United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 17, 2018 *No. 120*

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 17, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRADLEY BYRNE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

VITALITY AND THE IMPORTANCE OF INCENTIVIZING HEALTHY EATING

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as we look toward ways to help our constituents live healthier lives and address the rising cost of healthcare, I would like to draw attention to successful partnerships that are working to address these challenges.

We know that diet-related diseases are driving up healthcare costs. Research from the Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy at Tufts University estimates that diabetes costs our healthcare system an astounding $327 billion per year, and cardiovascular-related diseases cost more than $317 billion a year.

Much of this cost, and the human suffering it represents, could be lessened or prevented through greater access to nutritious foods and better eating.

I am proud that stakeholders in my home State of Massachusetts, including nonprofits, advocacy organizations, hospitals, universities, and other private sector partners, are coming together to examine the impact of hunger and diet-related disease on our health system.

One shining example of a collaboration formed to tackle this terrible problem is Vitality. John Hancock, a leading life insurance company based in Boston, has partnered with the Friedman School at Tufts University on an innovative life insurance product that helps to encourage healthier behaviors.

John Hancock clients complete an online health review and engage in activities like preventative care, physical activity, smoking cessation, education, and improved nutrition to earn points that translate into discounts on insurance and other products. What is particularly impressive about the program is the discount it provides to participants who want to increase their purchases of fruits and vegetables. Those who sign up receive a 25 percent discount on healthy food at more than 14,000 grocery stores across the country.

The Vitality program is one example of the positive impact incentives can have on our collective public health when they motivate and reward individuals to take up healthy behaviors. We should learn from this innovative model and look at ways to expand upon its reach to greater segments of the population.

Some Federal programs already allow for incentive-based programs. Within SNAP, our Nation's first line of defense against hunger, we know that incentives work. My home State of Massachusetts has been a leader in the effort to help ensure SNAP recipients have access to fresh fruits and vegetables.

In 2011, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts worked with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to pilot a first in the Nation initiative to provide incentives for the purchase of healthy foods. The pilot enabled participants to increase their consumption of fruits and vegetables by 26 percent and led to the creation of USDA's Food Insecurity and Nutrition Incentive, known as FINI.

FINI has provided States and localities across the country with Federal resources to expand incentive programs for SNAP beneficiaries. Massachusetts currently uses Federal FINI dollars in conjunction with private donations and State resources to increase the purchase of fruits and vegetables.

It is working. In our State, FINI has helped more than 63,000 SNAP recipients increase their fruit and vegetable intake in 1 year alone. Estimates suggest this increase can mean savings of more than $1.1 million in public health costs. So imagine the impact these sorts of programs and incentives could have if they were replicated and expanded on a larger scale.

New research from Tufts' Friedman School shows that incorporating technology-based incentives for healthier eating into other Federal programs like Medicare and Medicaid would be highly cost-effective, saving millions of lives and billions of dollars in healthcare costs.

We should also look at how we can reach beyond Federal health and nutrition programs to encourage private worksite wellness programs.

The fact of the matter is that all of us can and should be taking steps to make healthier choices. Congress should take lessons learned from successful partnerships like the Tufts and John Hancock collaboration to pilot and expand incentive programs. In doing so, we can provide greater access to nutritious foods, promote healthier choices, alleviate human suffering, and save our healthcare system billions and billions of dollars.

RECOGNIZING PENNSYLVANIA'S FIFTH DISTRICT INDUSTRIES ON MADE IN AMERICA DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on Made in America Day to speak about American craftsmanship, specifically in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

American entrepreneurs, workers, farmers, and innovators have built this country and drive our economy. They are the heart of this Nation, and they ensure that the Made in the USA label means quality and value, which is something we treasure.

Pennsylvania has a rich history of being a manufacturing leader, especially our storied Pennsylvania steel. The Commonwealth has been an important cog in the wheel of this country's Industrial Revolution, thanks to industries like iron, coal, and lumber, in addition to steel. Our Pennsylvania farmers have fed, and continue to feed, generations of Americans, providing safe, nutritious food for all our neighbors.

This rich history continues today. The Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District is home to numerous producers that have made vital contributions to our prosperity. They have employed American workers, produced American products, and grown American crops. From heritage companies to newer, rising stars, we have a wide cross-section of products produced in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District.

Brookville Equipment Corporation in Jefferson County is the leading manufacturer of diesel locomotive engines, street trolleys, and mining machinery. Brookville's mass transit resume includes fully refurbishing streetcars for cities including New Orleans, Philadelphia, and San Francisco.

Since 1889, W.R. Case & Sons Cutlery Company has been fashioning handcrafted pocketknives and sporting knives in McKean County, Pennsylvania.

Zippo Manufacturing Company, makers of the world-famous Zippo windproof lighter, owns Case Knives today. Zippo is another family-owned business based in Bradford, McKean County, since 1936.

Clarion Industries has two divisions in Clarion County: Clarion Boards, which produces high-quality fiberboard used to manufacture products such as laminate flooring, furniture, fixtures, cabinetry, and moldings; and Clarion Laminates, the only Made in the USA laminate flooring manufacturer of its kind.

Emporium Powdered Metal, Inc. in Cameron County is a powdered metal manufacturer staffed with more than 120 years of combined experience.

Welch's in Erie County is particularly known for its grape juices, jams, and jellies made from dark Concord grapes and its white Niagara grape juice.

Clearfield Machine Company has been producing custom machining since 1868 in Clearfield County.

Since 1830, the Woolrich name has stood for the best in sportswear for men and women, and it continues to make outerwear that combines comfort and function in Woolrich, Pennsylvania, in Clinton County.

Major leaguers have been swinging our fine Pennsylvania hardwoods, thanks to Jefferson County's BWP Bats. BWP's slogan is ''Built With Pride.''

Huntingdon County's Bonney Forge has a state-of-the-art forge facility capable of manufacturing our entire line of forged steel fitting and forged steel valve products since 1875.

Diamond Back Truck Covers is a company two Penn State students started in their garage in 2003. They made heavy-duty, utility-oriented diamond plate aluminum truck bed covers for pickup trucks in Philipsburg, Pennsylvania, in Centre County.

Domtar Paper Company in Elk County is the largest integrated producer of uncoated free-sheet paper in North America and the second largest in the world, based on production capacity.

Pull-A-Pump in Potter County manufactures portable pump pulling machines for those in need of water well technology, with a unique dual traction belt design that is second to none.

Whirley Industries Incorporated in Warren County designs, develops, and produces products for the food and beverage industry.

Centre County also boasts many new rising stars in high-tech industries, including KCF Technologies, a dynamic technology company that develops and commercializes products for industry and the military.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a sample of the manufacturers who employ our friends and neighbors in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. These companies and many others produce quality, American-made products, and we cannot be more proud to celebrate them during Made in America Week.

DUTY TO VOTE

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the most fundamental right in our country is voting.

The Pew Charitable Trust recently did a study on registration and voting in each State. I am sad to say that my State of Tennessee came out pretty bad.

We were 40th in the number of people registered in our State. About 78 percent of the people were registered to vote.

In turnout, we were last. Only 28.5 percent of the people in Tennessee voted. This was based on the 2014 elections.

The 2018 elections will determine a lot about who sits in this House, who sits in the Senate, and, eventually, who sits on the Supreme Court. It is imperative that everybody register to vote so that they can vote in the November elections, not just in Tennessee, but everywhere in the country, and that everyone turn out to vote so the voting totals are a fair representation of the people, all the people, if we are going to have a House and a Senate that is representative of America.

What occurred in Helsinki and what was brought out with the indictments by Special Counsel Mueller show how much the Russians think of our election system, that they got involved in a cyber attack on our country to defeat a candidate.

We should care as much about our electoral system as the Russians. We should care more about it. The fact that more than 20 percent of the citizens in my State do not register and do not vote is appalling.

With the continued threat to the electoral system in 2018, it is so important that we at least make it difficult for the Russians to have an impact. That means that each and every citizen needs to register, register others as their civic duty, vote as their civic duty, and make their voices heard. Otherwise, this room will not represent ''America the Beautiful.''

WORKFARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words this morning about the work that we have been doing here in the House to add workfare requirements to the food stamp program.

President Ronald Reagan once stated: ''The Federal Government declared war on poverty, and poverty won.'' That is as true today as it was when President Reagan said it.

Over the last five decades, Congress has spent more than $22 trillion of taxpayers' money on government welfare programs. The result: 50 years later, the poverty rate stands unchanged. If anyone ever needed more proof that more government isn't the solution to every problem, here is the proof.

If you were to measure success solely on how much taxpayer money the government spends to solve a problem,

then the government's war on poverty has been wildly successful. After all, we now have 13 Federal agencies running more than 80 government welfare programs.

But if we judge success based on how many people have been able to rise out of poverty to take care of themselves and their families, these government programs have failed.

So what have we learned after spending $22 trillion? It is simple: Workfare helps people stand on their own two feet. It helps people get off the welfare treadmill.

For example, before Congress reformed Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, also known as TANF, to incorporate a strict work requirement, there were 4.9 million families on the welfare rolls. Now, thanks to workfare reforms, we have seen 3.3 million families rise out of welfare dependence. That is a success.

□ 1015

In 2014, when Maine began enforcing workfare for able-bodied adults without dependents who are receiving food stamps, the Maine caseload decreased by 80 percent within months.

The simple requirement that able-bodied adults without dependents should work in order to receive welfare benefits, paired with job search assistance and training opportunities, works. It gets people out of welfare and into the workforce.

We have learned that it makes a profound difference in people's lives when they understand that welfare is not meant to be a handout but, actually, a hand up.

Now, we need to apply these lessons about the benefits of workfare to more government welfare programs like food stamps and housing. That is especially important today because, with the economy growing, thanks to tax reform, job openings recently hit a record high of 6.6 million, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. By taking a stand for workfare requirements, we now have an opportunity to move millions of Americans from reliance on welfare to work and financial independence.

I commend the House for passing a farm bill that includes a strong workfare requirement for able-bodied adults without dependents. We have opened the door to welfare reforms that will help put people on the road to self-reliance, and I encourage my colleagues to build on this foundation and continue to stand up for workfare instead of welfare.

BIZARRE BEHAVIOR

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, I was on a congressional trip with the Judiciary Committee into the Balkan region. A number of the countries there, living in the shadow of Russia and, also, the aggression of the Serbian allies of the Russians were very concerned about their security and their future.

Russia has, obviously, invaded Crimea, is supporting rebels in Ukraine, and is deeply involved in Syria to support the dictator there.

Now, in this last week, our President went to Europe, and he went to a meeting of our closest allies and NATO, which these countries on the periphery of Russia feel is critical to their defense. And he seems to—or did—deliberately so dissent and insult our two longest and strongest allies in NATO: Germany and England.

He seemed to be facilitating the Russian agenda there: Let's weaken NATO. Let's cause dissent in Europe.

But that couldn't be. He is the President of the United States. Of course he wouldn't be doing that. No. He was just being a businessman and trying to extract bigger payments out of them. He didn't mean to weaken or threaten the future of the alliance.

Then yesterday, in a sort of very bizarre moment, he meets alone with a professional KGB agent-dictator of Russia, Vladimir Putin. We don't know what went on in that room. Maybe they watched videotapes. I don't know. But the President came out again and, this time, directly attacked the United States of America.

How could this be? He said that he does not believe that our intelligence agencies—his hand-picked head of the DNI, Dan Coats, told him the Russians had interfered and proved to him the Russians had interfered in our election. He said that once about a year ago.

But then he comes out with Vladimir Putin and says: Well, I asked him about it. He says they didn't do it. You know, there's two sides to this. We did it. They did it. Who knows. Whatever. It doesn't matter.

Our basic institutions, our democracy, has been attacked by Russia, and Dan Coats says they are going to do it again in this election year.

What can explain this bizarre behavior on the part of the President of the United States?

I couldn't figure it out, so I went to my bookshelf and I said: Hmm, I'll look around my bookshelf. Maybe I'll find something.

I found two books. It is my recommended reading list to explain President Trump and some of what is going on in America today. The first would be ''The Manchurian Candidate.'' The second would be the dystopian novel, George Orwell's ''1984.'' Read them and weep.

THE 12TH WOMAN

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Meghan is a fourth-generation Texas A&M Aggie. Her decision to attend the prestigious school was never a question in her mind. It was an amazing experience, until it wasn't.

One morning, while serving as a tutor in the athletic department, a member of the Fighting Aggies football team twice her size exposed himself to her not 2 feet away, making sexual advances toward Meghan and becoming aggressive. Terrified and shocked, she abruptly left the room, trying to remain calm as he followed her. Unbeknownst to Meghan, her assailant had done the same thing to another tutor just hours before.

Mr. Speaker, Meghan feels she did not get justice against her attacker. Instead, she tells me, she was failed by a university that was not totally committed to protecting victims.

Meghan was scared of the upcoming process, scared to go back to work, terrified she might run into this individual again.

Before the hearing, the university claimed she did not need a lawyer; the assailant wasn't facing any criminal charges. So she didn't hire a lawyer. But she received no notice that her assailant had hired a lawyer.

Months later, Meghan's assailant was found not responsible for exposing himself to both tutors, with the panel stating it appeared he had a skin condition and simply couldn't control himself.

The response she received was nothing short of appalling. The school said: Sorry, Meghan, that you were offended, but there is nothing else we can do.

So she appealed the case. She still believed in the university and that the university would provide some justice for her. At the appeals hearing, she was informed that the charge against her attacker had been downgraded from sexual exploitation to sexual harassment; therefore, she was removed from the remainder of the hearing.

Doesn't that seem odd, Mr. Speaker?

Also, no one from the university title IX office ever contacted her. She never received any information regarding what sanctions her assailant received, if any. Of course, Mr. Speaker, her assailant was allowed back onto the football team.

Meghan felt abandoned by the university, and she thought the accused was protected due to his special status.

As a former judge, I agree with Meghan that universities must put the safety and care of sexual assault victims first, make it a priority. Together with CAROLYN MALONEY and JACKIE SPEIER, we have introduced several pieces of bipartisan legislation to end sexual assault on campuses.

First, the Bipartisan Campus Accountability and Safety Act, introduced by Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY, does many things, including establishing a mandatory victim advocate on campus and ensuring assault situations like Meghan's do not occur.

Second, the HALT Campus Sexual Violence Act, which will be introduced this week by Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER and me, makes sure that the universities do not shirk their legal responsibilities when responding to sexual assault crimes.

Texas A&M is not alone in this fight to provide a voice for victims. According to the National Sexual Violence Resource Center, each year one in five women will be assaulted while in college. That is a staggering statistic.

Mr. Speaker, Meghan said it best: ''A&M has a chance to be fearless on every front and to be fearless in the face of such horrible things that are happening to victims.''

I applaud Meghan for having the courage to come forward and publicly tell her story to the world. Other victims who have been suffering in silence have been inspired to come forward and rally the cause, forming an organization called the 12th Woman, a group of determined women dedicated to stopping sexual assault on our university campuses.

This is not a question of loyalty and pride in Texas A&M. It is a call to action. The 12th Woman is relentless in bringing change to the way universities address sexual assault not just at A&M, but across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to listen to Meghan and her band of sisters and do what is necessary to make sure our universities are safe from sexual assault on campus.

And that is just the way it is.

WE HAVE TO ACT

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again, I rise because I love my country. I am proud to say that I am an American.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I believe that, when democracy is at risk and the Republic is on the line, you have to take a stand.

I rise today because to be silent could be concluded as being acquiescent. To be silent can be said to be complicit. To be silent, according to Dr. King, at some point can be said to be seen as betrayal.

I rise because I love my country. Because I love my country, I will not allow myself to be driven by polls. I thank God that the great freedom fighters, the great wrong-righters were not driven by polls. If Dr. King, Rosa Parks, the great freedom fighters, had been driven by polls, I wouldn't be standing here today.

They drove the polls. They didn't adjust to the polls. They had the polls, the people who gave their thoughts, to adjust to righteousness.

So I rise today to speak truth to power, not driven by polls, not driven by political expediency. I rise today to let the world know that our country is better than what we saw in Helsinki.

I rise today to say to my colleagues: We have to act. Yes, we can talk about all of the atrocities imposed upon our society by this President, but that is not enough. At some point, we have to act, and more and more people are starting to say what that action is. More and more of the people who present the news and give commentary are starting to say what that action is.

It is unfortunate that we haven't gotten to the point where we are going to act not withstanding the polls, we are going to act notwithstanding political expediency, we are going to act because there is a moral imperative to remove a President from office who puts democracy at risk and the Republic on the line.

There is a moral imperative for us to take a stand. And we can do all of the things that can lead up to what the Framers of the Constitution afforded us. We can do many things, but Article II, section 4 of the Constitution was created for a time such as this and a President such as Trump.

Mr. Speaker, there is a solution to a President who puts himself above his country. The Framers of the Constitution knew that we would have this moment in time, and they gave us the solution. We but only have to have the courage, the intestinal fortitude, to stand up for our country and impeach this President.

The time has come. No more political expediency. No more driven by the polls. Stand for our country on a moral imperative.

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

INFLUENCING ELECTIONS

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last year CNN reported that the U.S. had interfered or attempted to influence presidential elections in other countries at least 81 times. This is probably a very conservative estimate.

This report came from a study by Professor Dov H. Levin of Carnegie Mellon University and apparently was just the tip of the iceberg. His study covered just years up to 2000, and these activities may have increased since that time.

Professor Levin defined an intervention as ''a costly act which is designed to determine the election results in favor of one of the two sides.'' He said these acts were carried out in secret two-thirds of the time and included ''funding the election campaigns of specific parties, disseminating misinformation or propaganda, training locals of only one side in various campaigning or public announcements on threats in favor of or against a candidate, and providing or withdrawing foreign aid.'' He reported that in 59 percent of these cases the side that received assistance came to power.

In a December 21, 2016, article, the Los Angeles Times said: ''The U.S. has a long history of attempting to influence presidential elections in other countries.''

□ 1030

The newspaper reported, that ''the CIA has accused Russia of interfering in the 2016 Presidential election by hacking into Democratic and Republican computer networks and selectively releasing emails.'' But the Times added: ''But critics might point out that the U.S. has done similar things.''

I am not criticizing our government's activities in this regard. Some of it has been good, designed to fight communism and promote freedom around the world. However, some of it has probably been wasteful, and, at times, has increased hatred for the U.S. We are involved, in many ways, in almost every country around the world through our State Department, Agency for International Development, the CIA, the Defense Department, and just about every Federal department and agency. Most countries take an active interest and involvement in U.S. Presidential elections through their citizens and former citizens who now live in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this article from the Los Angeles Times.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 21, 2016]

THE U.S. IS NO STRANGER TO INTERFERING IN THE ELECTIONS OF OTHER COUNTRIES

(By Nina Agrawal)

Update: President Obama on Thursday slapped Russia with new penalties for meddling in the U.S. presidential election, kicking out dozens of suspected spies and imposing banking restrictions on five people and four organizations the administration says were involved.

The CIA has accused Russia of interfering in the 2016 presidential election by hacking into Democratic and Republican computer networks and selectively releasing emails. But critics might point out the U.S. has done similar things.

The U.S. has a long history of attempting to influence presidential elections in other countries—it's done so as many as 81 times between 1946 and 2000, according to a database amassed by political scientist Dov Levin of Carnegie Mellon University.

That number doesn't include military coups and regime change efforts following the election of candidates the U.S. didn't like, notably those in Iran, Guatemala and Chile. Nor does it include general assistance with the electoral process, such as election monitoring.

Levin defines intervention as ''a costly act which is designed to determine the election results [in favor of] one of the two sides.'' These acts, carried out in secret two-thirds of the time, include funding the election campaigns of specific parties, disseminating misinformation or propaganda, training locals of only one side in various campaigning or get-out-the-vote techniques, helping one side design their campaign materials, making public pronouncements or threats in favor of or against a candidate, and providing or withdrawing foreign aid.

In 59 percent of these cases, the side that received assistance came to power, although Levin estimates the average effect of ''partisan electoral interventions'' to be only about a 3 percent increase in vote share.

The U.S. hasn't been the only one trying to interfere in other countries' elections, according to Levin's data. Russia attempted to

sway 36 foreign elections from the end of World War II to the turn of the century—meaning that, in total, at least one of the two great powers of the 20th century intervened in about 1 of every 9 competitive, national-level executive elections in that time period.

Italy's 1948 general election is an early example of a race where U.S. actions probably influenced the outcome.

''We threw everything, including the kitchen sink'' at helping the Christian Democrats beat the Communists in Italy, said Levin, including covertly delivering ''bags of money'' to cover campaign expenses, sending experts to help run the campaign, subsidizing ''pork'' projects like land reclamation, and threatening publicly to end U.S. aid to Italy if the Communists were elected.

Levin said that U.S. intervention probably played an important role in preventing a Communist Party victory, not just in 1948, but in seven subsequent Italian elections. Throughout the Cold War, U.S. involvement in foreign elections was mainly motivated by the goal of containing communism, said Thomas Carothers, a foreign policy expert at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. ''The U.S. didn't want to see left-wing governments elected, and so it did engage fairly often in trying to influence elections in other countries,'' Carothers said.

This approach carried over into the immediate post-Soviet period.

In the 1990 Nicaragua elections, the CIA leaked damaging information on alleged corruption by the Marxist Sandinistas to German newspapers, according to Levin. The opposition used those reports against the Sandinista candidate, Daniel Ortega. He lost to opposition candidate Violeta Chamorro.

In Czechoslovakia that same year, the U.S. provided training and campaign funding to Vaclav Havel's party and its Slovak affiliate as they planned for the country's first democratic election after its transition away from communism.

''The thinking was that we wanted to make sure communism was dead and buried,'' said Levin.

Even after that, the U.S. continued trying to influence elections in its favor.

In Haiti after the 1986 overthrow of dictator and U.S. ally Jean-Claude ''Baby Doc'' Duvalier, the CIA sought to support particular candidates and undermine Jean-Bertrande Aristide, a Roman Catholic priest and proponent of liberation theology. The New York Times reported in the 1990s that the CIA had on its payroll members of the military junta that would ultimately unseat Aristide after he was democratically elected in a landslide over Marc Bazin, a former World Bank official and finance minister favored by the U.S. The U.S. also attempted to sway Russian elections.

In 1996, with the presidency of Boris Yeltsin and the Russian economy flailing, President Clinton endorsed a $10.2-billion loan from the International Monetary Fund linked to privatization, trade liberalization and other measures that would move Russia toward a capitalist economy. Yeltsin used the loan to bolster his popular support, telling voters that only he had the reformist credentials to secure such loans, according to media reports at the time. He used the money, in part, for social spending before the election, including payment of back wages and pensions.

In the Middle East, the U.S. has aimed to bolster candidates who could further the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. In 1996, seeking to fulfill the legacy of assassinated Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and the peace accords the U.S. brokered, Clinton openly supported Shimon Peres, convening a peace summit in the Egyptian resort of Sharm el Sheik to boost his popular support and inviting him to a meeting at the White House a month before the election.

''We were persuaded that if [Likud candidate Benjamin] Netanyahu were elected, the peace process would be closed for the season,'' said Aaron David Miller, who worked at the State Department at the time.

In 1999, in a more subtle effort to sway the election, top Clinton strategists, including James Carville, were sent to advise Labor candidate Ehud Barak in the election against Netanyahu.

In Yugoslavia, the U.S. and NATO had long sought to cut off Serbian nationalist and Yugoslav leader Slobodan Milosevic from the international system through economic sanctions and military action. In 2000, the U.S. spent millions of dollars in aid for political parties, campaign costs and independent media. Funding and broadcast equipment provided to the media arms of the opposition were a decisive factor in electing opposition candidate Vojislav Kostunica as Yugoslav president, according to Levin. ''If it wouldn't have been for overt intervention . . . Milosevic would have been very likely to have won another term,'' he said.

SUPPORTING CONGRESSMAN JIM JORDAN

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there is greater turnover in elective offices today than ever before. And in my 30 years in Congress, I have now served with almost 1,500 other Members. Almost all have been good, kind men and women. But one of the best, one of the kindest is my friend, JIM JORDAN.

Now, Congressman JORDAN has been attacked with one of the dirtiest, most low-down political hit jobs that I have ever seen. He has been accused of knowing about, but failing to report, sexual abuse that occurred 25 to 30 years ago. This alleged abuse was done not by Mr. JORDAN but by another man, a team doctor, who has been dead for 13 years. And this abuse was not done to little boys or girls. It was supposedly done to grown adult men, Ohio State wrestlers, none of whom reported it at the time.

The timing is so suspicious coming out now when Mr. JORDAN may be seeking a leadership post. He is supposed to have known about this because of locker-room banter.

All the coaches and many of his players have defended Mr. JORDAN, calling him one of the most honest men they know. Surely, Mr. Speaker, even though politics of hatred is prevalent today, surely we are not going to stoop to convicting people based on locker-room banter or gossip.

WATER SUPPLY IN THE VALLEY

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I draw attention to the human right to have water to sustain ourselves.

Benjamin Franklin once said about this precious resource, water, that ''When the well's dry, we know the worth of water.''

In the San Joaquin Valley, I can tell you we know the worth of water. It is the lifeblood of our Valley communities and our agricultural economy. We like to say, Where water flows, food grows.

The Valley is one of the most advanced agricultural regions in the world. We produce over 250 crops that provide over 50 percent of the United States' fruits and vegetables on America's dinner table every night. The bounty of nature of food that we produce is coaxed out of the ground by some of the hardest working people you will ever meet, farmers and farmworkers, and it relies on a clean and reliable water resource.

And America's food supply, make no mistake about it, is a national security issue. I have spent decades working for commonsense short- and long-term solutions to address California's broken water system. When I served in the California legislature, I carried multiple bonds that were passed that provided over $2 billion for crucial water projects.

While in Congress, I have advanced legislation that have improved water supplies and funding for projects in many different ways: The North Valley Regional Recycled Water Program, which helps irrigate over 44,000 acres in western Merced and Stanislaus Counties with local and recycled water, and the San Luis-Delta Mendota Intertie project, which brings up to over 35,000 acre-feet of water annually to most of our rural Valley communities to advance efforts that are so important, that make a difference.

In addition, that doesn't include the success of the WIIN Act, bipartisan legislation which I helped lead through 4 years of tough negotiations. It became law in 2016. The WIIN Act creates more flexibility to move water based on real-time water realities and provides authorization for $563 million in Federal funds for water projects, like expanding Shasta Reservoir, like raising San Luis Reservoir, and like creating Temperance Flat.

Just this month, legislation I introduced to allow local water districts to improve the efficiency of dams passed the House. I call on the Senate to move this bill to the President's desk.

In the Valley, this would allow the Merced Irrigation District to advance a project to raise the spillway at New Exchequer Dam. This would increase the supply of water, over 56,000 acre-feet of water—much needed.

However, it seems like every time we are able increase our drought resilience, State or Federal regulators decide that they need to take more water from the Valley. It is wrong and it is unfair.

The most recent attempt to repurpose the Valley water supplies came earlier this month by the California State Water Board. Staff released the final draft of a plan that is simply unacceptable. And I must say, it is pretty easy to reallocate water when it is not your water supply. That is what the State board did.

The plan, if adopted, will effectively double the amount of water that must

remain in the San Joaquin River tributaries. This will force thousands of acres of farmland out of production, ravaging communities across the Valley, and weakening America's food security and its supply.

The board staff claims these changes are necessary to prevent total collapse of the fisheries in the Delta. But this plan will not save fish, sadly. It does not address the other problems that faces the fisheries; namely, rising water temperatures, lack of food, habitat, and increased predators, none of which have anything to do with the water flows.

This plan is in direct conflict with another California law that mandates we must use our groundwater more sustainably, which must be done. We must come into balance. However, it is impossible to use groundwater sustainably when we must pump groundwater to replace the surplus water that is being taken away. These actions are in conflict. It doesn't make any sense.

Our agricultural economy is showing tremendous innovation, growing twice as much food on a fraction of the water that we used to receive. But we have reached the tipping point—a point where the taking of the resource outstrips our ability to innovate.

Without water, we cannot feed America or maintain our quality of life, our sustenance. Our Valley and our Nation need long-term solutions that provides for reliable sources of safe drinking water, water for agricultural industries, as well as for our cities.

We, in the Valley, the San Joaquin Valley will continue to fight for the water we need to grow America's food. Because, in the Valley, we know the worth of water. We know it when the well runs dry, as Benjamin Franklin said.

So, in conclusion, we must work together in California to fix our broken water system for the long-term benefits of America's food supply.

LANSDALE MURAL ARTS PROGRAM

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a program in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, that brings together members of our community to celebrate artistic expression and economic opportunity.

The Lansdale Mural Arts Program seeks to beautify areas in Lansdale by painting murals on buildings in need of rehabilitation. By improving the aesthetics of many of these beloved community landmarks, the Lansdale Mural Arts Program hopes to enhance the economic and social value of the services and goods that the building's tenants provide.

Started in 2013, the Lansdale Mural Arts Program has painted the walls of local businesses: Chantilly Floral, Wes Carver Electric, The Underground at Round Guys Brewing Company, and perhaps the most profound, an American flag mural at the Lansdale VFW Post.

Currently, the program is looking to continue its work on the American Legion Post 206 building, and I applaud the Lansdale Mural Arts Program for their work, especially organizers Margie Booz and Ellen Foulke for their thoughtfulness and dedication to our community.

RECOGNIZING THE ANN SILVERMAN COMMUNITY HEALTH CLINIC

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a nonprofit organization in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that serves to protect the health and dignity of residents across our community. The Ann Silverman Community Health Clinic in Doylestown provides medical and dental care, along with social services to low-income and impoverished individuals at no cost.

Offering these critical services will not be possible without the tireless efforts of a highly skilled staff and volunteer doctors and nurses. These dedicated professionals deserve our recognition, and, recently, Dr. Kieran Cody of Bucks County Orthopedic Specialists was named Volunteer Physician of the Year for his services to the clinic and his patients over the past 10 years.

Throughout his tenure, Dr. Cody has performed countless surgeries and MRI services, following in the footsteps of his father, Dr. Kevin Cody, who has spent 19 years volunteering at the clinic.

I thank Drs. Kieran and Kevin Cody for their service, and I extend my gratitude to the Ann Silverman Community Health Clinic executive director, Sally Fabian-Oresic for her leadership.

RECOGNIZING CHARLES BRISKIN AND RACHEL KOHLBRENNER OF THE SHIR AMI CONGREGATION

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize two members of our community in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who will be continuing their service to the Jewish faith at Shir Ami Congregation in Newtown.

Charles Briskin and Rachel Kohlbrenner both joined Shir Ami as rabbi and cantor, respectively.

Rabbi Briskin, who for the past 10 years has led Temple Beth El in San Pedro, California, was ordained in 2001 and studied at the Hebrew Union College Jewish Institute of Religion.

Cantor Kohlbrenner previously served as cantor for the Central Synagogue-Beth Emeth in Rockville Centre, New York, and studied at the Debbie Friedman School of Sacred Music of Hebrew Union College.

I welcome Rabbi Charles Briskin and Cantor Rachel Kohlbrenner to our community and wish them all the best as they embark on the newest chapters of their career.

And I thank their predecessors, Rabbi Joel Simon and Cantor Emeritus Mark Elson for their service and spiritual wisdom that they have blessed our community with for so long.

HONORING CORPORAL JOSEPH MACIEL

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Corporal Joseph Maciel, who was killed July 7 from injuries sustained while in Afghanistan in support of Operation Freedom's Sentinel.

Corporal Maciel was only 20 years old and is remembered by those who loved him for his infectious smile and love for his country. According to his father Jose, Corporal Maciel knew in high school that he wanted to serve his country. And when he enlisted in the Army, he made his family proud.

Corporal Maciel was a beloved member of our community, admired by his family and those he served alongside. He gave his life for freedom, and we are forever indebted to his service and to him.

I extend my deepest sympathy and condolences to the family of Corporal Joseph Maciel's friends and family in South Gate, California, in my district, and I thank him for his service and his family for their sacrifice.

CUTS TO EPA FUNDING

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, for the last year, in my congressional district, California's 44th District, which includes the communities of Compton, Watts, South Gate, and the Port of Los Angeles, we have been fighting to make sure we have access to clean air and to clean water.

We learned several months ago that there is something called chromium-6 in the air, which is a deadly chemical that causes respiratory problems and can lead to cancer.

Now, who oversees to make sure that these polluters are cracked down on and that we make sure that polluters are held accountable? The EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency.

This week this House is expected to consider FY 2019—fiscal year 2019, the Interior-Environment appropriations bill as part of a two-bill minibus. Now, this Republican bill puts the health and safety of American people at risk.

What does it do? It is going to cut the Environmental Protection Agency by $100 million. You heard me right. They are going to cut funding for the EPA.

This is the agency that oversees at making sure that polluters are held accountable. That, my friends, will put the American people in jeopardy, and those polluters that are going around, across the country and polluting things, like chromium-6 that is killing our kids and our seniors and causing asthma and respiratory problems, it is going to make it easier for them to pollute.

□ 1045

What else does it do? It slashes clean water grant programs by $300 million. In my community in Compton, California, we recently had a brown water crisis. It is still going on. There is brown water coming out of the faucets. We don't have to think too far back as to what happened in Flint, Michigan.

To think that we are having a vote this week that is going to cut $300 million—money that is used to invest in America's water infrastructure—is appalling. When I heard about it this week, I thought it was important that the American people know about it. This is what should be on the front page of the newspapers. This is what the media should be reporting on, what is happening in this Congress and how the American people are put at risk when such cuts are happening to the very agencies that are put there to protect us, so that we ensure that we have clean air and clean water.

As somebody who serves as the chair of two environmental task forces here in Congress, we cannot allow this to continue to happen without raising our voices, calling our elected officials, calling our offices, and speaking out about what the American people want. And this is one: Clean air and clean water is a basic right that everybody is entitled to.

I believe this bill is going to take us backward. It is going to hurt us. And it really hurts our ability to make sure that we continue to look at things like climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this, and I urge the American people to have their voices heard.

POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, there are moments in history that require the deliberate and thoughtful response of the most powerful body in the world, the United States Congress, this House and the other House.

While Americans are preparing for recreation and fellowship with family members during this period of summer, when schoolchildren are out, as others are dealing with the excruciating heat, others dealing with the impact of climate change, gun violence, the need for putting back in the terrible cuts of the Republican budget on Medicare and Medicaid, and a number of other issues dealing with their communities and neighborhoods, and, I would say, frankly, keeping their children safe and recognizing the values of this Nation that include not snatching children away from family members, I get that and I understand the responsibility of this Congress to pass laws, to work together to ensure that the beauty of what America stands for, her values and her opportunities for so many others, is heard.

But I also think it is important because, as I have traveled in the last 24 hours, I saw Americans concerned about their Nation and wanting to be able to understand what transpired in Helsinki yesterday, Monday, July 16. As many have said, Republicans and Democrats, it was a disgraceful display of unpatriotic behavior. The tragedy of it is that it came from the Commander in Chief of this Nation.

As I read the Constitution, it says that executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States, and he shall hold his office for a period of time. His powers under section 2 include that the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of several States, when called into actual service. And, as well, it indicates that he shall appoint ambassadors.

That is translated into the President's responsibilities over the intelligence communities and many aspects of our defense. Also, the power of the President articulates the foreign policy of this Nation.

Yesterday, the display that was shown was that the foreign policy, and the patriotism, and the stature, and the leadership, and the Constitution of the United States became a footstool to a despot by the name of President Putin.

No one is against engagement, diplomacy, or resolving conflict, but President Putin stands very proudly as ex-KGB to have poisoned his own citizens, to have shot journalists, to have shot down an airplane over Ukraine with 300 innocent family members, children, and others, and, as well, has taken over a land of another country.

So here we stand with this picture to the world. As well, when posed a question of, who do you believe, the Commander in Chief, to the absolute dismay of those of us who have lived through 9/11 here in Congress, and who saw the loss of life in conflicts like Iraq and Afghanistan, were amazed that the sacred aspect of our work, and that is voting, was determined by the intelligence community of this Nation, that Russia invaded in our 2016 election and literally stole the election, and will continue to do so today, as emphasized by the Director of National Intelligence, Director Coats, and the intelligence community.

A report given by the Mueller investigation indicted 12 intelligence agents of Russia—not of any other country, not civilians, but intelligence agents, military—who had direct orders from President Putin. You would think that the President of the United States would forcefully say to the President: Stop it and stop it now.

That is a patriot. That is one who has the powers of the Presidency under Article II, section 2.

Yet this is what came about. President Trump was asked by a reporter: ''You first. Just now, President Putin denied having anything to do with the election interference in 2016.''

It is amazing how my time goes because I am talking about the President. But, in any event, let me conclude by saying that this document reports that the President said that he stands with Putin over the United States of America. Congress must demand the transcripts. We must have congressional hearings, Mr. Speaker. This is a serious matter.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Strengthen the constitutional commitments of the Members of this people's House in their work today. Guide and sustain them in Your wisdom and inspire all, especially those in leadership, with the insights needed to assist our Nation at this time.

Bless all who are responsible for the security and safety of our Nation in today's world. Grant them a surfeit of courage and resolve to execute their responsibilities with integrity and faithfulness.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KILMER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

NATO COMMITMENT

(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, on Friday, The Washington Times correctly reported on the front page about the NATO conference that ''President Trump's bare-knuckles diplomacy paid off.''

''Mr. Trump declared that the U.S. remained committed to the military alliance.''

The Brussels Declaration of July 11 itself confirmed: ''We will share fairly the responsibilities of defending each other. Real progress has been made across NATO. . . . But even if we have turned a corner, we need to do more, and there will be further progress.''

Today, I am grateful to welcome a delegation from Bulgaria as a valued NATO ally. Chairperson of the Foreign Policy Committee, Dzhema Grozdanova of the National Assembly, who also is chair of the Friendship group Bulgaria-USA, is leading a delegation of assembly members to Washington, coordinated by Ambassador Tihomir Stoytchev. It is inspiring to see young Bulgarians and Americans training together at the base at Novo Selo to establish peace through strength.

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

LET THERE BE LIGHT

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, in 1961, in the face of a challenge from the Soviets, President Kennedy visited the University of Washington and said we are neither ''warmongers nor appeasers. Neither hard nor soft. We are Americans, determined to defend the frontiers of freedom.''

He pointed out the university's motto is: ''Let there be light,'' and asked: ''What more can be said today, regarding all the dark and tangled problems we face, than: Let there be light.''

It is the unanimous view of the United States intelligence community that Russia used social media to influence our elections in 2016. After yesterday, Americans from all viewpoints called on Congress to stand up for our interests to protect our elections from Russian influence.

I offered the Honest Ads Act as an amendment to the bill we are voting on today. This bipartisan bill simply establishes the same disclosure requirements for online ads that currently apply to political ads on television and radio.

So today, Congress had the chance to stand up to Russia and pass the Honest Ads Act, but like the President a day ago, this body failed to act.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a duty to defend the frontiers of freedom. So, let there be light. Let's pass the Honest Ads Act and shine a light on the darkest corners of our election systems so that Russia can never again use our news feeds to influence our elections.

INVESTING IN AMERICAN WORKERS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced the Skills Investment Act of 2018 with Congressman DEREK KILMER to allow American workers to invest in their own futures.

This bill would create lifelong learning accounts workers could use to pay for skills-based education, career-related learning, and professional development. In an ever-changing economy, I know that such accounts would be put to good use.

As co-chair of the bipartisan House Career and Technical Education Caucus, I fully support expanding access to skills-based educational opportunities and professional development.

The tax treatment of these savings accounts would be similar to a health savings account. Mid-career workers could contribute up to $4,000 tax free each year, with a maximum contribution limit of $10,000. Employers would receive a 25 percent tax credit for contributions to a worker's account. Workers of all ages can use the account at any time to learn skills to make them more competitive as the economy changes.

This bill is a commonsense approach to investing in the American worker. I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor it today.

SURRENDERING OUR VALUES

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, like many Americans, yesterday I watched and was dumbfounded by the words and the actions of the President of the United States as he betrayed our principles and our national interests on the world stage.

Never before have we seen a President of the United States so quickly surrender our longstanding values and our national security interests to an adversary like Vladimir Putin. The President's pathetic performance was an embarrassment for the United States.

Just last week, of course, his own Justice Department indicted 12 Russian intelligence agents for the very act that he denied ever took place. When he had a chance to take sides between American interests and the American intelligence community, he wrapped his arms around Vladimir Putin, a KGB spy with a history of jamming his opponents and killing journalists. This is outrageous.

NORTH KOREA BRUTALIZES ITS PEOPLE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, North Korea's nuclear program is perhaps the greatest threat to U.S. national security, but we must never forget the horrendous plight of the North Korean people.

Little Kim and his dynasty are guilty of some of the worst human rights abuses in human history. Freedom of religion and freedom of speech do not exist in North Korea. Christians are routinely arrested, tortured, imprisoned, and executed, their families sent to prison camps for ''guilt by association.''

Reports estimate that almost 130,000 political prisoners are suffering brutal conditions in highly secret work camps around North Korea. Systematic murder, torture, rape, forced abortions, starvation, and overwork are leading to countless deaths every day, and the Kim regime is giving no signs of relenting.

Despite any nuclear agreement, we must make it clear that the United States will never waiver in its support for basic human dignity of the North Korean people.

And that is just the way it is.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's trade war is spiraling out of control and American workers and businesses are paying the price.

Back home in Illinois, already more than $3.8 billion in exports have been targeted for retaliation. I have heard from numerous working companies hurting from this misguided approach. They are struggling with new, high costs and are now less able or less likely to hire or expand.

Today, I am introducing legislation to help American businesses affected by the Trump tariffs. Trade Adjustment Assistance was created in 1962 to help U.S. workers and U.S. firms adapt to competition caused by changing trade policies. My bill would expand the Trade Adjustment Assistance for Firms to add reduced exports resulting from retaliatory tariffs as a qualifying factor for the TAA program.

I also enthusiastically support similar legislation by my Democratic colleagues being introduced this week to provide similar assistance to impacted workers and farmers.

President Trump needs to end this damaging trade war. Until he does, we need to provide relief to the businesses and workers who are adversely stuck with the consequences.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

RECOGNIZING JOHN COMERFORD OF BLACKBURN COLLEGE

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank my friend, John Comerford, for his years of service and leadership as president of Blackburn College in Carlinville, Illinois.

In his nearly 5 years as Blackburn's president, John provided tremendous leadership and helped implement innovative policies with tuition assistance and providing students with valuable work experience.

Under his leadership, Blackburn College has steadily grown its enrollment, renovated several buildings on campus, and implemented policies that provide local students with access to college.

Under Blackburn's Macoupin Promise program, which was created last year, high school students in Macoupin County can attend Blackburn College for free if they meet the college's academic standards, participate in the work program, and their household income falls below a set threshold.

Beginning this month, John will be moving to Otterbein University in Ohio, where he will serve as president. I wish John nothing but the best in the future and thank him for his leadership, feedback, and, most of all, his friendship.

BUILDING A NEW BUFFALO

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, at the foot of Main Street in Buffalo lies the DL&W Terminal, a century-old, vacant historic landmark along the Buffalo River that once served as a bustling stop for passengers traveling by both ship and rail.

A plan by the Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority will transform this piece of western New York history into a destination that serves a Buffalo of today and tomorrow, creating a multimodal center for people traveling by rail, automobile, bikes, and boats.

The DL&W Terminal is a project under consideration for a Federal grant through the United States Department of Transportation's Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development, otherwise known as the BUILD program.

I stand today in support of the NFTA's grant application for the DL&W Terminal, which serves as a national model for financing of infrastructure investments delivering significant economic impact.

Surrounded by Canalside, the Cobblestone District, downtown Buffalo, and the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus, development of the DL&W represents a transformative project building on the economic renaissance of the new Buffalo.

TAX REFORM FEEDBACK

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share that in 6 short months, tax reform has transformed lives and businesses in South Carolina.

I recently sent out two postcard surveys to over 50,000 of my constituents asking them how tax reform has affected them. I have received great feedback, with over 70 percent saying they saw increased pay or benefits.

One example I received in the Fifth District is from the Mattox family, a self-employed couple in Clover. They said that, due to their tax cuts this year, they are going to finally be able to buy new equipment for their business. The Mattox family also believes these tax cuts should remain permanent for all middle class families because of the benefits they personally see occurring in their community.

As a result of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, South Carolinians are now seeing opportunities and confidence coming back to their families and small businesses.

TRUMP BLAMES AMERICA FIRST

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to respectfully call upon our Republican colleagues to stand up for America by standing up against and rejecting President Donald Trump's surrender to murderous dictator Vladimir Putin.

Putin may well have elected Trump, but Putin is against us all, Democrats and Republicans alike, and he is against our cherished democracy.

Without his congressional Republican enablers, Trump cannot continue to coddle the Russians at the very time that his Director of National Intelligence, lifelong Republican Dan Coats, is warning that we are under sustained Russian attack.

In his embarrassing, fawning praise of Putin, Trump expresses no concern for Putin's military shooting down a civilian airliner four years ago today; Putin's agents poisoning his enemies and jailing his opponents; Putin's invasions of Ukraine and Georgia; and Putin's interference and attacks on our elections, as certified by U.S. intelligence agencies.

Don't await your retirement to stand up and address the truth of Trump's betrayal of our country.

□ 1215

PROTECTING FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, with access to millions of Americans' personal information, the IRS is one of the most powerful agencies in Washington. Unsurprisingly, the agency has failed to secure that information from abuse. That is why I was pleased to see the Treasury Department announce it will no longer require certain tax-exempt organizations to file personally identifiable information about their donors as part of their annual returns.

While the House has taken steps to limit schedule B disclosures of the tax-exempt organizations, the latest announcement from the IRS will exempt some 45,000 nonprofits from the reporting rule, including conservative organizations, but also unions and social welfare groups.

Today, one's political views can spark passion, hatred, even refusal of service at a restaurant. In an extreme case, your life may be threatened at baseball practice.

Regardless of political affiliation, Americans should feel comfortable donating to a cause or candidate of their choice without living in fear of reprisal. I applaud the administration's recent action and encourage this Congress to join their effort and defend the First Amendment rights of every American.

PROTECT PENSION PLANS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week in Columbus, Ohio, thousands of American retirees gathered to demand Congress act.

Pension plans for more than 1 million retirees and union workers are in danger of collapse if something is not done soon. More than 60,000 Ohio workers alone could be impacted, and millions across our Nation face cuts in their earned retirement benefits.

Retirees traveled from as far as Utah to Columbus as the Select Committee

on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans held a field hearing to hear from retirees and employers. Their jobs ranged from coal miners to truck drivers to candymakers.

As Perry Rapier from Pennsylvania said at the rally: ''We've worked and sweat and toiled into this position, and we've earned that pension; and now to know that somebody that's sitting behind a desk is willing to take that from us, we're going to stand up and fight for that.''

Retirement security is an American value. Workers' pensions must be protected. Congress must find a solution to their earned pensions and give security to the retirement years of millions of hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress to act before this Congress ends.

RULE OF LAW

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, countries that were part of the old Soviet Union are now growing democracies, but they face ongoing interference from the new Soviet Union, Russia. The country of Georgia is one such country.

