far past time for Congress to reassert our constitutional mandated role in war making.

Our amendment also states that any new authorization should include more specific provisions, including a sunset clause, clear and specific expression of objectives, targets, and geographic scope.

Madam Chair, my amendment is not only necessary, but it is timely. Right now, the Trump administration is threatening to use the 2001 AUMF as a legal basis to go to war with Iran. This demonstrates the dangers of leaving this authorization for the use of military force on the books indefinitely.

The 2001 AUMF is only 60 words, and one of the only modern authorizations

for the use of force that includes no limitations in time, geography, operations, or a named enemy.

On September 14, 2001, 3 days after the horrific attacks, I was the only “no” vote in Congress for the 2001 AUMF. It was an authorization that I knew would provide a blank check for the President, any President, to wage a war anywhere, any time, and for any length. In the last 18 years, it has been used by three consecutive administrations to wage war at any time, at any place, without congressional oversight or authorization.

According to a 2018 Congressional Research Service report, which I encourage all of my colleagues to read, the 2001 AUMF has, in fact, become that blank check for war. In the almost 18 years since its passage, it has been cited 41 times in 19 countries to wage war with little or no congressional oversight. And this report only looks at unclassified incidents. How many other times has it been used without the knowledge of Congress or the American people?

The AUMF has reportedly been invoked to deploy troops in Syria, Yemen, Somalia, Libya, and Niger. We know that this is far beyond what Congress intended when it was passed in 2001 in the days after the terrible attacks of 9/11.

That is why our amendment is so important. It is a sense of Congress simply recognizing that this has been used well beyond what Congress originally intended when it first passed in 2001; that Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution provides Congress with the sole authority to declare war; and that any new AUMF to replace the 2001 should include a timeframe within which Congress should revisit the authority provided in any AUMF, which many experts agree needs to be included in any replacement AUMF.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. It simply lists complaints about the 2001 authorization for the use of military force while avoiding the serious work of proposing an improved replacement.

Most Members, including me, would say they would be fine with an updated AUMF that better describes current threats. Unfortunately, there is no consensus at all about what that should look like. The fact that the majority has not put forward a single proposal in the 6 months they have been in charge indicates to me that they have deep disagreements.

The author of this amendment has also inserted an outright repeal of the 2001 AUMF into this year’s Defense appropriations bill, which would make all counterterrorism operations globally illegal. That is reckless because AUMF

provides the necessary legal authority to confront ongoing deadly threats against our homeland. It would also be simply irresponsible and dangerous to repeal it until an adequate replacement has passed both Chambers and been sent to the President’s desk.

The gentlewoman from California, with all respect, has held a principled, consistent position on this issue, and I do respect that. I just disagree with it.

But it is incorrect to assert, as this amendment does, that the 2001 AUMF is a blank check for any President to wage war at any time and at any place. The AUMF has been interpreted as covering al-Qaida, the Taliban, and “associated forces.” And while that interpretation is sometimes broad, it can’t be stretched to cover just anything. For example, it does not capture North Korea or countless other potential adversaries and, arguably, Iran, as well.

The amendment also complains that the 2001 AUMF did not include things like geographic limitations or a named enemy. But it is hard to see how it could have done so while also meeting the grave transnational terrorist threats it was intended to defeat. Because these enemies aren’t nation-states marching uniformed troops to face us on the fields of battle, authorizing force to fight them is much more complicated.

The amendment also wrongly implies that the will of Congress has been thwarted by how long and how broadly the AUMF has been used. But Congress has been kept aware of how it is being used, and has always had the same power to legislate, amend, or repeal, as it had back in 2001. The fact is—and this goes on both sides of the aisle—it has not done so. That indicates a decision that, under both Democrat and Republican majorities and administrations, the 2001 AUMF is working.

For my years as Homeland Security chairman, I know that our operations overseas, and the sacrifices of our service men and women, have saved American lives and helped to protect the homeland from countless thwarted attacks.

Unfortunately, the threat does continue. As the Director of National Intelligence has testified, al-Qaida and ISIS maintain transnational networks actively committed to our destruction. Don’t get me wrong: I would like to see an updated AUMF as well. That comes out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We should deliberate an updated AUMF on our committee. But this amendment contributes nothing towards that outcome.

Until we have new authorities in place to combat the real and dynamic threats to American lives and safety, we need to focus on responsibly using the authorities we have, not just complaining about their imperfections.

If the other side is serious about a fix, then let’s work together on a fix and provide a serious replacement to begin this process on a very serious issue of counterterrorism and war and peace.