Georgia and those nations that were behind the Iron Curtain are now working to improve their democracies. A strong economy allows these countries to grow and stand on their own. That is why Georgia and others seeking real freedom must work harder on the international stage to keep American and Western money flowing.

This money goes away if the rule of law is not followed. It is simple: Follow the rule of law; prosperity follows. Don't follow the rule of law; poverty follows. This simple act will make our world more free.

HONORING THE LIFE OF KURT VON TILLOW

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Kurt von Tillow.

Kurt attended the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1. Kurt enjoyed owning his own trucking company in northern California. He would often go to concerts and was happy to be going to the Route 91 festival with a number of his relatives.

Kurt and his wife loved to take golfing trips to Scotland and Ireland, and they loved to boat. He was fun, friendly, and liked to enjoy good beer. Kurt is remembered as being very patriotic and a big family man.

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

EXPRESSING AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT OF THE SPEAKER REGARDING RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN THE 2016 ELECTIONS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 999 was introduced by our colleague ELIOT ENGEL from New York. Basically, what it says is that the House of Representatives expresses its agreement with the statements of the Speaker of the House of Representatives made on July 16, 2018, regarding the Russian Federation's interference in the 2016 United States elections and related matters.

It basically, again, is an endorsement word for word of what the Speaker of the House said, a very strong statement, basically making it clear that there was no question that Russia interfered in our election and continues to attempt to undermine our democracy here and around the world.

It is not just the finding of the American intelligence community but also of the House Intelligence Committee.

REQUEST THAT COMMITTEES OF REFERRAL BE DISCHARGED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 999

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any committees of referral be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 999, expressing agreement with the statements of the Speaker of the House of Representatives made on July 16, 2018, regarding Russian Federation interference in the 2016 United States elections and related matters, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORMAN). 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.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how do I get this cleared? Maybe I can yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, who can maybe, in a gesture of bipartisanship, agree that it would be a strong statement for the House of Representatives to come together, Democrats and Republicans, and get behind the strong words of our Speaker of the House. Would that be appropriate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not been notified of clearance for the request by the gentleman.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my question was: How do I get it cleared now that I am on the floor? Can I ask the Republicans if they would agree to it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clearance comes from the leaderships and the committees.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 996, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 996 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 996

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-81 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 or clause 5(a) of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with the colon on page 251, line 5, through ''2012'' on page 251, line 8. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and pro forma amendments described in section 2 of this resolution. Each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 2 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been

adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 6147 for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my good friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of H.R. 6147, the Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2019, which also includes the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act of 2019.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriations package in front of us is the third installment of the House's effort to pass all 12 appropriations bills on the floor for fiscal year 2019. We have previously passed appropriations bills covering Energy and Water, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, Legislative Branch, and Defense.

Today we turn to the work of the Appropriations Committee Subcommittees on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies and Financial Services and General Government.

Once the House finishes its work for the week, we will have passed 6 of the 12 appropriations bills across the floor.

Overall, the package covers $58.65 billion in spending. Of those funds, $35.25 billion are allocated to the Interior bill and $23.4 billion to the Financial Services bill, which is equal to the enacted level for fiscal year 2018 for both of these bills. The package represents many months of work by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, as I have so often said when discussing appropriations bills, today's package represents the most fundamental duty of Congress, to fund the government and keep it open each year to continue to provide our constituents with the services they need and deserve. But, importantly, this package also fulfills an additional duty of Congress to the American people: its fiscally prudent stewardship of the taxpayers' hard-earned money and to ensure that we appropriately prioritize where and how to spend taxpayer dollars in the most efficient manner.

Mr. Speaker, the Interior and Environment Appropriations bill funds critical programs at the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other crucial areas. Among the areas of greatest importance, the bill includes $3.9 billion for the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Forest Service to fight wildfires. It includes $500 million for payments in lieu of taxes to help local governments, and it provides $2.6 billion for the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund.

□ 1230

It funds the National Park Service at $3.25 billion, an increase of $53 million over fiscal year 2018. Of great import, not only to my home State of Oklahoma but to Native Americans all across the country, the bill honors our treaties and trust agreements by providing $5.9 billion for the Indian Health Service and $3.1 billion for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian Education.

The bill also fulfills an additional commitment to the American people by including provisions to rein in the runaway regulatory agendas of parts of the Federal Government. It reduces the EPA's regulatory programs by $228 million. It also fully repeals the economically damaging waters of the United States rule and includes various prohibitions preventing the EPA from overregulating agricultural operations and exempting livestock producers from EPA greenhouse gas requirements.

The Financial Services and General Government portion of this bill provides $23.4 billion across several important accounts. It provides $7.7 billion for the operation of the Federal court system. The bill also provides funding to help combat the opioid crisis, including $415 million for the Office of National Drug Control Policy, including $280 million for high-intensity drug trafficking areas and $118 million for other Federal drug control programs.

It encourages responsible spending at the Internal Revenue Service by appropriating $11.6 billion for IRS activities, an increase of $186 million over fiscal year 2018, and continues stringent oversight and protections of taxpayer dollars that have been included in recent years.

The bill provides $1.66 billion for the Securities and Exchange Commission and will help grow the economy by providing $737 million, or full funding, in capital to various Small Business Administration loan programs. Perhaps most importantly, this bill includes provisions that will finally bring the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau under congressional oversight.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, when the CFPB was created in the original Dodd-Frank Act, the new agency was allowed to operate without congressional oversight because it did not receive appropriations. Consequently, since its inception, unelected bureaucrats at the CFPB have been allowed to operate entirely without congressional supervision. Today's bill will remedy that and will ensure that the CFPB falls under congressional authority, oversight, and supervision once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill. The package before us represents a fulfillment of our most important responsibility as Members of Congress and provides appropriate funding in two divisions: Interior and Environment, and Financial Services and General Government. I applaud my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their months of work in making this bill a reality and cheer their efforts on moving forward to completion of the fiscal year 2019 appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the measures included here aren't just bad, they are dangerous. Take the Interior Appropriations bill. It would put the health and safety of Americans at risk by slashing funding to address climate change and enforce environmental safeguards.

The EPA, the agency tasked with fighting carbon emissions, is cut by $100 million. That is especially ironic since the majority was completely unwilling to rein in the wasteful spending by its former Administrator, Scott Pruitt. This is someone who spent $43,000 on a soundproof phone booth, but the majority was silent.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is cut by $65 million. That is after Republicans cut it by a third in the last fiscal year. As many of my colleagues know, I have been a champion of the LWCF, especially the stateside grant program where States provide a 50 percent match to grants that create more recreational and green open spaces in our districts. The people in communities in nearly every congressional district in the country have benefitted from these grants. We should be increasing, not cutting, LWCF.

There is even language in the bill that would repeal a rule designed to protect our wetlands and waterways. State revolving funds were cut by $300 million, a $150 million cut to clean drinking water and a $150 million cut to clean water projects like water treatment and sewage programs.

Mr. Speaker, the American people rely on Congress to make sure that the

water they drink is clean. What is going on with this bill?

As always, Republicans have again attached several poison pill provisions that undermine the health and safety of our communities and the environment. Every year—every year—provisions like these weigh down this bill.

Mr. Speaker, when will my Republican friends realize that harmful provisions like this are why the bill has to become law? I am especially outraged to see what the majority has done with the Financial Services Appropriations bill, especially after what we saw on Friday. That is when some of our worst fears were confirmed.

As part of Special Counsel Robert Mueller's investigation, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein announced charges against 12 Russian military intelligence officers. They were accused of hacking the Democratic National Committee, hacking Hillary Clinton's Presidential campaign, and hacking the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. The website of a State electoral board was also hacked. Voter information was stolen. Even the vendor of voting equipment was targeted for a cyber attack. And those individuals involved in administering elections were also targeted.

These charges are proof that our Nation, that our very democracy, is under attack. No troops were sent into combat. Not a single gun was fired. Instead, an adversary turned the internet into a battlefield. That is the new face of warfare in the 21st century.

Although the methods were different, this Congress should be responding the way we always have, by putting partisanship aside and putting our country first by doing whatever it takes to ensure we are not left vulnerable again.

But, Mr. Speaker, how is this majority responding? By using the Financial Services Appropriations bill to zero out funding for grants that help protect our election systems from cyber hacking. That is a cut of $380 million compared to what Congress enacted in fiscal year 2018. The wolf is at the door, and my Republican colleagues are inviting it inside for dinner. This is insane.

The President tweeted, shortly after the election: ''Unless you catch 'hackers' in the act, it is very hard to determine who was doing the hacking.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, it may be hard, but it is not impossible, because we now have a 29-page indictment from President Trump's own Justice Department providing the roadmap. The indictment goes into extraordinary detail outlining how Russia successfully hacked into our election systems, how candidates and committees were successfully targeted—not by China or somebody sitting on their bed who weighs 400 pounds, as the President suggested, but by Russia, by Vladimir Putin.

It is mind-boggling that even after this indictment, after Russia's meddling was laid bare, the President did not stand up to Putin. He held a summit with him instead. He even told CBS News, in an interview before his sit down, that he ''hadn't thought'' about raising the issue with Putin during their talk.

It gets worse, Mr. Speaker. British investigators believe that current and former agents of the same Russian military intelligence service accused of disrupting our 2016 elections are also likely responsible for the nerve agent attack on a former Russian spy and his daughter in Salisbury, England, earlier this year.

Sadly, it is no surprise that the President didn't stand up to Putin. He never does. When President Trump was asked whether he was a friend or a foe, he recently called Putin a competitor instead, like this was all some kind of real estate deal.

A President who calls the free press, journalists in the United States, ''the enemy of the American people'' time and time again is unwilling to call the leader of Russia a foe or even an adversary. It is disturbing.

What kind of hold does Vladimir Putin have on this President, Mr. Speaker? So much so that the President basically blamed the United States for much of the tensions between the two countries.

The President even deflected when asked whether he trusts the American intelligence community or Putin.

The President may be satisfied by what he called Putin's strong and powerful denial of election interference, but I am not, Mr. Speaker. I am disgusted.

It is clear that an effort to defend our democracy will have to be led by Congress, because it is not coming from the White House. But we are not leading when we make it easier for an adversary like Russia to attack us again. That is retreating.

I remember learning about the separation of powers in school, how the legislative branch is a separate but equal branch of government. The Founders designed it that way so we could provide a check on a President.

Mr. Speaker, when are the Republicans in Congress going to provide a check on President Trump? He is cozying up to Putin instead of holding him accountable for hacking our election.

As Senator SCHUMER suggested, we should be increasing sanctions on the Russians. The Republican majority should be joining us, demanding the President's national security team that accompanied him to Helsinki testify before Congress, detailing what they know.

It is past time that Republicans end their attacks on the Department of Justice, on the FBI, and on the special counsel. Already, 32 people and three companies have been either indicted or pleaded guilty under Special Counsel Mueller's investigation. Now, we will see where else it leads, but there is already evidence of clear wrongdoing.

He should be able to finish his work without any interference. The majority should move a bill from Representative NADLER to the floor immediately, so we can protect the special counsel's investigation from the whims of this President.

President Trump has shown he is willing to fire his FBI Director. Mr. Speaker, are the Republicans really going to stand by and make it possible for him to fire Robert Mueller, too?

This majority must also demand the President insist that the 12 Russians named in Friday's indictment are sent to the United States to stand trial. The President should have already done this when he met with Putin, but, apparently, it was an afterthought. Maybe he was too busy admiring the strongman to stand up for his country's interests.

I wish I were optimistic that Republicans would take these commonsense steps to protect our country, but I am not, not after what we saw in the Rules Committee last night. The majority failed to make in order an amendment by Representative QUIGLEY. It was germane. But they failed to make in order his amendment that would provide $380 million to help States protect election systems from cyber hacking. This funding should not have been zeroed out in the first place.

Do my Republican friends see what is happening? Is anybody paying attention over there? Russia meddled in our election, and your response is to zero out funding for an election security assistance program. Then, when we pointed it out and tried to put the money back, you blocked the amendment. You won't even allow us to debate the program. That is the smallest step that they could have taken. Instead, we can't even have a debate on the floor.

Apparently, the Republicans are afraid of having a fair fight about protecting our democracy, and it is indefensible. If the President isn't willing to do more to prevent Putin from doing it again, then this Congress has an obligation to act, not gut the accounts that provide for election security.

We can start standing up by voting against this rule and the underlying legislation. It doesn't do nearly enough to protect our Nation against hostile foreign powers hell-bent on attacking our democracy.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and then I will turn and yield time to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to quickly respond to my friend's concern about the Election Assistance Commission funds.

As I am sure he is aware, that was the last installment last year, this fiscal year, of a $365 billion authorization that was actually done back in 2002. Currently, 39 percent of those funds for this year are still available to the

States. Actually, 19 States have yet to submit any sort of request, and the legislation itself has not been reauthorized. If the authorizing people reauthorize it, I am sure we will revisit this matter.

It also worth noting that anything added will be available only from October 1, and the election is 5 weeks after that. So the idea that we are going to do something in that period of time, I think, is a bit of a red herring.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), my good friend from the Seventh District.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying legislation that provides funding for programs vital to the environmental and economic health of my home State of Ohio and the entire Great Lakes region. This appropriations bill includes full funding, $300 million, for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

□ 1245

The GLRI is an important program focusing on critical environmental restoration projects, such as improving water quality, fighting invasive species, and repairing native habitats for wildlife.

The Great Lakes region supports over $200 billion in economic activity and is the world's largest source of fresh water. Restoring and preserving the Great Lakes is good for our environment and good for the thousands of Ohioans whose livelihoods depend on a clean Lake Erie.

Additionally, the bill repeals the burdensome Obama-era waters of the United States rule, a bureaucratic overreach that expands EPA jurisdiction beyond congressional intent and in contradiction of court rulings.

When the Obama administration announced this rule, I heard from farmers, ranchers, local and State governments, homeowners, and private property rights advocates. All agreed the Obama administration went too far, creating confusion and uncertainty about what would and would not fall under EPA jurisdiction. By repealing the flawed 2015 WOTUS rule, we are committing to work with State environmental agencies as partners in protecting our Nation's natural resources, rather than as adversaries.

Finally, this appropriations bill maintains funding for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, a valuable tool for State and local agencies to finance projects to ensure our municipalities have access to clean and affordable water.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and passage of the legislation to keep the Great Lakes healthy and continue to improve our Nation's water quality.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to my good friend from Oklahoma who I think said that 39 percent of the funds are still left in the Election Assistance Commission account. Well, we still have 5 months left in this year, and does anybody here really believe that these attacks are going to stop? And shouldn't we have money in the pipeline? Shouldn't we be prepared not just for this election, but for the election after that?

This is about protecting our democracy, and I don't understand why this is controversial. But no matter what you think about Mr. QUIGLEY's amendment, it was germane. It was relevant to this bill. It should have been brought up, and we should debate it. All we are asking for is a fair fight.

We are deeply concerned about what is happening to our country, and we are especially concerned in the aftermath of President Trump's disastrous meeting with Vladimir Putin.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for Congress to stand unified with the unanimous assessment of our intelligence community.

I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we do, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative ENGEL's resolution, H. Res. 999, which follows word for word yesterday's statement by Speaker RYAN affirming Russia's attacks on our democracy.

This is the second time today that I am going to give my Republican friends a chance to go on the Record and agree with the words of the Republican Speaker of the House, PAUL RYAN.

Defending our democracy shouldn't be controversial. Agreeing with the Republican Speaker that ''the United States must be focused on holding Russia accountable'' should not be controversial. I would say to my friends, take yes for an answer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding to me, and I want to strongly identify with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I led the Foreign Affairs Committee Democrats last week urging President Trump to cancel his meeting with Vladimir Putin because I knew this was going to turn out badly, but, frankly, I didn't know how bad it would be. It turns out President Trump embarrassed himself and disgraced our Nation.

Standing on foreign soil, the President of the United States questioned America's intelligence community; he attacked America's law enforcement with bizarre conspiracy theories; he lobbed petty political insults; and he did it all while standing next to America's chief rival, Vladimir Putin.

When faced head-on with the question, ''Who do you believe?'' President Trump sided with Putin and affirmed Putin's brazen lies. This is the tyrant who directed attacks on America's democracy in an effort to elect Donald Trump and hurt Hillary Clinton. And, as Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats said, these attacks are still ongoing.

As we all know, Putin is a ruthless leader who seeks to tear down our alliances, undermine Western unity, and destroy democracy. With the eyes of the world on them, it is plain that the President of the United States is now Putin's willing accomplice, Putin's poodle. It is outrageous; it is disgusting; it is dangerous; and it has been met with near universal condemnation.

Here is what Speaker RYAN said just yesterday, and I agree with the Speaker:

> There is no question that Russia interfered in our election and continues attempts to undermine democracy here and around the world. The President needs to understand that Russia is not our ally. There is no moral equivalency between the United States and Russia, which remains hostile to our most basic values and ideals, and that Russia must be held accountable.

That is what our Republican Speaker said, and I agree with him.

I have introduced this resolution so that the entire House can go on record agreeing with the Speaker, affirming that we stand with the Speaker. I deeply regret that a member of the Speaker's own party just blocked the House from speaking with one voice and taking up this resolution by unanimous consent.

We must reject the President's capitulation to Putin; we must stand up for American leadership on the global stage; and we must demand that this administration treat Russia like the enemy it is.

How can you treat Putin better than U.S. intelligence? It just boggles my mind.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution I have just introduced, which is H. Res. 999.

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

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

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

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to defeat the previous question.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Federal administrative law judges, commonly known as ALJs, decide over 1 million cases a year, covering everything from appeals of Social Security Disability and Medicare claims to disputes over black lung benefits and securities law violations. These are cases that can touch virtually all of our constituents.

On July 10, President Trump issued an executive order that will undermine the quality and independence of ALJs and the impartiality of the decisions they render. It does so by changing the hiring standards for judges.

The current standards guarantee that ALJs are fully qualified to serve. The executive order will replace those standards with a far more lenient system that would allow ALJs to be hired based on ideology or cronyism rather than experience and competence.

This executive order, titled, ''Exempting Administrative Law Judges from the Competitive Service'' will open the door for the politicization of a profession that plays a defining role in the lives of millions of American families.

Representatives ELIJAH CUMMINGS, DAVID CICILLINE, JOHN LARSON, and I filed an amendment to defund the executive order and preserve the impartiality, independence, and competence of administrative law judges. Unfortunately, the majority on the Rules Committee has refused to allow Members of Congress to vote on or even debate our amendment.

The longstanding hiring standards for ALJs were designed to guarantee the legitimacy of their decisions. ALJs were required to have 7 years of trial-level experience as an attorney and successfully complete a six-part examination. To insulate judicial decision-making from agency political pressure, the examination was conducted by the Office of Personnel Management, OPM, which maintained a list of the highest scoring applicants from which agencies can then select their candidates.

All of that was jettisoned by the President's executive order, which removes ALJs from the competitive service. Now the only requirements are that an ALJ must be a lawyer in good standing.

This executive order is strongly opposed by a broad spectrum of organizations. The Federal Administrative Law Judge Conference, a nonpartisan, voluntary professional association, warns, ''now, any agency that wants to hire an ALJ needs no approval from OPM and can hire any attorney regardless of skill or experience. The new appointment process will not afford members of the public the due process and fair hearings they deserve. Instead, it will give agency insiders and political loyalists a job for which they may not be qualified but for which they will feel indebted.''

The Association of Administrative Law Judges, which represents over 1,600 ALJs at the Social Security Administration, states that the President's order ''will politicize our courts, lead to cronyism, and replace independent and impartial adjudicators with those who do the bidding of political appointees.''

The American Association for Justice writes: ''It is important for all cases overseen by ALJs to have a neutral ALJ handling the case, not someone who may be beholden to a particular political party, hostile to a particular agency or program, or otherwise politically motivated in their decisionmaking.''

The American Bar Association writes: ''By giving agency heads sole discretion to hire ALJs who will be making determinations affirming or overturning decisions rendered by that agency, the executive order has the potential to politicize the appointment process and interfere with the decisional independence of ALJs.''

The American Bar Association says further that: ''Nothing less than the integrity of the administrative judiciary is at issue here. That is why it is critical that Members of Congress have an opportunity to participate in the debate and help formulate a solution. The first step is to halt implementation of the executive order.''

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letters from those four organizations.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR JUSTICE,
July 13, 2018.

Hon. MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The American Association for Justice strongly opposes the Trump Administration's recent executive order regarding the hiring and role of federal Administrative Law Judges (ALJs). An impartial judiciary is central to the strength of our justice system, and ALJs should not be involved in the political process. The ALJ executive order threatens the American people's right to a neutral arbiter and right to due process.

It is vital that ALJs be independent and impartial. This executive order eliminates the process of selecting ALJs based on their qualifications, and instead allows these positions to be filled by political appointees without any merit-based procedure. Administrative proceedings should continue to be overseen and adjudicated by ALJs who are qualified, such as attorneys with at least seven years of litigation experience and who are vetted by the Office of Personnel Management, as was the prior process. The appointment of ALJs with no experience, who can gain appointment solely due to their financial contributions or other political incentives so long as they possess a bar license, could result in unfair, biased rulings for millions of Americans.

The executive order will have a devastating effect on a vast array of cases, including cases before the Social Security Administration, Department of Labor, National Labor Relations Board, and Department of Health and Human Services. There are about 2,000 ALJs that decide over a million cases each year. Approximately 1,600 of those ALJs hear Social Security disability cases and render almost 700,000 decisions each year at the hearing level. It is important for all cases overseen by ALJs to have a neutral ALJ handling the case, not someone who may be beholden to a particular political party, hostile to a particular agency or program, or otherwise politically motivated in their decision-making. AAJ is especially concerned about bias against claimants seeking Social Security disability benefits.

We urge you to oppose this executive order and to support Amendment #55, sponsored by Reps. Scott (VA), Cummings, Cicilline and Larson (CT), to Division B of Rules Committee Print 115–81 (H.R. 6147). We greatly appreciate your support in protecting the American people's right to due process.

Sincerely,

LINDA LIPSEN,
CEO, American Association for Justice.

[News Release From the Association of Administrative Law Judges, July 12, 2018]

STATEMENT BY HON. MARILYN ZAHM, PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES (AALJ) ON WHITE HOUSE EXECUTIVE ORDER ON ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES

President Trump's executive order this week regarding the hiring and role of federal administrative law judges should concern anyone who has a Social Security Card. This is an assault on due process for the American people who have a right to a neutral arbiter. Currently, 1,600 of the roughly 2,000 federal ALJs hear Social Security disability cases. The president's order calls for replacing the current merit system used to hire judges with a court-packing plan that will allow agency heads to hand pick judges who hear cases at the Social Security Administration and dozens of other federal agencies. This change will politicize our courts, lead to cronyism and replace independent and impartial adjudicators with those who do the bidding of political appointees. This is a decision that should be reversed. If allowed to go forward it would be the equivalent of placing a thumb on the scale of justice.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, IL, July 16, 2018.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Committee on Rules, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES MCGOVERN,
Committee on Rules, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS AND RANKING MEMBER MCGOVERN: On behalf of the American Bar Association and its over 400,000 members nationwide, I write to urge you to support consideration of Representative Scott's proposed amendment to Division B of Rules Committee Print 115–81 during floor consideration of H.R. 6147. The amendment would prohibit the use of funds by the Office of Personnel Management or any other executive branch agency for the development, promulgation, modification, or implementation of the July 10, 2018, Executive Order Excepting Administrative Law Judges from Competitive Service.

The Executive Order (EO) is an ill-considered and legally vulnerable response to the Supreme Court ruling in Lucia et al. v. Securities and Exchange Commission, which held that SEC Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) are considered ''inferior officers of the United States'' and therefore require appointment consistent with the Appointments Clause of the United States Constitution.

The EO, which eliminates the nationwide, uniform, competitive selection exam process

and weakens existing qualifications standards, gives each agency head the unfettered authority to hire ALJs based on criteria established by the agency. In fact, the EO specifically states that it gives agencies greater discretion to assess critical qualities, including the applicant's ''ability to meet the particular needs of the agency,'' which are, of course, left entirely to the agency to define.

There is no doubt that changes to the current selection and appointment process for ALJs are required by Lucia, but we believe that those changes should be instituted after there has been an opportunity for Congress and the public to engage in an open and deliberative process that considers possible options for curing the constitutional defects in the current process. We hope this includes an examination of ways to assure that safeguards remain in place that respect the unique adjudicative role of ALJs and retain public confidence in the system. If adopted, the Scott amendment, by halting implementation of the EO, would allow congressional and public engagement on this important issue.

A fair and impartial administrative judiciary is indispensable to our system of justice. Vast numbers of Americans are involved in administrative adjudicative proceedings every day, and the decisions rendered by ALJs in these proceedings often affect their lives in profound ways.

By giving agency heads sole discretion to hire ALJs who will be making determinations affirming or overturning decisions rendered by that agency, the EO has the potential to politicize the appointment process and interfere with the decisional independence of ALJs.

Nothing less than the integrity of the administrative judiciary is at issue here. That is why it is critical that Members of Congress have an opportunity to participate in the debate and help formulate a solution. The first step is to halt implementation of the EO.

We therefore urge you to allow the House to vote on the Scott amendment when it deliberates on H.R. 6147.

Sincerely,

HILARIE BASS,
President.

[From the Federal Administrative Law Judges Conference, July 11, 2018]

EXECUTIVE ORDER ON ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES LOWERS STANDARDS AND REDUCES INDEPENDENCE

WASHINGTON, DC.—On July 10, 2018, President Donald J. Trump issued an executive order eliminating the competitive process to select nonpartisan Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) based on qualifications demonstrated through courtroom experience and an examination process. These positions may now be filled by inexperienced political appointees.

Nearly two thousand ALJs decide over a million cases each year. Americans are far more likely during their lifetime to encounter a federal ALJ than any other type of judge.

Since 1947, administrative proceedings, under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), have been objectively overseen by presidents from both political parties without partisan interference. In enacting the APA, Congress ensured that agency judges must be both highly qualified and independent from political influence.

Until yesterday, federal agencies hired ALJ candidates with 7 years of litigation experience. Candidates were ranked based on their scores on a six-part examination conducted by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). Now, any agency that wants to hire an ALJ needs no approval from OPM and can hire any attorney regardless of skill or experience.

The new appointment process will not afford members of the public the due process and fair hearings they deserve. Instead, it will give agency insiders and political loyalists a job for which they may not be qualified but for which they will feel indebted.

As judges, we are disappointed that a merit selection system that produced nonpartisan judges for seven decades was eliminated by the stroke of a pen. We call for presidential reconsideration or Congressional intervention to restore the ALJ merit selection system.

The Federal Administrative Law Judges Conference (FALJC), established in 1947, is a nonpartisan voluntary professional association for federal ALJs. FALJC is dedicated to improving the administrative judicial process, presenting educational programs, and ensuring due process and judicial independence in administrative proceedings.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, by refusing to allow this amendment to come to the floor, the majority has denied Members the opportunity to have an important debate on this issue. Rather than avoiding the issue, the majority should be standing up for a just and impartial review process. Rather than refusing a vote on this amendment, the majority should be joining us in holding the administration to account.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed by the majority's opposition to consider this issue that affects so many constituents across the country. I, therefore, urge Members to oppose the rule.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the majority has filled the Financial Services Appropriations bill with anti-Home Rule riders that meddle in local D.C. affairs. Not one or two provisions, which would be bad enough, but five.

One would prohibit D.C. from using its own funding to carry out Initiative 77, which eliminates the tipped minimum wage. That is an initiative, by the way, that passed recently with 56 percent of the vote.

Last night in the Rules Committee, the Republicans even made in order the Palmer amendment. This would prevent the District from implementing its local individual responsibility requirement. If passed, this amendment would increase health insurance premiums and cause residents to lose access to affordable coverage options.

Mr. Speaker, why are the Republicans continuing to interfere in local D.C. government? Where are the small-government conservatives? Where is the Freedom Caucus? They should be outraged by this meddling.

Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON filed amendments to strike these riders and spoke in the Rules Committee last night. She asked a pretty simple question: Don't my Republican friends have their own districts to worry about?

Her amendments complied with the rules of the House, yet they were blocked from getting a vote on the floor. We can't even debate them here. The majority is afraid of a fair fight.

We are long past the point of breaking the record for being the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America. This is more of the same for the most closed Congress in history, but that doesn't make it right, Mr. Speaker. When will the Republicans finally say, ''Enough''?

So enough with the meddling in D.C. affairs, enough with overriding the will of local residents, and enough with the restrictive amendment process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

□ 1300

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the ranking member for his very cogent remarks that go to the principle of the matter before the House today.

I have to say, I come to the well of the House in outrage against the attack on the District of Columbia by the Republican House. In 1973—that is 45 years ago—Congress passed the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, which created the locally elected government.

Understand that after the Civil War, it is Republicans who first gave the District of Columbia the right to have its own home rule, a tradition that this Republican majority has repudiated. According to the Home Rule Act, a central purpose of the act was, and I am quoting, ''to relieve Congress of the burden of legislating upon essentially local District matters.''

President Nixon, who signed the bill, affirmed that purpose himself when he wrote—and I am going to quote President Nixon: ''One of the major goals of this administration is to place responsibility for local functions under local control and to provide local governments with the authority and resources they need to serve their communities effectively. The measure I signed today represents a significant step in achieving this goal in the city of Washington. It will give the people of the District of Columbia the right to elect their own city officials and to govern themselves in local affairs.

''As the Nation approaches the 200th anniversary of its founding, it is particularly appropriate to ensure those persons who live in the Capital City the rights and privileges which have long been enjoyed by most of their countrymen. But the measure I signed today does more than create machinery for the election of local officials. It also broadens and strengthens the structure of city government to enable it to deal more effectively with its responsibility.''

Signed, Richard Nixon.

How do we square those words and the bipartisan Home Rule Act with a fiscal year 2019 appropriation bill which is the most significant abuse of congressional power over the District

of Columbia since Republicans took control of the House in 2011?

This bill repeals two D.C. laws and prohibits the city from spending its local funds, consisting only of local taxes raised in the city by local citizens, not a cent of it raised from this House, to either carry out or enact three laws.

I filed amendments to strike all five of these undemocratic riders. Even though my amendments complied with the House rules, the Rules Committee did not make any of them in order, afraid, apparently, of debate on this matter before the people of the United States. Adding insult to injury, the Rules Committee piled on by making in order two additional anti-Home Rule riders. If this bill stands, there will be a record seven anti-Home Rule riders in it.

Some of these riders come back every year, and yet we have been able to get them off every year in conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIQUIN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia an additional 1 minute.

Ms. NORTON. This Republican majority endlessly touts their support of local affairs—a lie, as long as that principle stops at the District of Columbia border, and Republicans interfere with the spending and laws of a local jurisdiction not their own.

Pardon me for being angry, but I remind my colleagues that the 700,000 American citizens who live in the District of Columbia pay the highest Federal taxes per capita in the United States and have fought and died in every war since the Revolutionary War; yet they have no voting representation on this House floor, even on their own appropriation, and no representation in the Senate at all.

These riders amount to bullying that takes unfair advantage of the District of Columbia. No wonder we are making headway on our D.C. statehood bill, but it should not take statehood.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. NORTON. It should not take statehood for any district to be treated with respect and fairness.

We have been successful in cleaning up the D.C. appropriation in the past, and we will be successful again. The people of the District of Columbia will not let you get away with bullying them after they have paid their Federal taxes the way every Member of this House has.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how many more speakers the gentleman has on his side.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close whenever my friend is.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, when Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein announced the charges against 12 Russian military officers on Friday, he said: ''We need to work together to hold the perpetrators accountable, and we need to keep moving forward to preserve our values, protect against future interference, and defend America.''

Well, Republicans and Democrats working together need to come together to defend this country. That shouldn't be controversial. It should be common sense, and it should be above partisanship.

But we have a President who probably tunes out anything the Deputy Attorney General says because President Trump is too busy attacking the special counsel investigation on a near-daily basis. He calls it a witch hunt and even worse, and that is despite the fact that the Justice Department has issued more than 100 criminal counts against more than 30 people and three companies. Numerous associates of the President have pled guilty, and his former campaign chairman is sitting in jail today.

Or maybe more accurately, Mr. Speaker, the President attacks Robert Mueller's investigation because of that fact, because the special counsel could be closing in on even more possible wrongdoing. Where there is smoke there is usually fire, and there is at least a lot of smoke so far.

So, given the President's action, we need, as a Congress, to step it up. We need to hold Russia accountable and prevent this kind of hacking from ever happening again because the President, who is unwilling to say even publicly that he trusts the American intelligence community over Vladimir Putin, will not.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can go on record as disagreeing and condemning what the President did in Helsinki, which was such a betrayal of our values. And what we are asking to do is to vote to endorse the Speaker of the House, the Republican Speaker of the House's words.

I mean, quite frankly, we should have a resolution of disapproval on the floor, or maybe even a censure, given what the President did. But we are saying let's come together in a bipartisan way, and let's make a statement that we disagree with what the President did, what his behavior was.

So vote ''no'' on the previous question, and vote ''no'' on the rule.

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

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

Let me make a couple of comments in response to my friend.

It was the last President, not this President, who told Russian leaders that he would be more flexible after an election.

It was the last President, not this President, who said Russia was not a geopolitical threat and chastised Mitt Romney when he raised it in the campaign.

And it was the last President, not this President, who drew a red line and then refused to enforce it.

If you actually look at the RECORD, it is this administration and this party that, frankly, has begun to restore America's defenses after years of neglect by the last administration. That is not good news for Russia.

It is this administration that has also encouraged and cajoled some of our allies to increase their defense level up to the levels that they, themselves, had committed to.

It was this President that twice enforced red lines in Syria.

It was this Congress that administered ever-increasing penalties on Russian sanctions.

So I think if you look at the actions, the actions are pretty impressive.

But I want to actually get back to the matter at hand, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to encourage all Members to support the rule. Today's bill represents the next step toward fulfilling our primary obligation as Members of Congress: funding the Government of the United States.

Although not perfect, the bill before us today will lead to the completion of the House's work on two more appropriations bills. We will provide funding for important government activities like fighting forest fires, funding the Indian Health Service, enforcing tax and securities laws, and funding our national parks; and we will ensure that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is no longer allowed to operate without congressional oversight.

While I look forward to completing our work and passing all 12 appropriations bills, this legislation represents an important step along the way to fulfilling that goal. I applaud my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their work.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 996 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have adopted the resolution (H. Res. 999) expressing agreement with the statements of the Speaker of the House of Representatives made on July 16, 2018, regarding Russian Federation interference in the 2016 United States elections and related matters.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to

offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adopting the resolution, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 183, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

YEAS—230

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—183

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Black
Cárdenas
Crowley
Ellison
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hill
Jackson Lee
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Roby
Shea-Porter
Simpson
Speier
Walz

□ 1336

Messrs. SOTO and O'HALLERAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. PALMER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 331.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 184, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 332]

AYES—229

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—184

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Black
Cárdenas
Clark (MA)
Crowley
Ellison
Garamendi
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Jackson Lee
Lujan Grisham, M.
Roby
Shea-Porter
Simpson
Speier
Walz

□ 1344

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 332.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, for personal reasons, I was unable to vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 331 and "yea" on rollcall No. 332.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1000

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Cloud.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Cloud.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

PRO BONO WORK TO EMPOWER AND REPRESENT ACT OF 2018

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 717) to promote pro bono legal services as a critical way in which to empower survivors of domestic violence, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 717

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Pro bono Work to Empower and Represent Act of 2018'' or the ''POWER Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Extremely high rates of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking exist at the local, State, tribal, and national levels and such violence or behavior harms the most vulnerable members of our society.

(2) According to a study commissioned by the Department of Justice, nearly 25 percent of women suffer from domestic violence during their lifetime.

(3) Proactive efforts should be made available in all forums to provide pro bono legal services and eliminate the violence that destroys lives and shatters families.

(4) A variety of factors cause domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and a variety of solutions at the local, State, and national levels are necessary to combat such violence or behavior.

(5) According to the National Network to End Domestic Violence, which conducted a census including almost 1,700 assistance programs, over the course of 1 day in September 2014, more than 10,000 requests for services, including legal representation, were not met.

(6) Pro bono assistance can help fill this need by providing not only legal representation, but also access to emergency shelter, transportation, and childcare.

(7) Research and studies have demonstrated that the provision of legal assistance to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking reduces the probability of such violence or behavior reoccurring in the future and can help survivors move forward.

(8) Legal representation increases the possibility of successfully obtaining a protective order against an attacker, which prevents further mental and physical injury to a victim and his or her family, as demonstrated by a study that found that 83 percent of victims represented by an attorney were able to obtain a protective order, whereas only 32 percent of victims without an attorney were able to do so.

(9) The American Bar Association Model Rules include commentary stating that ''every lawyer, regardless of professional prominence or professional workload, has a responsibility to provide legal services to those unable to pay, and personal involvement in the problems of the disadvantaged can be one of the most rewarding experiences in the life of a lawyer''.

(10) As leaders in their legal communities, judges in district courts should encourage lawyers to provide pro bono resources in an effort to help victims of such violence or behavior escape the cycle of abuse.

(11) A dedicated army of pro bono attorneys focused on this mission will inspire others to devote efforts to this cause and will raise awareness of the scourge of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking throughout the country.

(12) Communities, by providing awareness of pro bono legal services and assistance to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, will empower those survivors to move forward with their lives.

SEC. 3. DISTRICT COURTS TO PROMOTE EMPOWERMENT EVENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for a period of 4 years, the chief judge, or his or her designee, for each judicial district shall lead not less than 1 public event, in partnership with a State, local, tribal, or territorial domestic violence service provider or coalition and a State or local volunteer lawyer project, promoting pro bono legal services as a critical way in which to empower survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and engage citizens in assisting those survivors.

(b) DISTRICTS CONTAINING INDIAN TRIBES AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—During each 2-year period, the chief judge, or his or her designee, for a judicial district that contains an Indian tribe or tribal organization (as those terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)) shall lead not less than 1 public event promoting pro bono legal services under subsection (a) of this section in partnership with an Indian tribe or tribal organization with the intent of increasing the provision of pro bono legal services for Indian or Alaska Native victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—Each chief judge shall—

(1) have discretion as to the design, organization, and implementation of the public events required under subsection (a); and

(2) in conducting a public event under subsection (a), seek to maximize the local impact of the event and the provision of access to high-quality pro bono legal services by survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

SEC. 4. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPORT TO THE DIRECTOR OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS.—Not later than October 30 of each year, each chief judge shall submit to the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts a report detailing each public event conducted under section 3 during the previous fiscal year.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1 of each year, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall submit to Congress a compilation and summary of each report received under subsection (a) for the previous fiscal year.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—Each comprehensive report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include an analysis of how each public event meets the goals set forth in this Act, as well as suggestions on how to improve future public events.

SEC. 5. FUNDING.

The Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall use existing funds to carry out the requirements of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 717, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to be voting on S. 717, the Pro bono Work to Empower and Represent Act of 2018, otherwise known as the POWER Act.

The POWER Act directs that each year the chief judge in each judicial district across the country hold at least one event in partnership with domestic violence service providers or volunteer lawyer projects to promote pro bono legal services for survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault.

Lawyers play a critical role in combating domestic violence. Not only do government prosecutors enforce criminal laws, but in the civil realm, lawyers may provide legal representation in matters such as civil protection order applications which ultimately help keep victims safe from their abusers.

While victims are able to apply for these orders pro se, as this bill makes clear, legal representation increases the possibility of successfully obtaining a protective order against an attacker, which prevents further mental and physical injury to a victim and his or her family. One study has found that 83 percent of victims represented by an attorney were able to obtain a protective order, whereas only 32 percent of victims without an attorney were able to do so.

Federal courts already promote many pro bono programs in their judicial districts and have access to local attorneys who may be able to volunteer to work with domestic violence victims. This bill not only requires a public event in each Federal judicial district for every year during a 4-year period, it also requires an additional public event to be held every 2 years during the 4-year period in districts that contain Tribes or Tribal organizations that specifically focus on encouraging pro bono legal services for Indian or Alaska Native victims of domestic violence.

I would like to thank Senator SULLIVAN from Alaska for introducing this bill and shepherding it through the Senate. And I would like to thank Mr. KENNEDY from the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts for introducing this bill in the House. This is an extremely important issue, and I hope it will make a real difference in increasing legal services to victims.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the POWER Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 717, the Pro bono Work to Empower and Represent Act of 2018, or the POWER Act as, as amended.

It seeks to promote pro bono legal services as a way to empower survivors of domestic violence. We all know that domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking affect the people of every single one of our communities in profound ways.

Alas, the demand for legal services to assist victims who find themselves in a domestic violence situation far exceeds the availability of free or low-cost legal services, and yet research consistently shows, as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee just pointed out, that if you have got a lawyer, then you are significantly better equipped to prevent future domestic violence than if you don't have a lawyer. In fact, those victims who have a lawyer are three times more likely to be able to prevent future violence than those who are without a lawyer.

So this measure is consistent with the spirit and the goals of the legal profession. The American Bar Association's Model Rules of Professional Conduct encourage attorneys to bridge the gap in representation by providing free legal services to people who are unable to pay them, and this is an especially

vulnerable and often destitute population.

One bar jurisdiction that has stepped up in a very profound way to meet this professional standard and challenge is the District of Columbia Bar which has an extraordinary and successful project created by Karen Barker Marcou and Kathleen Buhle Biden which is called the DC Volunteer Lawyers Project. They just celebrated their 10th anniversary. They have 2,100 lawyers who have signed up pro bono to offer their assistance to victims of domestic violence, stalking, date rape, and so on.

They serve more than 1,000 clients every single year. They were just given an award by the D.C. Bar for the work that they have put together solely through the volunteer efforts of lawyers in the District of Columbia Bar.

So this legislation would modestly and simply direct the chief judge in each Federal judicial district to organize at least one public event annually for the next 4 years to promote pro bono legal services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking in the districts in which the court serves its jurisdiction.

In the case of districts containing an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization, chief judges in partnership with the Tribes would have to lead at least one public event promoting such pro bono legal services during each 2-year period.

People who have experienced and survived these types of violence deserve and will benefit from all the information and assistance that can be provided in such public events. Too often survivors simply don't know what resources are out there and are available to help them. S. 717 will help survivors of domestic violence vindicate their rights and protect themselves from future assaults which are still a scourge on the land.

I support this legislation. Obviously, there is a lot more we can do. Congress should work to allocate resources to the recruitment, training, and placement of pro bono attorneys through the myriad of already existing bar association programs like the one in the District of Columbia.

Of course, Congress should work to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act which provides an indispensable array of programs that help address domestic violence and sexual assault. We should not let the authorization for these important protections lapse.

All of these efforts are important, and the measure before us today will support a comprehensive response to these types of crimes. I support this bill, and I commend my colleague, Representative JOE KENNEDY, for his leadership in authoring the House companion to the Senate bill.

I want to thank the chairman for his leadership, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this legislation so we may bring it one step closer to enactment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS), who is the Republican Conference chair.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the POWER Act.

Survivors of sexual and domestic violence must know that they have a place to turn where they can step out of the shadows of abuse to find hope. To provide that hope, the POWER Act will bring more tools and resources to communities so that survivors can find access to legal services that they need. It will also encourage lawyers across the country to get involved in these cases, and it will help people break free from the dangerous cycle of abuse.

No one should ever have to live in fear of being intimidated from seeking justice. The first step is making sure they courageously know where they can safely go for help. Today, to build on our work to make our communities safer, I urge my colleagues to join me in sending the POWER Act to the President's desk to become law.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), who is my friend and colleague. Representative JOE KENNEDY is not only a distinguished champion of the rights of women and a foe of domestic violence, but he is a former prosecutor who spent a lot of time in Massachusetts prosecuting domestic violence cases.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. RASKIN, for his kind words and for his leadership on this bill and legislation in bringing it to this point and for all of his efforts in combating domestic violence as well.

I also want to thank my colleagues, in particular Congressman YOUNG; Congresswoman MCMORRIS RODGERS, the Republican Conference Chair; Congresswoman TULSI GABBARD; Congresswoman BROOKS; as well as the chairman, Mr. GOODLATTE, for his leadership in making sure that this bill comes to the floor today; as well as Senator SULLIVAN from Alaska who is the original author of this legislation and has been working with me on this for the past several years. I am grateful for his leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, I remember far too many times in a courtroom as a State-level prosecutor the challenges of bringing domestic violence cases to trial. I remember to this day talking to victims and seeing perhaps a paragraph in a police report and something that didn't quite seem right; doing an interview with the victim and peeling back layer after layer after layer of isolation and of control, and of the creation of a state of dependence and of perpetual fear.

□ 1400

I remember getting ready to try a case one day. The victim came in with her daughter. The victim had a black eye. She sat next to her husband, the defendant, throughout the entire morning of the case. She blamed the black eye on a newborn child who was sleeping in her bed.

I remember watching countless efforts for a restraining order as the attorney badgered a victim, and watching a victim get so disenchanted with our court system that she said she would never come back.

Standing in a courtroom, Mr. Speaker, with those survivors, you start to see our justice system through their eyes. It is, at times, an endless and impossible maze where abuse and injustice is relived and replicated on every single occasion.

That is why we as a Congress must ensure that no survivor is ever forced to stand alone before a judge, because we know and the data well proves that, oftentimes, these cases can be a matter of life and death. It is, in fact, the most predictable form of homicide we have in our Nation.

We know how prevalent and pervasive it is. Nearly 8 million women are raped, assaulted, or stalked every year by a current or former intimate partner. We know that low-income women and men are at higher risk of domestic violence and rape. We know that more than 80 percent of survivors with access to a lawyer successfully obtain restraining orders, while those who stand alone obtain one less than one-third of the time.

Mr. Speaker, passing the POWER Act will begin to restore our sacred promise of an equal justice system. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the dean of the House who has been a real champion in combating domestic violence.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kindness in recognizing me, but also for bringing up this bill. I also thank Mr. KENNEDY for his support. This is Senator SULLIVAN's bill, although I had a companion bill on the House side.

What has been said here prior to me is really what we are addressing. Domestic violence is a terror on our society. No one is immune to it, be they rich or poor, whatever race or ethnic group you may belong to. It cuts across the aisle.

Unfortunately, far too many Alaskans have firsthand experience in this reality. In 2015, a survey of Alaskan victims found that, out of every 100 adult women, 40 experienced intimate partner violence, 33 experienced sexual violence, and one in three adult women in Alaska have been a victim of stalking in their lifetime.

Not only must we do more to prevent this epidemic from growing, we must also do more to help the survivors, and that is what the POWER Act does. It allows the victims to have pro bono

legal representation from the legal profession to take and present their cases.

I believe this bill is well and long overdue.

If I can refer to what Mr. KENNEDY said, I have a little experience myself. A dear friend of mine, who was a friend of my late wife, used to get beat up by her husband because he was drinking all the time. My wife asked: Why don't you just hit him?

She said: Well, I couldn't do that. Violence begets violence.

Well, my wife at that time was very young, and she said: Well, I wouldn't put up with it.

About 2 weeks later, there was a knock on our door and my wife answered. She opened the door and our friend said: I did it.

She said: What did you do?

The woman said: My husband beat me up. He passed out, and I hit him with a frying pan when he was asleep.

I wouldn't suggest that solution, but she had no other recourse, no way to be represented legally to go to the courts.

I am saying this should be passed. To have representation in the courtroom is a good piece of legislation.

Again, I thank Mr. GOODLATTE for bringing this bill to the floor, Mr. SULLIVAN, and all those people involved with it. It is long overdue.

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

Domestic violence is a reign of terror for people who are caught up in it. Historically, of course, domestic violence was bolstered by a compliant or indifferent, sexist criminal justice system and laws that were inadequate to the task.

Even today, in many parts of the world, from Afghanistan to Saudi Arabia to India, women are still subject to domestic violence and to indifferent and hostile treatment from their legal systems. But in America, we have advanced far beyond that. Still, there is a lot more we can do to address the problems of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

One thing we know we can do is to get lawyers for women when they have been attacked. The information and the assistance that they will get from the lawyers will help them get out of a desperate situation.

The information and assistance that we provide under this legislation in public events will indeed advance the power of survivors to get out of domestic violence, dating violence, or a stalking reign of terror.

We support enactment of this legislation as well as the additional efforts we have mentioned to provide counsel for survivors, to promote their ability to access the resources of our criminal justice system.

We look forward to working with Chairman GOODLATTE and other colleagues on the other side of the aisle for rapid passage of this important, bipartisan measure and further legislative efforts that will strengthen the position of people who are victims of domestic violence.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill. I thank the Senator from Alaska, Mr. SULLIVAN, for working with me and my staff. On the minority side as well, I thank Congressman KENNEDY, Mr. RASKIN, and the ranking member on the Judiciary Committee.

This is truly a bipartisan effort to help educate people who are the victims of domestic violence about better ways that they can protect themselves and avail themselves of good representation in court.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTERMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 717, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE THAT THE NATION FACES A MORE COMPLEX AND GRAVE SET OF THREATS THAN AT ANY TIME SINCE THE END OF WORLD WAR II

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 995) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Nation now faces a more complex and grave set of threats than at any time since the end of World War II, and that the lack of full, on-time funding related to defense activities puts servicemen and servicewomen at risk, harms national security, and aids the adversaries of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 995

Whereas the United States now faces a more complex set of threats than at any time since the end of World War II;

Whereas the National Defense Strategy released on January 19, 2018, highlights these threats and acknowledges a return to great power competition;

Whereas countries like Russia and China are heavily investing in military modernization and developing capabilities that the United States may not be able to defend against while also expanding their influence across the globe;

Whereas North Korea's nuclear program continues to be a serious threat;

Whereas the National Defense Strategy states that ''Iran continues to sow violence and remains the most significant challenge to Middle East stability'';

Whereas the National Defense Strategy states that ''terrorist groups with long reach continue to murder the innocent and threaten peace more broadly'';

Whereas the United States continues to fight a war against terrorism and has troops deployed in hostile regions throughout the globe;

Whereas, on January 19, 2018, Secretary of Defense James Mattis stated, ''As hard as the last 16 years have been on our military, no enemy in the field has done more to harm the readiness of the U.S. military than the combined impact of the Budget Control Act's defense spending cuts, worsened by us operating, 9 of the last 10 years, under continuing resolutions, wasting copious amounts of precious taxpayer dollars'';

Whereas fiscal year 2009 was the last fiscal year the Department of Defense received on-time funding;

Whereas the House of Representatives has passed an annual appropriation bill for the Department of Defense before the start of the next fiscal year in each of those fiscal years;

Whereas article I, section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the responsibility to ''provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States'' and calls on Congress to ''raise and support Armies'' and ''provide and maintain a Navy''; and

Whereas Secretaries of Defense appointed by Presidents of both parties have warned about the damage funding uncertainty has on the readiness of our Armed Forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) failing to provide our military with full, stable, and on-time funding allows our adversaries to close critical military capability gaps, putting our servicemembers at increased risk, and severely harms our military's ability to prepare for, deter, and, if needed, defend against these capabilities, putting United States national security at greater risk;

(2) providing full, stable, and on-time funding for the Department of Defense is critically necessary to preventing these increased risks; and

(3) the House of Representatives is committed to ending the funding uncertainty for the Department of Defense and providing the resources United States servicemembers need to defend the Nation, and that the Senate should join the House of Representatives in these efforts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my resolution, H. Res. 995, which expresses this House's commitment to providing the full, on-time funding our men and women in uniform need to defend our Nation.

This week and next, Mr. Speaker, we will be spending time on this floor discussing the devastating impacts nine

consecutive continuing resolutions have had on our military's readiness and on our ability to deter and defend against our adversaries. Despite the fact that this House has consistently, and normally in a bipartisan fashion, completed our work on time, we have repeatedly seen partisan politics, particularly in the Senate, prevent the Congress from delivering a funding bill to the President's desk on time. In fact, since Republicans took control of the House in 2011, the House has never failed to pass a Defense Appropriations bill on time.

Just a few weeks ago, we passed H.R. 6157, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2019, with an overwhelmingly bipartisan 359–49 vote.

Today's resolution, Mr. Speaker, expresses the sense of this House that failing to provide full, on-time, stable funding increases the risk to our servicemembers and aids our adversaries. The resolution expresses our commitment to ending the funding uncertainty our military faces and urges the Senate to similarly complete its work so we can provide the on-time funding our armed services require.

Mr. Speaker, we must stop forcing our men and women in uniform and their families to pay the price for our dysfunction.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we will consider three resolutions.

H. Res. 995, which I have introduced, acknowledges the unprecedented global threat environment we face and the negative impact these continuing resolutions have had on our military's ability to confront this environment and deter and, if necessary, defeat our enemies.

We will also consider H. Res. 994, offered by my colleague and fellow member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. GALLAGHER from Wisconsin. Mr. GALLAGHER is a marine with two deployments to Al Anbar province in Iraq. His resolution details the negative impact of CRs and funding instability on the readiness of the U.S Marine Corps.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we will consider H. Res. 998, offered by Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, chairman of the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee. Mr. WITTMAN's resolution lays out the damage that the CRs and unpredictable funding have done to the United States Navy.

Next week, Mr. Speaker, we will consider resolutions addressing the impact of unstable funding on the United States Air Force and the United States Army.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that not every Member of this body is on one of the defense-related committees, but we also know that every Member of this body is committed to the security of our Nation. I take the opportunity today, along with my colleagues, to lay out in detail the threats we face and the impacts our actions in this House can have on our military's ability to keep us safe.

Reflecting on the challenges facing our Armed Forces, Secretary Mattis put it this way: ''As hard as the last 16 years have been on our military, no enemy in the field has done more to harm the readiness of the U.S. military than the combined impact of the Budget Control Act's defense spending cuts, worsened by us operating 9 out of the last 10 years under continuing resolutions.''

Secretary Mattis went on to explain the consequences of Congress' failure to provide reliable, on-time, sufficient funding: ''Ships will not receive the required maintenance to put to sea; the ships already at sea will be extended outside of port; aircraft will remain on the ground, their pilots not at the sharpest edge; and eventually ammunition, training, and manpower will not be sufficient to deter war.'' Not sufficient to defer war, Mr. Speaker.

No experience, Mr. Speaker, has had a greater impact on me during my time as a Member of this body than having the Secretary of Defense testify in front of us as members of the Armed Services Committee and say that congressional abrogation of our constitutional duty to fund our military is putting our servicemembers at greater risk.

While our military has suffered under this burden of continuing resolutions and dangerous policies of our previous administration, our adversaries have been making steady gains. Never before in recent history have we seen the gap between our capabilities and those of our adversaries widen at such a breathtaking pace—and not in our favor, Mr. Speaker.

China is pursuing an aggressive strategy to overtake our military and economic advantage globally. They are developing technologies that are specifically targeted to diminish our ability to project our force. They are developing weapons systems against which we may not be able to defend.

□ 1415

They have utilized deficiencies in our current CFIUS process to attempt to acquire critical U.S. technology. Chinese companies like Huawei and ZTE have made significant efforts to embed themselves in the United States, putting our telecommunications networks and, potentially, our defense supply chain at risk.

Militarily, economically, in cyberspace, in space, on land, in air, and at sea, the Chinese have made clear their objective is to achieve global preeminence, which means they must attempt to displace us.

The Russians continue to modernize their nuclear arsenal, as they violate their commitments to us under the INF Treaty. They, too, are developing advanced and threatening weapons systems and attempting to exercise their hegemonic ambitions across Europe. They have violated the borders and sovereignty of their neighbors. In the words of the National Defense Strategy, they are making efforts ''to shatter the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and use emerging technologies to discredit and subvert democratic processes in Georgia, Crimea, and eastern Ukraine.'' They have attempted to subvert our own democratic processes, as we saw in last week's indictment of 12 members of the GRU, Russian military intelligence.

We have seen in Russia and China a return to great power competition, and 8 years of Obama-era policies facilitated these developments. At the same time, we continue to face significant threats from rogue regimes like Iran and North Korea.

The Iranians benefited tremendously from the payments they received from the Obama administration, over $1.5 billion, when they entered into the Obama nuclear deal. This deal paved the way for a nuclear-armed Iran with no real verification provisions, no complete disclosure of their past activity, no cessation of their enrichment activity, and it lifted restrictions on their ballistic missile program.

President Trump was right to withdraw from this disastrous deal, but we are still living with the consequences of an emboldened Iran, enriched with U.S. taxpayer dollars and a pathway to a nuclear weapon. Their support for terrorist groups like Hamas and Hezbollah has grown, while they continue to pose an existential threat to the State of Israel.

The North Koreans, similarly, continue to pose a serious threat, Mr. Speaker, with an arsenal of nuclear weapons, an ongoing ballistic missile program, and continued pursuit of biological and chemical weapons.

Despite recent success on the battlefield against ISIS, radical Islamic terrorism continues to pose a threat to our Nation. We have got troops deployed today, Mr. Speaker, around the globe in the fight against terrorism.

As we face all of these threats, we are also living through an era of increasingly rapid technological development. The very nature of warfare is changing. The ability and the agility required to successfully respond to these threats requires funding sufficiency and certainty.

Mr. Speaker, that certainty simply cannot be provided through continuous continuing resolutions. In the face of all these threats, Mr. Speaker, we in this body must resolve not to add to the risk our troops are facing. We must resolve to fulfill our constitutional duty and provide sufficient, on-time, reliable funding.

It took many years for the readiness, manpower, and training crises we face to develop. We in this House and in the Senate must be part of the solution today and for many days and years into the future.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read something that the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral John Richardson, said before the House Armed

Services Committee last year in a hearing about the damage of continuing resolutions:

''I have a hard time believing,'' he said, ''that I am sitting before you now to discuss the potential that we might take steps to make our sailors' missions more difficult, to give our adversaries more advantage. . . . ''

Think about that, Mr. Speaker. That is what this debate is about. That is what this resolution is about. Insufficient, unreliable funding gives our adversaries an advantage. We must not be part of that any longer. We must resolve to get our work done on time, in the House and in the Senate, and to fulfill our constitutional obligation.

We must, in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, be worthy of the sacrifices our men and women in uniform make for us every day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to begin with, the resolution that is presented before us is 100 percent accurate, and I completely agree with it.

We have had uncertain funding for going on almost 8 years now for the Department of Defense. It has been a series of continuing resolutions, two government shutdowns, multiple threatened government shutdowns, and an unbelievable amount of uncertainty. From one month to the next, the Pentagon does not know how much money they have to spend. That uncertainty, without a doubt, has undermined our ability to provide an adequate national security for this country.

So I agree with the maker of this motion that budget certainty would help enormously in terms of preparing our national security—well, preparing the men and women in our Armed Forces to face the threats that are in front of us. Beyond that, there was a lot said in the opening remarks there that I don't quite agree with.

Also, it is really important to sort of understand the context. Why are we in this situation? Why do we have budget uncertainty year after year?

I don't agree that it is simple incompetence or Congress just isn't feeling like doing its job. We have deep-seated differences of opinion about where to spend our money, and also, we have no fiscal policy as a country.

Well, that is not true, actually. Our fiscal policy is really rather clear. We want a balanced budget; we want tax cuts; and we don't want to cut spending.

Everything you need to know about why we have this problem can be contained in three votes that the United States House of Representatives took over the course of about a 4-month period. As I tell you about these three votes, I want you to know that 134 Republican Members of Congress voted for all three of these things.

Number one, a roughly $2 trillion tax cut. Number two, a budget deal that increased spending by $500 billion. Some of that was for defense; a lot of it wasn't. Then, in the ultimate irony, a week later, those 134 Members of Congress, Republican Members of Congress, voted for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. They want to cut taxes by $2 trillion; they want to increase spending by $500 billion; and they want a balanced budget.

And, oh, by the way, we are roughly $22 trillion in debt and running up a deficit that is projected to go up over $1 trillion going forward. That is not a responsible fiscal policy.

Now, I serve on the Armed Services Committee with all of my colleagues who are here today, and I hear the same things that Congresswoman CHENEY hears about how our military is suffering under the uncertainty.

The readiness crisis is 100 percent real. It is getting better as we have gotten some funding the last couple years, but it is still a major challenge. But the reason for all of that is because of decisions that are made on the front end. You can't cut taxes by $2 trillion—after, by the way, over the course of the 15 years prior, we had already cut them by multiple trillion dollars—and then stand up and say DOD doesn't have enough money. You cut revenue and then complained that you don't have enough revenue. It doesn't really make sense.

The second point that I would make is it is not just the Department of Defense that is suffering under budget uncertainty. There are a whole bunch of different examples. I won't go into all of them, but the entire discretionary budget suffers under this uncertainty. And one big chunk of the discretionary budget is infrastructure, the bridges and roads and airports and a whole bunch of other things that basically enable our economy to function, which generates revenue and helps pay for things like national security.

Also, we have got bridges collapsing all over the country. There are, literally, United States citizens who have died as a result of our lack of investment in infrastructure.

So it is not just the Department of Defense. If we are going to address the uncertainty, if we are going to address the problems with dealing with our national security strategy, we have to address fiscal policy.

For going on 8 years now, we have been having this conversation in the Armed Services Committee, and most times my Republican colleagues sternly rebuke me for raising issues that are supposedly not directly related to the Armed Services, saying: We are the Armed Services Committee. We are not here to talk about the debt or the deficit or infrastructure or any of that other stuff.

Well, it all goes together, and what we as a congressional body have to do is come up with a plan that actually makes sense, that actually there is money for. If we do that, then we can have the stability for the Department of Defense.

Now, I will tell you, if we are $22 trillion in debt—and the deficit is projected to be pretty close to $1 trillion this year and quickly north of $1 trillion going forward—we are going to have to deal with that problem or there is not going to be as much money as we'd like for defense or infrastructure or education—or anything, for that matter.

So we have to address the fiscal irresponsibility of our budgeting process across the very long period of time, and certainly we can't keep cutting taxes.

Now, as far as what does that National Security Strategy look like, as was described, we face an incredibly complex threat environment. I agree with that.

I don't agree that getting rid of the Iran nuclear deal so that Iran can pursue nuclear weapons with absolutely no inhibition whatsoever is a step forward in the right direction, nor do I agree that sitting down with Kim Jong-un and agreeing, basically, to back off of a whole bunch of things and getting nothing in return—I know that, in the President's mind, North Korea is denuclearized, but they are not. They haven't taken a single, solitary step in that direction.

Lastly, the final point I want to make is the complex threat environment that we face is extraordinarily difficult. I will tell you one thing of which I am 100 percent confident. There is no way that, on our own, the United States of America can confront that threat environment.

We need allies. We need friends. We need countries that are willing to work with us to meet the national security threats that we face, which is why the trip that the President just took is so troubling. He spent the first part of it telling our allies, basically—sorry, I can't say that on the floor—just saying that he didn't need them, insulting them over and over and over again, allies that we are really going to need to meet the threats not just from Russia, but China, the terrorism threat that was described.

Our NATO allies are going to be crucially important to that, and the President, at one point, said he's not even sure why we are in NATO, insulted the EU and insulted all of our allies, and then turned right around and sided with Vladimir Putin against our intelligence communities, against our Justice Department, on the subject of Russian interference in our election.

So, in a complex threat environment, you don't want to make it easier for a country like Russia that threatens us and make it more difficult for countries ranging from Canada to Germany to Great Britain, who actually want to work with us, to meet that threat environment. So, on that point, we need more allies, and we certainly don't need to take the side of a dictator who

is threatening our country over our own intelligence agencies. That is not in the best interest of national security.

Overall, we have to have a fiscal policy. We can have the argument about the defense budget all we want, but if we keep cutting taxes and have no policy whatsoever to get our budget even close to under control, we are not going to have the money to spend on our national security needs or other things.

Now, I will close it out with this. General Mattis, Secretary Mattis, likes to say, ''We can afford survival.'' That is a nice phrase. Unfortunately, it is a little bit unclear on what it means because, what do you have to spend to survive? By and large, DOD doesn't engage in that sort of black-and-white way of looking at it: We spend this money, we survive; we don't spend this money, we die.

What they do, and what they've said over and over again, is they manage risk: If we don't spend the money here, that increases the risk by this amount.

I think that is a better way of looking at it. It is not a matter of whether or not we can afford survival, because we don't know exactly what China is going to do or Russia or any of these other folks are going to do or how we are going to manage it. It is a matter of managing risk.

It is very true that, if we continue to have an uncertain defense budget—heck, I would submit, if we continue to have an uncertain fiscal policy and an uncertain infrastructure budget, we are increasing the risk of our country's ability not so much to survive but to prosper and live in a peaceful world.

So this resolution is fine. It is horribly insufficient to actually give us the certainty and predictability in our budget that we need. To get there, we need to honestly address the fiscal challenges that our Nation faces and come up with a coherent fiscal policy that takes into account all the needs of our country in a balanced and coherent way so that we manage those risks in the best way possible and in the best interests of the American people.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and just want to say I enjoy very much the opportunity to serve with my colleague, Mr. SMITH, on the Armed Services Committee, and I appreciate his support for this important resolution.

□ 1430

We disagree on several points. I know that Mr. SMITH knows that the defense budget is not what is driving the debt in this country. I don't disagree that we need a fiscal policy and that we have got to address our fiscal concerns, but it is also the case that we have the votes, that we have the ability, as we have done in this House and as they could do in the Senate.

We saw, in the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Defense Appropriations bill passed out 30–1. So it is a bipartisan bill that we ought to pass. We passed it across this floor. We ought to pass it across the Senate floor. We ought to get it to the President's desk so that he can sign it, instead of being in a situation where we are holding it hostage to a whole range of other issues and concerns.

Mr. SMITH and I do have big disagreements. You know, to talk about somehow that the tax cuts are impacting the Defense budget ignores the history of the fact that the Defense budget was being strangled when Barack Obama was in office. And as far as I know, nobody is accusing President Obama of cutting taxes too much.

So the challenge that our military is facing and the challenge of reliable sufficient funding isn't directly tied to tax policy. I think what we have got to do is decouple these things.

If we don't get the funding for the military right, as Mr. SMITH said—you know, Secretary Mattis has said we can afford survival. Another way to say that is if we don't get this right, nothing else we do will matter. And the situation is so serious and so significant that if we let ourselves one more time go down the path of holding this funding hostage to other concerns and other issues, basically holding our men and women in uniform hostage, I would submit that we are not doing our job, and we are not fulfilling our constitutional obligation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), my colleague from the Rules Committee and from the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 995.

As many of us have stood on this floor and said, We have planes that can't fly, ships that can't sail, and troops that can't deploy.

Under the Obama administration, we saw an alarming trend where we allowed our Armed Forces to be hollowed out, and we allowed a critical readiness crisis to develop.

Over the last 2 years, members of the House Armed Services Committee and others have fought tirelessly to ensure our military gets the level of funding they need, not only to fix our current readiness crisis but also to build up our force to a size to match the current threat environment, which is the most complex one we have faced since World War II.

While I am proud of the work we have done so far to raise the top line Defense number, there is another critical piece to the puzzle. Continuing resolutions are just as detrimental to our national security as the Budget Control Act caps. Every day we don't pass the Defense Appropriations bill, we are denying resources to our servicemembers and making it harder for them to do their job.

Continuing resolutions and budgetary uncertainty also end up costing the taxpayers more money. The Secretary of the Navy has said that the Department of Navy alone wasted $4 billion since 2011 because of continuing resolutions. That is $4 billion of real money that could have been used to fund more ships, more planes, or more maintenance.

Under a continuing resolution, the Department of Defense and the services are not allowed to enter into any new contracts. Every year we have delayed the timelines of scheduled maintenance availabilities and procurement schedules. All of these things are crucial to maintain deployment rotation and ensure the U.S. presence is felt around the world.

Compare this to your personal finances. For half the year you are able only to pay your current expenses, like car payments and utilities. You know you will get money later in the year for new things you want to buy or invest in; however, you don't know how much you will get or whether you will get it. Does that sound frustrating and ineffective?

We have the world's greatest military. Yet, we are hamstringing them with an irresponsible funding cycle. Let me put this in very blunt terms. The inability of Congress to pass government funding bills on time has endangered the health, safety, and lives of our servicemembers. Just look at the aviation accidents and recent collisions of Navy ships. These incidents can be blamed, at least in part, on the readiness crisis.

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility here. We are not the ones on the front lines and deployed around the world, but we play an integral role: getting those servicemembers their funding on time.

In a time where we face great power competition with Russia and China, radical Islamic extremism in the Middle East, and Iran and North Korea, there is no shortage of national security priorities.

Here, in the House, we have passed our Defense funding bill on time yet again, but we need our colleagues in the Senate to follow suit. I know it is a priority for my Alabama colleague, Senate Appropriations Chairman RICHARD SHELBY, to get our military funded, so I hope we can do our job responsibly and on time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, let's not let petty political games get in the way of funding our Nation's military, protecting our servicemembers, and ensuring the safety and security of the American people. Let's pass this resolution and demonstrate our strong commitment to passing a Defense funding bill before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of quick points. The Department of Defense budget is 18 percent of the overall Federal budget, and you would be a pretty bad businessperson if you looked at your books and said that a thing that takes 18 percent of the budget has nothing do with the deficit. It all adds up piece by piece. It absolutely is a big part of what contributes to us having a deficit and a debt, so we cannot ignore what we spend on Defense and how it impacts everything else.

Now, you can make that policy decision that, you know, defense is just so much more important than infrastructure or healthcare or education or Social Security or Medicare or whatever, but to say that it doesn't impact the debt and the deficit is not, well, fiscally accurate.

And second, as far as tax cuts are concerned, yes, President Obama cut taxes repeatedly and by way, way too much and contributed to this problem. Most notably was in 2012 with the permanent extension of all of the Bush tax cuts. So, we did that, and then with the stimulus package back in 2009, there was about a $400 billion tax cut.

We have repeatedly, in this Congress—and I didn't vote for any of that. We have repeatedly in this Congress prioritized tax cuts over the men and women who serve in the military. That is what I find so ironic. We hear all these complaints about how we are underfunding the military, the complaints about readiness, and what the gentleman from Alabama said, when he talked about the impact that this is having on the men and women who serve, he is absolutely right. The continuing resolutions are devastating to the way we try to function within the Department of Defense.

I will again submit that they are also devastating to every other aspect of our discretionary budget, and that should not be ignored. But to cut taxes by trillions upon trillions of dollars and then look up and say, Gosh, how come we don't have enough revenue to fund our defense is hypocritical.

All I am asking is: Make a choice. If, in fact, we need to spend the amount of money on DOD that you are all saying we are, then let's raise the revenue and pay for it, okay. That is fine. That is a choice. But to both say, we are going to give away massive tax cuts primarily to the wealthiest people in this country, who, by the way, have been doing quite well for quite some time, and then come up and say, Gosh, it is just so irresponsible that we are not funding defense, that is not consistent and it is not a fiscal policy.

And, again, I will come back to the fact that this is all very well and good. I mean, what all these resolutions are saying is if we could just pass the Defense Appropriations bill, then everything would be fine. We have a $4 trillion plus budget. We have multiple layers of problems here. If we do not address the underlying fiscal issues that we are facing that I have described, then the men and women who serve in our military will face the brutal uncertainty that is very accurately described by my Republican colleagues over and over and over again.

We have to address the underlying issue, not just come out and make empty statements about how we want to support our men and women in the military after putting in place a budget and a tax policy that makes it next to impossible to do that. We have to deal with the issue up front so that we are in a position to actually provide what my colleagues have said we need to provide.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I appreciate very much my colleague's support for this important resolution. I look forward to having his support as we go forward on these resolutions that lay out very clearly how important it is to fund our men and women in uniform.

He and I have very serious and significant disagreements over tax policy. I believe—I know that the private sector is the engine of growth in this economy; that tax cuts, in fact, generate economic growth, and economic growth generates revenue; that if you really want to deal with the debt in this Nation, then you have got to generate additional revenue.

The way to do that is not by taxing people more. It is by letting people keep more of what they earn so they in fact can reinvest so we can see the kind of economic growth we need.

But I would say my colleague's focus on that issue today points out the problem that we have been facing. We face a number of critically important challenges in this body and in the United States Senate, but we have got to ensure that we don't hold our men and women in uniform hostage while we deal with those other issues.

We are, today, not at a time when we have got an international environment that is one in which we can feel safe in our predominance, in which we can feel safe in our ability to continue to project our power. We are in one where the threat to us is growing, and it is significant.

When you have got servicemen and -women, when you have got service chiefs, when you have got the Secretary of Defense telling us things like: our adversaries have weapons systems we might not be able to defend against, that policies and budget processes and votes that are undertaken in this body are increasing the risk to our men and women in uniform, those are things we have got to pay attention to. And I would say we have an obligation to pay attention to those things that is higher than any other obligation that we have.

We have to commit, Mr. Speaker, to fulfilling that constitutional obligation to providing full and on time funding for our troops.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close today with something that General Dunford said in his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee earlier this year. He said: ''The Joint Force must continue to receive sufficient, sustained, and predictable funding for the foreseeable future to restore our competitive advantage and ensure we never send our sons and daughters into a fair fight.''

Every single time we have to deploy our forces, Mr. Speaker, we must ensure that they have everything they need to prevail.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution. I urge a continued focus on completing the Defense funding process on time and getting the bill to the President's desk.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 995.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE THAT THE UNITED STATES NAVY'S TOTAL READINESS REMAINS IN A PERILOUS STATE

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 998) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Navy's total readiness remains in a perilous state due to high operational demands, increased deployment lengths, shortened training periods, and deferred maintenance all while the Navy is asked to do more with less as financial support for critical areas waned in the era of sequestration and without consistent Congressional funding.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 998

Whereas Navy readiness could further deteriorate in areas such as training, ship construction, ship repair, and deployability if Congress does not provide stable funding for the Department of Defense;

Whereas the USS Fitzgerald, a United States Navy destroyer, collided with a container ship while transiting through Sagami Bay near Japan on June 17, 2017, resulting in the deaths of seven sailors and hundreds of millions of dollars in damage;

Whereas the United States Navy's investigation of the USS Fitzgerald collision concluded that the event was ''avoidable'' and that numerous failures included failure to plan for safety, failure to adhere to sound navigation practice, failure to execute basic watch standing practices, failure to properly use available navigation tools, and failure to respond deliberately and effectively when in extremis;

Whereas the USS John S. McCain, a United States Navy destroyer, collided with an oil tanker while transiting through the Straits of Singapore on August 21, 2017, resulting in the deaths of 10 sailors and hundreds of millions of dollars in damage;

Whereas the United States Navy's investigation of the USS John S. McCain collision concluded that the crew suffered from a ''lack of preparation, ineffective command and control, and deficiencies in training and preparations for navigation'';

Whereas the Navy the Nation Needs, the United States Navy's plan for building and sustaining a lethal, resilient force through balanced investments across readiness, capability, and capacity, explicitly states a need for 355 Battle Force ships, yet the Navy's 30-year shipbuilding plan peaks at only 342 Battle Force ships in 2039 before a predicted decline;

Whereas an efficient and supported industrial base will be vital to building and maintaining a 355 ship Navy;

Whereas over the previous 5 decades, 14 defense-related new-construction shipyards have closed, 3 have left the defense industry, and only 1 new shipyard has opened;

Whereas stable and predictable funding allows for Navy leaders to properly forecast their missions and adhere to the Optimized Fleet Response Plan while also enabling industry partners to prepare for ship repair work at the most competitive prices to the United States Government;

Whereas China's shipbuilding industry, according to a Naval War College professor, is poised to make the People's Liberation Army Navy the world's second largest navy by 2020, and, if current trends continue, a combat fleet that in overall order of battle is quantitatively on par with that of the United States Navy by 2030;

Whereas China continues to develop forward operating bases on manmade islands in the South China Sea and, by doing so, consolidate its control over the strategic corridor between the Indian and Pacific Oceans through which ⅓ of global maritime trade passes; and

Whereas Russia's shipbuilding industry's focus on undersea warfare has positioned the Russian Navy to add six modernized nuclear attack submarines to its naval inventory by 2023 and aggressively modernize its aging Oscar-class nuclear attack submarine fleet: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the United States Navy's need for congressional support to address readiness, training, and modernization challenges that threaten to weaken naval superiority; and

(2) finds that failing to provide the United States Navy with stable, predictable funding negatively affects its ability to project power around the world, reassure critical allies, and defeat adversaries when necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), who is on the Armed Services Committee, to discuss his resolution.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I begin by thanking the gentlewoman from Wyoming for all of her efforts, as well as all of my colleagues for their continued effort to do everything possible to assure the passage of the National Defense Authorization Act and the Defense Appropriations bill prior to the end of the fiscal year. That is key.

We have heard testimony about how money is wasted and uncertainty has led us to where we are today. Without that, we must do everything we can to assure passage of both of those bills.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 998, which expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Navy's total readiness remains in a perilous state due to high operational demands, increased deployment lengths, shortened training periods, and deferred maintenance all while the Navy is asked to do more with less as financial support for critical areas waned in the era of sequestration and without consistent congressional funding.

We have heard that laid out. We agree on both sides that this has created the uncertainty that creates the situation we found ourselves in today.

I think it is important to define what the term ''Navy total readiness'' truly means. The Navy conducted an independent Strategic Readiness Review composed of retired Navy admirals, as well as current senior civilian executives in the aftermath of the tragic USS *Fitzgerald* and USS *McCain* collisions. This Strategic Readiness Review identified institutional deficiencies that have developed over a long period of time resulting in a weaker Navy.

Factors that contribute to total Navy readiness include: the total number of assets—we know them as ships—manning and training, that is, in particular, personnel, in how well they perform their jobs; equipping and maintaining, that means providing sailors gear and maintaining ships; command and control, which means establishing clear lines of leadership and funding; and operations, which is the tempo at which our men and women in uniform execute their missions.

□ 1445

If one or all of these total readiness factors are lacking, the Navy will suffer. Unfortunately, that is the situation we find ourselves in today.

But we didn't arrive here by accident. I believe we have a tendency to respond to the crisis of the day rather than prepare for long-term strategic problems with corresponding solutions.

Make no mistake about it, our adversaries are looking in the long term. Don't think for a moment that China isn't watching what we are doing and planning for where they will be not next week, not next month, not next year, but 10 years down the road, 20 years down the road, or a century down the road. The same with Russia, North Korea, and Iran. We need to do the same.

After the Cold War and the Reagan administration came to an end, our Navy rapidly decreased in size. In the next few decades, funding levels became smaller and smaller. Tough cuts were made. The surface warfare community decreased their level of training, weakening the skills of their officers and reducing their capacity to effectively and safely perform their jobs as ship drivers and warfighters. Ships retired without replacements.

Then, a nationwide financial crisis brought upon a shortsighted decision for sequestration, further crippling the Navy's ability to take care of itself.

Meanwhile, threats to the United States and operational tempo have not decreased. This created a situation where the Navy was overworked with too few resources.

But our men and women in uniform never complain and never say they can't accomplish their mission. They have the kind of resolve in doing the things this Nation asks them to do that this Congress should have in our commitment to providing them the resources necessary for them to continue the great job that we ask of them.

But at a certain point, we all know we can't continue to operate this way. Things begin to break down when they aren't given the resources necessary. When their ships aren't properly maintained, when training doesn't take place at scheduled intervals to make sure they maintain that expertise that we need of them, sailors get stressed. When there are simply too many jobs to do and not enough time for people to do them, mistakes happen, costly mistakes.

We won't be able to reverse this trend immediately, but we can continue to make targeted, strategic investments in assets, training, and manpower to improve the Navy's readiness. I am proud of the work that Congress has done in recent years, in particular, this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

The House-passed NDAA adds a total of 13 battle force ships to the Navy's inventory, makes critical investments in ship maintenance accounts to take care of the ships we already have, and takes strong action in regard to surface warfare officer training and command and control structures within the Navy.

In consultation with our Senate counterparts, I am confident that we will deliver a bill that supports the Navy's rebuilding efforts and the drive and the objective of a 355-ship Navy.

We cannot be complacent. Yes, we have the best Navy in the world, but we can be better. Our sailors and marines are the best on the face of the Earth, and they do a spectacular job, folks. But until they can walk on water,

which someday they may be able to do, until they can walk on water, then we must continue to build them ships.

It is imperative that this Congress supports the United States Navy financially and authoritatively in a manner that allows for reassuring our allies, maintaining global presence, and defeating adversaries when necessary. We must give our sailors and our marines the tools they need to succeed in an atmosphere and an environment that is even more challenging than it has ever been in the era of great power competition where we know that our allies are committing to not just countering the United States, but defeating the United States strategically.

We must do nothing less than fully support our Navy-Marine Corps team, giving them what they need not just for today, not just for next year, not just for within our purview of what this Congress has to do, but for years to come, for decades to come, and for centuries to come. For it is only with that, that we will be able to counter what our adversaries are doing every second of every day, and that is finding ways to defeat the United States strategically. We must do nothing less than the same.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's motion. It is part of the same discussion we had on the previous resolution, and I, as I said, completely agree. The lack of certainty on the continuing resolutions has negatively impacted the Department of Defense and our readiness. There is absolutely no question about it. The only thing I would debate today is: What is the best way to address that problem? How do we honestly get at it?

These resolutions would suggest that if we simply fund defense and ignore everything else, then we will be fine. I think the way we got into this mess is instructive, and it is also going to be helpful in terms of how we get out of this mess going forward.

It is worth noting, at the end of this, we talked a little bit about tax cuts and how one thing doesn't have to do with the other. Tax cuts do not increase revenue. If they did, we would have the easiest job in the world. Also, a tax rate of zero would generate the most revenue for the United States Government. Obviously, that is not true.

Now, it is true that tax policy, depending on how it is structured, can be more encouraging to investment. But we have never had lower tax rates on the Federal level than we have right now. After all of the Bush tax cuts, as I mentioned the tax cuts under President Obama, and now the tax cuts under President Trump, all of that has added up to a massive decrease in our revenue, and that is part of the equation.

When President Bush put the tax cuts in place in 2001, for three consecutive fiscal years after that, we had a real dollar decrease in the amount of revenue that the Federal Government took in.

Now, I also understand that taxes are always a burden on the people who have to pay them. If we are running government well, we are going to try to keep those taxes as low as is humanly possible. But if we are going to meet the needs of government, we have to raise revenue.

What we have heard today is a very, very compelling case for how, over the course of the last decade, we haven't met the needs of readiness within the Department of Defense. So, again, I simply urge us to make a choice here. If we want to cover these costs, then let's raise the revenue and pay for it, and not pretend with this fantasy that somehow cutting the amount of revenue you take in is going to increase the amount of revenue you are going to take in. It doesn't work that way, and it certainly doesn't work in the current economic environment.

The second thing I would say is, while national security is critically important, it is not the only thing we do that is important. And that is the other thing that worries me about this debate. We massively slash revenue so we have less money to play around with, then we make the case for why we need to massively increase our defense budget, and everything else that the Federal Government does just sort of drifts away as an afterthought.

There are a lot of examples of this. I used infrastructure in the previous debate, and I will use a different example this time, the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center. It is not in my district, but it is just across the street from my district in Seattle, Washington.

It is doing incredible work right now on cancer. They are literally this close to, in some cases, curing it. They have come up with a new way for dealing with blood cancers—taking the white blood cells out of the body, reenergizing them, and putting them back in—that has achieved truly miraculous results.

Fred Hutch gets an overwhelming amount of their funding from the National Institutes of Health, from the Federal Government. The budget that President Trump originally proposed last year would have cut funding for Fred Hutch by 75 percent.

So while we are caring about national security, I think we also have to care about, well, curing cancer. It is not irrelevant. It actually saves lives and makes a difference.

Lastly, I do, as I said earlier, worry about a view of the world that says, basically, the entire world is out to get us and we have to spend as much money as is humanly possible here in the United States to defend ourselves.

We face threats. There is no question about that. We need a National Security Strategy and a national security budget to meet those threats. But in order to really create a safer and more prosperous world, we need to build alliances so that we are threatened by fewer people and so that we have more friends who will help us deter those who do threaten us. This is a point that Ms. CHENEY made that I completely agree with.

Deterrence is incredibly important. In a place like North Korea, will Kim Jung-un attack South Korea? Or will Iran attack? If they feel like they face a credible deterrent, they won't, and the U.S. needs to be part of that. But our allies need to be part of that as well.

Here, Russia is a great example. If Russia feels that NATO is weak, they will be emboldened. We already are seeing what they are doing in Ukraine. Estonia, Latvia, and other countries in Eastern Europe feel threatened by Russia. They need to know that the United States stands with our allies in Europe in order to deter that aggression and stop the war before it happens.

That does not all fall on the United States defense budget. It falls on us having friends and allies who can back up our credible deterrence.

Lastly, I just close by saying that we certainly face the threats we face. It is worth noting that we still, in the United States, spend way more money every year on defense than any of our adversaries, than any other country in the world. So it is not just a matter of money; it is a matter of having a smart strategy and spending that money well.

I am pleased that—knock on wood—this is supposed to be the first year in forever that the Department of Defense will actually have a full audit of where they spend their money. But making sure the money that is spent is spent efficiently and effectively is also part of having an adequate national security budget. So I worry that, basically, we say, look, all we have to do is spend as much money as the Pentagon wants and everything will be fine. I think it is a lot more complicated question than that. Again, it comes back to having a sound fiscal policy and a sound national security policy.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. SMITH, is worried about a lot of things that really just aren't the case over here on this side of the aisle.

I agree with Mr. SMITH that weakness is provocative. We certainly need look no further than the Obama administration to see what happens when the United States is weak, to see what happens when the United States abandons its longstanding allies in the Middle East, including Israel, in order to provide funding and a pathway to nuclear weapons for the Iranians. We see what happened again and again and again.

We saw what happened when the Obama administration, President Obama, decided to pull troops out of

Iraq based on a timeline that he established in Washington, D.C., with no regard to the facts on the ground. We saw what happened. What happened was the rise of ISIS.

So the problem that we have is, in order to deter, we have to make sure people understand that we are strong. We have lived through 8 years in the previous administration of apologies and weakness, and President Trump is turning that around. President Trump is making clear that people understand that no longer will that be the case, and that we, in fact, are going to be a Nation that stands up for what we believe in.

I think it is also very educational, Mr. Speaker, to think about this debate we are having here today, this discussion, and to think about what it sounds like to men and women who are serving overseas and to their family members. What we are supposed to be discussing here and debating here is a resolution that expresses a sense of this body that the United States Navy has been hurt extensively by the lack of predictable funding. Instead, what we are getting is a lot of discussion and conversation about a whole bunch of other things that I am more than happy to debate.

Mr. SMITH and I clearly have very different opinions about the economy and about what you have to do to generate economic growth in this economy. But that is not this resolution.

I think we have the opportunity here, on a bipartisan basis, once and for all, to show that we are in a position where we are going to provide the kind of support that our men and women in uniform need.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, and I agree, that the fundamental point is that we need to make sure that we adequately provide for, in this case, what the resolution is focused on, the Navy and the Marine Corps. As I have agreed throughout, adequate readiness for them is incredibly important. The CRs and the budget fiasco that we have had have not provided that.

□ 1500

What I am trying to do is, rather than just an empty resolution that says, gosh, it would be great if we actually looked after you, to talk about the policy steps that are going to be necessary to actually do that. So I think that is an incredibly important part of this debate.

Now, we can have every resolution all day long saying we want to cure cancer, we want to bring peace to the world. That is great. But what are the steps that are going to be necessary, in this case, to get to the point where the Navy and Marine Corps has the adequate funds that they need, or at least has predictability for what they are going to be able to do, because we have been having these discussions about how, gosh, we ought to do this, and then we don't.

I am trying to explain to the people who serve in the military and everybody else exactly why we don't; instead of just giving them empty promises saying we would really like to help you, it just seems like year after year, somehow we don't. We don't, for all of the reasons that I have listed in terms of fiscal policy going forward.

The other thing that I would like to point out is, Obama is no longer President. Donald Trump is President. And it seems to me like the one thing the Republican Party would want to do, they would love to have Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama to kick around for, like, ever. But you are actually in charge now; so why don't you be responsible for the policies that we have right now.

And I just, I couldn't believe that I heard the Representative from Wyoming say that America is now projecting strength. If there was ever an example of the President of the United States projecting the most embarrassing, abject weakness I have ever seen than what President Trump just did with Vladimir Putin in Helsinki, I can't think of it. And quite frankly, a number of Republican commentators that I have seen talk over the last 24 hours can't think of it either.

So I know it is incredibly comforting, from a policy perspective, to blame everything, absolutely everything, that has gone wrong in the world on President Obama, but he is not in charge anymore.

Donald Trump is in charge. The Republican Party is in charge of the House and the Senate, and it is time to focus on policies that are going to move us forward and advance our interests; and not just feel comfort in the fact that we can sort of rewrite history and blame President Obama for absolutely everything that has gone wrong.

It is a big, complicated, and difficult world for President Trump. It was for President Obama. We need to work together. We need to find ways to confront the challenges we face in a thoughtful way. Simply blaming the past president for absolutely everything isn't going to get us there.

So, again, let me just conclude by saying I completely agree. The issue that needs to be addressed is to make sure that we have adequate readiness for all of the men and women who serve in the military.

We are only talking about the Navy and Marine Corps. As I think the gentlewoman said, we are going to talk about the Air Force and the Army next week. I think we should talk about all of them at the same time, because it is all equally important. But to get there, we need to have a strategy that is actually sustainable, instead of one that is based on hope.

And to my mind, that is the worst thing that we can do to the men and women who serve in the military is say we want you to do all of this, and we don't really have the funds to do it, so you are going to have to figure it out as you go. It would be far, far better to say, look, here is, realistically, where our budget is at. Here is, realistically, what we can do.

Give them that task, and then they will be trained and equipped to do it, instead of being asked to do more than we are willing to provide money for.

And it is one thing if this was just 1 year. It is one thing if we had a surplus. But we don't. We have the budget environment that we have. So if we are going to get to the point where we adequately address readiness and address the issues that are being raised, then we need to be realistic about what we can do and, like I said, not keep blaming past administrations for things; actually try to implement policy right now that is going to make sure that we have the strongest national security policy we can, and that, again, the men and women who serve in the military, at a minimum, are trained and equipped to do the missions that we are asking them to do; that we don't ask them to do missions that go beyond the funds that we provide for them.

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

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

These resolutions do lay out the steps necessary. These resolutions make clear that the House has done its business, has done its work; we need the Senate to do its work, and we need to get these bills to the President's desk.

As I recall, Mr. Speaker, the only person that had hope as a policy was Barack Obama, and my colleague is right, that he is no longer—President Obama is no longer in the Oval Office. However, the damage that his policies did are so devastating and so long-lasting that we are having to dig out from under it. That is why we are here today.

We are here today because not only have continuing resolutions hurt the Department of Defense, the policies of the last 8 years have created a situation, geopolitically and militarily, where the work that we have got to do to undo those very ill-guided policies is significant and requires the kind of funding that we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) to close.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming, again, for all of her efforts today to highlight this important issue about the commitment this Nation has to make to our military to make sure we rebuild this lost readiness, and H. Res. 998 is purely simply about that.

Are we willing to state our commitment to our sailors and Marines about what we must do as a Nation to provide the resources that they need to do the job that we ask them to do?

Are we willing to send a message to them that says, we are committed to standing by them for everything that has to happen to provide certainty to them so they know what their future holds?

Are we willing to send a message to our adversaries to say that this Nation is committed to rebuild our Navy and Marine Corps team to make sure that they are a force to be reckoned with anytime an adversary of ours may think of acting badly around the world; that that Navy and Marine Corps team will be there. That is what this resolution is about.

It is also sending a message to every one of our constituents; is this Congress committed to the right policies to making the commitment of resources to make sure that our Navy and Marine Corps team has what they need? That is another important part of this message.

And will we, as a nation, assure that in the long-term we are committed to countering what our adversaries are doing? And we see that. We see that in scores. Whether it is something like submarines, where we are on path, by 2029, to be down to 42 total attack submarines, the most requested asset in the entire United States inventory. We are down to 42 submarines in 2029.

China, by 2020, will have 70 submarines, total attack submarines and ballistic missile submarines, building five to six per year, so that by 2029, when we are at 42 submarines, attack submarines, and on the way to rebuilding Ohio-class submarines, the Chinese could be as high as 124 submarines. Now, quantity has a quality all of its own.

This resolution today says, are we going to make the commitment to make sure that we can counter those adversaries? Are we going to be able to tell our children and our grandchildren that when we had the chance we made the commitment? We made the commitment to our sailors, to our Marines, and as we will next week, to our soldiers and our airmen, and subsequently our Coast Guardsmen, to make sure that they have what they need, that this Nation makes the commitment to assure that we have the future of our Nation's defense well in hand. That is what today is about.