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE), my colleague, who serves on the Homeland Security Committee and Veterans’ Affairs Committee.

□ 2145

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Chair, I want to thank my good friend, Congresswoman LEE, for introducing this amendment and, just as importantly, for her, as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle noted, consistency and leadership on this issue for the last 18 years.

Madam Chair, it will be 18 years this coming September. Men and women will enlist in the United States military who were not born on 9/11. They are enlisting in the United States military, and they will likely go to fight in a war in Afghanistan that is currently being fought based off an authorization that was signed before they were born.

In the last 18 years, three different Presidents from both parties—yes, this is a Democratic and a Republican problem—have conducted countless military operations in 19 different countries against groups entirely unrelated to those who attacked our country.

I don’t want to hear that we don’t understand. I fought in Afghanistan. I am a New Yorker. I was in New York City on 9/11. We understand the severity of this problem. We understand that, in the immediate aftermath of 9/11, we had to kill those people who had killed innocent people in this country. But that is not what this is about today, and we refuse to make that the focus of this discussion.

This is about Congress doing its job. This is about the fact that we are still waging war, and 80 percent of this institution has never voted to declare war.

This is about the fact that, right now, we are unwilling to enact a piece of legislation that requires Congress to do its job in 8 months.

So I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we accept your invitation.

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

Mr. ROSE of New York. We accept your invitation, and we would love to work out a way for Congress to—

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is no longer recognized.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

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

Mr. McCAUL. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 428 OFFERED BY MS. GARCIA OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 428 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, 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 subtitle E of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10 . . . PROHIBITION ON USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES TO HOUSE OR DETAIN UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) PROHIBITION.—No Department of Defense facility may be used to house or detain unaccompanied alien children.

(b) UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN DEFINED.—The term “unaccompanied alien children” has the meaning given such term in section 462 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Chair, this amendment is simple and straightforward. It is 15 words. It prohibits defense facilities from being used to house or detain unaccompanied migrant children.

I understand the bill already provides some safeguards, so detention at DOD facilities would follow certain guidelines, but this amendment makes clear that the policy to detain children is out of line with American principles. Detention is not the answer to an influx of migrants.

There are communities across the country, including in my own district, ready to welcome the children seeking refuge. Asylum seekers are not criminals; they are human beings fleeing violence in search of a dignified life. Children fleeing violence should not be met with cruelty.

Preventing migrants from joining society is not only preventing the American economy from growing, but it also is costing taxpayers much more than it should.

Instead of encouraging placement of children with capable sponsors, the entire system appears to be weighted against moving children out of detention, all for the so-called deterrent effect.

There is no national security reason to detain children. Kids are not prisoners of war. They do not belong at military bases. They do not belong in tents. They do not belong in cages. They belong in the arms of their mothers and with their families.

It is our broken immigration system that keeps children locked up. It is inhumane; it is cruel; and it is unconscionable.

The administration's policies resemble those of a military style, and the distress it creates in the system is gen-

erating a costly humanitarian crisis. We should move away from this injustice and support my amendment.

We must close all baby jails, and Congress must stop perpetuating the expensive and cruel patchwork the immigration system has become. We must learn from the lessons that history teaches us and not turn military bases into internment camps.

This amendment would ensure that we don't repeat past mistakes. This amendment would also prohibit the administration from detaining immigrant children at Fort Sill, a military base once used as an internment camp for Japanese Americans.

Moreover, this administration is considering detaining migrants in Guantanamo Bay. This amendment would prevent children from being shipped and detained there.

The military should not be dragged into this detention crisis that this administration has created. Mission readiness should always be the top priority for our armed services.

Madam Chairwoman, I thank Representative CHUY GARCÍA from Illinois, JUAN VARGAS from California, ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ from New York, RASHIDA TLAIB from Michigan, and AYANNA PRESSLEY from Massachusetts for their cosponsorship of this amendment.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this simple amendment, 15 words that protect our children and helps put them in the arms of their families.

Madam Chairwoman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairwoman, liberals and progressives have launched a concerted attack on our defense authorization. They have attached a string of partisan, progressive policy riders designed to gut DOD's assistance along the southern border.

Every day, about half of all Customs and Border Protection officers are pulled off the line for administrative duty, transportation, and other work, taking them away from the border—mostly taking care of children. The important job of caring for families and unaccompanied children has been a tremendous challenge for these Border Patrol agents.

Border Patrol stations and many HHS shelters have been at or above capacity for months. In fact, the last 4 months, we have had over 100,000 apprehensions each of those months.