I ask my colleagues to join me to make sure that we are willing to make this simple commitment. While it may be in words, those words will speak volumes to our sailors, to our Marines, to our citizens, and to our adversaries, that this Nation has an unshakable resolve to make sure that we have what we need to counter the threats abroad, and to counter anybody that thinks of threatening the United States, or our friends, or our allies, or would want to act badly. Today's resolution is all about that, not just for today, but for decades to come.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 998.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE THAT THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS BUDGETARY UNCERTAINTY ERODES MILITARY READINESS

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 994) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Marine Corps faces significant readiness challenges and that budgetary uncertainty impedes the Corps' ability to meet ongoing and unexpected national security threats, putting United States national security at risk.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 994

Whereas since fiscal year 2010, United States Marine Corps active duty end strength has shrunk by 8 percent from 202,100 to 186,000;

Whereas, on March 1, 2016, Marine Corps Commandant Robert Neller stated, ''The fiscal reductions and instability of the past few years have impacted our readiness. As resources have diminished, the Marine Corps has protected the near-term operational readiness of its deployed and next-to-deploy units in order to meet operational commitments. This has come at a risk'';

Whereas, on February 26, 2015, now Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Joseph F. Dunford stated, ''[a]pproximately half of our non-deployed units—and those are the ones that provide the bench to respond to unforeseen contingencies—are suffering personnel, equipment and training shortfalls'';

Whereas, on February 8, 2017, Assistant Commandant Glenn Walters stated, ''A focus on [ongoing] operations, the decrease in funding levels from Fiscal Year (FY) 2012, fiscal instability and the lack of an inter-war period have left your Marine Corps insufficiently manned, trained and equipped across the depth of the force to operate in an evolving operational environment'';

Whereas the Marine Corps' Assault Amphibious Vehicle (AAV–7A1) and Light Armored Vehicle (LAV) average over 40 and 26 years old, respectively;

Whereas the Marine Corps has a stated requirement for 38 amphibious ships to support the operations of 2 Marine Expeditionary Brigades, but the amphibious fleet numbers only 32 ships today;

Whereas former Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Jonathan Greenert testified on March 12, 2014, that, ''[t]oday, in the world that we live in, the world that the Navy and Marine Corps lives in, and the future, we probably need 50 [amphibious ships]'';

Whereas, on April 5, 2017, Marine Corps leaders testified that, ''The most dire readiness situation lies within our Aviation element. An unhealthy percentage of our aviation units lack the minimum number of ready basic aircraft (RBA) for training, and we are significantly short ready aircraft for wartime requirements. We simply do not have the available aircraft to meet our squadrons' requirements'';

Whereas during parts of 2016, only 43 percent of the Marine Corps' total aviation fleet was available for operational employment, including less than ⅓ of its F/A–18 Hornets;

Whereas from fiscal year 2013 through fiscal year 2017, Marine Corps aviation accidents increased by 80 percent from 56 to 101 per year;

Whereas between 2011 and 2017, aviation accidents killed more than 60 Marines, including 19 over a 2-month period in 2017; and

Whereas, on March 10, 2017, Deputy Commandant Gary L. Thomas stated, ''Unstable fiscal environments prevent the deliberately planned, sustained effort needed to recover current readiness of our legacy equipment in the near term, and to modernize in the longer term . . . We must work to avoid a budget-driven strategy and return to a strategy-driven budget, informed by the strategic requirements of the current and future operating environments. Unless we do so, the range of options we have to address current and future threats will further erode'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes that the United States Marine Corps faces significant readiness challenges, as well as shortfalls in end strength and delayed modernization;

(2) finds that failing to provide the Marine Corps with stable, robust, and on-time funding impedes its ability to meet ongoing and unexpected security threats, putting United States national security at risk; and

(3) commits to enhancing the Marine Corps' ability to meet our Nation's threats ''In the air, on land, and sea''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER), my colleague on the Armed Services Committee, to discuss his resolution.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend from Wyoming for yielding the time but, more importantly, for her leadership in this effort to highlight the devastating impacts when we fail to provide full, on-time, and robust funding to our military.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 994, which would recognize the significant readiness challenges facing the United States Marine Corps, and warn that budgetary uncertainty is undermining the ability of our Marines to do their vital work day

in and day out in defense of this Nation.

Since fiscal year 2010, the Active-Duty Marine Corps has shrunk by 8 percent. Thanks to the work of this House, that figure is finally trending in the other direction, but there is still much more work to be done, all of which requires stable, robust, and on-time funding.

Seven years after the Budget Control Act we are still digging out from holes we dug ourselves. In hearing after hearing, we have heard military leaders make clear that they will face increased risk due to continuing resolutions and years of accumulated defense cuts.

It can be all too easy to wave off these warnings. After all, our military and Marine Corps, in particular, has a ''can-do spirit'' that is second to none. But increased risk isn't just an abstract notion. It can have very real consequences. The more than 60 Marines who have perished in marine aviation accidents since 2011 are a tragic reminder of what increased risk looks like in practice.

The new national security and national defense strategies marked sea changes in American security policy. With the new guidance that great power competition, and not terrorism, is the primary challenge to American national security policy. There is still much work to be done to ensure that the Marine Corps, along with the rest of the military, is best positioned to compete for the long-term.

From contested entry to dispersed operations from austere locations to contingency response, the Marine Corps is facing great challenges and opportunities. The obstacles are many as increasingly capable adversaries are forcing the Marine Corps to reconsider long-held assumptions about amphibious landings and its ability to operate close to shore.

In the face of these challenges, the Corps will have to do what it does best, innovate, and come up with new solutions to execute timeless missions. Ultimately, however, I am optimistic; not just because I was privileged to serve 7 years in the Marine Corps, and I know the quality of the men and women who continue to serve, but because of many other factors, including the simple geography of the Indo-Pacific, which is tailor-made for the United States Marine Corps.

As former adversaries learned on the islands of Guadalcanal, New Guinea, and Tarawa, the absolute last place on Earth you want to be is between a Marine and his objective.

In the long run however, the only thing that can stop the Marine Corps is this body's failure to do its job. If we fail to provide on-time, adequate, or predictable funding, we will undermine our Marine Corps' ability to get the job done.

This resolution takes a small step to recognize these challenges and commit to doing better. We owe our beloved Marine Corps nothing less.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have had the broader debate, so let me just say very quickly I agree with the resolution brought forward by Congressman GALLAGHER; that the budget uncertainty definitely impacts readiness and impacts the ability of Marines, in fact, the entire Department of Defense to fight adequately.

I do believe, as I have said earlier, that we need to get at the underlying fiscal issues that have created that, taking us all the way back to the Budget Control Act and why it was passed in 2011 in the first place. We need to get at a fiscal policy in this country so that we can adequately and predictably fund, certainly the Department of Defense, certainly the Marine Corps, but I would say the entire Federal budget in a way that puts us in a much stronger position as a country.

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

□ 1515

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking both my colleagues, Mr. WITTMAN from Virginia, Mr. GALLAGHER from Wisconsin, and all of the folks on the Armed Services Committee, Chairman THORNBERRY, Ranking Member SMITH, as well as the folks on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, led by Chairwoman KAY GRANGER, for their tremendous work on these crucially important issues.

I think that, again, Mr. SMITH has highlighted, really, the crux of this issue, and the crux of this issue is whether or not we as a body are going to recognize that we have the ability here and what we do here will determine whether or not we provide the support and the resources our troops need or whether we increase the risk they face.

When we are facing a situation where we have had more servicemembers die in training accidents than in combat in the last year, that is an unacceptable and indefensible situation.

Mr. Speaker, on this particular resolution, I want to thank my colleague from Wisconsin for introducing this resolution. As a marine, he understands better than most how what we do in this body impacts our men and women in uniform.

H. Res. 994 highlights the vast readiness impacts we have seen in the Marine Corps over the past 9 years of continuing resolutions, sequestration, and overall budget dysfunction. We do not want to be in a position, Mr. Speaker, where the Marines are forced to continue to use aging or outdated equipment, or they don't have the funds necessary to receive the training they require to undo this readiness crisis, or they don't have the flexibility they need to respond to the fact that we have got an absolutely changing world of warfare. They need agility to do that, and that requires funds from this body.

As my colleagues have said, we have made great progress. Over the past year, we have increased the defense spending caps for fiscal year 2018 and 2019, and we have agreed to fund the Department of Defense at $700 billion for fiscal year 2018.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to get that done now for fiscal year 2019. The readiness crisis was not created in a single year, and it will take many years of effort to be able to address it.

The bill that we considered in the House just a few weeks ago passed with over 300 bipartisan votes. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can now, today, commit all of ourselves as a body and urge our colleagues on the other side of this building to ensure that the work that we do is worthy of the men and women in uniform who protect all of us, to ensure that we stay on track to get this bill passed by the Senate and to the President's desk before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) to close.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the sentiment expressed by my colleague, Mr. SMITH, that we do need to look at the overall budget picture. I think what has changed in that picture over time has been the amount of the budget consumed by mandatory spending, which is a very difficult problem. I concede that it is going to require men and women of good faith on both sides of the aisle to come together and have, if nothing else, an honest debate.

The argument was also made that we spend more on defense than a large number of our competitors and our allies, combined, in many cases. I hear that a lot. That is true. It is also not that helpful of a statistic, as it ignores both the size of our economy, the relative size of our economy, as well as the unique nature of our global commitments.

A more useful matrix of perhaps what we are spending as a percentage of GDP, we are still spending below the post-World War II average on defense as a percentage of GDP. For example, during the 1950s, 8 years of peace and prosperity, we were spending closer to 10 percent of our GDP on defense.

So I just think we need to be careful when we throw around different terms like this. And I welcome that debate. It is one we definitely need to have.

I just would close by saying our Marines put their lives on the line on a daily basis. When we go to war, we cannot guarantee that everyone will come home safely, and the Marines know that. They gladly put their lives on the line. They take the risk, and they ride to the sound of the guns regardless.

But I do think that we need to look at what we have the power to affect, and what we have the power to affect

here as Members of Congress, regardless, actually, of who is in the White House, what we have the obligation to affect is to guarantee that we will never send our servicemembers into an unfair fight, that we will provide them with the training, the equipment, and the numbers they need to run up the score on the enemy with decisive and overwhelming force.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this resolution is about, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 994.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOBS AND INVESTOR CONFIDENCE ACT OF 2018

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 488) to increase the threshold for disclosures required by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to compensatory benefit plans, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 488

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''JOBS and Investor Confidence Act of 2018''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—HELPING ANGELS LEAD OUR STARTUPS

SEC. 101. DEFINITION OF ANGEL INVESTOR GROUP.

As used in this title, the term ''angel investor group'' means any group that—

(1) is composed of accredited investors interested in investing personal capital in early-stage companies;

(2) holds regular meetings and has defined processes and procedures for making investment decisions, either individually or among the membership of the group as a whole; and

(3) is neither associated nor affiliated with brokers, dealers, or investment advisers.

SEC. 102. CLARIFICATION OF GENERAL SOLICITATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise Regulation D of its rules (17 C.F.R. 230.500 et seq.) to require that in carrying out the prohibition against general solicitation or general advertising contained in section 230.502(c) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, the prohibition shall not apply to a presentation or other communication made by or on behalf of an issuer which is made at an event—

(1) sponsored by—

(A) the United States or any territory thereof, by the District of Columbia, by any State, by a political subdivision of any State or territory, or by any agency or public instrumentality of any of the foregoing;

(B) a college, university, or other institution of higher education;

(C) a nonprofit organization;

(D) an angel investor group;

(E) a venture forum, venture capital association, or trade association; or

(F) any other group, person or entity as the Securities and Exchange Commission may determine by rule;

(2) where any advertising for the event does not reference any specific offering of securities by the issuer;

(3) the sponsor of which—

(A) does not make investment recommendations or provide investment advice to event attendees;

(B) does not engage in an active role in any investment negotiations between the issuer and investors attending the event;

(C) does not charge event attendees any fees other than administrative fees;

(D) does not receive any compensation for making introductions between investors attending the event and issuers, or for investment negotiations between such parties;

(E) makes readily available to attendees a disclosure not longer than 1 page in length, as prescribed by the Securities and Exchange Commission, describing the nature of the event and the risks of investing in the issuers presenting at the event; and

(F) does not receive any compensation with respect to such event that would require registration of the sponsor as a broker or a dealer under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, or as an investment advisor under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940; and

(4) where no specific information regarding an offering of securities by the issuer is communicated or distributed by or on behalf of the issuer, other than—

(A) that the issuer is in the process of offering securities or planning to offer securities;

(B) the type and amount of securities being offered;

(C) the amount of securities being offered that have already been subscribed for; and

(D) the intended use of proceeds of the offering.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (a) may only be construed as requiring the Securities and Exchange Commission to amend the requirements of Regulation D with respect to presentations and communications, and not with respect to purchases or sales.

(c) NO PRE-EXISTING SUBSTANTIVE RELATIONSHIP BY REASON OF EVENT.—Attendance at an event described under subsection (a) shall not qualify, by itself, as establishing a pre-existing substantive relationship between an issuer and a purchaser, for purposes of Rule 506(b).

(d) DEFINITION OF ISSUER.—For purposes of this section and the revision of rules required under this section, the term ''issuer'' means an issuer that is a business, is not in bankruptcy or receivership, is not an investment company, and is not a blank check, blind pool, or shell company.

TITLE II—CREDIT ACCESS AND INCLUSION

SEC. 201. POSITIVE CREDIT REPORTING PERMITTED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 623 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s–2) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) FULL-FILE CREDIT REPORTING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the limitations in paragraphs (2) through (4) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may furnish to a consumer reporting agency information relating to the performance of a consumer in making payments—

''(A) under a lease agreement with respect to a dwelling, including such a lease in which the Department of Housing and Urban Development provides subsidized payments for occupancy in a dwelling; or

''(B) pursuant to a contract for a utility or telecommunications service.

''(2) LIMITATION.—Information about a consumer's usage of any utility services provided by a utility or telecommunication firm may be furnished to a consumer reporting agency only to the extent that such information relates to payment by the consumer for the services of such utility or telecommunication service or other terms of the provision of the services to the consumer, including any deposit, discount, or conditions for interruption or termination of the services.

''(3) PAYMENT PLAN.—An energy utility firm, telephone company, or wireless provider may not report payment information to a consumer reporting agency with respect to an outstanding balance of a consumer as late if—

''(A) the energy utility firm, telephone company, or wireless provider and the consumer have entered into a payment plan (including a deferred payment agreement, an arrearage management program, or a debt forgiveness program) with respect to such outstanding balance; and

''(B) the consumer is meeting the obligations of the payment plan, as determined by the energy utility firm, telephone company, or wireless provider.

''(4) RELATION TO STATE LAW.—Notwithstanding section 625, this subsection shall not preempt any law of a State with respect to furnishing to a consumer reporting agency information relating to the performance of a consumer in making payments pursuant to a contract for a utility or telecommunications service.

''(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the following definitions shall apply:

''(A) ENERGY UTILITY FIRM.—The term 'energy utility firm' means an entity that provides gas or electric utility services to the public.

''(B) UTILITY OR TELECOMMUNICATION FIRM.—The term 'utility or telecommunication firm' means an entity that provides utility services to the public through pipe, wire, landline, wireless, cable, or other connected facilities, or radio, electronic, or similar transmission (including the extension of such facilities).''.

(b) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—Section 623(c) of the Consumer Credit Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s–2(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) subsection (f) of this section, including any regulations issued thereunder; or''.

(c) HUD RULEMAKING.—Not later than the end of the 8-month period following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue regulations directing public housing agencies to develop procedures and capacity to—

(1) ensure the complete and accurate reporting of data regarding tenants of public housing and families assisted under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) when furnishing information to a consumer reporting agency pursuant to section 623(f) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act; and

(2) handle complaints with respect to such reporting.

(d) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date that final rules are issued pursuant to subsection (c), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the impact of furnishing information pursuant to subsection (f) of section 623 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s–2) (as added by this section) on consumers.

(e) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment by subsection (a) shall not apply to a consumer in connection with a lease in which the Department of Housing and Urban Development provides subsidized payments for occupancy in a dwelling until the date on which final rules are issued pursuant to subsection (c).

TITLE III—SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKERAGE SIMPLIFICATION

SEC. 301. REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.

Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(13) REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an M&A broker shall be exempt from registration under this section.

''(B) EXCLUDED ACTIVITIES.—An M&A broker is not exempt from registration under this paragraph if such broker does any of the following:

''(i) Directly or indirectly, in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, receives, holds, transmits, or has custody of the funds or securities to be exchanged by the parties to the transaction.

''(ii) Engages on behalf of an issuer in a public offering of any class of securities that is registered, or is required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the issuer files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

''(iii) Engages on behalf of any party in a transaction involving a shell company, other than a business combination related shell company.

''(iv) Directly, or indirectly through any of its affiliates, provides financing related to the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company.

''(v) Assists any party to obtain financing from an unaffiliated third party without—

''(I) complying with all other applicable laws in connection with such assistance, including, if applicable, Regulation T (12 C.F.R. 220 et seq.); and

''(II) disclosing any compensation in writing to the party.

''(vi) Represents both the buyer and the seller in the same transaction without providing clear written disclosure as to the parties the broker represents and obtaining written consent from both parties to the joint representation.

''(vii) Facilitates a transaction with a group of buyers formed with the assistance of the M&A broker to acquire the eligible privately held company.

''(viii) Engages in a transaction involving the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company to a passive buyer or group of passive buyers. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a buyer that is actively involved in managing the acquired company is not a passive buyer, regardless of whether such buyer is itself owned by passive beneficial owners.

''(ix) Binds a party to a transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company.

''(C) DISQUALIFICATIONS.—An M&A broker is not exempt from registration under this paragraph if such broker is subject to—

''(i) suspension or revocation of registration under paragraph (4);

''(ii) a statutory disqualification described in section 3(a)(39);

''(iii) a disqualification under the rules adopted by the Commission under section 926 of the Investor Protection and Securities Reform Act of 2010 (15 U.S.C. 77d note); or

''(iv) a final order described in paragraph (4)(H).

''(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit any other authority of the Commission to exempt any person, or any class of persons, from any provision of this title, or from any

provision of any rule or regulation thereunder.

''(E) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) BUSINESS COMBINATION RELATED SHELL COMPANY.—The term 'business combination related shell company' means a shell company that is formed by an entity that is not a shell company—

''(I) solely for the purpose of changing the corporate domicile of that entity solely within the United States; or

''(II) solely for the purpose of completing a business combination transaction (as defined under section 230.165(f) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations) among one or more entities other than the company itself, none of which is a shell company.

''(ii) CONTROL.—The term 'control' means the power, directly or indirectly, to direct the management or policies of a company, whether through ownership of securities, by contract, or otherwise. There is a presumption of control for any person who—

''(I) is a director, general partner, member or manager of a limited liability company, or corporate officer of a corporation or limited liability company, and exercises executive responsibility (or has similar status or functions);

''(II) has the right to vote 25 percent or more of a class of voting securities or the power to sell or direct the sale of 25 percent or more of a class of voting securities; or

''(III) in the case of a partnership or limited liability company, has the right to receive upon dissolution, or has contributed, 25 percent or more of the capital.

''(iii) ELIGIBLE PRIVATELY HELD COMPANY.—The term 'eligible privately held company' means a privately held company that meets both of the following conditions:

''(I) The company does not have any class of securities registered, or required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the company files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

''(II) In the fiscal year ending immediately before the fiscal year in which the services of the M&A broker are initially engaged with respect to the securities transaction, the company meets either or both of the following conditions (determined in accordance with the historical financial accounting records of the company):

''(aa) The earnings of the company before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization are less than $25,000,000.

''(bb) The gross revenues of the company are less than $250,000,000.

For purposes of this subclause, the Commission may by rule modify the dollar figures if the Commission determines that such a modification is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

''(iv) M&A BROKER.—The term 'M&A broker' means a broker, and any person associated with a broker, engaged in the business of effecting securities transactions solely in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, regardless of whether the broker acts on behalf of a seller or buyer, through the purchase, sale, exchange, issuance, repurchase, or redemption of, or a business combination involving, securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, if the broker reasonably believes that—

''(I) upon consummation of the transaction, any person acquiring securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, acting alone or in concert, will control and, directly or indirectly, will be active in the management of the eligible privately held company or the business conducted with the assets of the eligible privately held company; and

''(II) if any person is offered securities in exchange for securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, such person will, prior to becoming legally bound to consummate the transaction, receive or have reasonable access to the most recent fiscal year-end financial statements of the issuer of the securities as customarily prepared by the management of the issuer in the normal course of operations and, if the financial statements of the issuer are audited, reviewed, or compiled, any related statement by the independent accountant, a balance sheet dated not more than 120 days before the date of the offer, and information pertaining to the management, business, results of operations for the period covered by the foregoing financial statements, and material loss contingencies of the issuer.

''(v) SHELL COMPANY.—The term 'shell company' means a company that at the time of a transaction with an eligible privately held company—

''(I) has no or nominal operations; and

''(II) has—

''(aa) no or nominal assets;

''(bb) assets consisting solely of cash and cash equivalents; or

''(cc) assets consisting of any amount of cash and cash equivalents and nominal other assets.

''(F) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, and every 5 years thereafter, each dollar amount in subparagraph (E)(ii)(II) shall be adjusted by—

''(I) dividing the annual value of the Employment Cost Index For Wages and Salaries, Private Industry Workers (or any successor index), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the adjustment is being made by the annual value of such index (or successor) for the calendar year ending December 31, 2012; and

''(II) multiplying such dollar amount by the quotient obtained under subclause (I).

''(ii) ROUNDING.—Each dollar amount determined under clause (i) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100,000.''.

SEC. 302. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by this title shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—FAIR INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROFESSIONAL EXPERTS

SEC. 401. DEFINITION OF ACCREDITED INVESTOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(a)(15) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)(15) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (F), respectively; and

(2) in subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon, and inserting after such subparagraph the following:

''(B) any natural person whose individual net worth, or joint net worth with that person's spouse, exceeds $1,000,000 (which amount, along with the amounts set forth in subparagraph (C), shall be adjusted for inflation by the Commission every 5 years to the nearest $10,000 to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) where, for purposes of calculating net worth under this subparagraph—

''(i) the person's primary residence shall not be included as an asset;

''(ii) indebtedness that is secured by the person's primary residence, up to the estimated fair market value of the primary residence at the time of the sale of securities, shall not be included as a liability (except that if the amount of such indebtedness outstanding at the time of sale of securities exceeds the amount outstanding 60 days before such time, other than as a result of the acquisition of the primary residence, the amount of such excess shall be included as a liability); and

''(iii) indebtedness that is secured by the person's primary residence in excess of the estimated fair market value of the primary residence at the time of the sale of securities shall be included as a liability;

''(C) any natural person who had an individual income in excess of $200,000 in each of the 2 most recent years or joint income with that person's spouse in excess of $300,000 in each of those years and has a reasonable expectation of reaching the same income level in the current year;

''(D) any natural person who is currently licensed or registered as a broker or investment adviser by the Commission, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, or an equivalent self-regulatory organization (as defined in section 3(a)(26) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934), or the securities division of a State or the equivalent State division responsible for licensing or registration of individuals in connection with securities activities;

''(E) any natural person the Commission determines, by regulation, to have demonstrable education or job experience to qualify such person as having professional knowledge of a subject related to a particular investment, and whose education or job experience is verified by the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority or an equivalent self-regulatory organization (as defined in section 3(a)(26) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934); or''.

(b) RULEMAKING.—The Commission shall revise the definition of accredited investor under Regulation D (17 C.F.R. 230.501 et seq.) to conform with the amendments made by subsection (a).

TITLE V—FOSTERING INNOVATION

SEC. 501. TEMPORARY EXEMPTION FOR LOW-REVENUE ISSUERS.

Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7262) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) TEMPORARY EXEMPTION FOR LOW-REVENUE ISSUERS.—

''(1) LOW-REVENUE EXEMPTION.—Subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to an audit report prepared for an issuer that—

''(A) ceased to be an emerging growth company on the last day of the fiscal year of the issuer following the fifth anniversary of the date of the first sale of common equity securities of the issuer pursuant to an effective registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933;

''(B) had average annual gross revenues of less than $50,000,000 as of its most recently completed fiscal year; and

''(C) is not a large accelerated filer.

''(2) EXPIRATION OF TEMPORARY EXEMPTION.—An issuer ceases to be eligible for the exemption described under paragraph (1) at the earliest of—

''(A) the last day of the fiscal year of the issuer following the tenth anniversary of the date of the first sale of common equity securities of the issuer pursuant to an effective registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933;

''(B) the last day of the fiscal year of the issuer during which the average annual gross revenues of the issuer exceed $50,000,000; or

''(C) the date on which the issuer becomes a large accelerated filer.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

''(A) AVERAGE ANNUAL GROSS REVENUES.—The term 'average annual gross revenues'

means the total gross revenues of an issuer over its most recently completed three fiscal years divided by three.

''(B) EMERGING GROWTH COMPANY.—The term 'emerging growth company' has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c).

''(C) LARGE ACCELERATED FILER.—The term 'large accelerated filer' has the meaning given that term under section 240.12b–2 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.''.

TITLE VI—END BANKING FOR HUMAN TRAFFICKERS

SEC. 601. INCREASING THE ROLE OF THE FINANCIAL INDUSTRY IN COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

(a) TREASURY AS A MEMBER OF THE PRESIDENT'S INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE TO MONITOR AND COMBAT TRAFFICKING.—Section 105(b) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(b)) is amended by inserting ''the Secretary of the Treasury,'' after ''the Secretary of Education,''.

(b) REQUIRED REVIEW OF PROCEDURES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Financial Institutions Examination Council, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the private sector, and appropriate law enforcement agencies, shall—

(1) review and enhance training and examinations procedures to improve the capabilities of anti-money laundering and countering the financing of terrorism programs to detect financial transactions relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons;

(2) review and enhance procedures for referring potential cases relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons to the appropriate law enforcement agency; and

(3) determine, as appropriate, whether requirements for financial institutions are sufficient to detect and deter money laundering relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(c) INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS TARGETING MONEY LAUNDERING RELATED TO HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall submit to the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the head of each appropriate Federal banking agency—

(A) an analysis of anti-money laundering efforts of the United States Government and United States financial institutions relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons; and

(B) appropriate legislative, administrative, and other recommendations to strengthen efforts against money laundering relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(2) REQUIRED RECOMMENDATIONS.—The recommendations under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) feedback from financial institutions on best practices of successful programs to combat severe forms of trafficking in persons currently in place that may be suitable for broader adoption by similarly situated financial institutions;

(B) feedback from stakeholders, including victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons and financial institutions, on policy proposals derived from the analysis conducted by the task force referred to in paragraph (1) that would enhance the efforts and programs of financial institutions to detect and deter money laundering relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons, including any recommended changes to internal policies, procedures, and controls relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons;

(C) any recommended changes to training programs at financial institutions to better equip employees to deter and detect money laundering relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons;

(D) any recommended changes to expand information sharing relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons among financial institutions and between such financial institutions, appropriate law enforcement agencies, and appropriate Federal agencies; and

(E) recommended changes, if necessary, to existing statutory law to more effectively detect and deter money laundering relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons, where such money laundering involves the use of emerging technologies and virtual currencies.

(d) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to grant rulemaking authority to the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term ''appropriate Federal banking agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 3(q) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(q));

(2) the term ''severe forms of trafficking in persons'' has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

(3) the term ''Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking'' means the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking established by the President pursuant to section 105 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103); and

(4) the term ''law enforcement agency'' means an agency of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal or civil law.

SEC. 602. COORDINATION OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING ISSUES BY THE OFFICE OF TERRORISM AND FINANCIAL INTELLIGENCE.

(a) FUNCTIONS.—Section 312(a)(4) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) as subparagraphs (F), (G), and (H), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

''(E) combating illicit financing relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons;''.

(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—Section 312(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—The Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Undersecretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, shall designate an office within the OTFI that shall coordinate efforts to combat the illicit financing of severe forms of trafficking in persons with—

''(A) other offices of the Department of the Treasury;

''(B) other Federal agencies, including—

''(i) the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons of the Department of State; and

''(ii) the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking;

''(C) State and local law enforcement agencies; and

''(D) foreign governments.''.

(c) DEFINITION.—Section 312(a) of title 31, United States Code, as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'severe forms of trafficking in persons' has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).''.

SEC. 603. ADDITIONAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT UNDER THE TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000.

Section 105(d)(7) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(7)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting ''the Committee on Financial Services,'' after ''the Committee on Foreign Affairs,''; and

(B) by inserting ''the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,'' after ''the Committee on Foreign Relations,'';

(2) in subparagraph (Q)(vii), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in subparagraph (R), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(S) the efforts of the United States to eliminate money laundering relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons and the number of investigations, arrests, indictments, and convictions in money laundering cases with a nexus to severe forms of trafficking in persons.''.

SEC. 604. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 108(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7106(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(13) Whether the government of the country, consistent with the capacity of the country, has in effect a framework to prevent financial transactions involving the proceeds of severe forms of trafficking in persons, and is taking steps to implement such a framework, including by investigating, prosecuting, convicting, and sentencing individuals who attempt or conduct such transactions.''.

TITLE VII—INVESTING IN MAIN STREET

SEC. 701. INVESTMENT IN SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES.

Section 302(b) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 682(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the period the following: ''or, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, 15 percent of such capital and surplus'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the period the following: ''or, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, 15 percent of such capital and surplus''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'appropriate Federal banking agency' has the meaning given that term under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.''.

TITLE VIII—EXCHANGE REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 801. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Over time, national securities exchanges have expanded their businesses beyond listings and trading to include the sale of additional products and services to their members and listed companies.

(2) The Securities and Exchange Commission should be transparent in its interpretation of the term ''facility'' in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

SEC. 802. FACILITY DEFINED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission (the

''Commission'') shall adopt regulations to further interpret the term ''facility'' under section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Such regulations shall set forth the facts and circumstances the Commission considers when determining whether any premises or property, or the right to use any premises, property, or service is or is not a facility of an exchange.

(b) APPLICATION TO PROPOSED RULES.—The Commission shall apply the facts and circumstances set forth in the regulations issued pursuant to subsection (a) in determining whether any proposed rule is or is not required to be submitted as a proposed rule filing pursuant to section 19 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the rules and regulations issued thereunder.

TITLE IX—ENCOURAGING PUBLIC OFFERINGS

SEC. 901. EXPANDING TESTING THE WATERS AND CONFIDENTIAL SUBMISSIONS.

The Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 5(d)—

(A) by striking ''Notwithstanding'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding'';

(B) by striking ''an emerging growth company or any person authorized to act on behalf of an emerging growth company'' and inserting ''an issuer or any person authorized to act on behalf of an issuer''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may issue regulations, subject to public notice and comment, to impose such other terms, conditions, or requirements on the engaging in oral or written communications described under paragraph (1) by an issuer other than an emerging growth company as the Commission determines appropriate.

''(B) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Prior to any rulemaking described under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing a list of the findings supporting the basis of such rulemaking.''; and

(2) in section 6(e)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES'' and inserting ''DRAFT REGISTRATION STATEMENTS'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and

(C) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) PRIOR TO INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERING.—Any issuer, prior to its initial public offering date, may confidentially submit to the Commission a draft registration statement, for confidential nonpublic review by the staff of the Commission prior to public filing, provided that the initial confidential submission and all amendments thereto shall be publicly filed with the Commission not later than 15 days before the date on which the issuer conducts a road show (as defined under section 230.433(h)(4) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations) or, in the absence of a road show, at least 15 days prior to the requested effective date of the registration statement.

''(2) WITHIN 1 YEAR AFTER INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERING OR EXCHANGE REGISTRATION.—Any issuer, within the 1-year period following its initial public offering or its registration of a security under section 12(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, may confidentially submit to the Commission a draft registration statement, for confidential nonpublic review by the staff of the Commission prior to public filing, provided that the initial confidential submission and all amendments thereto shall be publicly filed with the Commission by a date and time prior to any requested effective date and time that the Commission determines is appropriate to protect investors.

''(3) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may issue regulations, subject to public notice and comment, to impose such other terms, conditions, or requirements on the submission of draft registration statements described under this subsection by an issuer other than an emerging growth company as the Commission determines appropriate.

''(B) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Prior to any rulemaking described under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing a list of the findings supporting the basis of such rulemaking.''.

TITLE X—FAMILY OFFICE TECHNICAL CORRECTION

SEC. 1001. ACCREDITED INVESTOR CLARIFICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), any family office or a family client of a family office, as defined in section 275.202(a)(11)(G)–1 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be deemed to be an accredited investor, as defined in Regulation D of the Securities and Exchange Commission (or any successor thereto) under the Securities Act of 1933.

(b) LIMITATION.—Subsection (a) only applies to a family office with assets under management in excess of $5,000,000, and a family office or a family client not formed for the specific purpose of acquiring the securities offered, and whose purchase is directed by a person who has such knowledge and experience in financial and business matters that such person is capable of evaluating the merits and risks of the prospective investment.

TITLE XI—EXPANDING ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR RURAL JOB CREATORS

SEC. 1101. ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR RURAL-AREA SMALL BUSINESSES.

Section 4(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph(4)(C), by inserting ''rural-area small businesses,'' after ''women-owned small businesses,''; and

(2) in paragraph (6)(B)(iii), by inserting ''rural-area small businesses,'' after ''women-owned small businesses,''.

TITLE XII—FINANCIAL INSTITUTION LIVING WILL IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 1201. LIVING WILL REFORMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 165(d) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5365(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''periodically'' and inserting ''every 2 years''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''The Board'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board'';

(B) by striking ''shall review'' and inserting the following: ''shall—

''(i) review'';

(C) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date the company submits the resolution plan, provide feedback to the company on such plan.

''(B) DISCLOSURE OF ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK.—The Board of Governors and the Corporation shall publicly disclose the assessment framework that is used to review information under this paragraph.''.

(b) TREATMENT OF OTHER RESOLUTION PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an appropriate Federal banking agency that requires a banking organization to submit to the agency a resolution plan not described under section 165(d) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act—

(A) the respective agency shall ensure that the review of such resolution plan is consistent with the requirements contained in the amendments made by this section;

(B) the agency may not require the submission of such a resolution plan more often than every 2 years; and

(C) paragraphs (6) and (7) of such section 165(d) shall apply to such a resolution plan.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

(A) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.—The term ''appropriate Federal banking agency''—

(i) has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; and

(ii) means the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(B) BANKING ORGANIZATION.—The term ''banking organization'' means—

(i) an insured depository institution;

(ii) an insured credit union;

(iii) a depository institution holding company;

(iv) a company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of section 8 of the International Banking Act; and

(v) a U.S. intermediate holding company established by a foreign banking organization pursuant to section 252.153 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(C) INSURED CREDIT UNION.—The term ''insured credit union'' has the meaning given that term under section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act.

(D) OTHER BANKING TERMS.—The terms ''depository institution holding company'' and ''insured depository institution'' have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section, or any amendment made by this section, shall be construed as limiting the authority of an appropriate Federal banking agency (as defined under subsection (b)(2)) to obtain information from an institution in connection with such agency's authority to examine or require reports from the institution.

TITLE XIII—PREVENTION OF PRIVATE INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

SEC. 1301. CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURES.

Section 165 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(l) CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURES.—Section 552a(i)(1) of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to a determination made under subsection (d) or (i) based on individually identifiable information submitted pursuant to the requirements of this section to the same extent as such section 552a(i)(1) applies to agency records which contain individually identifiable information the disclosure of which is prohibited by such section 552a or by rules or regulations established thereunder.''.

TITLE XIV—INTERNATIONAL INSURANCE STANDARDS

SEC. 1401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''International Insurance Standards Act of 2018''.

SEC. 1402. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The State-based system for insurance regulation in the United States has served American consumers well for more than 150 years and has fostered an open and competitive marketplace with a diversity of insurance products to the benefit of policyholders and consumers.

(2) Protecting policyholders by regulating to ensure an insurer's ability to pay claims has been the hallmark of the successful United States system and should be the paramount objective of domestic prudential regulation and emerging international standards.

(3) The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111–203) reaffirmed the State-based insurance regulatory system.

SEC. 1403. REQUIREMENT THAT INSURANCE STANDARDS REFLECT UNITED STATES POLICY.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Parties representing the Federal Government in any international regulatory, standard-setting, or supervisory forum or in any negotiations of any international agreements relating to the prudential aspects of insurance shall not agree to, accede to, accept, or establish any proposed agreement or standard if the proposed agreement or standard fails to recognize the United States system of insurance regulation as satisfying such proposals.

(2) INAPPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any forum or negotiations relating to a covered agreement (as such term is defined in section 313(r) of title 31, United States Code).

(b) FEDERAL INSURANCE OFFICE FUNCTIONS.—Subparagraph (E) of section 313(c)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''Federal Government'' after ''United States''.

(c) NEGOTIATIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent participation in negotiations of any proposed agreement or standard.

SEC. 1404. STATE INSURANCE REGULATOR INVOLVEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SETTING.

In developing international insurance standards pursuant to section 1403, and throughout the negotiations of such standards, parties representing the Federal Government shall, on matters related to insurance, closely consult, coordinate with, and seek to include in such meetings State insurance commissioners or, at the option of the State insurance commissioners, designees of the insurance commissioners acting at their direction.

SEC. 1405. CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Parties representing the Federal Government with respect to any agreement under section 1403 shall provide written notice to and consult with the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and any other relevant committees of jurisdiction—

(1) before initiating negotiations to enter into the agreement, regarding—

(A) the intention of the United States to participate in or enter into such negotiations; and

(B) the nature and objectives of the negotiations; and

(2) during negotiations to enter into the agreement, regarding—

(A) the nature and objectives of the negotiations

(B) the implementation of the agreement, including how it is consistent with and does not materially differ from or otherwise affect Federal or State laws or regulations;

(C) the impact on the competitiveness of United States insurers; and

(D) the impact on United States consumers.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE.—Before entering into an agreement under section 1403, the Secretary of the Treasury shall seek to consult with the Federal Advisory Committee on Insurance formed pursuant to section 313(h) of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 1406. REPORT TO CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL INSURANCE AGREEMENTS.

Before entering into an agreement under section 1403, parties representing the Federal Government shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report that describes —

(1) the implementation of the agreement, including how it is consistent with and does not materially differ from or otherwise affect Federal or State laws or regulations;

(2) the impact on the competitiveness of United States insurers; and

(3) the impact on United States consumers.

SEC. 1407. COVERED AGREEMENTS.

(a) PREEMPTION OF STATE INSURANCE MEASURES.—Subsection (f) of section 313 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Director'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Secretary''.

(b) DEFINITION.—Paragraph (2) of section 313(r) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) applies only on a prospective basis.''.

(c) CONSULTATION; SUBMISSION AND LAYOVER; CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.—Section 314 of title 31, United States Code is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking ''laws'' and inserting the following: ''and Federal law, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of such laws that would be required to carry out a covered agreement''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) ACCESS TO NEGOTIATING TEXTS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS.—Appropriate congressional committees and staff with proper security clearances shall be given timely access to United States negotiating proposals, consolidated draft texts, and other pertinent documents related to the negotiations, including classified materials.'';

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

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

''(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSULTATIONS WITH STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS.—Throughout the negotiations of a covered agreement, parties representing the Federal Government shall closely consult and coordinate with State insurance commissioners.'';

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''only if—'' and inserting the following: ''only if, before signing the final legal text or otherwise entering into the agreement—'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''congressional committees specified in subsection (b)(1)'' and inserting ''appropriate congressional committees and leadership and to congressional committee staff with proper security clearances''; and

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2)(A) the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the copy of the final legal text of the agreement is submitted under paragraph (1) to the congressional committees, leadership, and staff has expired; and

''(B) the covered agreement has not been prevented from taking effect pursuant to subsection (e).''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(e) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—During the layover period referred to in subsection (d)(2)(A), the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Finance of the Senate and the Committees on Financial Services and Ways of Means of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, exercise their full oversight responsibility.

''(2) EFFECT OF ENACTMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a covered agreement submitted under subsection (d)(1) is enacted in accordance with subsection (f), the covered agreement shall not enter into force with respect to the United States.

''(f) JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL.—

''(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'joint resolution of disapproval' means, with respect to proposed covered agreement, only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

''(A) that is introduced during the 90-day period referred to in subsection (d)(2)(A) relating to such proposed covered agreement;

''(B) which does not have a preamble;

''(C) the title of which is as follows: 'A joint resolution disapproving a certain proposed covered agreement under section 314 of title 31, United States Code.'; and

''(D) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: 'Congress disapproves of the proposed covered agreement submitted to Congress under section 314(c)(1) of title 31, United States Code, on _____ relating to _____.', with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed covered agreement.

''(2) INTRODUCTION.—During the layover period referred to in subsection (d)(2)(A), a joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced—

''(A) in the House of Representatives, by any Member of the House, and

''(B) in the Senate, by any Senator,

and shall be referred to the appropriate committees.

''(3) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

''(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

''(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''(g) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'appropriate congressional committees and leadership' means—

''(1) the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and Finance, and the majority and minority leaders, of the Senate; and

''(2) the Committees on Financial Services and Ways and Means, and the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader, of the House of Representatives.''.

SEC. 1408. INAPPLICABILITY TO TRADE AGREEMENTS.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall not apply to any forum or negotiations related to a trade agreement.

TITLE XV—ALLEVIATING STRESS TEST BURDENS TO HELP INVESTORS

SEC. 1501. STRESS TEST RELIEF FOR NONBANKS.

Section 165(i)(2) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5365(i)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''are regulated by a primary Federal financial regulatory agency'' and inserting: ''whose primary financial regulatory agency is a Federal banking agency or the Federal Housing Finance Agency'';

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''Each Federal primary financial regulatory agency'' and inserting ''Each Federal banking agency and the Federal Housing Finance Agency''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) SEC AND CFTC.—The Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission may each issue regulations requiring financial companies with respect to which they are the primary financial regulatory agency to conduct periodic analyses of the financial condition, including available liquidity, of such companies under adverse economic conditions.''.

TITLE XVI—NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COMBATING THE FINANCING OF TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 1601. NATIONAL STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, acting through the Secretary of the Treasury, shall, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, the Director of the United States Secret Service, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and the Federal functional regulators, develop a national strategy to combat the financial networks of transnational organized criminals.

(b) TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate Congressional committees and make available to the relevant government agencies as defined in subsection (a), a comprehensive national strategy in accordance with subsection (a).

(2) UPDATES.—After the initial submission of the national strategy under paragraph (1), the President shall, not less often than every 2 years, update the national strategy and submit the updated strategy to the appropriate Congressional committees.

(c) SEPARATE PRESENTATION OF CLASSIFIED MATERIAL.—Any part of the national strategy that involves information that is properly classified under criteria established by the President shall be submitted to Congress separately in a classified annex and, if requested by the chairman or ranking member of one of the appropriate Congressional committees, as a briefing at an appropriate level of security.

SEC. 1602. CONTENTS OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.

The national strategy described in section 1601 shall contain the following:

(1) THREATS.—An identification and assessment of the most significant current transnational organized crime threats posed to the national security of the United States or to the U.S. and international financial system, including drug and human trafficking organizations, cyber criminals, kleptocrats, and other relevant state and non-state entities, including those threats identified in the President's ''Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime'' (published July 2011).

(2) ILLICIT FINANCE.—(A) An identification of individuals, entities, and networks (including terrorist organizations, if any) that provide financial support or financial facilitation to transnational organized crime groups, and an assessment of the scope and role of those providing financial support to transnational organized crime groups.

(B) An assessment of methods by which transnational organized crime groups launder illicit proceeds, including money laundering using real estate and other tangible goods such as art and antiquities, trade-based money laundering, bulk cash smuggling, exploitation of shell companies, and misuse of digital currencies and other cyber technologies, as well as an assessment of the risk to the financial system of the United States of such methods.

(3) GOALS, OBJECTIVES, PRIORITIES, AND ACTIONS.—(A) A comprehensive, research-based discussion of short-term and long-term goals, objectives, priorities, and actions, listed for each department and agency described under section 1601(a), for combating the financing of transnational organized crime groups and their facilitators.

(B) A description of how the strategy is integrated into, and supports, the national security strategy, drug control strategy, and counterterrorism strategy of the United States.

(4) REVIEWS AND PROPOSED CHANGES.—A review of current efforts to combat the financing or financial facilitation of transnational organized crime, including efforts to detect, deter, disrupt, and prosecute transnational organized crime groups and their supporters, and, if appropriate, proposed changes to any law or regulation determined to be appropriate to ensure that the United States pursues coordinated and effective efforts within the jurisdiction of the United States, including efforts or actions that are being taken or can be taken by financial institutions, efforts in cooperation with international partners of the United States, and efforts that build partnerships and global capacity to combat transnational organized crime.

SEC. 1603. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

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

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

(B) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL REGULATOR.—The term ''Federal functional regulator'' has the meaning given that term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809).

(3) TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME.—The term ''transnational organized crime'' refers to those self-perpetuating associations of individuals who operate transnationally for the purpose of obtaining power, influence, monetary or commercial gains, wholly or in part by illegal means, while—

(A) protecting their activities through a pattern of corruption or violence; or

(B) while protecting their illegal activities through a transnational organizational structure and the exploitation of transnational commerce or communication mechanisms.

TITLE XVII—COMMON SENSE CREDIT UNION CAPITAL RELIEF

SEC. 1701. DELAY IN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding any effective date set forth in the rule issued by the National Credit Union Administration titled ''Risk-Based Capital'' (published at 80 Fed. Reg. 66626 (October 29, 2015)), such final rule shall take effect on January 1, 2021.

TITLE XVIII—OPTIONS MARKETS STABILITY

SEC. 1801. RULEMAKING.

Within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Comptroller of the Currency shall, jointly, issue a proposed rule, and finalize such rule within 360 days of the date of enactment of this Act, to adopt a methodology for calculating the counterparty credit risk exposure, at default, of a depository institution, depository institution holding company, or affiliate thereof to a client arising from a guarantee provided by the depository institution, depository institution holding company, or affiliate thereof to a central counterparty in respect of the client's performance under an exchange-listed derivative contract cleared through that central counterparty pursuant to the risk-based and leverage-based capital rules applicable to depository institutions and depository institution holding companies under parts 3, 217, and 324 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations. In issuing such rule, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Comptroller of the Currency shall consider—

(1) the availability of liquidity provided by market makers during times of high volatility in the capital markets;

(2) the spread between the bid and the quote offered by market makers;

(3) the preference for clearing through central counterparties;

(4) the safety and soundness of the financial system and financial stability, including the benefits of central clearing;

(5) the safety and soundness of individual institutions that may centrally clear exchange-listed derivatives or options on behalf of a client, including concentration of market share;

(6) the economic value of delta weighting a counterparty's position and netting of a counterparty's position;

(7) the inherent risk of the positions;

(8) barriers to entry for depository institutions, depository institution holding companies, affiliates thereof, and entities not affiliated with a depository institution or depository institution holding company to centrally clear exchange-listed derivatives or options on behalf of market makers;

(9) the impact any changes may have on the broader capital regime and aggregate capital in the system; and

(10) consideration of other potential factors that impact market making in the exchange-listed options market, including changes in market structure.

SEC. 1802. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

At the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date the final rule is issued under section 1801, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall submit to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report detailing the impact of the final rule during such period on the factors described under paragraphs (1) through (10) of section 1801.

TITLE XIX—COOPERATE WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES AND WATCH

SEC. 1901. SAFE HARBOR WITH RESPECT TO KEEP OPEN LETTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 5333. Safe harbor with respect to keep open letters

''(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a customer account or customer transaction of a financial institution, if a Federal, State, Tribal, or local law enforcement agency requests, in writing, the financial institution to keep such account or transaction open—

''(1) the financial institution shall not be liable under this subchapter for maintaining such account or transaction consistent with the parameters of the request; and

''(2) no Federal or State department or agency may take any adverse supervisory action under this subchapter with respect to the financial institution for maintaining such account or transaction consistent with the parameters of the request.

''(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

''(1) from preventing a Federal or State department or agency from verifying the validity of a written request described under subsection (a) with the Federal, State, Tribal, or local law enforcement agency making the written request; or

''(2) to relieve a financial institution from complying with any reporting requirements, including the reporting of suspicious transactions under section 5318(g).

''(c) LETTER TERMINATION DATE.—For purposes of this section, any written request described under subsection (a) shall include a termination date after which such request shall no longer apply.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5332 the following:

''5333. Safe harbor with respect to keep open letters.''.

TITLE XX—MAIN STREET GROWTH

SEC. 2001. VENTURE EXCHANGES.

(a) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—Section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) VENTURE EXCHANGE.—

''(1) REGISTRATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A person may register themself (and a national securities exchange may register a listing tier of such exchange) as a national securities exchange solely for the purposes of trading venture securities by filing an application with the Commission pursuant to subsection (a) and the rules and regulations thereunder.

''(B) PUBLICATION OF NOTICE.—The Commission shall, upon the filing of an application under subparagraph (A), publish notice of such filing and afford interested persons an opportunity to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning such application.

''(C) APPROVAL OR DENIAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Within 90 days of the date of publication of a notice under subparagraph (B) (or within such longer period as to which the applicant consents), the Commission shall—

''(I) by order grant such registration; or

''(II) institute a denial proceeding under clause (ii) to determine whether registration should be denied.

''(ii) DENIAL PROCEEDING.—A proceeding under clause (i)(II) shall include notice of the grounds for denial under consideration and opportunity for hearing and shall be concluded within 180 days of the date of the publication of a notice under subparagraph (B). At the conclusion of such proceeding the Commission, by order, shall grant or deny such registration. The Commission may extend the time for conclusion of such proceeding for up to 90 days if the Commission finds good cause for such extension and publishes the Commission's reasons for so finding or for such longer period as to which the applicant consents.

''(iii) CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OR DENIAL.—The Commission shall grant a registration under this paragraph if the Commission finds that the requirements of this title and the rules and regulations thereunder with respect to the applicant are satisfied. The Commission shall deny such registration if it does not make such finding.

''(2) POWERS AND RESTRICTIONS.—In addition to the powers and restrictions otherwise applicable to a national securities exchange, a venture exchange—

''(A) may only constitute, maintain, or provide a market place or facilities for bringing together purchasers and sellers of venture securities;

''(B) may not extend unlisted trading privileges to any venture security;

''(C) may only, if the venture exchange is a listing tier of another national securities exchange, allow trading in securities that are registered under section 12(b) on a national securities exchange other than a venture exchange; and

''(D) may, subject to the rule filing process under section 19(b)—

''(i) determine the increment to be used for quoting and trading venture securities on the exchange; and

''(ii) choose to carry out periodic auctions for the sale of a venture security instead of providing continuous trading of the venture security.

''(3) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN EXEMPTED SECURITIES.—A security that is exempt from registration pursuant to section 3(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 shall be exempt from section 12(a) of this title to the extent such securities are traded on a venture exchange, if the issuer of such security is in compliance with—

''(A) all disclosure obligations of such section 3(b) and the regulations issued under such section; and

''(B) ongoing disclosure obligations of the applicable venture exchange that are similar to those provided by an issuer under tier 2 of Regulation A (17 C.F.R. 230.251 et seq.).

''(4) VENTURE SECURITIES TRADED ON VENTURE EXCHANGES MAY NOT TRADE ON NON-VENTURE EXCHANGES.—A venture security may not be traded on a national securities exchange that is not a venture exchange during any period in which the venture security is being traded on a venture exchange.

''(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed as requiring transactions in venture securities to be effected on a national securities exchange.

''(6) COMMISSION AUTHORITY TO LIMIT CERTAIN TRADING.—The Commission may limit transactions in venture securities that are not effected on a national securities exchange as appropriate to promote efficiency, competition, capital formation, and to protect investors.

''(7) DISCLOSURES TO INVESTORS.—The Commission shall issue regulations to ensure that persons selling or purchasing venture securities on a venture exchange are provided disclosures sufficient to understand—

''(A) the characteristics unique to venture securities; and

''(B) in the case of a venture exchange that is a listing tier of another national securities exchange, that the venture exchange is distinct from the other national securities exchange.

''(8) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

''(A) EARLY-STAGE, GROWTH COMPANY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'early-stage, growth company' means an issuer—

''(I) that has not made any registered initial public offering of any securities of the issuer; and

''(II) with a public float of less than or equal to the value of public float required to qualify as a large accelerated filer under section 240.12b–2 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations.

''(ii) TREATMENT WHEN PUBLIC FLOAT EXCEEDS THRESHOLD.—An issuer shall not cease to be an early-stage, growth company by reason of the public float of such issuer exceeding the threshold specified in clause (i)(II) until the later of the following:

''(I) The end of the period of 24 consecutive months during which the public float of the issuer exceeds $2,000,000,000 (as such amount is indexed for inflation every 5 years by the Commission to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, setting the threshold to the nearest $1,000,000).

''(II) The end of the 1-year period following the end of the 24-month period described under subclause (I), if the issuer requests such 1-year extension from a venture exchange and the venture exchange elects to provide such extension.

''(B) PUBLIC FLOAT.—With respect to an issuer, the term 'public float' means the aggregate worldwide market value of the voting and non-voting common equity of the issuer held by non-affiliates.

''(C) VENTURE SECURITY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'venture security' means—

''(I) securities of an early-stage, growth company that are exempt from registration pursuant to section 3(b) of the Securities Act of 1933;

''(II) securities of an emerging growth company; or

''(III) securities registered under section 12(b) and listed on a venture exchange (or, prior to listing on a venture exchange, listed on a national securities exchange) where—

''(aa) the issuer of such securities has a public float less than or equal to the value of public float required to qualify as a large accelerated filer under section 240.12b–2 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations; or

''(bb) the average daily trade volume is 75,000 shares or less during a continuous 60-day period.

''(ii) TREATMENT WHEN PUBLIC FLOAT EXCEEDS THRESHOLD.—Securities shall not cease to be venture securities by reason of the public float of the issuer of such securities exceeding the threshold specified in clause (i)(III)(aa) until the later of the following:

''(I) The end of the period of 24 consecutive months beginning on the date—

''(aa) the public float of such issuer exceeds $2,000,000,000; and

''(bb) the average daily trade volume of such securities is 100,000 shares or more during a continuous 60-day period.

''(II) The end of the 1-year period following the end of the 24-month period described under subclause (I), if the issuer of such securities requests such 1-year extension from a venture exchange and the venture exchange elects to provide such extension.''.

(b) SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—Section 18 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) TREATMENT OF SECURITIES LISTED ON A VENTURE EXCHANGE.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), a security is not a covered security pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(A) if the security is only listed, or authorized for listing, on a venture exchange (as defined under section 6(m) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934).''.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Securities and Exchange Commission should—

(1) when necessary or appropriate in the public interest and consistent with the protection of investors, make use of the Commission's general exemptive authority under section 36 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78mm) with respect to the provisions added by this section; and

(2) if the Commission determines appropriate, create an Office of Venture Exchanges within the Commission's Division of Trading and Markets.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to impair or limit the construction of the antifraud provisions of the securities laws (as defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a))) or the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission under those provisions.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE FOR TIERS OF EXISTING NATIONAL SECURITIES EXCHANGES.—In the case of a securities exchange that is registered as a national securities exchange under section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78f) on the date of the enactment of this Act, any election for a listing tier of such exchange to be treated as a venture exchange under subsection (m) of such section shall not take effect before the date that is 180 days after such date of enactment.

TITLE XXI—BUILDING UP INDEPENDENT LIVES AND DREAMS

SEC. 2101. MORTGAGE LOAN TRANSACTION DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) TILA AMENDMENT.—Section 105 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1604) is amended by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) DISCLOSURE FOR CHARITABLE MORTGAGE LOAN TRANSACTIONS.—With respect to a mortgage loan transaction involving a residential mortgage loan offered at zero percent interest primarily for charitable purposes by an organization having tax-exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, forms HUD–1 and GFE (as defined under section 1024.2(b) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations), together with a disclosure substantially in the form of the Loan Model Form H–2 (as defined under Appendix H to section 1026 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations) shall, collectively, be an appropriate model form for purposes of subsection (b).''.

(b) RESPA AMENDMENT.—Section 4 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2603) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) With respect to a mortgage loan transaction involving a residential mortgage loan offered at zero percent interest primarily for charitable purposes, an organization having tax-exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may use forms HUD–1 and GFE (as defined under section 1024.2(b) of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations) together with a disclosure substantially in the form of the Loan Model Form H–2 (as defined under Appendix H to section 1026 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations), collectively, in lieu of the disclosure published under subsection (a).''.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to implement the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE XXII—MODERNIZING DISCLOSURES FOR INVESTORS

SEC. 2201. FORM 10–Q ANALYSIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall conduct an analysis of the costs and benefits of requiring reporting companies to use Form 10–Q for submitting quarterly financial reports. Such analysis shall consider—

(1) the costs and benefits of Form 10–Q to emerging growth companies;

(2) the costs and benefits of Form 10–Q to the Commission in terms of its ability to protect investors, maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets, and facilitate capital formation;

(3) the costs and benefits of Form 10–Q to other reporting companies, investors, market researchers, and other market participants, including the costs and benefits associated with—

(A) the public availability of the information required to be filed on Form 10–Q;

(B) the use of a standardized reporting format across all classes of reporting companies; and

(C) the quarterly disclosure by some companies of financial information in formats other than Form 10–Q, such as a quarterly earnings press release;

(4) the costs and benefits of alternative formats for quarterly reporting for emerging growth companies to emerging growth companies, the Commission, other reporting companies, investors, market researchers, and other market participants; and

(5) the expected impact of the use of alternative formats of quarterly reporting by emerging growth companies on overall market transparency and efficiency.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a report to Congress that includes—

(1) the results of the analysis required by subsection (a); and

(2) recommendations for decreasing costs, increasing transparency, and increasing efficiency of quarterly financial reporting by emerging growth companies.

TITLE XXIII—FIGHT ILLICIT NETWORKS AND DETECT TRAFFICKING

SEC. 2301. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) According to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) 2017 National Drug Threat Assessment, transnational criminal organizations are increasingly using virtual currencies.

(2) The Treasury Department has recognized that: ''The development of virtual currencies is an attempt to meet a legitimate market demand. According to a Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago economist, United States consumers want payment options that are versatile and that provide immediate finality. No United States payment method meets that description, although cash may come closest. Virtual currencies can mimic cash's immediate finality and anonymity and are more versatile than cash for online and cross-border transactions, making virtual currencies vulnerable for illicit transactions.''.

(3) Virtual currencies have become a prominent method to pay for goods and services associated with illegal sex trafficking and drug trafficking, which are two of the most detrimental and troubling illegal activities facilitated by online marketplaces.

(4) Online marketplaces, including the dark web, have become a prominent platform to buy, sell, and advertise for illicit goods and services associated with sex trafficking and drug trafficking.

(5) According to the International Labour Organization, in 2016, 4.8 million people in the world were victims of forced sexual exploitation, and in 2014, the global profit from commercial sexual exploitation was $99 billion.

(6) In 2016, within the United States, the Center for Disease Control estimated that there were 64,000 deaths related to drug overdose, and the most severe increase in drug overdoses were those associated with fentanyl and fentanyl analogs (synthetic opioids), which amounted to over 20,000 overdose deaths.

(7) According to the United States Department of the Treasury 2015 National Money Laundering Risk Assessment, an estimated $64 billion is generated annually from United States drug trafficking sales.

(8) Illegal fentanyl in the United States originates primarily from China, and it is readily available to purchase through online marketplaces.

SEC. 2302. GAO STUDY.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on how virtual currencies and online marketplaces are used to facilitate sex and drug trafficking. The study shall consider—

(1) how online marketplaces, including the dark web, are being used as platforms to buy, sell, or facilitate the financing of goods or services associated with sex trafficking or drug trafficking (specifically, opioids and synthetic opioids, including fentanyl, fentanyl analogs, and any precursor chemicals associated with manufacturing fentanyl or fentanyl analogs) destined for, originating from, or within the United States;

(2) how financial payment methods, including virtual currencies and peer-to-peer mobile payment services, are being utilized by online marketplaces to facilitate the buying, selling, or financing of goods and services associated with sex or drug trafficking destined for, originating from, or within the United States;

(3) how virtual currencies are being used to facilitate the buying, selling, or financing of goods and services associated with sex or drug trafficking, destined for, originating from, or within the United States, when an online platform is not otherwise involved;

(4) how illicit funds that have been transmitted online and through virtual currencies are repatriated into the formal banking system of the United States through money laundering or other means;

(5) the participants (state and non-state actors) throughout the entire supply chain that participate in or benefit from the buying, selling, or financing of goods and services associated with sex or drug trafficking (either through online marketplaces or virtual currencies) destined for, originating from, or within the United States;

(6) Federal and State agency efforts to impede the buying, selling, or financing of goods and services associated with sex or drug trafficking destined for, originating from, or within the United States, including efforts to prevent the proceeds from sex or drug trafficking from entering the United States banking system;

(7) how virtual currencies and their underlying technologies can be used to detect and deter these illicit activities; and

(8) to what extent can the immutable and traceable nature of virtual currencies contribute to the tracking and prosecution of illicit funding.

(b) SCOPE.—For the purposes of the study required under subsection (a), the term ''sex

trafficking'' means the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting of a person for the purpose of a commercial sex act that is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age.

(c) 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 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report summarizing the results of the study required under subsection (a), together with any recommendations for legislative or regulatory action that would improve the efforts of Federal agencies to impede the use of virtual currencies and online marketplaces in facilitating sex and drug trafficking.

TITLE XXIV—IMPROVING INVESTMENT RESEARCH FOR SMALL AND EMERGING ISSUERS

SEC. 2401. RESEARCH STUDY.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall conduct a study to evaluate the issues affecting the provision of and reliance upon investment research into small issuers, including emerging growth companies and companies considering initial public offerings.

(b) CONTENTS OF STUDY.—The study required under subsection (a) shall consider—

(1) factors related to the demand for such research by institutional and retail investors;

(2) the availability of such research, including—

(A) the number and types of firms who provide such research;

(B) the volume of such research over time; and

(C) competition in the research market;

(3) conflicts of interest relating to the production and distribution of investment research;

(4) the costs of such research;

(5) the impacts of different payment mechanisms for investment research into small issuers, including whether such research is paid for by—

(A) hard-dollar payments from research clients;

(B) payments directed from the client's commission income (i.e., ''soft dollars''); or

(C) payments from the issuer that is the subject of such research;

(6) any unique challenges faced by minority-owned, women-owned, and veteran-owned small issuers in obtaining research coverage; and

(7) the impact on the availability of research coverage for small issuers due to—

(A) investment adviser concentration and consolidation, including any potential impacts of fund-size on demand for investment research of small issuers;

(B) broker and dealer concentration and consolidation, including any relationships between the size of the firm and allocation of resources for investment research into small issuers;

(C) Securities and Exchange Commission rules;

(D) registered national securities association rules;

(E) State and Federal liability concerns;

(F) the settlement agreements referenced in Securities and Exchange Commission Litigation Release No. 18438 (i.e., the ''Global Research Analyst Settlement''); and

(G) Directive 2014/65/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 May 2014 on markets in financial instruments and amending Directive 2002/92/EC and Directive 2011/61/EU, as implemented by the European Union (''EU'') member states (''MiFID II'').

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) the results of the study required by subsection (a); and

(2) recommendations to increase the demand for, volume of, and quality of investment research into small issuers, including emerging growth companies and companies considering initial public offerings.

TITLE XXV—DEVELOPING AND EMPOWERING OUR ASPIRING LEADERS

SEC. 2501. DEFINITIONS.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall—

(1) revise the definition of a qualifying investment under paragraph (c) of section 275.203(l)–1 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to include an equity security issued by a qualifying portfolio company, whether acquired directly from the company or in a secondary acquisition; and

(2) revise paragraph (a) of such section to require, as a condition of a private fund qualifying as a venture capital fund under such paragraph, that the qualifying investments of the private fund are predominantly qualifying investments that were acquired directly from a qualifying portfolio company.

TITLE XXVI—EXPANDING INVESTMENT IN SMALL BUSINESSES

SEC. 2601. SEC STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall carry out a study of the 10 per centum threshold limitation applicable to the definition of a diversified company under section 5(b)(1) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–5(b)(1)) and determine whether such threshold limits capital formation.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out the study required under subsection (a), the Commission shall consider the following:

(1) The size and number of diversified companies that are currently restricted in their ability to own more than 10 percent of the voting shares in an individual company.

(2) If investing preferences of diversified companies have shifted away from companies with smaller market capitalizations.

(3) The expected increase in the availability of capital to small and emerging growth companies if the threshold is increased.

(4) The ability of registered funds to manage liquidity risk.

(5) Any other consideration that the Commission considers necessary and appropriate for the protection of investors.

(c) SOLICITATION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS.—In carrying out the study required under subsection (a), the Commission may solicit public comments.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress, and make such report publicly available on the website of the Commission, containing—

(1) all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a); and

(2) any legislative recommendations of the Commission, including any recommendation to update the 10 per centum threshold.

TITLE XXVII—PROMOTING TRANSPARENT STANDARDS FOR CORPORATE INSIDERS

SEC. 2701. SEC STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall carry out a study of whether Rule 10b5–1 (17 C.F.R. 240.10b5–1) should be amended to—

(A) limit the ability of issuers and issuer insiders to adopt a plan described under paragraph (c)(1)(i)(A)(3) of Rule 10b5–1 (''trading plan'') when the issuer or issuer insider is permitted to buy or sell securities during issuer-adopted trading windows;

(B) limit the ability of issuers and issuer insiders to adopt multiple, overlapping trading plans;

(C) establish a mandatory delay between the adoption of a trading plan and the execution of the first trade pursuant to such a plan and, if so and depending on the Commission's findings with respect to subparagraph (A)—

(i) whether any such delay should be the same for trading plans adopted during an issuer-adopted trading window as opposed to outside of such a window; and

(ii) whether any exceptions to such a delay are appropriate;

(D) limit the frequency that issuers and issuer insiders may modify or cancel trading plans;

(E) require issuers and issuer insiders to file with the Commission trading plan adoptions, amendments, terminations and transactions; or

(F) require boards of issuers that have adopted a trading plan to—

(i) adopt policies covering trading plan practices;

(ii) periodically monitor trading plan transactions; and

(iii) ensure that issuer policies discuss trading plan use in the context of guidelines or requirements on equity hedging, holding, and ownership.

(2) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out the study required under paragraph (1), the Commission shall consider—

(A) how any such amendments may clarify and enhance existing prohibitions against insider trading;

(B) the impact any such amendments may have on the ability of issuers to attract persons to become an issuer insider;

(C) the impact any such amendments may have on capital formation;

(D) the impact any such amendments may have on an issuer's willingness to operate as a public company; and

(E) any other consideration that the Commission considers necessary and appropriate for the protection of investors.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue 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 containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under section (a).

(c) RULEMAKING.—After the completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Commission shall, subject to public notice and comment, revise Rule 10b5–1 consistent with the results of such study.

TITLE XXVIII—INVESTMENT ADVISER REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 2801. DEFINITION OF SMALL BUSINESS OF SMALL ORGANIZATION.

Not later than end the of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise the definitions of a ''small business'' and ''small organization'' under section 275.0–7 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to provide alternative methods under which a business or organization may qualify as a ''small business'' or ''small organization'' under such section. In

making such revision, the Commission shall consider whether such alternative methods should include a threshold based on the number of non-clerical employees of the business or organization.

TITLE XXIX—ENHANCING MULTI-CLASS SHARE DISCLOSURES

SEC. 2901. DISCLOSURE RELATING TO MULTI-CLASS SHARE STRUCTURES.

Section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78n) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) DISCLOSURE FOR ISSUERS WITH MULTI-CLASS SHARE STRUCTURES.—

''(1) DISCLOSURE.—The Commission shall, by rule, require each issuer with a multi-class share structure to disclose the information described in paragraph (2) in any proxy or consent solicitation material for an annual meeting of the shareholders of the issuer, or any other filing as the Commission determines appropriate.

''(2) CONTENT.—A disclosure made under paragraph (1) shall include, with respect to each person who is a director, director nominee, or named executive officer of the issuer, or who is the beneficial owner of securities with 5 percent or more of the total combined voting power of all classes of securities entitled to vote in the election of directors—

''(A) the number of shares of all classes of securities entitled to vote in the election of directors beneficially owned by such person, expressed as a percentage of the total number of the outstanding securities of the issuer entitled to vote in the election of directors; and

''(B) the amount of voting power held by such person, expressed as a percentage of the total combined voting power of all classes of the securities of the issuer entitled to vote in the election of directors.

''(3) MULTI-CLASS SHARE STRUCTURE.—In this subsection, the term 'multi-class share structure' means a capitalization structure that contains 2 or more classes of securities that have differing amounts of voting rights in the election of directors.''.

TITLE XXX—NATIONAL SENIOR INVESTOR INITIATIVE

SEC. 3001. SENIOR INVESTOR TASKFORCE.

Section 4 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) SENIOR INVESTOR TASKFORCE.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Commission the Senior Investor Taskforce (in this subsection referred to as the 'Taskforce').

''(2) DIRECTOR OF THE TASKFORCE.—The head of the Taskforce shall be the Director, who shall—

''(A) report directly to the Chairman; and

''(B) be appointed by the Chairman, in consultation with the Commission, from among individuals—

''(i) currently employed by the Commission or from outside of the Commission; and

''(ii) having experience in advocating for the interests of senior investors.

''(3) STAFFING.—The Chairman shall ensure that—

''(A) the Taskforce is staffed sufficiently to carry out fully the requirements of this subsection; and

''(B) such staff shall include individuals from the Division of Enforcement, Office of Compliance Inspections and Examinations, and Office of Investor Education and Advocacy.

''(4) MINIMIZING DUPLICATION OF EFFORTS.—In organizing and staffing the Taskforce, the Chairman shall take such actions as may be necessary to minimize the duplication of efforts within the divisions and offices described under paragraph (3)(B) and any other divisions, offices, or taskforces of the Commission.

''(5) FUNCTIONS OF THE TASKFORCE.—The Taskforce shall—

''(A) identify challenges that senior investors encounter, including problems associated with financial exploitation and cognitive decline;

''(B) identify areas in which senior investors would benefit from changes in the regulations of the Commission or the rules of self-regulatory organizations;

''(C) coordinate, as appropriate, with other offices within the Commission, other taskforces that may be established within the Commission, self-regulatory organizations, and the Elder Justice Coordinating Council; and

''(D) consult, as appropriate, with State securities and law enforcement authorities, State insurance regulators, and other Federal agencies.

''(6) REPORT.—The Taskforce, in coordination, as appropriate, with the Office of the Investor Advocate and self-regulatory organizations, and in consultation, as appropriate, with State securities and law enforcement authorities, State insurance regulators, and Federal agencies, shall issue a report every 2 years to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, the first of which shall not be issued until after the report described in section 3002 of the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act of 2018 has been issued and considered by the Taskforce, containing—

''(A) appropriate statistical information and full and substantive analysis;

''(B) a summary of recent trends and innovations that have impacted the investment landscape for senior investors;

''(C) a summary of regulatory initiatives that have concentrated on senior investors and industry practices related to senior investors;

''(D) key observations, best practices, and areas needing improvement, involving senior investors identified during examinations, enforcement actions, and investor education outreach;

''(E) a summary of the most serious issues encountered by senior investors, including issues involving financial products and services;

''(F) an analysis with regard to existing policies and procedures of brokers, dealers, investment advisers, and other market participants related to senior investors and senior investor-related topics and whether these policies and procedures need to be further developed or refined;

''(G) recommendations for such changes to the regulations, guidance, and orders of the Commission and self-regulatory organizations and such legislative actions as may be appropriate to resolve problems encountered by senior investors; and

''(H) any other information, as determined appropriate by the Director of the Taskforce.

''(7) SUNSET.—The Taskforce shall terminate after the end of the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection, but may be reestablished by the Chairman.

''(8) SENIOR INVESTOR DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'senior investor' means an investor over the age of 65.''.

SEC. 3002. GAO STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress and the Senior Investor Taskforce the results of a study on the economic costs of the financial exploitation of senior citizens.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include information with respect to—

(1) costs—

(A) associated with losses by victims that were incurred as a result of the financial exploitation of senior citizens;

(B) incurred by State and Federal agencies, law enforcement and investigatory agencies, public benefit programs, public health programs, and other public programs as a result of the financial exploitation of senior citizens; and

(C) incurred by the private sector as a result of the financial exploitation of senior citizens; and

(2) any other relevant costs that—

(A) result from the financial exploitation of senior citizens; and

(B) the Comptroller General determines are necessary and appropriate to include in order to provide Congress and the public with a full and accurate understanding of the economic costs resulting from the financial exploitation of senior citizens in the United States.

(c) SENIOR CITIZEN DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ''senior citizen'' means an individual over the age of 65.

TITLE XXXI—MIDDLE MARKET IPO UNDERWRITING COST

SEC. 3101. STUDY ON IPO FEES.

(a) STUDY.—The Securities and Exchange Commission, in consultation with the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, shall carry out a study of the costs associated with small- and medium-sized companies to undertake initial public offerings (''IPOs''). In carrying out such study, the Commission shall—

(1) consider the direct and indirect costs of an IPO, including—

(A) fees, such as gross spreads paid to underwriters, IPO advisors, and other professionals;

(B) compliance with Federal and State securities laws at the time of the IPO; and

(C) such other IPO-related costs as the Commission determines appropriate;

(2) compare and analyze the costs of an IPO with the costs of obtaining alternative sources of financing and of liquidity;

(3) consider the impact of such costs on capital formation;

(4) analyze the impact of these costs on the availability of public securities of small- and medium-sized companies to retail investors; and

(5) analyze trends in IPOs over a time period the Commission determines is appropriate to analyze IPO pricing practices, considering—

(A) the number of IPOs;

(B) how costs for IPOs have evolved over time, including fees paid to underwriters, investment advisory firms, and other professions for services in connection with an IPO;

(C) the number of brokers and dealers active in underwriting IPOs;

(D) the different types of services that underwriters and related persons provide before and after a small- or medium-sized company IPO and the factors impacting underwriting costs;

(E) changes in the costs and availability of investment research for small- and medium-sized companies; and

(F) any other consideration the Commission considers necessary and appropriate.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a) and any administrative or legislative recommendations the Commission may have.

TITLE XXXII—CROWDFUNDING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 3201. CROWDFUNDING VEHICLES.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—The Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2(a) (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)), by adding at the end the following:

''(20) The term 'crowdfunding vehicle' has the meaning given the term in section 3(c)(15)(B) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–3(c)(15)(B)).'';

(2) in section 4(a)(6) (15 U.S.C. 77d(a)(6))—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by inserting '', other than a crowdfunding vehicle,'' after ''sold to all investors''; and

(ii) by inserting ''other than a crowdfunding vehicle,'' after ''the issuer,''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting '', other than a crowdfunding vehicle,'' after ''any investor''; and

(3) in section 4A(f) (15 U.S.C. 77d–1(f))—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''Section 4(6)'' and inserting ''Section 4(a)(6)''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''by any of paragraphs (1) through (14) of'' before ''section 3(c)''.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940.—Section 3(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–3(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(15)(A) Any crowdfunding vehicle.

''(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'crowdfunding vehicle' means a company—

''(i) the purpose of which (as set forth in the organizational documents of the company) is limited to acquiring, holding, and disposing of securities issued by a single company in 1 or more transactions made under section 4(a)(6) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77d(a)(6));

''(ii) that issues only 1 class of securities;

''(iii) that receives no compensation in connection with the acquisition, holding, or disposition of securities described in clause (i);

''(iv) no investment adviser or associated person of which receives any compensation on the basis of a share of capital gains upon, or capital appreciation of, any portion of the funds of an investor of the company;

''(v) the securities of which have been issued in a transaction made under section 4(a)(6) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77d(a)(6)), where both the crowdfunding vehicle and the company whose securities the crowdfunding vehicle holds are co-issuers;

''(vi) that is current with respect to ongoing reporting requirements under section 227.202 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation;

''(vii) that holds securities of a company that is subject to ongoing reporting requirements under section 227.202 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation; and

''(viii) that is advised by an investment adviser that is—

''(I) registered under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b–1 et seq.); and

''(II) required to—

''(aa) disclose to the investors of the company any fees charged by the investment adviser; and

''(bb) obtain approval from a majority of the investors of the company with respect to any increase in the fees described in item (aa).''.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO THE INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.—The Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b–1 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 202(a) (15 U.S.C. 80b–2(a))—

(A) by redesignating the second paragraph (29) as paragraph (31); and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(32) The term 'crowdfunding vehicle' has the meaning given the term in section 3(c)(15)(B) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–3(c)(15)(B)).

''(33)(A) The term 'crowdfunding vehicle adviser' means an investment adviser that acts as an investment adviser solely with respect to crowdfunding vehicles.

''(B) A determination, for the purposes of subparagraph (A), regarding whether an investment adviser acts as an investment adviser solely with respect to crowdfunding vehicles shall not include any consideration of the activity of any affiliate of the investment adviser.'';

(2) in section 203 (15 U.S.C. 80b–3), by adding at the end the following:

''(o) CROWDFUNDING VEHICLE ADVISERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A crowdfunding vehicle adviser shall be required to register under this section.

''(2) TAILORED REQUIREMENTS.—As necessary or appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors, and to promote efficiency, competition, and capital formation, the Commission may tailor the requirements under section 275.206(4)–2 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, with respect to the application of those requirements to a crowdfunding vehicle adviser.''; and

(3) in section 203A(a) (15 U.S.C. 80b–3a(a))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) is a crowdfunding vehicle adviser.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''a crowdfunding vehicle adviser,'' after ''unless the investment adviser is''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting ''except with respect to a crowdfunding vehicle adviser,'' before ''has assets''.

SEC. 3202. CROWDFUNDING EXEMPTION FROM REGISTRATION.

Section 12(g)(6) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 781(g)(6)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Commission'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission'';

(2) in subparagraph (A), as so designated, by striking ''section 4(6)'' and inserting ''section 4(a)(6)''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) TREATMENT OF SECURITIES ISSUED BY CERTAIN ISSUERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An exemption under subparagraph (A) shall be unconditional for securities offered by an issuer that had a public float of less than $75,000,000, as of the last business day of the most recently completed semiannual period of the issuer, which shall be calculated in accordance with clause (ii).

''(ii) CALCULATION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—A public float described in clause (i) shall be calculated by multiplying the aggregate worldwide number of shares of the common equity securities of an issuer that are held by non-affiliates by the price at which those securities were last sold (or the average bid and asked prices of those securities) in the principal market for those securities.

''(II) CALCULATION OF ZERO.—If a public float calculation under subclause (I) with respect to an issuer is zero, an exemption under subparagraph (A) shall be unconditional for securities offered by the issuer if the issuer had annual revenues of less than $50,000,000, as of the most recently completed fiscal year of the issuer.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, two things that are vital to the American economy: number one, 3 percent economic growth, and number two, competing with China.

Three percent economic growth, Mr. Speaker, is so important because, when you look at the history of America, if you look at jobs that are created, if you look at increasing incomes, if you look at decreasing unemployment, this happens in our 3 percent-plus growth years, and that is why it is so great that America is once again seeing 3 percent-plus economic growth.

But, Mr. Speaker, can we keep it?

There are some alarming trends that we have to arrest, and that is that, unfortunately, entrepreneurship, that is, launching new businesses, recently hit a generational low. Companies that are going public—and 90 percent of the jobs that a company creates happen after they go public, IPOs, initial public offerings—they have been in a decline, a 20-year decline, and they have reached a new low.

If we look at what China is trying to do with their 2025 program, Mr. Speaker, and dominate the world in high tech and then we turn around and we see that China has over a third of the world's IPOs, America—our decline is now down to 11 percent—has got to change.

So thus, today, we are taking up the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act, also known as the JOBS Act 3.0.

What we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, number one, we are doing it on a bipartisan basis, but we are trying to ensure that our entrepreneurs at least don't face the challenge of having the capital they need to launch their companies, because, Mr. Speaker, when we have more small businesses that are launching new enterprises and going public and staying public, these are the Amazons and the Googles and the Microsofts of the future.

So, again, Members on both sides of the aisle have come together because, historically, capital formation has been a bipartisan issue here. We have come together, Democrat and Republican, to make sure that these small

businesses get this start. And we try to treat the whole capital formation ecosystem, from venture capital with the HALOS Act and helping accredited investors be able to bring their capital to the table, to early growth companies and how they have to handle the very expensive 404(b) Sarbanes-Oxley provision, to the stages of companies going public, but once they go public, Mr. Speaker, the ability to stay public, and so we have a venture exchange bill to make sure that they can concentrate their liquidity in one area.

So this is important. It is important to keep 3 percent economic growth. It is important that America's garages have fewer old cars, more new startups.

I want to thank Members on both sides of the aisle, but I especially want to thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California, working so strongly and fervently and on a good, bipartisan, cooperative basis to produce the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act.

Mr. Speaker, I expect that we can have a strong bipartisan vote on the floor, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an example of true bipartisanship. I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING, the members of the Financial Services Committee, and the staff on both sides of the aisle for their work on this legislative package.

S. 488, the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act of 2018, is evidence that Democrats and Republicans can come together to strengthen our Nation's small businesses and entrepreneurs, bolster investor confidence, protect consumers, promote financial stability, and counter human and drug trafficking.

S. 488 helps small businesses grow by encouraging capital formation and requires the Securities and Exchange Commission to consider unique issues facing rural small businesses and small investment advisers. When entrepreneurs are looking to retire, S. 488 allows them to easily sell their businesses.

The bill also requires several rulemakings and studies to encourage small businesses to go public, including by protecting them from excessive underwriting fees.

Main Street investors and consumers also benefit from S. 488. One provision, which I authored, cracks down on corporate insiders engaged in illegal insider trading.

Democrats also led provisions to enhance disclosures about outsized insider voting power.

The bill also creates a task force at the SEC to protect seniors and their financial best interests.

Additionally, the bill helps nonprofits, like Habitat for Humanity, continue to extend affordable mortgages to low-income families aspiring to the dream of homeownership.

Thanks to Mr. ELLISON, the legislation enables millions of Americans with thin credit files to improve and build their credit by allowing alternative types of data, like the on-time payment of rent and utilities, to be included in their credit reports without preempting State law.

S. 488 also improves financial stability. The bill directs regulators to improve the calculation for bank capital held to offset risk in the options and derivatives markets so that riskier products are covered by more capital.

Finally, S. 488 strengthens our government's efforts to stop drug and human trafficking by preventing criminals who engage in these unconscionable acts from accessing the financial system.

There are several provisions that we did not reach bipartisan agreement on in time, including reforms to private offerings under regulation D that requires issuers to file disclosures before their first sell and after the termination of the offering. I am pleased that the chairman has offered to continue working on this and other issues with me, and I hope that the Senate has its own chance to make these and other changes.

Throughout my work on this legislation, I insisted that nothing could be included that would weaken Dodd-Frank's financial reforms, harm consumers, or provide giveaways to Wall Street. Instead, building on the bipartisan work of the Financial Services Committee, S. 488 includes measures that will help small businesses grow and protect hardworking Americans who entrust their savings to the capital markets.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank my colleagues for their strong bipartisan support on this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the chairman of the Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments Subcommittee, the real leader of this capital formation package on the Republican side of the aisle, and also the sponsor of two provisions of the bill: H.R. 477, the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act, and H.R. 6139, the Improving Investment Research for Small and Emerging Issuers Act.

□ 1530

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the opportunity to lead this effort.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has the strongest, deepest, and most liquid markets in the world, which has helped hardworking Americans save for everything from college, to home ownership, to retirement.

However, over time, our capital markets have become, frankly, less stable, less efficient, and less liquid due to the one-size-fits-all securities regulations currently in place. In fact, small and midsized companies, which are the heartbeat of the American economy, are struggling the most because of this outdated regulatory structure. They have the most difficult time obtaining the necessary capital and financial resources needed in order to expand and create jobs because they are drowning in regulation and increased compliance costs.

Although the bipartisan Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act, JOBS Act, back from a few years ago was an important first step in helping appropriately tailor regulation and promote capital formation, particularly for the small and emerging growth companies, it is clear that Congress needs to do more.

Today's bill, the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act, is a compilation of 32 bipartisan bills that will promote capital formation and ensure that our regulatory structure is appropriately tailored to allow the free flow of capital, strengthen job creation, and increase economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, our economy is finally starting to fire on all cylinders. With this reform-minded legislation, we can further unleash American innovation, economic growth, and job creation while providing greater investment opportunities for Mr. and Mrs. 401(k). Today, we can deliver some very commonsense regulatory relief, while also providing an important layer of investor protections, and make our capital markets even more efficient.

By voting in support of this important progrowth jobs package, we can open the door to innovation, enhance small-business job creation, and increase opportunity for hardworking Americans in west Michigan and across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support S. 488, the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act, and, again, I say thank you to the chairman, the ranking member, and my subcommittee chair as well for their work.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the ranking member of our Capital Markets, Securities, and Investment Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee, and the leading sponsor and Democratic cosponsor of several of the bills in this package.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act, which will help in capital formation and help our economy grow. I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for all their hard work on this bipartisan package, which reflects a great deal of work by all of us on the Financial Services Committee.

In this package are 22 bills that came through the Capital Markets, Securities, and Investment Subcommittee on

which I serve with Chairman HUIZENGA as ranking member, and I thank him for his leadership in pushing this through.

This package includes one of my bills, the Family Office Technical Correction Act, which is a narrowly tailored solution that will allow family offices to better serve their clients. The bill would clarify that all family clients of a family office are sophisticated, accredited investors. This fixes a problem where, if just one family client of a family office isn't an accredited investor, then the entire family office can't buy any securities that are limited to accredited investors, like privately issued stocks or bonds.

The package also includes several other bills that I strongly support, such as Mr. HIMES' Middle Market IPO Underwriting Cost Act. This bill will require the SEC to study the costs associated with going public, and not just the regulatory costs that have been studied many times, but the much higher costs that are paid to the underwriters and other professionals when a company decides to go public.

Ranking Member WATERS also has a bill in this package that would require the SEC to study and fix a glaring loophole in our insider trading laws, where company executives can take advantage of a safe harbor to buy and sell stock in their own company based on material, nonpublic information.

Finally, the package includes a bill that would provide a badly needed update to the definition of a sophisticated accredited investor, which would allow people who can demonstrate that they are sophisticated in investment matters to qualify as an accredited investor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan package.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is the chairman of the House Small Business Committee and who has sponsored a very important provision in the package, H.R. 79, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act of 2018.

Despite an improving economy, small businesses, entrepreneurs, and startups still face numerous challenges. One of the chief challenges that they face is access to capital, getting money.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I am pleased to say that we have worked together in a bipartisan manner to pass one piece of legislation that is contained in this, and we support the whole bill, but this one is the HALOS Act, or Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act.

The HALOS Act would improve how investors and small businesses get together at events, called demo days, where the people who have the money and people who need the money can actually get together and streamline some of the problems that they now face.

From my State of Ohio, to California, to New York State, all over the country, small businesses are the job creators. Seventy percent of the new jobs in America are created by small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for working with the Small Business Committee and including the HALOS Act in this very important legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee and the leading Democratic cosponsor of several of the bills in this package.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MAXINE WATERS for the excellent leadership she has provided in working with our chairman, JEB HENSARLING, in putting together this very good package.

I also want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), my Republican colleague, and his staff for his leadership on what is title 8, the exchange regulatory improvement title, which mirrors the work that I did, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) mentioned, as the Democratic lead on H.R. 3555.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also mention that we spent about a year working on this because it was so important that we give clarification and modernization to the term ''facility.'' That term dates all the way back to 1934. That is 84 years ago. So we needed to make some changes because of the fact that there are many business lines, such as e-mortgage registries, data analytics, and regulatory compliance software, that are obsolete now and have nothing to do with and are completely unrelated to the exchange's core business, which is facilitating transactions.

What my colleague Mr. LOUDERMILK and I are simply trying to do is this: If there is a product or business that the exchange has that is totally unrelated to the transactions of the exchange, then that product should be exempt from SEC oversight. Our bill does this by simply asking the SEC, or Securities and Exchange Commission, to set forth the facts and the circumstances that it considers when determining whether a business line is, in fact, a facility.

I want to make this final point, and I want to be crystal clear here. It is vitally important that the SEC retain oversight of the important exchange functions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. We ran out at 2 minutes there. But this is very important, because when you are making changes, you want to make clear that you are not taking away any important and critical oversight and authority from the SEC.

So I want to make a point that we work hard to make sure that the SEC retains oversight of important exchange functions, such as those related to exchange market data, listing standards, member and market regulation, colocation, and order routing services. We, the drafters of the bill, do not take away any authority from the SEC.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the chair of our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, also the lead sponsor of an important provision in this package of bills, H.R. 5970, the Modernizing Disclosure for Investors Act.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today in support of the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act of 2018, and I urge its immediate passage.

This progrowth legislation is a continuation of the work that our committee has done over the last year. We are tailoring regulations for small and midsized companies while protecting investors by giving them the broadest of investment opportunities. I am especially happy to see my bill, the Modernizing Disclosures for Investors Act, included in this package.

H.R. 5970 will go a long way in improving and simplifying disclosure requirements for small and emerging growth companies that, for years, have struggled with the size and the complexity of these quarterly financial reporting forms.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the chairman and the ranking member for their work to get this bipartisan bill to the floor. It was no small task. Again, I urge all Members to support this bipartisan legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), a member of the Financial Services Committee, the chair of the New Democrat Coalition, and the author of one of the bills in this package that ensures companies aren't paying excessive fees to go public.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I will start by thanking Chairman JEB HENSARLING and Ranking Member MAXINE WATERS for their great work on this bipartisan bill in which we stand up on both sides of the aisle today and urge our colleagues to vote for it.

This has been a gratifying effort to watch around a terribly important purpose, which is trying to do all we can, without damaging the safety and soundness of our financial system, to make sure that young companies, the lifeblood of our economy, the source of opportunity for so many people, are given the opportunity to get started to pick up momentum and ultimately to provide the products and jobs that so benefit our communities.

I am standing today, in particular, to highlight an element of this bill that I

am very grateful was included, which is title 31. Title 31 would call for a study around one of the biggest expenses that young companies that are about to go public face. That is the cost of going public, the cost that is charged in the form of a growth spread and other costs associated with the act of going public.

We want our companies trading on the public markets. It is a good source of capital. It is a good opportunity, in many instances, for investors and retail investors, in particular, to participate.

Growth spreads in this country—that is, the fee for going public—have been remarkably constant over decades at 7 percent. That is a lot of money. For a $200 million IPO, which is not an atypical size, that is $14 million. That substantially exceeds the estimates that people make about what compliance with regulation costs.

I have seen estimates for the cost of compliance between $1 million and $3 million a year. In a $200 million IPO, $14 million is a huge amount of money at a very sensitive moment in a company's lifecycle.

This study would simply look at it to see if there are things that we could do to make this market more efficient, perhaps achieve better pricing, perhaps make it easier and less costly for more companies to access the public markets.

I stand in support of this bill, and urge its passage.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), the chair of our Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act of 2018, and I thank the chairman for his leadership.

If America wants to compete in the 21st century economy, then we need 21st century capital formation rules.

□ 1545

Currently, many of the securities regulations governing startups and investors arise from 1930s-era statutes. Because of this outdated legal architecture, the number of business startups is at a 40-year low, and the number of companies going public is the lowest it has been in 20 years. The result is fewer high-paying jobs, less retirement security, slower capital formation, and weaker economic growth.

Fortunately, the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act modernizes our regulation of capital markets, enabling greater access to capital for small businesses and entrepreneurs. Coupled with historic tax cuts and major banking reform that was enacted into law earlier this year, this JOBS bill represents the next step in robust economic growth that will boost wages, unleash startup enterprises, and finance the future of American small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act of 2018.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), who is a member of the Financial Services Committee and a leading Democratic cosponsor on several of the bills in this package.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member WATERS for yielding.

I want to begin by recognizing the good work of the ranking member and the chairman and their staffs in compiling this capital formation package. I want to compliment the legislative skill shown by the ranking member and her staff in securing minority bills in this package, which I recognize involved a lot of give and take.

We are a long ways from where this Chamber was a little over 13 months ago when we voted in a very partisan manner on the Financial CHOICE Act. I am proud to support this package which contains a number of priorities which I supported in committee and on the floor.

I worked on two of these bills with my colleagues, Congressmen HILL and HULTGREN. While I know that there are many others who contributed to this package, I want to thank in particular Katelynn Bradley, Katy Strohmaier, and Lisa Peto of the ranking member's staff for helping draft these amendments that led to unanimous support for these two bills in committee.

First, the Options Markets Stability Act would direct the banking regulators to write rules to provide far more accurate circulations of counterparty credit risk for options and derivatives. Under the current exposure method used today, banks that centrally clear trades today on behalf of their clients must hold capital against the total notional value of any positions without regard for the way hedges offset risk.

This bill directs the regulators to implement a framework that incentivizes central clearing of options and derivatives, which is a major part of our response in the Dodd-Frank bill that has provided financial stability for the last 8 years.

The second bill is the Cooperate With Law Enforcement Agencies and Watch Act. This bill creates a safe harbor for financial institutions and money service businesses from the Bank Secrecy Act so long as they have a letter from law enforcement asking for a specific account to be kept open. Law enforcement agencies often send these letters so that they can follow the money and obtain crucial evidence in investigations. This bill will encourage bank cooperation with these letters which are otherwise optional because it eliminates a situation of technical noncompliance.

Other provisions in this package will improve transparency in markets which drives investor demand from around the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Illinois an additional 20 seconds.

Mr. FOSTER. Other provisions in this bill will simply make our capital markets work better.

I applaud the bipartisanship of the ranking member and the chairman, and I look forward to further improvements in the regulatory landscape as our markets evolve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), who is the vice-chairman of our Capital Markets, Securities, and Investment Subcommittee.

Mr. HULTGREN is the lead sponsor of two provisions of the bill, H.R. 5749, the Options Market Stability Act, and H.R. 6319, the Expanding Investment in Small Businesses Act.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for their hard work in crafting this bipartisan package of bills.

If enacted, this much-needed legislation will deliver American small businesses and entrepreneurs improved access to capital, which we all know is the foundation for driving job creation and economic growth.

I am pleased that two of my bills, which are very important to a number of stakeholders in Illinois, were included in this package. The Options Markets Stability Act will help maintain options for investors and support their ability to manage risk in volatile markets.

The Expanding Investment in Small Businesses Act requires the SEC to study and provide a recommendation to Congress regarding the current limit on percentage of voting shares a diversified company may hold in a single issuer, which is currently discouraging funds from investing in small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this job-creating legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 7¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Will the Speaker please check the minutes again? We have calculated differently, and we think I have 9 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has reviewed the time, and the Chair states that the Chair's announcement is correct.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I am sorry. What is the Chair saying about the time that I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 7¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. MAXINE WATER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), who is a member of the Financial Services Committee and the leading author of a bill in this package.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act of 2018. This is a true bipartisan compromise, and I thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for their leadership and willingness to work across the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, every day I hear from Arizonans who are sick and tired of the dysfunction in Washington. Arizonans want Congress focused on job creation and national security, which is why this package includes three bills I helped introduce that create good-paying jobs and fight drug cartels that threaten the safety of our border communities.