DHS has found 63,000 unaccompanied alien children along the southern border so far this year. That is 13,000 more than all of last year. In the past, DOD has been a trusted partner in housing thousands of migrant children. This amendment bans all DOD assistance to housing unaccompanied children.

Since 2012, DOD has provided DOD facilities and land for the Department of Health and Human Services to shelter nearly 16,000 unaccompanied alien children who receive care, security, transportation, and medical services. It would be irresponsible to cut off DOD's ability to provide safe, secure, and accountable shelter for these unaccompanied children in the middle of a border crisis.

I strongly oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my colleague from Houston.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chairwoman, let me thank the gentlewoman from Texas, Congresswoman GARCIA, for her leadership. It can be seen that we are intertwining on this issue, and I thank her for acknowledging the fact that these children are unaccompanied.

We are not saying adults. We are not saying criminals. What we are saying is they are children who are unaccompanied migrant children. Many of them are unaccompanied because of the zero-tolerance policy of this administration, the continued policy of separating children from their guardian, from their grandmother, from their aunt.

How do I know this? Because I saw this firsthand this past Monday, just 3 days ago, where unaccompanied children were held in a facility.

I asked the question: How are they unaccompanied? They are unaccompanied because we took the adults away from them.

This is simple to say that these children not be held in Department of Defense facilities. This does not undermine this bill. It simply says that children are precious and should be handled in a manner that provides them with the care, courtesy, and love of the right kind of facilities.

But, most importantly, I support this amendment because I join my colleague in saying that we do not accept zero tolerance in separating children.

I support the amendment. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership in taking these children out of the Department of Defense facilities.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chairwoman, I have no further speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, I will just close. I think I probably have about 30 to 45 seconds.

I just want to repeat something I have said. I think it is important that we emphasize that we are talking about children, young children.

And, again, there is no national security reason to detain children. Kids aren't prisoners of war. They do not belong in military bases. They do not belong in tents. They do not belong in

cages. They belong in the arms of their mothers or with their families or with a capable sponsor.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chairwoman, I just want to remind people that we don't want to have these unaccompanied children not have appropriate places to stay and to get medical care, transportation, and supervision that they need. That is all that we are providing for them, because we don't have them in the CBP.

So I would urge people 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 gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

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

Mr. ROGERS 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 gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 429 OFFERED BY MS. OCASIO-CORTEZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 429 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. 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 subtitle E of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR ENFORCEMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2020 may be obligated or expended for any activity authorized pursuant to chapter 15 of title 10, United States Code, or section 1059 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 15 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 986; 10 U.S.C. 271 note prec.), if a significant purpose of the activity is to assist with the enforcement of any part of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Chair, this amendment prohibits the executive branch from deploying troops on the southern border if the purpose of this deployment is to enforce immigration law.

According to the Congressional Research Service, the armed services do not have a clear legislative mandate to protect or patrol the border. That is under the guidance of other aspects of our legislative and executive branch.

The militarization of our immigration system, particularly under this administration, must be stopped. This

amendment ensures that our troops are to be deployed only in the most exigent circumstances to address actual national security threats.

This amendment would rescind the authority granted in the 2016 NDAA, which empowers the President to needlessly deploy troops to the border to enforce immigration law.

The amendment would not interfere with any mission that is truly humanitarian or a true national security concern.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to point out, when DOD assets are sent to the border, it is in a support capacity. They don't serve in a law enforcement capacity. They don't patrol the border.

Right now, we have half of our Border Patrol agents, on a daily basis, being taken off the border and put into administrative functions, not doing law enforcement.

□ 2200

When we send DOD assets down there, it is typically National Guard personnel. They fill those back-end administrative functions so the CBP-trained agents can go in and enforce the law.

Madam Chair, you never have seen and you are not going to see the DOD assets being used to enforce the law.

The military has played an important role in securing our southern border since the 1980s. Presidents Reagan, H.W. Bush, Clinton, W. Bush, and Obama have authorized DOD assistance on the border in the form of equipment or manpower on multiple occasions.

Every day, about half of all Customs and Border Protection officers are pulled off the line for administrative duty, transportation, and other work away from the border.

There were over 104,000 illegal aliens in June. That is a 380 percent increase over June 2017. CBP is on track for over 1 million apprehensions in this fiscal year.

DOD has been on site for months providing support. DOD medium-lift air mobility support moves CBP agents to remote areas. Administrative and transportation support puts CBP agents back in the field and off bus duty. They provide camera and areal sensor operations to help identify large groups of migrants and smuggler activity and to cut down on response times.