First, I introduced the Fostering Innovation Act to deliver regulatory relief to cutting-edge biotech companies like HTG Molecular Diagnostics in Tucson that are hiring Arizonans into good-paying jobs. Our bill cuts red tape to ensure HTG and other innovative biotech companies can expand their high-wage workforces and develop life-saving medical breakthroughs.

I am also a cosponsor of the HALOS Act to help turn good Arizona ideas into successful Arizona startups. ASU's SkySong Innovation Center is a start-up incubator that helps these ideas and visions turn into companies and careers, and the HALOS Act cuts red tape to help Arizona startups access the capital they need to thrive. That means more good-paying jobs all over our State.

To protect Arizonans from violent drug cartels, I am an original cosponsor of the National Strategy to Combat the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act. This bill requires the administration to take a tough but smart step to combat drug and human trafficking, cybercrime, money laundering, and other issues that these criminals bring to our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to work with anyone willing to get things done and deliver for Arizona.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), who is the chairman of our Housing and Insurance Subcommittee. Mr. DUFFY is the sponsor of a provision of this bill, H.R. 4537, the International Insurance Standards Act.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his great bipartisan work on this package in S. 488, as well as the ranking member, Ms. WATERS, for her bipartisanship.

This is a package that takes the finer work, not just over the last 2 years, but work over the last 4 to 6 years of Chairman HENSARLING's leadership, puts them together where we have had Democrat, Republican, House, and Senate agreement on into a package that can hopefully make our markets and our economy work better.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for including in this package our international insurance standards bill. This is a bill that was on the floor last week. It passed with a unanimous vote, which was fantastic. What we are trying to do is basically make sure that we maintain in international agreements our State-based model of insurance, that that doesn't get undermined. If we are going to undermine State-based insurance, it should come through this institution and not through an international agreement.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), who is a member of the Financial Services Committee who helped ensure that this bill cracks down on the use of digital currency in human trafficking.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this bipartisan package brought to the floor today under the leadership of Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS.

It is not every day the American people get to see bipartisanship in action, so it is important for Members today to highlight it when it does occur because it really should be the rule of the people's House, not the exception.

Technology and finance evolves by the hour in today's world, and this bipartisan package will update our laws to better adapt to that reality while also encouraging the American entrepreneur to innovate and solve the problems of tomorrow.

As a businesswoman, I understand that this package will help create the businesses of tomorrow and at the same time enhance transparency in today's public markets while simultaneously combating the scourge of human trafficking.

I am proud to have worked with my colleague from the other side of the aisle, Mr. ROYCE, to include language in this bill that requires the administration to more closely examine and create solutions for Congress to consider how human traffickers use emerging technologies and virtual currencies to launder money through the global banking system in hope of slowing the fastest growing crime in the world.

My home State of Ohio ranks fourth in the country for human trafficking cases according to our State Attorney General's office.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our ranking member again for allowing me the opportunity to push my bill. Working together is the only way we can end this inhumane practice.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), who is the vice-chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the House amendment to the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act. This bill that was cosponsored with my good friend, KEITH ELLISON from Minnesota, is part of 32 combined bills.

Our bill, the Credit Accuracy and Inclusion Act, will allow 100 million Americans to gain better access to credit. That is what this bill is all about. Just think about it: an individual now can take their rent payment, their car payment, and their utility payment and use that to apply toward increasing their better credit application to the credit reporting agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this bill. This is important for our economy, and it is important for the American people to be able to go out in the market and acquire what they need to acquire in homes and cars to build their own wealth.

So I thank the leadership, I thank Mr. HENSARLING, and I thank Ms. WATERS for her leadership in this bill, and I commend them for this bipartisan effort.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), who is a member of the Financial Services Committee and author of one of the bills in this package.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act. This important bipartisan package includes my Senior Security Act which seeks to protect seniors from financial scammers and help them save for retirement.

I am committed to helping seniors keep their hard-earned money for retirement so they can afford to stay in New Jersey and enjoy their lives and times with their kids and grandkids. We need to protect Social Security and Medicare, cut taxes, and cut costs for our seniors. We need to do so by working with both sides of the aisle, with Democrats and Republicans.

For decades, the Greatest Generation has supported their families and communities, making America the greatest country in the world. Now we need to commit to fighting for them by stopping financial predators from scamming seniors out of their savings.

Older Americans are criminally defrauded of $13 billion annually, in most cases by friends, family members, or caregivers. With more than 10,000 Americans turning 65 every day through 2030, we can't afford this any longer.

The Senior Security Act will identify problems that seniors face while saving, making recommendations to Congress to help seniors save their hard-earned money.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for their bipartisan work on this package of Financial Services bills. I also want to thank Congressman HOLLINGSWORTH and Congresswoman SINEMA for helping co-lead the Senior Security Act, working hard to strike a bipartisan compromise. Together we work to protect seniors from malicious scammers and ensure our seniors have the savings they need and deserve in their golden years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act.

□ 1600

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), the vice chairman of our Financial Institutions Subcommittee, who is also the lead Republican sponsor of one of the bills in the package, H.R. 6069, the Fight Illicit Networks and Detect Trafficking Act.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS, as well as members of the Financial Services Committee from both parties, for this important bipartisan piece of legislation.

Small and emerging businesses drive our economy, create jobs for American workers, and are at the forefront of technological change. We need to create the conditions where these ventures can access the capital they need to grow.

This legislation builds upon the successes of the JOBS Act and JOBS 2.0. The JOBS and Investor Confidence Act includes reforms that will make it easier for the next Microsoft or Amazon or the developer of the next lifesaving treatment to get off the ground. When coupled with the progrowth provisions of a revamped Tax Code, especially the Opportunity Zones program, this will bring capital to marginalized areas and create opportunity for all.

This package includes an important and, again, bipartisan bill that Congressman VARGAS and I introduced. The FIND Trafficking Act directs the Comptroller of the Currency to study how virtual currencies and online marketplaces can be misused by bad actors to trade in illicit goods or facilitate human trafficking. I thank the chairman for including this bill in the package.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the passage of the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a senior Democrat on the committee and the lead sponsor of the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to applaud the chair and the ranking member for a tour de force of bipartisanship: 32 bipartisan bills with near unanimous support in our committee, all put together in one outstanding package.

I want to thank them both for including in this the BUILD Act, introduced by Mr. LOUDERMILK and me. This bill will help Habitat for Humanity and similar organizations. It says that when they provide a zero percent loan, they can use the old disclosure forms or the new disclosure forms, whichever is easiest for them and whichever they have the software to produce.

This bill is supported by Habitat for Humanity International and the National Housing Conference. It passed our committee with a unanimous 53–0 recorded vote.

I want to thank both the chairman and the ranking member for including this legislation in an excellent package, and I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act of 2018, which is comprised of 32 pieces of legislation that have passed the committee or the House this Congress with wide bipartisan support.

As a small business owner, I know how suffocating Big Government can be for the little guy. The fact is small businesses makes up 90 percent of American companies and employ almost half of our workforce. We need to fight for them.

In order for the United States to compete with the global market, we must continue to sustain long-term economic growth, and that starts with the passage of the JOBS and Investors Confidence Act of 2018.

I am proud to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in support of this bipartisan legislation, and I am looking forward to the Senate passing this package quickly. Quite simply, business is good.

In God we trust.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), the majority whip of the committee and also the lead sponsor of H.R. 5783, the Cooperate with Law Enforcement Agencies and Watch Act, and who worked, also, extensively on H.R. 1585, the Fair Investment Opportunities for Professional Experts Act.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, a hardy congratulations to Chairman HENSARLING and the ranking member for this exceptional package, the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act. I support it, and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

This important bill includes H.R. 1585, a bill that I worked on with my friends from Arizona, Ms. SINEMA and Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and a bill also supported and helped by Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I would like to highlight title IV.

This bill expands the accredited investor definition by recognizing the ability to participate in a private offering should not be based solely on an asset or an income test, but that individuals who have the sophistication should also be able to participate.

I have spent much of my career helping small companies obtain funding, helping them do private placements under regulation D. This has been a long time in coming. It is a matter of basic fairness, which will provide greater investment opportunities for more Americans and help our businesses grow and invest their capital faster.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this good measure.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), who is the lead sponsor of a very important provision in the package, H.R. 5877, the Main Street Growth Act.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act of 2018.

Terms like ''capital formation,'' ''liquidity,'' and ''qualified investor'' may sound like Washington jargon. In reality, they represent a few of the many important building blocks that drive our markets and create jobs and opportunity around our country.

On the heels of the largest regulatory relief effort in nearly a decade, the JOBS Act 3.0 will breathe new light into the entrepreneurial spirit that makes our country so special.

This package of nonpartisan reforms includes several policy changes to help small businesses and startups access the most liquid and vibrant markets in the world, including the text of our Main Street Growth Act, which the House unanimously adopted last week.

I appreciate the efforts of the chairman and the ranking member to bring this significant legislation to the floor, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support the continued growth of our economy and to vote ''yes'' on the JOBS Act 3.0.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), who is the lead sponsor of two provisions in the package: H.R. 3555, the Exchange Regulatory Improvement Act, and H.R. 5953, the earlier referenced BUILD Act.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Chairman HENSARLING for not only working on this bill, but working to include these two important provisions as part of this 32-bill strong, bipartisan package we are bringing forward today. This is going to go a long way for small business as well as consumers in this Nation.

I also want to thank Mr. MEEKS and Mr. SCOTT for working with me on the Exchange Regulatory Improvement Act, which passed the Financial Services Committee unanimously, and also Mr. SHERMAN for working with me on the BUILD Act, which also passed the committee unanimously.

I appreciate the bipartisan work we have seen come together on this bill,

and I want to echo my strong support with all of my colleagues in support of this bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the lead sponsor of one of the provisions in the bill, H.R. 3903, the Encouraging Public Offerings Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this bipartisan JOBS and Investor Confidence Act, and I appreciate Chairman HENSARLING for his leadership on this capital formation package.

I want to highlight my own bill included in this package, H.R. 3903, the Encouraging Public Offerings Act, which allows issuers to submit to the SEC for confidential review, before publicly filing, draft registration statements for IPOs.

H.R. 3903 will reduce the risk to companies that are contemplating going public in order to make listing on exchanges more attractive, which, in the end, will only strengthen America's financial markets.

Mr. Speaker, the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act will make it easier for startups and small businesses in my district to attract the investments they need to go public, to grow, and to create more jobs. I am proud to support it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield myself the remainder of my time to close.

I once again thank my colleagues for their outstanding bipartisan work on this carefully crafted bipartisan legislation. S. 488, the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act of 2018, is an example of Members on both sides of the aisle working together to support our Nation's small businesses and investors.

S. 488 facilitates access to capital for small businesses, increases protections for consumers and investors, fights the scourge of drug and human trafficking, and promotes financial stability.

S. 488 is supported by institutional investors, angel investors, venture capitalists, biotech companies, credit unions, small businesses, entrepreneurs, and exchanges. This bill will help entrepreneurs, small businesses, and investors to thrive in our economy.

Finally, I would like to thank Mr. HENSARLING for his foresight in knowing that this was possible because both sides of the aisle really support small businesses. It was Mr. HENSARLING who said: Given that we do both support small businesses, why can't we come together around a package where we have already shown our support on individual bills either in committee or on the floor and put it all together?

He did that. He provided that leadership. I joined with him.

Our staffs are to be congratulated because they worked very hard on both sides of the aisle to work out any concerns that we may have, any differences that we may have. They did a magnificent job, and they are responsible for helping us to understand what certainly is and was possible.

So despite this, if I may say, there are many onlookers who never thought this could happen. There are many pundits, those who come from special interests, those who come from right here in the House on both sides of the aisle, who are still questioning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I had one inquiry from one of the magazines, I believe it was, who said: Tell me what happened in the background, what was really going on. How did this all come together?

I want the gentleman from Texas to know I told him it is none of his business. It really happened, and we are pleased about it. We worked very hard on that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HENSARLING and all of the members who worked so hard to make this happen, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

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

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, some would say the ranking member and I can't agree even on the time of day. I was told when this debate started that thunderstorms came over Washington, D.C., it was that monumental of an achievement.

But in seriousness, I do want to offer my thanks and my gratitude to the ranking member. She and her staff worked very constructively with us on this bill and the preceding important bill, the CFIUS reform, which we are still trying to work out our differences on with the Senate. But, long story short, we came together.

This is going to be an important day for small business. It is an important day for 3 percent economic growth, which is so important to American families.

I, too, want to echo how important the work of our staffs is. Particularly on the majority side, I wish to thank Kevin Edgar and Fritz Vaughan and their staff for their contribution.

This is going to make a difference, ultimately, because small businesses one day become big businesses. This will make a difference in economic growth for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act of 2018, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1615

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 488, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

DEFENDING ECONOMIC LIVELIHOODS AND THREATENED ANIMALS ACT

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4819) to promote inclusive economic growth through conservation and biodiversity programs that facilitate transboundary cooperation, improve natural resource management, and build local capacity to protect and preserve threatened wildlife species in the greater Okavango River Basin of southern Africa, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4819

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Defending Economic Livelihoods and Threatened Animals Act'' or the ''DELTA Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The greater Okavango River Basin, which ranges from the highland plateau of Angola to northeastern Namibia and northern Botswana, and also provides critical natural resources that sustain wildlife in Zambia and Zimbabwe, is the largest freshwater watershed in southern Africa.

(2) The greater Okavango River Basin is the main source of water and livelihoods for over 1,000,000 people, and the effective management and protection of this critical watershed will help advance important conservation and economic growth objectives for Angola, Botswana, Namibia, local communities, and the broader region.

(3) The greater Okavango River Basin is home to the largest remaining elephant population in the world, as well as other threatened wildlife species.

(4) Poaching and trafficking of threatened wildlife species in the greater Okavango River Basin has increased in recent years, and has the potential to undermine regional stability by disrupting local governance and management of resources, and supplanting key economic opportunities for community members.

(5) Governments in the region have taken important steps to coordinate through existing conservation frameworks to combat trafficking, ensure responsible resource management, support local livelihoods, and protect threatened wildlife species.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that it is in the interest of the United States to engage, as

appropriate, with the Governments of Angola, Botswana, Namibia, and neighboring countries, and in partnership with donors, regional organizations, nongovernmental organizations, local communities, and the private sector, to advance conservation efforts and promote economic growth and stability in the greater Okavango River Basin and neighboring watersheds and conservation areas.

SEC. 4. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to promote inclusive economic growth through conservation and biodiversity programs that facilitate transboundary cooperation, improve water and natural resource management, and build local capacity to protect and preserve threatened wildlife species in the greater Okavango River Basin and neighboring watersheds and conservation areas.

SEC. 5. STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Administrator, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall seek, as appropriate, to work with the Governments of Angola, Botswana, Namibia, and neighboring countries, and in partnership with donors, regional organizations, nongovernmental organizations, local communities, and the private sector, to develop a strategy to—

(1) create and advance a cooperative framework to promote responsible natural resource, water, and wildlife management practices in the greater Okavango River Basin;

(2) protect traditional migration routes of elephants and other threatened wildlife species;

(3) combat wildlife poaching and trafficking;

(4) address human health and development needs of local communities; and

(5) catalyze economic growth in such countries and across the broader region.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy established pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(1) promote cooperative and responsible water, natural resource, and wildlife management policies and practices within and among the countries of Angola, Botswana, and Namibia, with a particular focus on the greater Okavango River Basin and the critical headwaters located in Angola;

(2) protect and restore wildlife habitats and traditional migratory patterns of elephants and other threatened species;

(3) combat wildlife poaching and trafficking in Angola, Botswana, Namibia, and those areas of Zambia and Zimbabwe that border Angola, Botswana, or Namibia, including within regional and national parks and reserves, by building the capacity of the governments of such countries, local law enforcement, community leaders, and park rangers to detect, disrupt, and prosecute poachers and traffickers;

(4) promote conservation as a foundation for inclusive economic growth and development within a comprehensive assistance strategy that places Angola, Botswana, and Namibia on a trajectory toward graduation from the need for United States foreign assistance;

(5) identify opportunities and mechanisms to leverage regional organizations, nongovernmental organizations, and public-private partnerships to contribute to support the implementation of the strategy;

(6) establish monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, including measurable goals, objectives, and benchmarks of success, that are included in grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements to ensure the effective use of United States foreign assistance; and

(7) coordinate with and build the capacity of regional conservation frameworks in order to advance regional conservation objectives.

SEC. 6. UNITED STATES SUPPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Administrator, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, are authorized to prioritize and advance ongoing efforts to—

(1) promote inclusive economic growth and development through responsible water and natural resource management and wildlife protection activities in the greater Okavango River Basin;

(2) provide technical assistance to governments and local communities in Angola, Botswana, and Namibia to create a policy-enabling environment for such responsible water and natural resource management and wildlife protection activities; and

(3) build the capacity of local law enforcement, park rangers, and community leaders to combat wildlife poaching and trafficking.

(b) COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION WITH REGIONAL CONSERVATION FRAMEWORKS.—The Secretary and the Administrator, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall coordinate assistance provided by Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and such other relevant Federal agencies with existing regional conservation frameworks in order to ensure regional integration of conservation, wildlife trafficking, and water management initiatives, to prevent duplication of efforts, and to advance regional conservation objectives.

(c) COORDINATION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR.—The Secretary and the Administrator, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, are authorized to work with the private sector and nongovernmental organizations to leverage public and private capital to promote responsible resource management, combat wildlife poaching and trafficking, and support inclusive economic growth and local livelihoods in the greater Okavango River Basin.

(d) MONITORING AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall establish monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, to include measurable goals, objectives, and benchmarks, to ensure the effective use of United States foreign assistance to achieve the objectives of this section.

SEC. 7. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Administrator, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of this Act.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include a description of the strategy required by section 5, including—

(1) the monitoring and evaluation plans and indicators used to measure performance under the strategy;

(2) any legislative impediments to meeting the objectives of such strategy;

(3) the extent to which Angola, Botswana, and Namibia have demonstrated a commitment and willingness to cooperate to advance efforts described in section 5(b);

(4) progress made to date in meeting the objectives of such strategy;

(5) efforts to coordinate, deconflict, and streamline conservation programs in order to maximize resource effectiveness;

(6) the extent to which Angola, Botswana, and Namibia and other government in the region are investing resources to advance conservation initiatives; and

(7) the extent to which other funding sources, including through private sector investment and other investment by Angola, Botswana, and Namibia, have been identified to advance conservation initiatives.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Okavango Delta supports the economic livelihood of a million people in that region. It is in a desert, but the Okavango River flows into that desert and makes a home to the largest remaining population of elephants in the world.

This ecosystem spans three countries. It starts in the highlands of Angola, and it flows through Namibia and Botswana. Like other regions across Africa, there is a challenge here in the poaching and trafficking of threatened species in the delta. That poaching of elephant, black rhino, and hippo is increasing.

I have seen firsthand the devastating impact of poachers and organized criminal networks across the continent. Wildlife trafficking and profits from poaching provide a key funding source for international criminal networks and for terrorists.

These deadly groups undermine regional stability. They spread violence. They disrupt local governance. They have a devastating impact on the economic opportunities for members of the community.

This legislation provided by our good friend here, Mr. FORTENBERRY, H.R. 4819, is the Defending Economic Livelihoods and Threatened Animals Act of 2018. This DELTA Act is an opportunity to be proactive and protect this part of the world before it is too late. It strengthens coordination among the Governments of the United States and Angola, Botswana, and Namibia to address these poaching threats and to support local communities in this greater Okavango River Basin.

A few months ago, I led a bipartisan delegation to the region, and I saw the critical need for these countries to work together to preserve and protect this magnificent landscape. I had not been in Angola since the beginning of that war, and to go back to see Angola today and have an opportunity to meet with the chairman of the committee responsible for conservation there—she is, in fact, herself a park ranger—and to see how Angola has emerged from years of civil war and unrest and is now looking to the international community for partnership and for support is heartening.

With Angola's immense natural resources, we are already seeing, unfortunately, foreign governments—for example, Beijing—pushing unwise development that threatens to siphon off this critical water source. Obviously, to siphon off this water source, it would devastate the river basin. This is why we must act now to protect the animals and communities that call the region home.

Animals and poachers, of course, know no boundaries. The water doesn't know any boundaries. In order for conservation efforts to be successful, we must take a transboundary approach.

I was proud to be the author of the Congo Basin Forest Partnership Act some years ago. I think it was in 2004 that it was passed. We saw how increased coordination across national borders can be successful in protecting critical landscapes and combating poaching threats.

This DELTA Act looks to build on these proven successes, which have set up national parks now in seven landscapes across Africa. This legislation strengthens the coordination among the Governments, as I said, of the United States, Angola, Botswana, and Namibia. It does that by leveraging partnerships with the private sector, with nongovernment organizations, and with regional bodies. It prioritizes wildlife trafficking and anti-poaching programs in this greater Okavango River Basin. And it promotes responsible economic growth for local communities through responsible natural resource management.

Again, I thank the bill's author, Representative FORTENBERRY, and our fellow co-chairs of the House International Conservation Caucus, Representatives MCCOLLUM and CUELLAR, for their leadership and steadfast efforts to keep conservation and anti-poaching efforts alive here in Congress and to help us drive these efforts.

I want to thank Ranking Member ENGEL and, of course, from New York, JOE CROWLEY, for their work on this legislation. It is deeply appreciated, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4819, the DELTA Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for his initiative in putting forward this legislation to help protect one of Africa's most important ecosystems. I am pleased to cosponsor this measure. I also want to commend Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their leadership on international conservation issues, particularly the fight against wildlife trafficking.

The Okavango River Basin in Angola, Botswana, and Namibia supports an amazing array of wildlife, including the largest remaining concentration of elephants in Africa. It is also home to more than a million people.

The DELTA Act requires the development of a strategy to encourage sustainable management of natural resources in the river basin, including the protection of wildlife. This strategy will require input from a wide range of stakeholders, including national governments, local communities, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector.

The goal is to support economic development for the residents of the region while preserving unique ecosystems and protecting wildlife.

The DELTA Act has the support of key conservation organizations, including the World Wildlife Fund and the Wildlife Conservation Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this bipartisan legislation, which passed our committee by unanimous voice vote, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and the author of this landmark legislation.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, let me thank Chairman ROYCE, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, for his extraordinary leadership, not only on this bill, but on a whole array of conservation and security initiatives. I thank the gentleman for his chairmanship and for his long service in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank Ranking Member ENGEL for his support of this legislation and Congressman SHERMAN for his kind and generous remarks. They are very much appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, the greater Okavango River Basin is the largest freshwater wetland in southern Africa. Not only is it the main source of water and livelihood for more than 1 million people, as we have heard, it is home to the largest remaining elephant population in the entire world.

The pathway for habitat along the three-country waterway is essential for sustaining this majestic animal and other species. As a creative approach to conservation, to foster an ecosystem of well-being for communities and for the purpose of international stability and security, as so well stated by Chairman ROYCE, given the scourge of wildlife trafficking and the nexus that it creates to terrorist network financing, we introduced this bipartisan bill, a transnational conservation initiative linking the natural habitat of the three nations, Angola, Namibia, and Botswana, to ensure the survival of this pristine ecosystem that is essential for the future of conservation, species, as well as the communities and people who live there.

When we consider past conflicts that existed in parts of this region, it is truly heartwarming to work with the leaders of these countries to support their vision for the flourishing of animals and people, for the sake of the environment, and for the sake of their economies.

This is imaginative foreign policy. It moves us from a singular, traditional type of solution to addressing challenges in a comprehensive, multinational, multisectoral strategy that mirrors the complexity of nature itself, beyond human-defined borders. This bill is a unique opportunity to help save and enhance one of the most beautiful and delicate ecosystems in the entire world before other international actors ruin it.

As a co-chair of the International Conservation Caucus with Chairman ROYCE and with my good friends Congressman CUELLAR from Texas and Congresswoman MCCOLLUM from Minnesota, I am very grateful for their hard work to help ensure the proper stewardship of natural resources in our own great country, as well as around the world.

This bill offers the opportunity to continue to build authentic relations with the countries of Angola, Botswana, and Namibia, as well as local communities and the private sector, to develop effective strategies to promote sustainable resource management, combat wildlife trafficking, and stimulate economic regeneration in this part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, again, I greatly appreciate Chairman ROYCE's cosponsorship, active support, and leadership in moving the DELTA Act through the committee, and I urge my colleagues to support this innovative, imaginative, and important initiative.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. SHERMAN for yielding and for the leadership that he has provided on this issue. Certainly, I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California, Mr. ED ROYCE, who has been working on this issue for so many years. I want to thank him and the ranking member of the committee, Mr. ENGEL, for all of the work that they have done.

In particular, I want to thank my co-chair, Mr. FORTENBERRY, for his leadership. I remember talking about this particular bill at the very beginning, and here we are about to pass very important legislation. Certainly, I want

to join Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ED ROYCE, Mr. ENGEL, myself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and the rest of the cosponsors on this bipartisan bill that promotes sustainable economic development, combats wildlife trafficking in Africa's critical Okavango River Basin, which supports more than a million people in Angola, Botswana, Namibia, and which is home to several threatened wildlife species, including the largest remaining elephant population in the world.

□ 1630

Today, that region is at a near breaking point due to the not very well thought of development activities, and we have got to make sure that we act together.

Specifically, this bill will protect the vital Okavango River Basin by strengthening coordination between the United States, Angola, Botswana, and Namibia, and leveraging partnerships with the private sector, nongovernmental organizations, and regional bodies; prioritizing wildlife trafficking to make sure that we stop these poaching programs that have really affected this particular area; promoting sustainable economic growth for local communities through responsible natural resource management; and, more importantly, helping to stop the extinction of these majestic animals, these elephants and other endangered species.

So it is important that we all work together as lawmakers in a bipartisan way and also partner with nations to build international political support for sustainable development while protecting the world's most sensitive ecosystems. In today's global community, it is crucial that we assist our international partners and make sure that we find a better way to protect our world.

In conclusion, I would say that we only have one world to live in. It is up to us to ensure that we promote sustainable development so our children and grandchildren have a better world to live in.

I want to thank the International Conservation Caucus Foundation, my colleagues, our co-chairs, and all of the Members on both sides that have worked so hard for this bipartisan support of this particular bill. So I thank my Members and colleagues for bringing this important matter to the U.S. Congress' attention, and I urge the support of this bill.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to reiterate the importance of conservation in combating the scourge of wildlife trafficking around the world. This bill reaffirms our commitment to these goals and will result in a strategy to encourage sustainable management of natural resources in the Okavango River Basin located in Angola, Botswana, and Namibia.

I thank Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CUELLAR, and, of course, Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their work. This bill passed our committee by unanimous, bipartisan voice vote. I strongly support it, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the greater Okavango River Basin is home to the largest remaining elephant population on this planet, but like other regions across Africa, we know that poaching and trafficking of threatened species is increasing. We know that greater transboundary cooperation is essential to protect the basin in order to combat poaching threats and, obviously, to encourage the responsible management of water resources.

The U.S. currently supports programs in Africa to combat poaching threats and promote economic growth, but greater coordination and diplomatic engagement with these governments, these governments working together to streamline these programs and galvanize support from partner countries also in the region, is essential.

We do this not only to protect these threatened species, but also because it is in our national security interest to do so. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4819, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIE WIESEL GENOCIDE AND ATROCITIES PREVENTION ACT OF 2018

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3030) to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3030

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States affirms the critical importance of strengthening the United States Government's efforts at atrocity prevention and response through interagency coordination such as the Atrocities Prevention Board (referred to in this section as the ''Board'') or successor entity. In carrying out the work of the Board or successor entity, appropriate officials of the United States Government should—

(1) meet regularly to monitor developments throughout the world that heighten the risk of atrocities;

(2) identify any gaps in United States foreign policy concerning regions or particular countries related to atrocity prevention and response;

(3) facilitate the development and implementation of policies to enhance the capacity of the United States to prevent and respond to atrocities worldwide;

(4) provide the President with recommendations to improve policies, programs, resources, and tools related to atrocity prevention and response;

(5) conduct outreach, including consultations, not less frequently than biannually, with representatives of nongovernmental organizations and civil society dedicated to atrocity prevention and response;

(6) operate with regular consultation and participation of designated interagency representatives of relevant Federal agencies, executive departments, or offices; and

(7) ensure funds are made available for the policies, programs, resources, and tools related to atrocity prevention and response, including through mechanisms such as the Complex Crises Fund or other related accounts.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States to—

(1) regard the prevention of genocide and other atrocities as in its national security interests;

(2) mitigate threats to United States security by addressing the root causes of insecurity and violent conflict to prevent—

(A) the mass slaughter of civilians;

(B) conditions that prompt internal displacement and the flow of refugees across borders; and

(C) other violence that wreaks havoc on regional stability and livelihoods;

(3) enhance the capacity of the United States to identify, prevent, address, and respond to the drivers of atrocities and violent conflict as part of the United States' humanitarian, development, and strategic interests; and

(4) pursue a Government-wide strategy to prevent and respond to the risk of genocide and other atrocities by—

(A) strengthening the diplomatic, risk analysis and monitoring, strategic planning, early warning, and response capacities of the Government;

(B) improving the use of foreign assistance to respond early, effectively, and urgently in order to address the root causes and drivers of violence, and systemic patterns of human rights abuses and atrocities;

(C) strengthening diplomatic response and the use of foreign assistance to support transitional justice measures, including criminal accountability, for past atrocities;

(D) supporting and strengthening local civil society, including human rights defenders and others working to help prevent and respond to atrocities, and protecting their ability to receive support from and partner with civil society at large;

(E) promoting financial transparency and enhancing anti-corruption initiatives as part of addressing a root cause of insecurity; and

(F) employing a variety of unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral means to prevent and respond to conflicts and atrocities by—

(i) placing a high priority on timely, preventive diplomatic efforts; and

(ii) exercising a leadership role in promoting international efforts to end crises peacefully.

SEC. 4. TRAINING OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS IN CONFLICT AND ATROCITIES PREVENTION.

Section 708 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4028) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) instruction on recognizing patterns of escalation and early warning signs of potential atrocities or violence, including gender-based violence, and methods of conflict assessment, peacebuilding, mediation for prevention, early action and response, and transitional justice measures to address atrocities.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'peacebuilding' means nonviolent activities designed to prevent conflict through—

''(1) addressing root causes of violence;

''(2) promoting sustainable peace;

''(3) delegitimizing violence as a dispute resolution strategy;

''(4) building capacity within society to peacefully manage disputes, including the capacity of governments to address citizen grievances; and

''(5) reducing vulnerability to triggers that may spark violence.''.

SEC. 5. REPORTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter for the following six years, the President shall transmit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report, with a classified annex if necessary, that includes—

(1) a review, in consultation with appropriate interagency representatives, consisting of a detailed description of—

(A) current efforts based on United States and locally identified indicators, including capacities and constraints for Government-wide detection, early warning and response, information-sharing, contingency planning, and coordination of efforts to prevent and respond to situations of genocide and atrocities and other mass violence, such as gender-based violence and violence against religious minorities;

(B) recommendations to further strengthen United States capabilities described in subparagraph (A);

(C) funding expended by relevant Federal departments and agencies on atrocities prevention activities, including transitional justice measures and the legal, procedural, and resource constraints faced by the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development throughout respective budgeting, strategic planning, and management cycles to support conflict and atrocities prevention activities in countries identified to be at risk of atrocities;

(D) current annual Government global assessments of sources of instability, conflict, and atrocities, the outcomes and findings of such assessments, and, where relevant, a review of activities, and the efficacy of such activities, that the Atrocities Prevention Board or successor entity undertook to respond to sources of instability, conflict, and atrocities;

(E) consideration of analysis, reporting, and policy recommendations to prevent and respond to atrocities produced by civil society, academic, and other nongovernmental organizations and institutions;

(F) countries and regions at risk of atrocities, including a description of most likely pathways to violence, specific risk factors, potential groups of perpetrators, and at-risk target groups; and

(G) instruction on recognizing patterns of escalation and early warning signs of potential atrocities and methods of conflict assessment, peace-building, mediation for prevention, early action and response, and transitional justice measures to address atrocities in the Federal training programs for Foreign Service officers;

(2) recommendations to ensure shared responsibility by—

(A) enhancing multilateral mechanisms for preventing atrocities, including strengthening the role of international organizations and international financial institutions in conflict prevention, mitigation, and response; and

(B) strengthening regional organizations;

(3) implementation status of the recommendations contained in such review; and

(4) identification of the Federal departments and agencies and civil society, academic, and nongovernmental organizations and institutions consulted for preparation of such report.

SEC. 6. DEFINITION.

In this Act, the term ''genocide'' means an offense under subsection (a) of section 1091 of title 18, United States Code, or any substantially similar conduct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it was over 60 years ago that free people around the world pledged to never again stand by in silence as oppressed people are annihilated in a genocide. Unfortunately, since then, we have witnessed mass atrocities and genocide in places such as Bosnia, the Rwandan genocide, Cambodia, Burma, and in the ISIS strongholds in Syria and in Iraq.

The United States has often been a leader in responding to these and other humanitarian crises—not soon enough, in many cases. However, there is more, obviously, that can be done, and U.S. efforts have been largely reactive and disjointed, with little transparency or oversight.

This bill is the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act. It would correct these deficiencies. This act would require an annual report of administration actions to prevent and respond to potential genocides and mass atrocities, and it would mandate the identification of countries that are at risk of such crimes against humanity.

This act also requires that all Foreign Service officers, who often are at the forefront of U.S. efforts to address atrocities ever since our Ambassador in Armenia was the first to sound the alarm on the Armenian genocide, be trained to deal with early warning signs, conflict assessment, mediation, and other responses.

All of this will better enable our government to develop a coordinated response as a crisis is developing and, ultimately, to save lives.

With its name, this bill honors the legacy of Holocaust survivor and Nobel Laureate Elie Wiesel, and it furthers our commitment to his call, for it was his call for ''never again''—never again by strengthening the U.S. Government's coordination on efforts to prevent, mitigate, and respond to genocide and other mass atrocities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

July 17, 2018.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On June 22, 2018, H.R. 3030, the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2018 was referred to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (the Committee).

In order to expedite the House's consideration of the measure, the Committee will forgo consideration of the measure. This courtesy is conditioned on our mutual understanding and agreement that it will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee with respect to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in the legislation or any similar measure, nor will this waiver inhibit the Committee's ability to address issues of concern going forward. I appreciate your support to the appointment of Members from the Committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I also appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2018.

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 3030, the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2018, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your Committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this measure or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to

seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 3030 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your Committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed our committee by unanimous, bipartisan voice vote. It is named for Elie Wiesel, the Holocaust survivor and author who spent decades leading the fight to bring Nazis to justice.

First, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri, Ambassador WAGNER, and the chairman of the Democratic Caucus, the gentleman from New York, JOE CROWLEY, for their work in bringing forward this very important bill that improves our capacity to prevent and respond to genocides and mass atrocities. I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Millions of innocent civilians have died in mass atrocities and genocides. I would like to take just a second to remind everyone of a few of these tragedies:

The first genocide of the 20th century, the Armenian genocide, which killed approximately 1.5 million people;

The Holocaust, from 1933 to 1945, more than 9 million people were killed, including over 6 million Jews;

Cambodia in 1975, which saw the slaying of 2 million people;

Rwanda in 1990, which saw the deaths of 800,000 in just 100 days; and

Sudan, Darfur, and the tragedy there.

Tragedies and crises like this are not just in the past. Today, we are witnessing mass killings of innocent people in many places around the globe.

In Burma, the military has inflicted horrific violence against the Rohingya people. Thousands have been killed. This is ethnic cleansing, and it appears on the verge of genocide.

Now, 700,000 refugees have been pushed into Bangladesh, 80 percent of them are women and children. And as I mentioned, in Darfur, some 300,000 are dead, 3 million displaced.

This measure gives us the tools to detect the warning signs of a mass atrocity or genocide so that we can respond quickly and improves interagency coordination. Overall, this measure will make our government better equipped to handle the growing threats of genocide and crimes against humanity.

This is a good bill. The prevention of genocide and mass atrocity should be a core objective of our Nation's national security and foreign policy missions. The bill passed, as I said before, our committee by a unanimous bipartisan voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), who is the author of this legislation.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act.

I introduced this bill to improve U.S. efforts to prevent mass atrocity crimes. The legislation honors the legacy of Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel and his life's work to fight evil around the world.

Mr. Wiesel was just 15 years old when the Nazis deported him and his family to Auschwitz. Having witnessed the near total destruction of his people, he spent his life defending the persecuted. As Mr. Wiesel understood so well, the true horror of genocide is that it is preventable.

We are haunted by repeated failures and missed opportunities to end these tragedies before they begin. There is more the United States can and must do to help vulnerable communities and persecuted people around the world.

The reality is that good intentions and platitudes like ''never again'' have not prevented the deaths of hundreds of thousands of civilians at the hands of the Assad regime nor the ethnic cleansing of the Rohingya Muslims in Burma.

When I introduced this legislation, I thought of the Bosnian community in St. Louis, my hometown. This community has shaped what St. Louis looks and feels like. It has added great cultural diversity to the city, immense intellectual capital, thriving small businesses, and a strong religious presence.

Two decades ago, members of our Bosnian community were refugees. In 1995, Orthodox Serbs, under the command of General Ratko Mladic, initiated a horrific ethnic cleansing campaign against majority-Muslim Bosniaks. The bloodshed forced 130,000 Bosnian refugees to seek new lives in the United States.

It is fitting that today we remember the victims of the Bosnian genocide just a few days after its 23rd anniversary. I am continually amazed by the resilience of our Bosnian neighbors. Their courage has inspired me to seek change.

The Elie Wiesel Act expresses Congress' strong support for better utilization of existing resources, particularly the Atrocities Prevention Board, which is dedicated to coordinating U.S. atrocity prevention and response, and the Complex Crises Fund, which supports agile, efficient responses to unforeseen crises overseas.

Additionally, we require the administration to evaluate existing prevention efforts, report on countries at risk of genocide and mass atrocity crimes, and recommend concrete improvements to our early warning systems.

The bill also mandates that U.S. Foreign Service officers are trained in atrocities recognition and response. Should this bill become law, America's diplomats will be better equipped to act before violence spirals out of control.

The Elie Wiesel Act establishes that it is the official policy of the United States to regard atrocities prevention as a core national security interest and to address root causes of conflict through our humanitarian, development, and strategic endeavors.

Let me be clear, Mr. Speaker, genocide is preventable. The United States is the global leader in genocide and atrocities response, but we must shift our attention towards prevention so that no one ever becomes a victim in the first place.

□ 1645

H.R. 3030 is an important first step. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for his cooperation on this piece of bipartisan legislation, and I urge its support.

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) an original cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act.

I thank my good friend, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ROYCE, and Ranking Member ENGEL for their support in bringing this important legislation to the floor today.

I also appreciate the work of Ambassador WAGNER on this measure, and I am proud to be a cosponsor and the lead Democrat on this bill with Congresswoman WAGNER.

Standing up against genocide and mass atrocities is a critical responsibility for the United States. There is no other country in the world that can hold other nations accountable but the United States. No other country can do it like we can—not France, not Germany, not Great Britain, certainly not China, especially not Russia. No other country in history has had the moral suasion of the United States.

Many of us are concerned about what is happening to our country right now and our positioning in being able to push back against atrocities and human rights violations around the world. I would be remiss if I didn't mention a concern for what took place yesterday in Helsinki as an example of a growing concern of our ability to hold and to sway moral convictions on these issues. But it is a responsibility that is important to our country and, more importantly, it is a responsibility that is important to our world.

If you walk down Independence Avenue and to the Holocaust Memorial Museum, you will see and hear the words, ''Never again.'' It is a phrase that brings to mind some of the world's worst atrocities and most heinous crimes.

As Elie Wiesel, who this bill is named after, and a man whom I had the opportunity to know and be in his company

on many occasions, wrote, 'Never again' is more than a set of words. He went on to say, ''It's a prayer, a promise, a vow. . . . And never again the glorification of base, ugly, dark violence.''

It also reminds us that taking responsibility for stopping atrocities is incumbent on all of us. It requires us to put ourselves in the shoes of the victims and to think about what we hope would be done if we were in their place, if we faced that horror, if we faced those atrocities. What would we want to be done on our behalf?

The measure before us takes a step in that direction. It encourages the government to meet regularly and take steps to predict and prevent mass atrocities. It gives strong support for the Atrocities Prevention Board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. And it requires the training of foreign service officers on how to take steps to recognize and prevent genocide and other atrocities.

It is not as strong a bill as Representative WAGNER and I would have liked it to have been. I know we both wanted to see more in this bill. But, as with most legislation, this is a very important first step, upon which I know further progress will be made down the road.

This is an important signal from Congress that preventing atrocities must be part and parcel of the United States foreign policy in the White House, the State Department, the intelligence community, and throughout our government.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support its passage, and I encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chair of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as always, I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their work in always bringing forth solid, bipartisan bills to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my full support for Ambassador ANN WAGNER's bill before us today, H.R. 3030, the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2018, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor. This bill takes necessary and overdue steps to make preventing genocide and other atrocities a priority in our foreign policy. Indeed, this bill makes it clear that it will be the policy of the United States that the prevention of genocide and other atrocities is not only in our national security interests, but it is a core moral responsibility for us to do so.

Far too often, these acts have been met with indifference, indifference from responsible nations and indifference from those who are not directly impacted by the mass murders and the torment and the destruction. Elie Wiesel, this bill's namesake, challenged us to always take sides, to not allow indifference or neutrality to dictate our actions. As he said, ''Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented.''

Our values and ideals as Americans dictate that we must do what we can to prevent genocide, to prevent atrocities, and to prevent human rights violations. This bill enshrines those principles. It ensures that the United States is at the forefront of the fight against these crimes against humanity, and will use the full weight and force of our foreign policy to prevent them from ever happening again.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ambassador WAGNER for authoring this bill, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for bringing this bill to the floor today, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to commend Congresswoman WAGNER, Congressman ENGEL, and Congressman CROWLEY for working in a bipartisan fashion to put together this important legislation.

This legislation firmly establishes that official United States policy is to prevent genocide and other criminal atrocities, and makes certain that it is treated as a core national security interest by supporting the programs that can help avert the deaths of innocents around our globe.

Representing one of the largest populations of holocaust survivors in the Nation is one of my greatest privileges as a Member of Congress. To honor these survivors, and to honor the 6 million Jews who did not survive, we must do everything in our power to prevent another atrocity like the one they experienced.

When we commemorate the Holocaust, we make a sacred promise to ourselves and to all of our neighbors by saying and committing to ''Never again.'' This legislation puts real weight behind those words.

From the brutal lessons we have learned from crimes against humanity that span continents and centuries, we must forge a brighter future.

Jewish tradition compels us to perform tzedakah—acts of justice—and we are driven by tikkun olam—repairing the world. We have a responsibility to be a voice for those who cannot speak for themselves, to make the world a better place.

But these values are not unique to Jews or to Judaism. They are values we all strive to share.

Our Nation has the unique capability to prevent these tragedies before they unfold.

Elie Wiesel, who I was privileged to know, the rightful namesake of this legislation, wrote, ''We must take sides. Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented.''

When this bill becomes law, we can take comfort in knowing the United States of America is taking sides, is not neutral, and is not silent in the face of inhumanity. When we are faced with bigotry and hate, with war crimes and crimes against humanity, with ethnic cleansing and genocide, the United States must always remain a beacon of hope for justice, freedom, and peace. With this bill, we do just that.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this measure, and I thank Ambassador WAGNER and Representative CROWLEY for their work.

This bill will equip our government with the tools to better monitor and, hopefully, prevent genocide. It passed our committee with an unanimous bipartisan voice vote.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I thank my colleague, Congresswoman ANN WAGNER, for her leadership on this important bill. I also thank the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ENGEL, for his support, along with Mr. SHERMAN, on this bill.

Passage of this legislation sends a strong message of the continuing U.S. commitment to respond to genocide and to respond to mass atrocities as they emerge, with effective and coordinated programs that will best protect the most vulnerable. The U.S. must be a world leader in efforts to prevent genocide and crimes against humanity.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3030, the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2017, sponsored by my friend ANN WAGNER. This bill will greatly strengthen our efforts to anticipate, prevent, and mitigate genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes.

Wherever there are atrocities being committed, or at risk of being committed, our foreign service officers are also often serving on the front lines. What H.R. 3030 would ensure is that they have the right training to recognize and respond to early warning signs of such crimes.

This legislation will also strengthen Congressional oversight by requiring the President to annually report on what is happening on the ground, how the United States has responded, and recommendations for strengthening the U.S. response.

I commend my colleague for naming this bill after the late, iconic Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel. He spoke so powerfully about the unique, persistent evil of anti-Semitism that generated the Holocaust, warning that ''the

antisemite is by definition ideologically fanatic and pathologically racist . . . an antisemite is someone who has never met me, never heard of me, yet he hates me.''

Mr. Wiesel and I worked together at the historic 2004 Berlin conference of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). There, 55 participating governments committed to taking specific actions to combat anti-Semitism. In 2002, I led the original Congressional push to place combating anti-Semitism at the top of the OSCE agenda, and I was proud to lead this movement once again in 2004, together with parliamentarians from Germany, the UK, and France—and Mr. Wiesel.

In his 2004 Berlin keynote address, Mr. Wiesel said, ''We know . . . that anti-Semitism is dangerous not only to Jews but to countries too, where it is allowed to flourish . . . When a Jew is slapped in the face, humankind itself falls to ground . . . Anti-semitism is rooted in hatred; its language is a language of hatred, its doctrine is filled with hatred—and hatred by its nature, always runs overboard, crossing geographical boundaries and ethnic affiliations. It is a contagious disease.''

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wiesel dedicated his life to exposing the insidiousness of anti-Semitism and working to prevent other genocides, including those in Bosnia, Rwanda, and Sudan. Named for him, the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act offers new ways for us to strengthen our fight against genocide, and I am proud to cosponsor this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3030, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROTECTING DIPLOMATS FROM SURVEILLANCE THROUGH CONSUMER DEVICES ACT

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4989) to require the Department of State to establish a policy regarding the use of location-tracking consumer devices by employees at diplomatic and consular facilities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4989

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Protecting Diplomats from Surveillance Through Consumer Devices Act''.

SEC. 2. SECURE UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR FACILITIES AGAINST CYBERSURVEILLANCE.

(a) POLICY ON LOCATION-TRACKING CONSUMER DEVICES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall establish a policy on the use of location-tracking consumer devices, including GPS-enabled devices, at United States diplomatic and consular facilities by United States Government employees, contractors, locally employed staff and members of other agencies deployed to or stationed at such facilities.

(b) SECURITY BRIEFING.—Existing and new employees at United States diplomatic and consular facilities, including contractors, locally employed staff, and members of other agencies deployed to or stationed at such facilities, shall, as a part of the security briefings provided to such employees, be informed of the policy described in subsection (a) and given instructions on the use of location-tracking consumer devices both on and off the premises of such facilities.

(c) COORDINATION.—The Secretary of State may coordinate with the heads of any other agencies whose employees are deployed to or stationed at United States diplomatic and consular facilities in the formulation of the policy described in subsection (a) and the dissemination of such policy pursuant to subsection (b).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the formulation of the policy described in subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on the details of such policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I thank Mr. CASTRO and Mr. MCCAUL, the co-authors of this legislation. I know Mr. MCCAUL knows some of the dangers that our diplomats face overseas. In his past service to the United States, he has been in parts of this dangerous world, and this is what our diplomats face. As they work to prevent armed conflict, there are armed combatants on the other side of those issues. As they try to combat terrorism, as they are working out there to empower women or to open new markets for U.S. exports, they are in tough environments. In turn, it is our job to ensure that our diplomats have the information and resources they need to stay safe while they serve our country overseas.

□ 1700

Now more than ever, everyday devices such as smartphones include location tracking capabilities. While these are enormously useful tools, they also, obviously, present security concerns as users' locations can then be tracked by others, by hostiles.

For the thousands of State Department employees who work overseas, this is a real concern. It is a real security risk.

While the State Department has longstanding and thorough policies on the use of these devices while in embassies and in consulates, the Department has no such policy to guide personnel outside Department grounds. And that is where we send them, outside the Department grounds.

So the bill before us today addresses this security gap. It mandates that the State Department develop a comprehensive, modernized policy on devices that contain tracking capability. It also requires that all current and future diplomatic staff be briefed on the new policy and current best practices for using devices that are enabled with local tracking features. The objective is to build in a culture of safety and self-awareness.

Technology is advancing every day, and we must not allow our agencies to expose personnel to new risks.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 4989, the Protecting Diplomats from Surveillance Through Consumer Devices Act. This bill, again, passed our committee by unanimous, bipartisan voice vote.

I want to begin by thanking Mr. CASTRO, and also others, for introducing this legislation. I am pleased to be one of the cosponsors.

This bill aims to ensure the Department of State has policies in place to prevent our adversaries from tracking the locations of our Foreign Service officers through their electronic devices.

From fitness trackers, to smartwatches, to phones, most of us have at least one device that could be used to track us with the right technology that has GPS capacities. Many of us would literally be lost without these devices, but they could pose a security risk. This is especially true for our diplomats overseas whose locations and travels can reveal sensitive information sources. Location information is a potential gold mine to our adversaries.

This commonsense measure would make sure that the Secretary of State has a policy in place on the safe use of consumer electronic devices by our diplomatic and consular facilities and personnel. It would require proper training for employees and contractors, and ensure that the policy is coordinated across all parts of our government that use our diplomatic and consular facilities.

This bill would also improve congressional oversight of this policy.

This bill will reduce the security risks associated with GPS devices and other consumer electronic device.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, a senior member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the coauthor of this measure.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill, the Protecting Diplomats from Surveillance Through Consumer Devices Act.

Earlier this year, a private sector analysis revealed the risks of using wearable technologies, such as Fitbits and Apple Watches, which use GPS tracking. As the report stated, researchers were able to track the movements of the deployed troops in overseas locations.

This, obviously, poses an enormous national security risk for our soldiers serving abroad. Enemies could track patrol routes or discover the locations of secret foreign installments.

This exposure puts our diplomats at risk as well. We have men and women engaging in diplomatic efforts all over the world, often in sensitive and high-risk areas. We must not make it easier for our enemies to track their movements.

As such, our bill requires the Department of State to establish a policy on use of location-tracking devices by diplomats at U.S. facilities around the world.

As the chairman said, many of us here have been to these hot spots—Iraq, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Egypt, Tunisia. I got briefed by the Libyan team in exile after Benghazi. And they deserve to be protected. This bill will do just that.

I would like to thank my good friend Congressman CASTRO for his friendship and leadership on this issue, as well as Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL on this important legislation.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), the author of the bill.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, subcommittee Ranking Member SHERMAN, also my colleague from Texas and the coauthor, Representative MCCAUL. I thank them for all of their hard work on this.

Every day, diplomats work to advance the interests of the United States, often at embassies and consulates in the most dangerous pockets of the world. They risk their lives to be our Nation's frontline civilians and are faced with having to adapt to changing technologies that often come with security risks.

As Members of Congress, and especially those who conduct oversight of the United States State Department, we must protect our diplomats who serve our Nation from any threats posed by evolving technology, including fitness trackers, for example, that expose location.

That is why I joined my fellow Texan, Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL, to introduce the Protecting Diplomats from Surveillance Through Consumer Devices Act. This bill requires the State Department to account for these devices in the security policies of U.S. embassies and consulates worldwide and update embassy and consulate security policies by addressing vulnerabilities associated with location-tracking consumer devices worn by diplomatic personnel.

These frontline civilians risk their lives in service to the United States. As lawmakers, we have a responsibility to ensure these brave diplomats and development workers have the protections they deserve.

I am glad to see this bill being considered on the House floor today, and I request and urge the support of all of my colleagues.

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

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

H.R. 4989 is commonsense legislation that will improve the safety of U.S. personnel overseas. I want to commend the chair and the ranking member for bringing this through our committee, and commend Mr. CASTRO of Texas and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas for their hard work in creating this legislation.

This bill will ensure that the State Department is addressing the risks associated with consumer devices that can be used, in some cases, to track the locations of those who own them.

This bill passed with a unanimous, bipartisan voice vote in our committee. I commend it to my colleagues. I will support this measure. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Our diplomats serve in some of the most dangerous parts of the world. They advance U.S. interests overseas, and while they serve our Nation overseas, it is our job here to ensure that they have the information and resources that they need to stay safe. So I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this timely bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4989, Protecting Diplomats from Surveillance Through Consumer Devices Act.

H.R. 4989 directs the Department of State to: (1) establish a policy on the use of location-tracking consumer devices, including GPS-enabled devices, at U.S. diplomatic and consular facilities by U.S. government employees, contractors, locally employed staff, and members of other agencies deployed to or stationed at such facilities; and (2) submit a related report to Congress.

This bill states that existing and new employees at such facilities shall, as a part of their security briefings, be informed of such policy and given instructions on the use of location-tracking consumer devices on and off facility premises.

The State Department may coordinate policy formulation with other agencies whose employees are deployed to or stationed at U.S. diplomatic and consular facilities.

The public release earlier this year of GPS tracking data from the American fitness company Strava revealed highly sensitive information on U.S. activities abroad, such as military base locations, jogging paths of personnel located at these bases and, in many cases, also identified paths with individual accounts.

This data was collected from wearable electronic devices such as Fitbits and other technologies and presents a glaring security vulnerability that our adversaries may exploit to undermine our interests, thereby putting our personnel serving abroad at extreme risk.

While the issue has most seriously affected U.S. military installations, in lieu of a policy on the use of these devices, State Department personnel remain at risk as well.

As such, H.R. 4989 requires the Department of State to establish and disseminate a policy on the use of location-tracking consumer devices by diplomats and other employees at U.S. embassies and consular facilities outside the United States.

This is a commonsense step to ensure we are doing all we can to protect our diplomatic personnel serving our nation abroad.

Our enemies and adversaries work around the clock to undermine our interests.

We should not make it any easier for them.

I thank my colleague and good friend, Congressman JOAQUIN CASTRO, for introducing this important legislation.

By passing H.R. 4989, we can help ensure the safety of our nation's dutiful diplomats.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 4989.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4989.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

BETTER UTILIZATION OF INVESTMENTS LEADING TO DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2018

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5105) to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5105

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018'' or the ''BUILD Act of 2018''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

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

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

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

(2) LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRY.—The term ''less developed country'' means a country with a low-income economy, lower-middle-income economy, or upper-middle-income economy, as defined by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association (collectively referred to as the ''World Bank'').

(3) PREDECESSOR AUTHORITY.—The term ''predecessor authority'' means authorities repealed by title VI.

(4) QUALIFYING SOVEREIGN ENTITY.—The term ''qualifying sovereign entity'' means—

(A) any agency or instrumentality of a foreign state (as defined in section 1603 of title 28, United States Code) that has a purpose that is similar to the purpose of the Corporation as described in section 102(b); or

(B) any international financial institution (as defined in section 1701(c) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c))).

TITLE I—ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 101. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to facilitate market-based private sector development and economic growth in less developed countries through the provision of credit, capital, and other financial support—

(1) to mobilize private capital in support of sustainable, broad-based economic growth, poverty reduction, and development through demand-driven partnerships with the private sector that further the foreign policy interests of the United States;

(2) to finance development that builds and strengthens civic institutions, promotes competition, and provides for public accountability and transparency;

(3) to help private sector actors overcome identifiable market gaps and inefficiencies without distorting markets;

(4) to achieve clearly defined economic and social development outcomes;

(5) to coordinate with institutions with purposes similar to the purposes of the Corporation to leverage resources of those institutions to produce the greatest impact;

(6) to provide countries a robust alternative to state-directed investments by authoritarian governments and United States strategic competitors using high standards of transparency and environmental and social safeguards, and which take into account the debt sustainability of partner countries;

(7) to leverage private sector capabilities and innovative development tools to help countries transition from recipients of bilateral development assistance toward increased self-reliance; and

(8) to complement and be guided by overall United States foreign policy, development, and national security objectives, taking into account the priorities and needs of countries receiving support.

SEC. 102. UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCE CORPORATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Executive branch the United States International Development Finance Corporation (in this Act referred to as the ''Corporation''), which shall be a wholly owned Government corporation for purposes of chapter 91 of title 31, United States Code, under the foreign policy guidance of the Secretary of State.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Corporation shall be to mobilize and facilitate the participation of private sector capital and skills in the economic development of less developed countries, as described in subsection (c), and countries in transition from nonmarket to market economies, in order to complement the development assistance objectives, and advance the foreign policy interests, of the United States. In carrying out its purpose, the Corporation, utilizing broad criteria, shall take into account in its financing operations the economic and financial soundness and development objectives of projects for which it provides support under title II.

(c) LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRY FOCUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall prioritize the provision of support under title II in less developed countries with a low-income economy or a lower-middle-income economy.

(2) SUPPORT IN UPPER-MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES.—The Corporation shall restrict the provision of support under title II in a less developed country with an upper-middle-income economy unless—

(A) the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such support furthers the national economic or foreign policy interests of the United States; and

(B) such support is likely to be highly developmental or provide developmental benefits to the poorest population of that country.

SEC. 103. MANAGEMENT OF CORPORATION.

(a) STRUCTURE OF CORPORATION.—There shall be in the Corporation a Board of Directors (in this Act referred to as the ''Board''), a Chief Executive Officer, a Deputy Chief Executive Officer, a Chief Risk Officer, a Chief Development Officer, and such other officers as the Board may determine.

(b) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—

(1) DUTIES.—All powers of the Corporation shall vest in and be exercised by or under the authority of the Board. The Board—

(A) shall perform the functions specified to be carried out by the Board in this Act;

(B) may prescribe, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, regulations, policies, and procedures governing the manner in which the business of the Corporation may be conducted and in which the powers granted to the Corporation by law may be exercised; and

(C) shall develop, in consultation with stakeholders and other interested parties, a publicly-available policy with respect to consultations, hearings, and other forms of engagement in order to provide for meaningful public participation in the Board's activities.

(2) MEMBERSHIP OF BOARD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall consist of—

(i) the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation;

(ii) the officers specified in subparagraph (B); and

(iii) four other individuals who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of which—

(I) one individual should be appointed from among a list of at least five individuals submitted by the majority leader of the Senate after consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(II) one individual should be appointed from among a list of at least five individuals submitted by the minority leader of the Senate after consultation with the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(III) one individual should be appointed from among a list of at least five individuals submitted by the Speaker of the House of Representatives after consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(IV) one individual should be appointed from among a list of at least five individuals submitted by the minority leader of the House of Representatives after consultation with the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(B) OFFICERS SPECIFIED.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The officers specified in this subparagraph are the following:

(I) The Secretary of State or a designee of the Secretary.

(II) The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development or a designee of the Administrator.

(III) The Secretary of the Treasury or a designee of the Secretary.

(IV) The Secretary of Commerce or a designee of the Secretary.

(ii) REQUIREMENTS FOR DESIGNEES.—A designee under clause (i) shall be selected from among officers—

(I) appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(II) whose duties relate to the programs of the Corporation; and

(III) who is designated by and serving at the pleasure of the President.

(C) REQUIREMENTS FOR NONGOVERNMENT MEMBERS.—A member of the Board described in subparagraph (A)(iii)—

(i) may not be an officer or employee of the United States Government;

(ii) shall have relevant experience, which may include experience relating to the private sector, the environment, labor organizations, or international development, to carry out the purpose of the Corporation;

(iii) shall be appointed for a term of 3 years and may be reappointed for one additional term;

(iv) shall serve until the member's successor is appointed and confirmed;

(v) shall be compensated at a rate equivalent to that of level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, when engaged in the business of the Corporation; and

(vi) may be paid per diem in lieu of subsistence at the applicable rate under the Federal Travel Regulation under subtitle F of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, from time to time, while away from the home or usual place of business of the member.

(3) CHAIRPERSON.—There shall be a Chairperson of the Board designated by the President from among the individuals described in paragraph (2)(A).

(4) VICE CHAIRPERSON.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, or the designee of the Administrator under paragraph (2)(B)(i)(II), shall serve as the Vice Chairperson of the Board.

(5) QUORUM.—Five members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business by the Board.

(c) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—

(1) PUBLIC HEARINGS BY THE BOARD.—The Board shall hold at least one public hearing each year in order to afford an opportunity for any person to present views with respect to whether—

(A) the Corporation is carrying out its activities in accordance with this Act; and

(B) any support provided by the Corporation under title II in any country should be suspended, expanded, or extended.

(2) ADDITIONAL PUBLIC HEARINGS.—In conjunction with each meeting of the Board, the Corporation shall hold a public hearing in order to afford an opportunity for any person to present views regarding the activities of the Corporation. Such views shall be made part of the record.

(d) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—There shall be in the Corporation a Chief Executive Officer, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

(2) AUTHORITIES AND DUTIES.—The Chief Executive Officer shall be responsible for the management of the Corporation and shall exercise the powers and discharge the duties of the Corporation subject to the bylaws, rules, regulations, and procedures established by the Board.

(3) RELATIONSHIP TO BOARD.—The Chief Executive Officer shall report to and be under the direct authority of the Board.

(4) COMPENSATION.—Section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Chief Executive Officer, United States International Development Finance Corporation.''.

(e) DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—There shall be in the Corporation a Deputy Chief Executive Officer, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

(f) CHIEF RISK OFFICER.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—Subject to the approval of the Board, the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation shall appoint a Chief Risk Officer, from among individuals with experience at a senior level in financial risk management, who—

(A) shall report directly to the Board; and

(B) shall be removable only by a majority vote of the Board.

(2) DUTIES.—The Chief Risk Officer shall, in coordination with the audit committee of the Board established under section 401, develop, implement, and manage a comprehensive process for identifying, assessing, monitoring, and limiting risks to the Corporation, including the overall portfolio diversification of the Corporation.

(g) CHIEF DEVELOPMENT OFFICER.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—Subject to the approval of the Board, the Chief Executive Officer, in conjunction with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall appoint a Chief Development Officer, from among individuals with experience in development, who—

(A) shall report directly to the Board; and

(B) shall be removable only by a majority vote of the Board.

(2) DUTIES.—The Chief Development Officer shall—

(A) coordinate the Corporation's development policies and implementation efforts with the United States Agency for International Development, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and other relevant United States Government departments and agencies, including directly liaising with missions of the United States Agency for International Development, to ensure that departments, agencies, and missions have training, awareness, and access to the Corporation's tools in relation to development policy and projects in countries;

(B) under the guidance of the Chief Executive Officer, manage employees of the Corporation that are dedicated to structuring, monitoring and evaluating transactions and projects co-designed with the United States Agency for International Development and other relevant United States Government departments and agencies;

(C) authorize and coordinate transfers of funds or other resources to and from such agencies, departments, or missions upon the concurrence of those institutions in support of the Corporation's projects or activities; and

(D) coordinate and implement the activities of the Corporation under section 405.

(h) OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, officers, employees, and agents shall be selected and appointed by the Corporation, and shall be vested with such powers and duties as the Corporation may determine.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVELY DETERMINED EMPLOYEES.—

(A) APPOINTMENT; COMPENSATION; REMOVAL.—Of officers and employees employed by the Corporation under paragraph (1), not more than 50 may be appointed, compensated, or removed without regard to title 5, United States Code.

(B) REINSTATEMENT.—Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, officers and employees appointed to a position under subparagraph (A) may be entitled, upon removal from such position (unless the removal was for cause), to reinstatement to the position occupied at the time of appointment or to a position of comparable grade and salary.

(C) ADDITIONAL POSITIONS.—Positions authorized by subparagraph (A) shall be in addition to those otherwise authorized by law, including positions authorized under section 5108 of title 5, United States Code.

(D) RATES OF PAY FOR OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.—The Corporation may set and adjust rates of basic pay for officers and employees appointed under subparagraph (A) without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 or subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, respectively.

(3) LIABILITY OF EMPLOYEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An individual who is a member of the Board or an officer or employee of the Corporation has no liability under this Act with respect to any claim arising out of or resulting from any act or omission by the individual within the scope of the employment of the individual in connection with any transaction by the Corporation.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed to limit personal liability of an individual for criminal acts or omissions, willful or malicious misconduct, acts or omissions for private gain, or any other acts or omissions outside the scope of the individual's employment.

(C) SAVINGS PROVISION.—This paragraph shall not be construed—

(i) to affect—

(I) any other immunities and protections that may be available to an individual described in subparagraph (A) under applicable law with respect to a transaction described in that subparagraph; or

(II) any other right or remedy against the Corporation, against the United States under applicable law, or against any person other than an individual described in subparagraph (A) participating in such a transaction; or

(ii) to limit or alter in any way the immunities that are available under applicable law for Federal officers and employees not described in this paragraph.

SEC. 104. INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE CORPORATION.

The President shall appoint and maintain an Inspector General in the Corporation, in accordance with the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

SEC. 105. INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall establish a transparent and independent accountability mechanism.

(b) FUNCTIONS.—The independent accountability mechanism established pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(1) annually evaluate and report to the Board and Congress regarding compliance with environmental, social, labor, human rights, and transparency standards, consistent with Corporation statutory mandates;

(2) provide a forum for resolving concerns regarding the impacts of specific Corporation-supported projects with respect to such standards; and

(3) provide advice regarding Corporation projects, policies, and practices.

TITLE II—AUTHORITIES

SEC. 201. AUTHORITIES RELATING TO PROVISION OF SUPPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The authorities in this title should only be exercised to—

(1) carry out of the policy of the United States in section 101 and the purpose of the Corporation in section 102;

(2) mitigate risks to United States taxpayers by sharing risks with the private sector and qualifying sovereign entities through co-financing and structuring of tools; and

(3) ensure that support provided under this title is additional to private sector resources by mobilizing private capital that would otherwise not be deployed without such support.

(b) LENDING AND GUARANTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may make loans or guaranties upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine.

(2) DENOMINATION.—Loans and guaranties issued under paragraph (1) may be denominated and repayable in United States dollars or foreign currencies. Foreign currency denominated loans and guaranties should only be provided if the Board determines there is a substantive policy rationale for such loans and guaranties.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL CREDIT REFORM ACT OF 1990.—Loans and guaranties issued under paragraph (1) shall be subject to the requirements of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.).

(c) EQUITY INVESTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may, as a minority investor, support projects with funds or use other mechanisms for the purpose of purchasing, and may make and fund commitments to purchase, invest in, make pledges in respect of, or otherwise acquire, equity or quasi-equity securities or shares or financial interests of any entity, including as a limited partner or other investor in investment funds, upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine.

(2) DENOMINATION.—Support provided under paragraph (1) may be denominated and repayable in United States dollars or foreign currency. Foreign currency denominated support provided by paragraph (1) should only be provided if the Board determines there is a substantive policy rationale for such support.

(3) GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA.—The Corporation shall develop guidelines and criteria to require that the use of the authority provided by paragraph (1) with respect to a project has a clearly defined development and foreign policy purpose, taking into account the following objectives:

(A) The support for the project would be more likely than not to substantially reduce or overcome the effect of an identified market failure in the country in which the project is carried out.

(B) The project would not have proceeded or would have been substantially delayed without the support.

(C) The support would meaningfully contribute to transforming local conditions to promote the development of markets.

(D) The support can be shown to be aligned with commercial partner incentives.

(E) The support can be shown to have significant developmental impact and will contribute to long-term commercial sustainability.

(F) The support furthers the policy of the United States described in section 101.

(4) LIMITATIONS ON EQUITY INVESTMENTS.—

(A) PER PROJECT LIMIT.—The aggregate amount of support provided under this subsection with respect to any project shall not exceed 30 percent of the aggregate amount of all equity investment made from any source to the project at the time that the Corporation approves support of the project.

(B) TOTAL LIMIT.—Support provided pursuant to this subsection shall be limited to not more than 35 percent of the Corporation's aggregate exposure on the date that such support is provided.

(5) SALES AND LIQUIDATION OF POSITION.—The Corporation shall seek to sell and liquidate any support for a project provided under this subsection as soon as commercially feasible, commensurate with other similar investors in the project and taking into consideration the national security interests of the United States.

(6) TIMETABLE.—The Corporation shall create a project-specific timetable for support provided under paragraph (1).

(d) INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE.—The Corporation may issue insurance or reinsurance, upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine, to private sector entities and qualifying sovereign entities assuring protection of their investments in whole or in part against any or all political risks such as currency inconvertibility and transfer restrictions, expropriation, war, terrorism, civil disturbance, breach of contract, or nonhonoring of financial obligations.

(e) PROMOTION OF AND SUPPORT FOR PRIVATE INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to carry out the purpose of the Corporation described in section 102(b), the Corporation may initiate and support, through financial participation, incentive grant, or otherwise, and on such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine, feasibility studies for the planning, development, and management of, and procurement for, potential bilateral and multilateral development projects eligible for support under this title, including training activities undertaken in connection with such projects, for the purpose of promoting investment in such projects and the identification, assessment, surveying, and promotion of private investment opportunities, utilizing wherever feasible and effective, the facilities of private investors.

(2) CONTRIBUTIONS TO COSTS.—The Corporation shall, to the maximum extent practicable, require any person receiving funds under the authorities of this subsection to—

(A) share the costs of feasibility studies and other project planning services funded under this subsection; and

(B) reimburse the Corporation those funds provided under this section, if the person succeeds in project implementation.

(f) SPECIAL PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS.—The Corporation may administer and manage special projects and programs in support of specific transactions undertaken by the Corporation, including programs of financial and advisory support that provide private technical, professional, or managerial assistance in the development of human resources, skills, technology, capital savings, or intermediate financial and investment institutions or cooperatives and including the initiation of incentives, grants, and studies for renewable energy, women's economic empowerment, microenterprise households, or other small business activities.

(g) ENTERPRISE FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may, following consultation with the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and the heads of other relevant departments or agencies, establish and operate enterprise funds in accordance with this subsection.

(2) PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS.—The provisions of section 201 of the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989 (22 U.S.C. 5421) (other than the provisions of subsections (a), (b), (c), (d)(1), (d)(3), (e), (f), and (j) of that section), shall be deemed to apply with respect to any enterprise fund established by the Corporation under this subsection and to funds made available to any such enterprise fund in the same manner and to the same extent as such provisions apply with respect to enterprise funds established pursuant to such section 201 or to funds made available to enterprise funds established under that section.

(3) PURPOSES FOR WHICH SUPPORT MAY BE PROVIDED.—The Corporation, subject to the approval of the Board, may designate private, nonprofit organizations as eligible to receive support under this title for the following purposes:

(A) To promote development of economic freedom and private sectors, including small- and medium-sized enterprises and joint ventures with the United States and host country participants.

(B) To facilitate access to credit to small- and medium-sized enterprises with sound business plans in countries where there is limited means of accessing credit on market terms.

(C) To promote policies and practices conducive to economic freedom and private sector development.

(D) To attract foreign direct investment capital to further promote private sector development and economic freedom.

(E) To complement the work of the United States Agency for International Development and other donors to improve the overall business-enabling environment, financing the creation and expansion of the private business sector.

(F) To make financially sustainable investments designed to generate measurable social benefits and build technical capacity in addition to financial returns.

(4) OPERATION OF FUNDS.—

(A) EXPENDITURES.—Funds made available to an enterprise fund shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payments for projects and activities carried out under this subsection.

(B) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 3 percent per annum of the funds made available to an enterprise fund may be obligated or expended for the administrative expenses of the enterprise fund.

(5) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—Each enterprise fund established under this subsection should be governed by a Board of Directors comprised of private citizens of the United States or the host country, who—

(A) shall be appointed by the President after consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the appropriate congressional committees; and

(B) have pursued careers in international business and have demonstrated expertise in international and emerging market investment activities.

(6) MAJORITY MEMBER REQUIREMENT.—The majority of the members of the Board of Directors shall be United States citizens who shall have relevant experience relating to the purposes described in paragraph (3).

(7) REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the establishment of an enterprise fund under this subsection, and annually thereafter until the enterprise fund terminates in accordance with paragraph (10), the Board of Directors of the enterprise fund shall—

(A) submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report—

(i) detailing the administrative expenses of the enterprise fund during the year preceding the submission of the report;

(ii) describing the operations, activities, engagement with civil society and relevant local private sector entities, development objectives and outcomes, financial condition, and accomplishments of the enterprise fund during that year;

(iii) describing the results of any audit conducted under paragraph (8); and

(iv) describing how audits conducted under paragraph (8) are informing the operations and activities of the enterprise fund; and

(B) publish, on a publicly available internet website of the enterprise fund, each report required by subparagraph (A).

(8) OVERSIGHT.—

(A) INSPECTOR GENERAL PERFORMANCE AUDITS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Corporation shall conduct periodic audits of the activities of each enterprise fund established under this subsection.

(ii) CONSIDERATION.—In conducting an audit under clause (i), the Inspector General shall assess whether the activities of the enterprise fund—

(I) support the purposes described in paragraph (3);

(II) result in profitable private sector investing; and

(III) generate measurable social benefits.

(B) RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS.—The Corporation shall ensure that each enterprise fund receiving support under this subsection—

(i) keeps separate accounts with respect to such support; and

(ii) maintains such records as may be reasonably necessary to facilitate effective audits under this paragraph.

(9) RETURN OF FUNDS TO TREASURY.—Any funds resulting from any liquidation, dissolution, or winding up of an enterprise fund, in whole or in part, shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

(10) TERMINATION.—The authority of an enterprise fund to provide support under this subsection shall terminate on the earlier of—

(A) the date that is 7 years after the date of the first expenditure of amounts from the enterprise fund; or

(B) the date on which the enterprise fund is liquidated.

(h) SUPERVISION OF SUPPORT.—Support provided under this title shall be subject to section 622(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2382(c)).

SEC. 202. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), support provided by the Corporation under this title shall be on such terms and conditions as the Corporation may prescribe.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The following requirements apply to support provided by the Corporation under this title:

(1) The Corporation shall provide support using authorities under this title only if it is necessary—

(A) to alleviate a credit market imperfection; or

(B) to achieve specified development or foreign policy objectives of the United States Government by providing support in the most efficient way to meet those objectives on a case-by-case basis.

(2) The final maturity of a loan made or guaranteed by the Corporation shall not exceed the lesser of—

(A) 25 years; or

(B) debt servicing capabilities of the project to be financed by the loan (as determined by the Corporation).

(3) The Corporation shall, with respect to providing any loan guaranty to a project, require the parties to the project to bear the risk of loss in an amount equal to at least 20 percent of the guaranteed support by the Corporation in the project.

(4) The Corporation may not make or guarantee a loan unless the Corporation determines that the borrower or lender is responsible and that adequate provision is made for servicing the loan on reasonable terms and protecting the financial interest of the United States.

(5) The interest rate for direct loans and interest supplements on guaranteed loans shall be set by reference to a benchmark interest rate (yield) on marketable Treasury securities or other widely recognized or appropriate benchmarks with a similar maturity to the loans being made or guaranteed, as determined in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury. The Corporation shall establish appropriate minimum interest rates for loans, guaranties, and other instruments as necessary.

(6) The minimum interest rate for new loans as established by the Corporation shall be adjusted periodically to take account of changes in the interest rate of the benchmark financial instrument.

(7)(A) The Corporation shall set fees or premiums for support provided under this title at levels that minimize the cost to the Government while supporting achievement of the objectives of support.

(B) The Corporation shall review fees for loan guaranties periodically to ensure that the fees assessed on new loan guaranties are at a level sufficient to cover the Corporation's most recent estimates of its costs.

(8) Any loan guaranty provided by the Corporation shall be conclusive evidence that—

(A) the guaranty has been properly obtained;

(B) the loan qualified for the guaranty; and

(C) but for fraud or material misrepresentation by the holder of the guaranty, the guaranty is presumed to be valid, legal, and enforceable.

(9) The Corporation shall prescribe explicit standards for use in periodically assessing the credit risk of new and existing direct loans or guaranteed loans.

(10) The Corporation may not make loans or loan guaranties except to the extent that budget authority to cover the costs of the loans or guaranties is provided in advance in an appropriations Act, as required by section 504 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661c).

(11) The Corporation shall rely upon specific standards to assess the developmental and strategic value of projects for which it provides support and should only provide the minimum level of support necessary in order to support such projects.

(12) Any loan or loan guaranty made by the Corporation should be provided on a senior basis or pari passu with other senior debt unless there is a substantive policy rationale to provide such support otherwise.

SEC. 203. PAYMENT OF LOSSES.

(a) PAYMENTS FOR DEFAULTS ON GUARANTEED LOANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Corporation determines that the holder of a loan guaranteed by the Corporation suffers a loss as a result of a default by a borrower on the loan, the Corporation shall pay to the holder the percent of the loss, as specified in the guaranty contract after the holder of the loan has made such further collection efforts and instituted such enforcement proceedings as the Corporation may require.

(2) SUBROGATION.—Upon making a payment described in paragraph (1), the Corporation shall ensure the Corporation will be subrogated to all the rights of the recipient of the payment.

(3) RECOVERY EFFORTS.—The Corporation shall pursue recovery from the borrower of the amount of any payment made under paragraph (1) with respect to the loan.

(b) LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by paragraph (2), compensation for insurance, reinsurance, or a guaranty issued under this title shall not exceed the dollar value of the tangible or intangible contributions or commitments made in the project, plus interest, earnings, or profits actually accrued on such contributions or commitments, to the extent provided by such insurance, reinsurance, or guaranty.

(2) EXCEPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may provide that—

(i) appropriate adjustments in the insured dollar value be made to reflect the replacement cost of project assets; and

(ii) compensation for a claim of loss under insurance of an equity investment under section 201(d) may be computed on the basis of the net book value attributable to the equity investment on the date of loss.

(3) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2)(A)(ii) and except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Corporation shall limit the amount of direct insurance and reinsurance issued under section 201 with respect to a project so as to require that the insured and its affiliates bear the risk of loss for at least 10 percent of the amount of the Corporation's exposure to that insured and its affiliates in the project.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The limitation under subparagraph (A) shall not apply to direct insurance or reinsurance of loans provided by banks or other financial institutions to unrelated parties.

(c) ACTIONS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall take such action as may be appropriate to enforce any right accruing to the United States as a result of the issuance of any loan or guaranty under this title.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of a borrower that may be agreed upon by the parties to a loan guaranteed by the Corporation if budget authority for any resulting costs to the United States Government (as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) is available.

SEC. 204. TERMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The authorities provided under this title terminate on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) TERMINATION OF CORPORATION.—The Corporation shall terminate on the date on which the portfolio of the Corporation is liquidated.

TITLE III—ADMINISTRATIVE AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. OPERATIONS.

(a) BILATERAL AGREEMENTS.—The Corporation may provide support under title II in connection with projects in any country the government of which has entered into an agreement with the United States authorizing the Corporation to provide such support in that country.

(b) CLAIMS SETTLEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Claims arising as a result of support provided under title II or under predecessor authority may be settled, and disputes arising as a result thereof may be arbitrated with the consent of the parties, on such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine.

(2) SETTLEMENTS CONCLUSIVE.—Payment made pursuant to any settlement pursuant to paragraph (1), or as a result of an arbitration award, shall be final and conclusive notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(c) PRESUMPTION OF COMPLIANCE.—Each contract executed by such officer or officers as may be designated by the Board shall be conclusively presumed to be issued in compliance with the requirements of this Act.

(d) ELECTRONIC PAYMENTS AND DOCUMENTS.—The Corporation shall implement policies to accept electronic documents and electronic payments in all of its programs.

SEC. 302. CORPORATE POWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation—

(1) may adopt, alter, and use a seal, to include an identifiable symbol of the United States;

(2) may make and perform such contracts, including no-cost contracts (as defined by the Corporation), grants, and other agreements notwithstanding division C of subtitle I of title 41, United States Code, with any person or government however designated and wherever situated, as may be necessary for carrying out the functions of the Corporation;

(3) may lease, purchase, or otherwise acquire, improve, and use such real property wherever situated, as may be necessary for carrying out the functions of the Corporation and which, if done for the Corporation's

own occupancy, shall be made in consultation with the Administrator of General Services;

(4) may accept cash gifts or donations of services or of property (real, personal, or mixed), tangible or intangible, for the purpose of carrying out the functions of the Corporation;

(5) may use the United States mails in the same manner and on the same conditions as the Executive departments (as defined in section 101 of title 5, United States Code);

(6) may contract with individuals for personal services, who shall not be considered Federal employees for any provision of law administered by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management;

(7) may hire or obtain passenger motor vehicles;

(8) may sue and be sued in its corporate name;

(9) may acquire, hold, or dispose of, upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine, any property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, or any interest in such property and which, if done for the Corporation's own occupancy, shall be made in consultation with the Administrator of General Services;

(10) may lease office space for the Corporation's own use, with the obligation of amounts for such lease limited to the current fiscal year for which payments are due until the expiration of the current lease under predecessor authority, as of the day before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(11) may indemnify directors, officers, employees, and agents of the Corporation for liabilities and expenses incurred in connection with their activities on behalf of the Corporation;

(12) notwithstanding any other provision of law, may represent itself or contract for representation in any legal or arbitral proceeding;

(13) may exercise any priority of the Government of the United States in collecting debts from bankrupt, insolvent, or decedents' estates;

(14) may collect, notwithstanding section 3711(g)(1) of title 31, United States Code, or compromise any obligations assigned to or held by the Corporation, including any legal or equitable rights accruing to the Corporation;

(15) may make arrangements with foreign governments (including agencies, instrumentalities, or political subdivisions of such governments) or with multilateral organizations or institutions for sharing liabilities;

(16) may sell direct investments of the Corporation to private investors upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine; and

(17) shall have such other powers as may be necessary and incident to carrying out the functions of the Corporation.

(b) TREATMENT OF PROPERTY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of property by the United States, the Corporation shall have the right in its discretion to complete, recondition, reconstruct, renovate, repair, maintain, operate, or sell any property acquired by the Corporation pursuant to the provisions of this Act and which, if done for the Corporation's own occupancy, shall be made in consultation with the Administrator of General Services.

SEC. 303. MAXIMUM CONTINGENT LIABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The maximum contingent liability of the Corporation outstanding at any one time shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNT SPECIFIED.—

(1) INITIAL 5-YEAR PERIOD.—The amount specified in this subsection for the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, is $60,000,000,000.

(2) SUBSEQUENT 5-YEAR PERIODS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than every 5 years thereafter, the amount specified in paragraph (1) shall be adjusted to reflect the percentage of the increase (if any) in the average of the Consumer Price Index during the preceding 5-year period.

(3) CONSUMER PRICE INDEX DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''Consumer Price Index'' means the most recent Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

SEC. 304. CORPORATE FUNDS.

(a) CORPORATE CAPITAL ACCOUNT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the ''Corporate Capital Account'' to carry out the purposes of the Corporation.

(b) FUNDING.—The Corporate Capital Account shall consist of—

(1) fees charged and collected pursuant to subsection (c);

(2) any amounts received pursuant to subsection (e);

(3) investments and returns on such investments pursuant to subsection (g);

(4) unexpended balances transferred to the Corporation pursuant to subsection (i);

(5) payments received in connection with settlements of all insurance and reinsurance claims of the Corporation; and

(6) all other collections transferred to or earned by the Corporation, excluding the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a), of loans and loan guaranties.

(c) FEE AUTHORITY.—Fees may be charged and collected for providing services in amounts to be determined by the Corporation.

(d) USES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to Acts making appropriations, the Corporation is authorized to pay—

(A) the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of loans and loan guaranties;

(B) administrative expenses of the Corporation;

(C) for the cost of providing support authorized by subsections (c), (e), (f), and (g) of section 201; and

(D) project-specific transaction costs.

(2) INCOME AND REVENUE.—In order to carry out the purposes of the Corporation, all collections transferred to or earned by the Corporation, excluding the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of loans and loan guaranties, shall be deposited into the Corporate Capital Account and shall be available to carry out its purpose, including without limitation—

(A) payment of all insurance and reinsurance claims of the Corporation;

(B) repayments to the Treasury of amounts borrowed under subsection (e); and

(C) dividend payments to the Treasury under subsection (f).

(e) FULL FAITH AND CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All support provided pursuant to predecessor authorities or title II shall continue to constitute obligations of the United States, and the full faith and credit of the United States is hereby pledged for the full payment and performance of such obligations.

(2) AUTHORITY TO BORROW.—The Corporation is authorized to borrow from the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to fulfill such obligations of the United States and any such borrowing shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities, for a period jointly determined by the Corporation and the Secretary, and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(f) DIVIDENDS.—The Board, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall annually assess a dividend payment to the Treasury if the Corporation's insurance portfolio is more than 100 percent reserved.

(g) INVESTMENT AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may request the Secretary of the Treasury to invest such portion of the Corporate Capital Account as is not, in the Corporation's judgement, required to meet the current needs of the Corporate Capital Account.

(2) FORM OF INVESTMENTS.—Such investments shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in public debt obligations, with maturities suitable to the needs of the Corporate Capital Account, as determined by the Corporation, and bearing interest at rates determined by the Secretary, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities.

(h) COLLECTIONS.—Interest earnings made pursuant to subsection (g), earnings collected related to equity investments, and amounts, excluding fees related to insurance or reinsurance, collected pursuant to subsection (c), shall not be collected for any fiscal year except to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

(i) TRANSFER FROM PREDECESSOR AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS.—By the date end of the transition period described in title VI, the unexpended balances, assets, and responsibilities of any agency specified in the plan required by section 602 shall be transferred to the Corporation.

(j) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—In order to carry out this Act, funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) may be transferred to the Corporation and funds authorized to be appropriated to the Corporation may be transferred to the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development.

(k) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''project-specific transaction costs''—

(1) means those costs incurred by the Corporation for travel, legal expenses, and direct and indirect costs incurred in claims settlements associated with the provision of support under title II and shall not be considered administrative expenses for the purposes of this section; and

(2) does not include information technology (as such term is defined in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code).

SEC. 305. COORDINATION WITH OTHER DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Corporation should use relevant data of the Department of State, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the United States Agency for International Development, and other departments and agencies that have development functions to better inform the decisions of the Corporation with respect to providing support under title II.

TITLE IV—MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING

SEC. 401. ESTABLISHMENT OF RISK AND AUDIT COMMITTEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To assist the Board to fulfill its duties and responsibilities under section 201(a), the Corporation shall establish a risk committee and an audit committee.

(b) DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF RISK COMMITTEE.—Subject to the direction of the

Board, the risk committee established under subsection (a) shall have oversight responsibility of—

(1) formulating risk management policies of the operations of the Corporation;

(2) reviewing and providing guidance on operation of the Corporation's global risk management framework;

(3) developing policies for enterprise risk management, monitoring, and management of strategic, reputational, regulatory, operational, developmental, environmental, social, and financial risks;

(4) developing the risk profile of the Corporation, including a risk management and compliance framework and governance structure to support such framework; and

(5) developing policies and procedures for assessing, prior to providing, and for any period during which the Corporation provides, support to any foreign entities, whether such entities have in place sufficient enhanced due diligence policies and practices to prevent money laundering and corruption to ensure the Corporation does not provide support to persons that are—

(A) knowingly engaging in acts of corruption;

(B) knowingly providing material or financial support for terrorism, drug trafficking, or human trafficking; or

(C) responsible for ordering or otherwise directing serious or gross violations of human rights.

(c) DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF AUDIT COMMITTEE.—Subject to the direction of the Board, the audit committee established under subsection (a) shall have the oversight responsibility of—

(1) the integrity of the Corporation's financial reporting and systems of internal controls regarding finance and accounting;

(2) the integrity of the Corporation's financial statements;

(3) the performance of the Corporation's internal audit function; and

(4) compliance with legal and regulatory requirements related to the finances of the Corporation.

SEC. 402. PERFORMANCE MEASURES, EVALUATION, AND LEARNING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall develop a performance measurement system to evaluate and monitor projects supported by the Corporation under title II and to guide future projects of the Corporation.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing the performance measurement system required by subsection (a), the Corporation shall—

(1) develop a successor for the development impact measurement system of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (as such system was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act);

(2) develop a mechanism for ensuring that support provided by the Corporation under title II is in addition to private investment;

(3) develop standards for, and a method for ensuring, appropriate financial performance of the Corporation's portfolio; and

(4) develop standards for, and a method for ensuring, appropriate development performance of the Corporation's portfolio, including—

(A) measurement of the projected and ex post development impact of a project; and

(B) the information necessary to comply with section 403.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—The Corporation shall make available to the public on a regular basis information about support provided by the Corporation under title II and performance metrics about such support on a country-by-country basis.

(d) COLLABORATION.—In developing the performance measurement system required by subsection (a), the Corporation shall consult with stakeholders and other interested parties engaged in sustainable economic growth and development.

SEC. 403. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—After the end of each fiscal year, the Corporation shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a complete and detailed report of its operations during that fiscal year, including an assessment of—

(1) the economic and social development impact, including with respect to matters described in subsections (d) and (e) of section 501, of projects supported by the Corporation under title II;

(2) the extent to which the operations of the Corporation complement or are compatible with the development assistance programs of the United States and qualifying sovereign entities;

(3) the Corporation's institutional linkages with other relevant United States Government department and agencies, including efforts to strengthen such linkages; and

(4) the compliance of projects supported by the Corporation under title II with human rights, environmental, labor, and social policies, or other such related policies that govern the Corporation's support for projects, promulgated or otherwise administered by the Corporation.

(b) ELEMENTS.—Each annual report required by subsection (a) shall include analyses of the effects of projects supported by the Corporation under title II, including—

(1) reviews and analyses of—

(A) the desired development outcomes for projects and whether or not the Corporation is meeting the associated metrics, goals, and development objectives, including, to the extent practicable, in the years after conclusion of projects; and

(B) the effect of the Corporation's support on access to capital and ways in which the Corporation is addressing identifiable market gaps or inefficiencies and what impact, if any, such support has on access to credit for a specific project, country, or sector;

(2) an explanation of any partnership arrangement or cooperation with a qualifying sovereign entity in support of each project;

(3) projections of—

(A) development outcomes, and whether or not support for projects are meeting the associated performance measures, both during the start-up phase and over the duration of the support, and to the extent practicable, measures of such development outcomes should be on a gender-disaggregated basis, such as changes in employment, access to financial services, enterprise development and growth, and composition of executive boards and senior leadership of enterprises receiving support under title II; and

(B) the value of private sector assets brought to bear relative to the amount of support provided by the Corporation and the value of any other public sector support; and

(4) an assessment of the extent to which lessons learned from the monitoring and evaluation activities of the Corporation, and from annual reports from previous years compiled by the Corporation, have been applied to projects.

SEC. 404. PUBLICLY AVAILABLE PROJECT INFORMATION.

The Corporation shall—

(1) maintain a user-friendly, publicly available, machine-readable database with detailed country-level information, including a description of the support provided by the Corporation under title II; and

(2) include a clear link to information about each project supported by the Corporation under title II on the internet website of the Department of State, ''ForeignAssistance.gov'', or a successor website or other online publication.

SEC. 405. ENGAGEMENT WITH INVESTORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation, acting through the Chief Development Officer, shall, in cooperation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development—

(1) develop a strategic relationship with private sector entities focused at the nexus of business opportunities and development priorities;

(2) engage such entities and reduce business risks primarily through direct transaction support and facilitating investment partnerships;

(3) develop and support tools, approaches, and intermediaries that can mobilize private finance at scale in the developing world;

(4) pursue projects of all sizes, especially those that are small but designed for work in the most underdeveloped areas, including countries with chronic suffering as a result of extreme poverty, fragile institutions, or a history of violence; and

(5) pursue projects consistent with the policy of the United States described in section 101 and the Joint Strategic Plan and the Mission Country Development Cooperation Strategies of the United States Agency for International Development.

(b) ASSISTANCE.—To achieve the goals described in subsection (a), the Corporation shall—

(1) develop risk mitigation tools;

(2) provide transaction structuring support for blended finance models;

(3) support intermediaries linking capital supply and demand;

(4) coordinate with other Federal agencies to support or accelerate transactions;

(5) convene financial, donor, civil society, and public sector partners around opportunities for private finance within development priorities;

(6) offer strategic planning and programming assistance to catalyze investment into priority sectors;

(7) provide transaction structuring support;

(8) deliver training and knowledge management tools for engaging private investors;

(9) partner with private sector entities that provide access to capital and expertise; and

(10) identify and screen new investment partners.

(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Corporation shall coordinate with the United States Agency for International Development and other agencies and departments, as necessary, on projects and programs supported by the Corporation that include technical assistance.

SEC. 406. NOTIFICATION OF SUPPORT TO BE PROVIDED BY THE CORPORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days prior to the Corporation making a financial commitment associated with the provision of support under title II in an amount in excess of $10,000,000, the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report in writing that contains the information required by subsection (b).

(b) INFORMATION REQUIRED.—The information required by this subsection includes—

(1) the amount of each such financial commitment;

(2) an identification of the recipient or beneficiary; and

(3) a description of the project, activity, or asset and the development goal or purpose to be achieved by providing support by the Corporation.

TITLE V—CONDITIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND PROHIBITIONS

SEC. 501. LIMITATIONS AND PREFERENCES.

(a) LIMITATION ON SUPPORT FOR SINGLE ENTITY.—No entity receiving support from the Corporation under title II may receive more than an amount equal to 5 percent of the Corporation's maximum contingent liability authorized under section 303.

(b) PREFERENCE FOR SUPPORT FOR PROJECTS SPONSORED BY UNITED STATES PERSONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation should give preferential consideration to projects sponsored by or involving private sector entities that are United States persons.

(2) UNITED STATES PERSON DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''United States person'' means—

(A) a United States citizen; or

(B) an entity significantly beneficially owned by individuals described in subparagraph (A).

(c) PREFERENCE FOR SUPPORT IN COUNTRIES IN COMPLIANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL TRADE OBLIGATIONS.—

(1) CONSULTATIONS WITH UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—Not less frequently than annually, the Corporation shall consult with the United States Trade Representative with respect to the status of countries eligible to receive support from the Corporation under title II and the compliance of those countries with their international trade obligations.