This support is directly improving border apprehensions and response times.

Again, DOD support on the border has been a bipartisan policy to address migration surges for decades. Cutting off DOD assistance will immediately and substantially worsen the crisis on our border.

Madam Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Chair, the deployment of troops on our border is a relatively new phenomenon. It is one that is unprecedented, and it represents an unnecessary militarization toward what should be seen as a humanitarian crisis.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Chair, the President should be sending the Red Cross to the border, not the United States military.

I stand today with many of my colleagues to ensure that our government is not misusing funds, resources, and personnel that Congress has provided. We have seen again and again how this administration manipulates the law, congressional intent, and allocated funding in order to impede the immigration process and play with people's lives.

There is no reason for the administration to force the Department of Defense to advance his anti-immigrant agenda and use our valuable troops to conduct immigration enforcement duties. These are young children and women who are fleeing desperate situations, and they should be treated for what they are, folks seeking asylum at the U.S.-Mexico border who are lawfully petitioning for asylum in the United States.

We don't need the military there. We need the Red Cross.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), who is my friend and colleague.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and further thank him for his leadership on border security matters and for opposing this harmful and extremist amendment.

Madam Chair, I rise in the strongest possible opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York. This amendment is dangerous, and it is disrespectful to the hard-working men and women of our Border Patrol.

To make matters worse, my same colleague who is pushing this amendment also wants to eliminate the Department of Homeland Security.

Madam Chair, if you want to get rid of DHS and you want to take away DOD's ability to help secure the border, who is going to be left to stop the drug traffickers and the cartel members who continue to infiltrate our country in record numbers?

Madam Chair, this amendment is just another step in the ongoing effort by my colleagues across the aisle to make us a country of open borders.

I urge all Members of the House to stand up for the rule of law and reject this amendment.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Chair, I think it is important that we clarify

that in order to have a humane immigration system, we do not require militarization or cruelty to children.

Asking that children not be caged and asking that human beings' rights—human rights—be respected does not mean "open borders." It means that we be a humane nation that respects our mission as one that guarantees liberty, prosperity, and the pursuit of happiness for all people who live on American soil.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I really take issue with the characterization of militarization of our border. I just told the gentlewoman a few minutes ago that these people don't work on the border. When the military goes down there, they are in support positions to allow the professional Border Patrol agents to do their jobs so that we can provide better care for these individuals who are trying to legally be processed.

There is no need for this. This is a wrongheaded amendment.

Madam Chair, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

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

Mr. ROGERS 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 gentlewoman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 430 OFFERED BY MS. OCASIO-CORTEZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 430 printed in part B of House Report 116-143.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Chair, I present an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of subtitle E of title 10 the following:

SEC. ____ LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PROVIDING HOUSING FOR UNDOCUMENTED ALIENS.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense may be used for the purpose of providing housing in any Department of Defense facility for any detained alien who has no lawful immigration status in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 476, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Chair, this amendment prohibits the executive branch from using the authorized funds to detain undocumented immigrants in Department of Defense facilities.

One of the central aspects of the crisis at our border is that the administration is asking agencies and departments that are unprepared to house and detain refugees and asylum seekers when that is simply not what they are trained or resourced to do.

This amendment will ensure that military and migrant families alike will not be forced into operating or living in facilities never intended for mass detention of human beings.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, the Border Patrol stations are at a breaking point. Every station has been overcapacity for nearly all of 2019.

We have Border Patrol stations that were designed for a maximum capacity of 4,000 individuals. On a regular basis, we have been having 20,000 people in these facilities.

DHS has already apprehended more than 390,000 illegal immigrant family members in 2019, which is more than triple last year. This explosion in families coming across the border is a key factor behind the current crisis. Smugglers are intentionally dumping groups of over 100 people at a time in remote areas to overwhelm Border Patrol agents and resources.

House Democrats stalled a supplemental for weeks as children and families languished in overcrowded stations that were never designed for this kind of crisis. Democrats are actively limiting DHS' ability to detain migrants, which only fuels catch-and-release policies that started the crisis to begin with.

DOD has provided safe, secure, and accountable housing for unaccompanied alien children in the past and should absolutely have the option to deal with them in the future.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Chair, I think it is important for us to clarify when we talk about "unaccompanied children" whom the administration is labeling an "unaccompanied child."

If a child comes with their grandmother, they are deemed unaccompanied. If the child comes with their older brother or sister, they are deemed unaccompanied. If a child comes with a family member that is anyone but their biological mother or father, they are deemed unaccompanied. Their family is labeled as human traffickers, often by the press or otherwise.

I think it is important that we add a cultural context to this conversation. We have to reassert that seeking asylum is not a crime. We should not be expanding a system of detention and criminalization of people who have

committed no crime and hurt no person, aside from just simply trying to seek asylum, which is their human right.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chair, first, I do want to make a point that we are not just talking about unaccompanied children here. The gentlewoman's amendment is not just limited to that.

The gentlewoman does make a point that is correct, but I want to emphasize why she is right. If they are not with their legal parent or guardian, we don't know for sure whom that is they are traveling with. They may say it is their grandmother, but for all we know, it is a sex trafficker or a drug dealer who is just using the kid to get into the States. We have on multiple occasions had CBP notice the same child coming through five, six times with different "families."

If we are not sure that that is their legal guardian or parent, yes, we are going to find a way to separate them until we can discern whether or not that person should be traveling with them.

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

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman.

I think the process that the gentlewoman is advocating in this amendment, which I support, is not militarizing the immigration system, particularly since the immigration system is mostly civil.

Most of the migrants who are coming across the border are asking for asylum. If we would simply put in place a process to be able to process the asylum seekers and to increase the legal process for them, then we wouldn't have to militarize the border by a deployment of troops or by incarcerating individuals in military facilities.

That can be a bipartisan effort. If we join with my colleague to do comprehensive immigration reform, then we will not need to utilize these facilities. I agree that immigration does not equal defense or criminalization.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

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

Mr. ROGERS 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 gentlewoman from New York will be postponed.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CASTRO of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mrs. FLETCHER, 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. 2500) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1811. An act to make technical corrections to the America's Water Infrastructure Act of 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; in addition, to the Committee on Natural Resources for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 866. An act to provide a lactation room in public buildings.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 744.—An act to amend section 175b of title 18, United States Code, to correct a scrivener's error.

S. 998.—An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to expand support for police officer family services, stress reduction, and suicide prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 1749.—An act to clarify seasoning requirements for certain refinanced mortgage loans, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 12, 2019, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1576. A letter from the FPAC-BC, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of

Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Dairy Margin Coverage Program and Dairy Indemnity Payment Program [Docket No.: CCC-2019-0004] (RIN: 0560-A137) received July 9, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1577. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's notice — Applications for New Awards; Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Career and Technical Institutions Program received July 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1578. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Standards of Performance for Stationary Compression Ignition Internal Combustion Engines [EPA-HQ-OAR-2018-0851; FRL-9990-21-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AU27) July 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1579. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Redesignation of the Terre Haute Area to Attainment of the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2018-0733; FRL-9996-11-Region 5] received July 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1580. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-Propenoic acid, methyl ester, polymer with ethene and 2,5-furandione; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0736; FRL-9995-51] received July 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1581. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; Coachella Valley 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area; Reclassification to Extreme [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0840; FRL-9996-12-Region 9] July 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1582. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Negative Declaration for the Oil and Natural Gas Industry Control Techniques Guidelines [EPA-R03-OAR-2018-0795; FRL-9996-26-Region 3] received July 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1583. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Emissions Statements Rule Certification for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2018-0825; FRL-9996-07-Region 3] received July 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1584. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Measurement of Emissions of Air Contaminants [EPA-R07-OAR-2019-0102; FRL-9995-61-Region 7] received July 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1585. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Jefferson County Existing and New VOC Water Separators Rule Revision [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0807; FRL-9996-24-Region 4] received July 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1586. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acrylamide-Sodium Acrylamidomethylpropanesulfonate Copolymer; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0670; FRL-9994-53] received July 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1587. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acetic Acid Ethenyl Ester, Polymer with Ethene and Ethanol; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0096; FRL-9995-17] received July 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1588. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to the Filing Process for Commission Forms [Docket No.: RM19-12-000; Order No.: 859] (RIN: 1902-AF58) received July 9, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1589. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule — Interlocking Officers and Directors; Requirements for Applicants and Holders [Docket No.: RM18-15-000; Order No. 856] (RIN: 1902-AF53) received July 9, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1590. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Internal Agency Review of Decisions; Requests for Supervisory Review of Certain Decisions Made by the Center for Devices and Radiological Health [Docket No.: FDA-2016-N-2378] (RIN: 0910-AH37) received July 9, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1591. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Unverified List (UVL) [Docket No.: 190605486-9486-01] (RIN: 0694-AH79) received July 9, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1592. A letter from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Reporting, Procedures and Penalties Regulations received July 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121,