(2) PREFERENTIAL CONSIDERATION.—The Corporation shall give preferential consideration to providing support under title II for projects in countries in compliance with or making substantial progress coming into compliance with their international trade obligations.

(d) WORKER RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation should support projects under title II in countries that are taking steps to adopt and implement laws that extend internationally recognized worker rights (as defined in section 507 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2467)) to workers in that country, including any designated zone in that country.

(2) REQUIRED CONTRACT LANGUAGE.—The Corporation shall also include the following language, in substantially the following form, in all contracts which the Corporation enters into with eligible investors to provide support under title II: ''The person receiving support agrees not to take actions to prevent employees of the foreign enterprise from lawfully exercising their right of association and their right to organize and bargain collectively. The person further agrees to observe applicable laws relating to a minimum age for employment of children, acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational health and safety, and not to use forced labor or the worst forms of child labor (as defined in section 507 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2467(6))). The person is not responsible under this paragraph for the actions of a foreign government.''.

(e) ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT.—The Board shall not vote in favor of any project proposed to be supported by the Corporation under title II that is likely to have significant adverse environmental or social impacts that are sensitive, diverse, or unprecedented, unless—

(1) at least 60 days before the date of the vote, an environmental and social impact assessment or initial environmental and social audit, analyzing the environmental and social impacts of the proposed project and of alternatives to the proposed project, is completed; and

(2) such assessment or audit has been made available to the public of the United States, locally affected groups in the country in which the project will be carried out, and nongovernmental organizations in that country.

(f) WOMEN'S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT.—In utilizing its authorities under title II, the Corporation should consider the impacts of its support on women's economic opportunities and outcomes and make efforts to mitigate gender gaps and maximize development impact by working to improve women's economic opportunities.

(g) PREFERENCE FOR PROVISION OF SUPPORT IN COUNTRIES EMBRACING PRIVATE ENTERPRISE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation should give preferential consideration to projects for which support under title II may potentially be provided in countries the governments of which have demonstrated consistent support for economic policies that promote the development of private enterprise, both domestic and foreign, and maintaining the conditions that enable private enterprise to make its full contribution to the development of such countries, including—

(A) market-based economic policies;

(B) protecting private property rights;

(C) respect for the rule of law; and

(D) systems to combat corruption and bribery.

(2) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—The Corporation should rely on both third-party indicators and United States Government information, such as the Department of State's Investment Climate Statements, the Department of Commerce's Country Commercial Guides, or the Millennium Challenge Corporation's Constraints Analysis, to assess whether countries meet the conditions described in paragraph (1).

(h) CONSIDERATION OF FOREIGN BOYCOTT PARTICIPATION.—In providing support for projects under title II, the Corporation shall consider, using information readily available, whether the project is sponsored by or substantially affiliated with any person taking or knowingly agreeing to take actions, or having taken or knowingly agreed to take actions within the past three years, which demonstrate or otherwise evidence intent to comply with, further, or support any boycott fostered or imposed by any foreign country, or request to impose any boycott by any foreign country, against a country which is friendly to the United States and which is not itself the object of any form of boycott pursuant to United States law or regulation.

SEC. 502. ADDITIONALITY AND AVOIDANCE OF MARKET DISTORTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Before the Corporation provides support for a project under title II, the Corporation shall ensure that private sector entities are afforded an opportunity to support the project.

(b) SAFEGUARDS, POLICIES, AND GUIDELINES.—The Corporation shall develop appropriate safeguards, policies, and guidelines to ensure that support provided by the Corporation under title II—

(1) supplements and encourages, but does not compete with, private sector support;

(2) operates according to internationally recognized best practices and standards with respect to ensuring the avoidance of market distorting government subsidies and the crowding out of private sector lending; and

(3) does not have a significant adverse impact on United States employment.

SEC. 503. PROHIBITION ON SUPPORT IN SANCTIONED COUNTRIES AND WITH SANCTIONED PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation is prohibited from providing support under title II in a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism for purposes of—

(1) section 6(j)(1)(A) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4605(j)(1)(A)) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.));

(2) section 620A(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371(a));

(3) section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780(d)); or

(4) any other provision of law.

(b) PROHIBITION ON SUPPORT OF SANCTIONED PERSONS.—The Corporation is prohibited from supporting a project under title II that directly benefits any entity subject to sanctions imposed by the United States.

(c) PROHIBITION ON SUPPORT OF ACTIVITIES SUBJECT TO SANCTIONS.—The Corporation shall require any entity or party receiving support under title II to certify it, any entity owned or controlled by the entity or party, or any entity or party which owns or otherwise manages the entity or party receiving support, does not conduct any activities subject to sanctions imposed by the United States.

SEC. 504. PENALTIES FOR MISREPRESENTATION, FRAUD, AND BRIBERY.

Subsections (g), (l), and (n) of section 237 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2197) shall apply with respect to the Corporation to the same extent and in the same manner as such subsections applied with respect to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' includes any entity, organizational unit, program, or function.

(2) TRANSITION PERIOD.—The term ''transition period'' means the period—

(A) beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) ending on the effective date of the reorganization plan required by section 602(e).

SEC. 602. REORGANIZATION PLAN.

(a) SUBMISSION OF PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a reorganization plan regarding the following:

(A) The transfer of agencies, personnel, assets, and obligations to the Corporation pursuant to this title.

(B) Any consolidation, reorganization, or streamlining of agencies transferred to the Corporation pursuant to this title.

(C) Any efficiencies or cost savings achieved as a result of the transfer of agencies, personnel, assets, and obligations to the Corporation pursuant to this title, including reductions in unnecessary or duplicative operations, assets, and personnel.

(2) CONSULTATION.—Not later than 15 days before the date on which the plan is transmitted pursuant to this subsection, the President shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees on such plan.

(b) PLAN ELEMENTS.—The plan transmitted under subsection (a) shall contain, consistent with this Act, such elements as the President deems appropriate, including the following:

(1) Identification of any functions of agencies transferred to the Corporation pursuant to this title that will not be transferred to the Corporation under the plan.

(2) Specification of the steps to be taken to organize the Corporation, including the delegation or assignment of functions transferred to the Corporation.

(3) Specification of the funds available to each agency that will be transferred to the Corporation as a result of transfers under the plan.

(4) Specification of the proposed allocations within the Corporation of unexpended funds transferred in connection with transfers under the plan.

(5) Specification of any proposed disposition of property, facilities, contracts, records, and other assets and obligations of agencies transferred under the plan.

(c) REPORT ON COORDINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The transfer of functions authorized by this section may occur only after the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development jointly submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Committee on Foreign Relations and Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report in writing that contains the information required by paragraph (2).

(2) INFORMATION REQUIRED.—The information required by this paragraph includes a description in detail of the procedures to be followed after the transfer of functions authorized by this section have occurred to coordinate between the Corporation and the United States Agency for International Development in carrying out the functions so transferred.

(d) MODIFICATION OF PLAN.—The President shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees before making any material modification or revision to the plan before the plan becomes effective in accordance with subsection (e).

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The reorganization plan described in this section, including any modifications or revisions of the plan under subsection (c), shall become effective for an agency on the date specified in the plan (or the plan as modified pursuant to subsection (d)), except that such date may not be earlier than 90 days after the date the President has transmitted the reorganization plan to the appropriate congressional committees pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to require the transfer of functions, personnel, records, balances of appropriations, or other assets of an agency on a single date.

SEC. 603. TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective at the end of the transition period, there shall be transferred to the Corporation the functions, personnel, assets, and liabilities of—

(1) the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, as in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) the following elements of the United States Agency for International Development:

(A) The Development Credit Authority.

(B) The existing Legacy Credit portfolio under the Urban Environment Program and any other direct loan programs and non-Development Credit Authority guaranty programs authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) or other predecessor Acts, as in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act, other than any sovereign loan guaranties.

(b) ADDITIONAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Effective at the end of the transition period, there is authorized to be transferred to the Corporation the functions, personnel, assets, and liabilities of the following elements of the United States Agency for International Development:

(1) The Office of Private Capital and Microenterprise.

(2) The enterprise funds.

(c) SOVEREIGN LOAN GUARANTY TRANSFER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective at the end of the transition period, there is authorized to be transferred to the Corporation or any other appropriate department or agency of the United States Government the loan accounts and the legal rights and responsibilities for the sovereign loan guaranty portfolio held by the United States Agency for International Development as in existence on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) INCLUSION IN REORGANIZATION PLAN.—The President shall include in the reorganization plan submitted under section 602 a description of the transfer authorized under paragraph (1).

(d) BILATERAL AGREEMENTS.—Any bilateral agreement of the United States in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act that serves as the basis for programs of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Development Credit Authority shall be considered as satisfying the requirements of section 301(a).

(e) TRANSITION.—During the transition period, the agencies specified in subsection (a) shall—

(1) continue to administer the assets and obligations of those agencies; and

(2) carry out such programs and activities authorized under this Act as may be determined by the President.

SEC. 604. TERMINATION OF OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION AND OTHER SUPERCEDED AUTHORITIES.

Effective at the end of the transition period—

(1) the Overseas Private Investment Corporation is terminated; and

(2) title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2191 et seq.) (other than subsections (g), (l), and (n) of section 237 of that Act) is repealed.

SEC. 605. TRANSITIONAL AUTHORITIES.

(a) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE BY OFFICIALS.—Until the transfer of an agency to the Corporation under section 603, any official having authority over or functions relating to the agency on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act shall provide to the Corporation such assistance, including the use of personnel and assets, as the Corporation may request in preparing for the transfer and integration of the agency into the Corporation.

(b) SERVICES AND PERSONNEL.—During the transition period, upon the request of the Corporation, the head of any executive agency may, on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis, provide services or detail personnel to assist with the transition.

(c) ACTING OFFICIALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the transition period, pending the advice and consent of the Senate to the appointment of an officer required by this Act to be appointed by and with such advice and consent, the President may designate any officer whose appointment was required to be made by and with such advice and consent and who was such an officer before the date of the enactment of this Act (and who continues in office) or immediately before such designation, to act in such office until the same is filled as provided in this Act. While so acting, such officers shall receive compensation at the higher of—

(A) the rates provided by this Act for the respective offices in which they act; or

(B) the rates provided for the offices held at the time of designation.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require the advice and consent of the Senate to the appointment by the President to a position in the Corporation of any officer whose agency is transferred to the Corporation pursuant to this title and whose duties following such transfer are germane to those performed before such transfer.

(d) TRANSFER OF PERSONNEL, ASSETS, OBLIGATIONS, AND FUNCTIONS.—Upon the transfer of an agency to the Corporation under section 603—

(1) the personnel, assets, and obligations held by or available in connection with the agency shall be transferred to the Corporation for appropriate allocation, subject to the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and in accordance with section 1531(a)(2) of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) the Corporation shall have all functions—

(A) relating to the agency that any other official could by law exercise in relation to the agency immediately before such transfer; and

(B) vested in the Corporation by this Act or other law.

SEC. 606. SAVINGS PROVISIONS.

(a) COMPLETED ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Completed administrative actions of an agency shall not be affected by the enactment of this Act or the transfer of such agency to the Corporation under section 603, but shall continue in effect according to their terms until amended, modified, superseded, terminated, set aside, or revoked in accordance with law by an officer of the United States or a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(2) COMPLETED ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''completed administrative action'' includes orders, determinations, rules, regulations, personnel actions, permits, agreements, grants, contracts, certificates, policies, licenses, registrations, and privileges.

(b) PENDING PROCEEDINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pending proceedings in an agency, including notices of proposed rulemaking, and applications for licenses, permits, certificates, grants, and financial assistance, shall continue notwithstanding the enactment of this Act or the transfer of the agency to the Corporation, unless discontinued or modified under the same terms and conditions and to the same extent that such discontinuance could have occurred if such enactment or transfer had not occurred.

(2) ORDERS.—Orders issued in proceedings described in paragraph (1), and appeals therefrom, and payments made pursuant to such orders, shall issue in the same manner and on the same terms as if this Act had not been enacted or the agency had not been transferred, and any such orders shall continue in effect until amended, modified, superseded, terminated, set aside, or revoked by an officer of the United States or a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(c) PENDING CIVIL ACTIONS.—Pending civil actions shall continue notwithstanding the enactment of this Act or the transfer of an agency to the Corporation, and in such civil actions, proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered and enforced in the same manner and with the same effect as if such enactment or transfer had not occurred.

(d) REFERENCES.—References relating to an agency that is transferred to the Corporation under section 603 in statutes, Executive orders, rules, regulations, directives, or delegations of authority that precede such transfer or the date of the enactment of this Act shall be deemed to refer, as appropriate, to the Corporation, to its officers, employees, or agents, or to its corresponding organizational units or functions. Statutory reporting requirements that applied in relation to such an agency immediately before the effective date of this Act shall continue to apply

following such transfer if they refer to the agency by name.

(e) EMPLOYMENT PROVISIONS.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—The Corporation may, in regulations prescribed jointly with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, adopt the rules, procedures, terms, and conditions, established by statute, rule, or regulation before the date of the enactment of this Act, relating to employment in any agency transferred to the Corporation under section 603.

(2) EFFECT OF TRANSFER ON CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, or under authority granted by this Act, the transfer pursuant to this title of personnel shall not alter the terms and conditions of employment, including compensation, of any employee so transferred.

(f) STATUTORY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Any statutory reporting requirement that applied to an agency transferred to the Corporation under this title immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act shall continue to apply following that transfer if the statutory requirement refers to the agency by name.

SEC. 607. OTHER TERMINATIONS.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, whenever all the functions vested by law in any agency have been transferred pursuant to this title, each position and office the incumbent of which was authorized to receive compensation at the rates prescribed for an office or position at level II, III, IV, or V of the Executive Schedule under subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, shall terminate.

SEC. 608. INCIDENTAL TRANSFERS.

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Corporation, is authorized and directed to make such additional incidental dispositions of personnel, assets, and liabilities held, used, arising from, available, or to be made available, in connection with the functions transferred by this title, as the Director may determine necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 609. REFERENCE.

With respect to any function transferred under this title (including under a reorganization plan under section 602) and exercised on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, reference in any other Federal law to any department, commission, or agency or any officer or office the functions of which are so transferred shall be deemed to refer to the Corporation or official or component of the Corporation to which that function is so transferred.

SEC. 610. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) EXEMPT PROGRAMS.—Section 255(g) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 905(g)) is amended by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Noncredit Account (71–4184–0–3–151).'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation.''.

(b) EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE.—Title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 5314, by striking ''President, Overseas Private Investment Corporation.'';

(2) in section 5315, by striking ''Executive Vice President, Overseas Private Investment Corporation.''; and

(3) in section 5316, by striking ''Vice Presidents, Overseas Private Investment Corporation (3).''.

(c) OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.—Section 22 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''the President of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Director'' and inserting ''the Board of Directors of the United States International Development Finance Corporation, the Director''; and

(2) by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' each place it appears and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''.

(d) UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE.—Section 2301 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4721) is amended by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' each place it appears and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''.

(e) TRADE PROMOTION COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—Section 2312(d)(1)(K) of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4727(d)(1)(K)) is amended by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''.

(f) INTERAGENCY TRADE DATA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 5402(b) of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4902(b)) is amended by striking ''the President of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' and inserting ''the Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Development Finance Corporation''.

(g) MISUSE OF NAMES OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Section 709 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking '' 'Overseas Private Investment', 'Overseas Private Investment Corporation', or 'OPIC','' and inserting '' 'United States International Development Finance Corporation' or 'DFC' ''.

(h) ENGAGEMENT ON CURRENCY EXCHANGE RATE AND ECONOMIC POLICIES.—Section 701(c)(1)(A) of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4421(c)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''.

(i) INTERNSHIPS WITH INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC POLICY.—Section 625 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1131c(a)) is amended by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''.

(j) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 449B(b)(2) (22 U.S.C. 2296b(b)(2)), by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''; and

(2) in section 481(e)(4)(A) (22 U.S.C. 2291(e)(4)(A)), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''(including programs under title IV of chapter 2, relating to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation)'' and inserting ''(and any support under title II of the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018, relating to the United States International Development Finance Corporation)''.

(k) ELECTRIFY AFRICA ACT OF 2015.—Sections 5 and 7 of the Electrify Africa Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–121; 22 U.S.C. 2293 note) are amended by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' each place it appears and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''.

(l) FOREIGN AID TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2016.—Section 2(3) of the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–191; 22 U.S.C. 2394c note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''except for'' and all that follows through ''chapter 3'' and insert ''except for chapter 3'';

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018.''.

(m) SUPPORT FOR EAST EUROPEAN DEMOCRACY (SEED) PROGRAM.—The Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989 (22 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2(c) (22 U.S.C. 5401(c)), by striking paragraph (12) and inserting the following:

''(12) UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCE CORPORATION.—Programs of the United States International Development Finance Corporation.''; and

(2) in section 201(e) (22 U.S.C. 5421(e)), by striking ''Agency for International Development'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''.

(n) CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY (LIBERTAD) ACT OF 1996.—Section 202(b)(2)(B)(iv) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6062(b)(2)(B)(iv)) is amended by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''.

(o) INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM ACT OF 1998.—Section 405(a)(10) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6445(a)(10)) is amended by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''.

(p) TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000.—Section 103(8)(A) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(8)(A)) is amended in clause (viii) to read as follows:

''(viii) any support under title II of the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018 relating to the United States International Development Finance Corporation; and''.

(q) TECHNOLOGY DEPLOYMENT IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.—Section 732(b) of the Global Environmental Protection Assistance Act of 1989 (22 U.S.C. 7902(b)) is amended by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''.

(r) EXPANDED NONMILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR UKRAINE.—Section 7(c)(3) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8926(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION'' and inserting ''UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCE CORPORATION'';

(2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''; and

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''by eligible investors (as defined in section 238 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2198))''.

(s) GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 2016.—Section 4(7) of the Global Food Security Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9303(7)) is amended by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''.

(t) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EUROPEAN AND EURASIAN ENERGY SECURITY.—Section 257(c)(2)(B) of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017 (22 U.S.C. 9546(c)(2)(B)) is amended by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''.

(u) WHOLLY OWNED GOVERNMENT CORPORATION.—Section 9101(3) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''.

(v) ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY ACT OF 2007.—Title IX of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17321 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 914 (42 U.S.C. 17334)—

(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION**'' and inserting ''**UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCE CORPORATION**'';

(B) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation''; and

(C) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall include in its annual report required under section 240A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2200a)'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation shall include in its annual report required under section 403 of the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018''; and

(2) in section 916(a)(2)(I) (42 U.S.C. 17336(a)(2)(I)), by striking ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation:'' and inserting ''United States International Development Finance Corporation;''.

(w) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect at the end of the transition period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the BUILD Act. Across the globe, lack of access to capital is constraining economic growth, especially in the world's least developed countries.

According to the International Finance Corporation, micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises have an unmet financing need of more than $5 trillion every year in emerging markets, depriving them of the capital that they need to grow. Foreign investment is critical to empowering entrepreneurs, critical to creating jobs and to reducing poverty.

Our country has an undeniable interest in supporting the development of vibrant and stable economies around the world. Healthy private sectors promote good governance and support thriving civil societies. It helps reduce civil strife. The resulting stability is good for our national security and also benefits U.S. exports and jobs.

Increasingly, other countries are working to advance their economic and political interests by shaping overseas markets. China's One Belt, One Road initiative is estimated at $1 trillion. This dwarfs the size of the Marshall Plan that rebuilt war-torn Europe in the 1940s and 1950s.

Across Africa, Asia, and beyond, Beijing is making massive investments in new construction and infrastructure projects, from the headquarters of the African Union to a port in Djibouti, where both the U.S. and China now have military bases. Beijing now owns 80 percent of this strategically located African nation's foreign debt.

As the president and CEO of OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, testified to the Foreign Affairs Committee, his words: ''A condition of many of these loans is that Chinese firms, and labor, get the business. . . . This state-directed approach is not consistent with our values, which incorporate the high standards of international financial institutions related to governance, transparency, debt sustainability, environmental, and social safeguards.''

Chinese development practices have often left countries worse off—and I have seen this with my own eyes—putting some countries into debt distress. Last December, Sri Lanka gave control of the strategic Sri Lankan port to Beijing for 99 years after it could not repay the Chinese-backed loans to fund it. That granted Beijing a foothold in the Indian Ocean and its critical shipping lanes.

And due to Beijing's ''no strings attached'' financing, some of Africa's most brutal regimes have been thrown an economic lifeline that undermines democratic governance. Unlike the United States, Beijing does not have an anti-corruption standard. It is willing to fund just about any government, from Venezuela to Sudan.

The U.S. cannot and should not match China's investments dollar-for-dollar, but we can and should do more to support international economic development with partners who have embraced the private sector-driven development model.

However, America's development finance tool kit, which is spread across multiple agencies, is limited, it is duplicative, it is uncoordinated. So the BUILD Act will address these shortcomings. It will modernize America's antiquated development finance capabilities to address the challenges of this century. Specifically, it will merge OPIC and USAID's development credit authority into a standalone U.S. international development finance corporation with new authorities.

□ 1715

Among these new authorities will be the ability to cofinance projects with our allies like the U.K.

What this is going to do, just on the U.S. side, is this is going to double their book of business.

Through the provision of loans and guarantees and limited equity investments and feasibility studies, political risk insurance, and other investments of support, the new Development Finance Corporation will mobilize private capital to provide countries a competitive alternative to the state-directed approach of Beijing and Moscow.

I am pleased that this bill doesn't just merge existing functions together but also includes critical reforms to protect taxpayers, to improve government efficiency, and to make America's development finance toolkit very effective. Notably, it adopts many of the same principles as the Millennium Challenge Corporation, including the constraints analysis, which directs investment to where it will have the most impact.

This bill will create a dedicated inspector general of the new corporation. It will require that the corporation prioritize support in the poorest countries and those making continual progress towards economic policies that support free enterprise, and it will create lasting institutional linkages between the Development Finance Corporation and other development agencies.

This bill has got strong support from the White House, which made it a priority in its National Security Strategy and 2019 budget.

In short, the BUILD Act represents a major opportunity for this Congress and the executive branch to transform and modernize our Nation's tools to support global development and increase opportunities for American entrepreneurs in these emerging markets.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2018.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I write concerning H.R. 5105, the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of2018. This legislation includes matters that I believe fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 5105, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. Further, I appreciate your agreement to incorporate changes suggested by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure into the bill prior to floor consideration. Finally, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I ask that you support my request to have the Committee represented on the conference committee.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest in the Congressional Record during House Floor consideration of the bill. I look

forward to working with the Committee on Foreign Affairs as the bill moves through the legislative process,

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2018.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to forgo a sequential referral request on H.R. 5105, the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development (BUILD) Act of 2018, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. Edits requested by your committee have been incorporated in the bill text scheduled for consideration by the House.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 5105 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5105.

H.R. 5105, the BUILD Act, which stands for Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act, modernizes our international development finance system. It does so by consolidating the existing Overseas Private Investment Corporation, which has the most unfortunate acronym in the Federal Government, since it is referred to as OPIC and is often confused with OPEC. It consolidates that organization into the new Development Finance Corporation.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this important measure.

I want to start by commending the lead sponsors of this bipartisan bill, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), whom I am pleased to work with on the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee, where he serves as chairman and I serve as ranking member; and the second lead sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee.

It has been more than a decade since Congress last updated OPIC's charter. The landscape in development finance has changed substantially, and we now need a new approach to the way our government uses financial instruments to spur economic development and tackle poverty in the developing world.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to thank the leadership of the committee and the sponsors of the legislation for accepting four of my amendments.

The first of these requires a certification from the new DFC, or Development Finance Corporation, that the corporations that benefit from their investment and their affiliates do not conduct any activity which is the subject of U.S. sanctions. This is an important safeguard to ensure that entities that engage in contact that violates U.S. Government sanctions do not benefit from U.S. Government financing.

Simply prohibiting the support of sanctioned entities is not enough. We need an affirmative statement from prospective beneficiaries of the DFC that they and their affiliates are in compliance with American sanctions law.

Second, the new agency will need to consider whether the benefiting entity is participating in a foreign boycott that is at cross-purposes with American foreign policy. The U.S. should not be in the business of providing assistance to entities that participate in discriminatory boycotts against foreign countries.

Since the 1970s, we have had on the books laws designed to prevent our corporations from participating in the Arab League boycott of Israel. It is common sense that the DFC, when it is selecting projects, should take this into consideration. So my amendment will do just that.

I should point out that there is another amendment that I would have offered, but, instead, we secured a letter from OPIC that will be binding policy on the new DFC stating that the DFC will not finance regional projects in the Caucasus that are designed to exclude Armenia. If it doesn't make geographic sense that a regional railroad or road or other activity excludes Armenia, then that is OPIC policy that will be carried forward with the new agency that this will not be financed by the DFC.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following letters from OPIC in the RECORD.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE
INVESTMENT CORPORATION,
Washington, DC, May 8, 2018.

Hon. BRAD SHERMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHERMAN: Thank you for your continued support of U.S. development finance, including your support for H.R. 5105, the BUILD Act. Knowing of your long-standing support for Armenia, I wanted to clarify an issue raised by your office in writing.

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation will not support regional projects in the Caucasus that deliberately, by design or effect, exclude Armenia from participation or benefit, unless such exclusion is necessitated by geographic or economic impracticality. As you know, when the BUILD Act legislation is enacted into law, the functions, personnel, assets, liabilities and policies of OPIC will transfer to the U.S. Development Finance Corporation. Accordingly, this will become the policy of the DFC.

Again, thank you for your continued support.

Regards,

CAMERON S. ALFORD,
Deputy General Counsel, Projects.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE
INVESTMENT CORPORATION,
Washington, DC, May 8, 2018.

Hon, BRAD SHERMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHERMAN: Thank you for your continued support of U.S. development finance, including your support for H.R. 5105, the BUILD Act. I wanted to clarify an issue raised by your office in writing.

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation's Environmental and Social Policy Statement (ESPS) includes OPIC's greenhouse gas policy developed pursuant to Section 7079(b) of division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–117; 123 Stat. 3396). As a result of the inclusion of the word ''policies'' in Section 606(a)(2) of the BUILD Act Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute, OPIC's ESPS will be transferred to the U.S. Development Finance Corporation. Accordingly, this will become the policy of the DFC.

Again, thank you for your continued support.

Regards,

CAMERON S. ALFORD,
Deputy General Counsel, Projects.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the third amendment that I thank the sponsors for agreeing to requires an annual report from the new DFC on its compliance with its own human rights, labor, environmental, and social policies.

OPIC maintains robust environmental and social policies. This bill carries those policies forward so the new DFC will follow them and will now make an annual report so that Congress can see whether these policies are actually being implemented.

The fourth such amendment states that, as to the four public nongovernmental members of the DFC board, that we take into account their experience in international environmental, developmental, and labor organizations. There are a number of other factors that go into selecting the public members of the board, but certainly experience in the environment and labor ought to be taken into consideration.

The BUILD Act updates U.S. development finance and, I think, will complement our foreign assistance efforts. With this bill, we can keep the U.S. as a global leader in promoting economic prosperity around the world while, at the same time, encouraging American jobs.

I support this measure and hope my colleagues will join me in doing so. Once again, this bill had a unanimous, bipartisan voice vote in our committee.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO). He is the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, and he is the author of this legislation.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I am excited to speak on behalf of H.R. 5105, the

BUILD Act, and urge its passage in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, Ranking Member SHERMAN, and my lead cosponsor, ADAM SMITH of Washington, for the hard work they and their teams have done to bring this bill to the floor. These gentlemen worked tirelessly along with their teams. I would also like to give a shout-out to our legislative director, James Walsh, who did yeoman's work for this bill.

Today, America is confronting unprecedented instability and growing humanitarian crises around the world, all of which have a direct impact on our national security and economic interests here at home.

Delivering effective U.S. foreign assistance is crucial, especially in the current fiscal climate in which it is imperative for the U.S. Government to use every dollar more efficiently and effectively. The BUILD Act will ensure the United States delivers foreign assistance both effectively and efficiently by catalyzing the private sector to invest in developing countries.

Of our top 15 trading partners, 12 of them were once recipients of foreign aid. Forty-three of our top 50 consumer nations of American agriculture products were once U.S. foreign aid recipients. Additionally, 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside of the United States, and the poorest two-thirds of the world now represent about $5 trillion in purchasing power. Their markets are growing faster than many of our traditional partners and are central to the future of America's economic prosperity, job growth, and security.

It is imperative to the United States economy that we seize upon these opportunities and make the investment now so that we may reap the benefits down the road. One of the ways to do this is to make our development finance more efficient and nimble.

U.S. businesses have the capital to invest and lead the world in the understanding of capital markets and sophisticated financial transactions, generally delivering investments in infrastructure and other industries quicker and less expensively.

Despite our comparative advantage, other countries, especially China, are using development finance institutions more effectively to expand their influence into the developing world, even here in the Western Hemisphere in the country of Haiti.

Our tools for development finance are dispersed across too many Federal agencies and need to be streamlined. The primary U.S. development agency, OPIC, has not been significantly updated since its creation in 1971. The BUILD Act will modernize all foreign finance development and bring it into the 21st century.

As you can imagine, the world of financial development has vastly changed since 1970, as all things do, to stay competitive. A modernized Development Finance Corporation is imperative to capitalizing upon those changes. It will help transition countries from aid to trade.

We want to help countries become robust trading partners with the United States. By doing so, we will be helping create stable, self-sufficient societies around the world and open new markets for U.S. goods and services. If we are trading goods, economies are growing, they are growing stronger, and relationships are forged, increasing national security.

There is truth to the saying, ''a rising tide lifts all boats.'' The BUILD Act will help make this a reality by transitioning recipient countries again from aid to trade.

In addition to improving efficiency, the BUILD Act also creates a more significant amount of oversight and increases the United States' development effectiveness.

The BUILD Act empowers the new Development Finance Corporation, as Secretary Pompeo testified to the Senate, ''to have the flexibility to identify a development need, bring to bear the right resources over the right period and manage it in a way that effectively delivers the outcome and measures it all along the way.''

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleague to pass the BUILD Act.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee and the lead Democratic sponsor of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I really want to thank Congressman YOHO. We have worked together on this bill. We have also worked together as co-chairs of the Caucus for Effective Foreign Assistance. This bill really shows the bipartisan support on the committee.

I certainly want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work, as well, towards a very important goal, and that is to make more effective use of U.S. foreign aid and foreign development.

It is a crucial tool right now in the world. We need as many friends and as many partners as we can find in the world. Development through USAID and other agencies is a crucial way that we build the relationships and, as has been mentioned by all three of the previous speakers, as importantly, build the capacity of our partners to have a strong economy and to grow.

What this bill does is it makes our foreign investment policy better, more cohesive, and more robust. It enables that agency to invest in the projects that are necessary to help it be successful by expanding what it can do, by expanding its ability to work with other partners, to work with the private sector, and, crucially, to take an equity stake in some of their investments, something that current law prohibits. This will greatly expand their ability to find projects across the developing world to invest in and help grow these countries and move them forward.

The overall goal of foreign aid is to make sure that there, hopefully, at some point, are no countries in the world that can't provide for their people, to go after poverty, to reduce it wherever we can.

There are a lot of different projects that are important to foreign aid. Certainly, global health, education, and direct assistance all play a crucial role. But I would submit that nothing is more important than enabling these countries to develop their own economy by giving them the capital they need to invest in projects and grow businesses so that they become self-sustaining partners.

This bill does a crucially important job in making sure that the U.S. contribution to that effort is as effective as it possibly can be. It lives up to the name of our caucus, effective foreign assistance. This is critically important.

A lot of times people think of foreign aid as being, well, that is just sort of a leftwing issue. Well, I want you to know there is true bipartisan support in this Congress by Republicans and Democrats to improve the quality of our foreign aid.

□ 1730

I thank Congressman YOHO for his leadership on that. He has done a great job in making sure that this is a bipartisan issue because it is crucial that we reduce poverty and improve security across the globe, and it is also crucial that the U.S., as the largest, strongest economy in the world, plays a strong role in that effort.

This bill will put us in a better position to do precisely that. I will also say, I think this is but the first of many efforts that we can have on improving the quality of foreign aid, of making it more effective and more robust. It is worth noting that this bill also expands the amount of money that is available to our foreign lending. It gives them more money to deal with.

I strongly support this bill, this bipartisan effort, and I appreciate Congressman YOHO's leadership. I look forward to continuing to work with him on this and many other issues.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4989.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to commend the sponsors of this legislation and the leadership of our committee. I urge an ''aye'' vote,

and I point out that this bill received a unanimous bipartisan voice vote in our committee, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask for an ''aye'' vote on the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5105, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOMEN'S ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT ACT OF 2018

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5480) to improve programs and activities relating to women's entrepreneurship and economic empowerment that are carried out by the United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5480

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Because women make up the majority of the world's poor and gender inequalities prevail in incomes, wages, access to finance, ownership of assets, and control over the allocation of resources, women's entrepreneurship and economic empowerment is important to achieve inclusive economic growth at all levels of society. Research shows that when women exert greater influence over household finances, economic outcomes for families improve, and childhood survival rates, food security, and educational attainment increase. Women also tend to place a greater emphasis on household savings which improves families' financial resiliency.

(2) A 2016 report by the McKinsey Global Institute estimated that achieving global gender parity in economic activity could add as much as $28 trillion to annual global gross domestic product (GDP) by 2025.

(3) Lack of access to financial services that address gender-specific constraints impedes women's economic inclusion. More than one billion women around the world are currently left out of the formal financial system, which in turn causes many women to rely on informal means of saving and borrowing that are riskier and less reliable. Among other consequences, this hampers the success of women entrepreneurs, including those seeking to run or grow small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). The International Finance Corporation has estimated that 70 percent of women-owned SMEs in the formal sector are unserved or underserved in terms of access to credit, amounting to a $285 billion credit gap.

(4) Women's economic empowerment is inextricably linked to a myriad of other women's human rights that are essential to their ability to thrive as economic actors across the lifecycle. This includes, but is not limited to, living lives free of violence and exploitation, achieving the highest possible standard of health and well-being, enjoying full legal and human rights such as access to registration, identification, and citizenship documents, benefitting from formal and informal education, and equal protection of and access to land and property rights, access to fundamental labor rights, policies to address disproportionate care burdens, and business and management skills and leadership opportunities.

(5) Discriminatory legal and regulatory systems and banking practices are hurdles to women's access to capital and assets, including land, machinery, production facilities, technology, and human resources. Often, these barriers are connected to a woman's marital status, which can determine whether she is able to inherit land or own property in her name. These constraints contribute to women frequently running smaller businesses, with fewer employees and lower asset values.

(6) Savings groups primarily comprised of women are recognized as a vital entry point, especially for poor and very poor women, to formal financial services and there is a high demand for such groups to protect and grow their savings with formal financial institutions. Evidence shows that, once linked to a bank, the average savings per member increases between 40 to 100 percent and the average profit per member doubles. Key to these outcomes is investing in financial literacy, business leadership training, and mentorship.

(7) United States support for microenterprise and microfinance development programs, which seek to reduce poverty in low-income countries by giving small loans to small-scale entrepreneurs without collateral, have been a useful mechanism to help families weather economic shocks, but many microcredit borrowers largely remain in poverty. The vast majority of microcredit borrowers are women who would like to move up the economic ladder but are held back by binding constraints that create a ''missing middle''–large numbers of microenterprises, a handful of large firms or conglomerates, and very few SMEs in between, which are critical to driving economic growth in developing countries.

(8) According to the World Bank, SMEs create 4 out of 5 new positions in emerging markets but about half of formal SMEs don't have access to formal credit. The financing gap is even larger when micro and informal enterprises are taken into account. Overall, approximately 70 percent of all micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) in emerging markets lack access to credit.

SEC. 3. ACTIONS TO IMPROVE GENDER POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

(a) DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION POLICY.—It shall be the development cooperation policy of the United States—

(1) to reduce gender disparities in access to, control over, and benefit from economic, social, political, and cultural resources, wealth, opportunities, and services;

(2) to strive to eliminate gender-based violence and mitigate its harmful effects on individuals and communities through efforts to develop standards and capacity to reduce gender-based violence in the workplace and other places where women conduct work;

(3) to support activities that secure private property rights and land tenure for women in developing countries, including legal frameworks to give women equal rights to own, register, use, profit from, and inherit land and property, legal literacy to exercise these rights, and capacity of law enforcement and community leaders to enforce such rights; and

(4) to increase the capability of women and girls to realize their rights, determine their life outcomes, assume leadership roles, and influence decision-making in households, communities, and societies.

(b) ACTIONS.—In order to advance the policy described in subsection (a), the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall ensure that—

(1) strategies, projects, and activities of the Agency are shaped by a gender analysis and, when applicable, use standard indicators to provide one measure of success of such strategies, projects, and activities; and

(2) gender equality and female empowerment is integrated throughout the Agency's Program Cycle and related processes for purposes of strategic planning, project design and implementation, and monitoring and evaluation.

(c) GENDER ANALYSIS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''gender analysis''—

(1) means a socio-economic analysis of available or gathered quantitative and qualitative information to identify, understand, and explain gaps between men and women which typically involves examining—

(A) differences in the status of women and men and their differential access to and control over assets, resources, opportunities, and services;

(B) the influence of gender roles, structural barriers, and norms on the division of time between paid employment, unpaid work (including subsistence production and care for family members), and volunteer activities;

(C) the influence of gender roles, structural barriers, and norms on leadership roles and decision making; constraints, opportunities, and entry points for narrowing gender gaps and empowering women; and

(D) potential differential impacts of development policies and programs on men and women, including unintended or negative consequences; and

(2) includes conclusions and recommendations to enable development policies and programs to narrow gender gaps and improve the lives of women and girls.

SEC. 4. DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FOR MICRO, SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED ENTERPRISES.

(a) FINDINGS AND POLICY.—Section 251 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2211) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''microenterprise'' and inserting ''micro, small and medium-sized enterprise'';

(B) by striking ''and in the development'' and inserting '', in the development''; and

(C) by adding at the end before the period the following: '', and in the economic empowerment of the poor, especially women'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''microenterprise'' and inserting ''micro, small and medium-sized enterprise''; and

(B) by adding at the end before the period the following: '', particularly those enterprises owned, managed, and controlled by women'';

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''microenterprises'' and inserting ''micro, small and medium-sized enterprises'';

(4) in paragraph (4), by striking ''microenterprise'' and inserting ''micro, small and medium-sized enterprise'';

(5) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking ''should continue'' and inserting ''should continue and be expanded''; and

(B) by striking ''microenterprise and microfinance development assistance'' and inserting ''development assistance for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises''; and

(6) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking ''have been successful'' and inserting ''have had some success'';

(B) by striking ''microenterprise programs'' and inserting ''development assistance for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises''; and

(C) by striking '', such as countries in Latin America''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION; IMPLEMENTATION; TARGETED ASSISTANCE.—Section 252 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2211a) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''credit, savings, and other services'' and inserting ''credit, including the use of innovative credit scoring models, savings, financial technology, financial literacy, insurance, property rights, and other services''; and

(ii) by striking ''microfinance and microenterprise clients'' and inserting ''micro, small and medium-sized enterprise clients'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''microfinance and microenterprise clients'' and inserting ''micro, small and medium-sized enterprise clients, particularly those clients owned, managed, and controlled by women'';

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''microenterprises'' and inserting ''micro, small and medium-sized enterprises''; and

(ii) by inserting ''acquire United States goods and services,'' after ''United States markets,'';

(D) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''microfinance and microenterprise institutions'' and inserting ''financial intermediaries'';

(ii) by striking ''microfinance and microenterprise clients'' and inserting ''micro, small and medium-sized enterprises''; and

(iii) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(E) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''microfinance and microenterprise clients and institutions'' and inserting ''micro, small and medium-sized enterprises, financial intermediaries, and capital markets''; and

(ii) by striking ''the poor and very poor.'' and inserting ''the poor and very poor, especially women;''; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) assistance for the purpose of promoting the economic empowerment of women, including through increased access to financial resources and improving property rights, inheritance rights, and other legal protections; and

''(6) assistance for the purpose of scaling up evidence-based graduation approaches, which include targeting the very poor and households in ultra-poverty, consumption support, promotion of savings, skills training, and asset transfers.''.

(2) In subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be established within the Agency an office to support the Agency's efforts to broaden and deepen local financial markets, expand access to appropriate financial products and services, and support the development of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises. The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall possess technical expertise and ability to offer leadership in the field of financial sector development.'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking ''USE OF CENTRAL FUNDING MECHANISMS.—'' and all that follows through ''In order to ensure'' and inserting ''USE OF CENTRAL FUNDING MECHANISMS.—In order to ensure'';

(II) by striking ''the office shall'' and all that follows through ''and other practitioners'' and inserting ''the office shall provide coordination and support for field-implemented programs, including through targeted core support for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises and local financial markets''; and

(III) by striking clause (ii);

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by inserting '', particularly by protecting the use and funding of local organizations in countries in which the Agency invests,'' after ''and sustainability''; and

(II) by inserting '', especially women'' after ''the poor and very poor''; and

(C) by striking paragraph (3).

(3) In subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''all microenterprise resources'' and inserting ''all micro, small and medium-sized enterprise resources''; and

(B) by striking ''clients who are very poor.'' and all that follows and inserting ''activities that reach the very poor, and 50 percent of all small and medium-sized enterprise resources shall be targeted to activities that reach enterprises owned, managed, and controlled by women.''.

(c) MONITORING SYSTEM.—Section 253(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2211b(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting '', including goals on a gender disaggregated basis, such as improvements in employment, access to financial services, enterprise development, earnings and control over income, and property and land rights,'' after ''performance goals'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''include performance indicators'' and all that follows through ''the achievement'' and inserting ''incorporate Agency planning and reporting processes and indicators to measure or assess the achievement''; and

(3) by striking paragraph (4).

(d) POVERTY MEASUREMENT METHODS.—Section 254 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2211c) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 254. POVERTY MEASUREMENT METHODS.

''The Administrator of the Agency, in consultation with financial intermediaries and other appropriate organizations, should have in place at least one method for implementing partners to use to assess poverty levels of their current incoming or prospective clients.''.

(e) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES.—Section 255 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2211d) is amended—

(1) by striking ''assistance for microenterprise development assistance'' and inserting ''development assistance for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises''; and

(2) by striking ''and, to the extent applicable'' and all that follows and inserting a period.

(f) MICROENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT CREDITS.—Section 256 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2212) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**MICROENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT CREDITS**'' and inserting ''**DEVELOPMENT CREDITS FOR MICRO, SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED ENTERPRISES**'';

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''micro- and small enterprises'' and inserting ''micro, small and medium-sized enterprises''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''microenterprises'' and inserting ''micro, small and medium-sized enterprises'';

(3) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''and other financial services'' after ''credit'';

(4) by striking ''microenterprise households'' each place it appears and inserting ''micro, small and medium-sized enterprises and households''; and

(5) by striking ''microfinance institutions'' each place it appears and inserting ''financial intermediaries''.

(g) UNITED STATES MICROFINANCE LOAN FACILITY.—Section 257 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2213) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''United States-supported microfinance institutions'' and inserting ''United States-supported financial intermediaries''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''United States-supported microfinance institutions'' each place it appears and inserting ''United States-supported financial intermediaries''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''microfinance institutions'' and inserting ''financial intermediaries''.

(h) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—Subsection (b) of section 258 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2214) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) CONTENTS.—To the extent practicable, the report should contain the following:

''(1) Information about assistance provided under section 252, including—

''(A) the amount of each grant or other form of assistance;

''(B) the name and type of each intermediary and implementing partner organization receiving assistance;

''(C) the name of each country receiving assistance; and

''(D) the methodology used to ensure compliance with the targeted assistance requirements in subsection (c) of such section.

''(2) The percentage of assistance provided under section 252 disaggregated by income level, including for the very poor, and gender.

''(3) The estimated number of individuals that received assistance provided under section 252 disaggregated by income level, including for the very poor, and gender, and by type of assistance, including loans, training, and business development services.

''(4) The results of the monitoring system required under section 253.

''(5) Information about any method in place to assess poverty levels under section 254.''.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—Section 259 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2214a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''Committee on International Relations'' and inserting ''Committee on Foreign Affairs'';

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''microenterprises'' and inserting ''micro, small and medium-sized enterprises'';

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''microenterprise institution'' and inserting ''micro, small and medium-sized enterprise institution''; and

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''microfinance institution'' and inserting ''financial intermediary'';

(4) in paragraph (7) to read as follows:

''(7) MICRO, SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED ENTERPRISE INSTITUTION.—The term 'micro, small and medium-sized enterprise institution' means an entity that provides services, including finance, training, or business development services, for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises in foreign countries.'';

(5) in paragraph (8) to read as follows:

''(8) FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARY.—The term 'financial intermediary' means the entity that acts as the intermediary between parties in a financial transaction, such as a bank, credit union, investment fund, a village savings and loan group, or an institution that provides financial services to a micro, small or medium-sized enterprise.'';

(6) by striking paragraph (9);

(7) by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (14) as paragraphs (9) through (13), respectively;

(8) in paragraph (9) (as redesignated), by striking ''of microenterprise development'';

(9) in paragraph (10) to read as follows:

''(10) PRACTITIONER INSTITUTION.—The term 'practitioner institution' means a not-for-profit entity, financial intermediary, information and communications technology firm with a mobile money platform, a village and savings loan group, or any other entity that provides financial or business development services authorized under section 252 that benefits micro, small and medium-sized enterprise clients.'';

(10) in paragraph (12) (as redesignated)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''UNITED STATES-SUPPORTED MICROFINANCE INSTITUTION'' and inserting ''UNITED STATES-SUPPORTED FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARY''; and

(B) by striking ''United States-supported microfinance institution'' and inserting ''United States-supported financial intermediary'';

(11) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (13) (as redesignated) to read as follows:

''(B) living below the International Poverty Line, as defined by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association (collectively referred to as the 'World Bank').''.

(j) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Title VI of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended in the title heading by striking ''MICROENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'' and inserting ''DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FOR MICRO, SMALL AND MEDIUM–SIZED ENTERPRISES''.

SEC. 5. REPORT AND BRIEFING BY UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall provide a briefing and submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on the implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act, including actions to improve the gender policies of the United States Agency for International Development pursuant to section 3.

(b) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be posted and made available on a text-based, searchable, and publicly-available internet website.

SEC. 6. REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on development assistance for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises administered by the United States Agency for International Development.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include an assessment of the following:

(1) What is known about the impact of such development assistance on the economies of developing countries.

(2) The extent to which such development assistance is targeting women and the very poor, including what is known about how such development assistance benefits women.

(3) The extent to which the United States Agency for International Development has developed a methodology used to ensure compliance with the targeted assistance requirement in section 252(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 4 of this Act, and the quality of such methodology.

(4) The monitoring system required in section 253(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 4 of this Act, including the quality of such monitoring system.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am the author of this measure. It is the Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act, and I want to thank those members on the staff that worked on this measure: Amy Porter, Joan Condon, Jessica Kelch, and Emily Cottle, and I thank them because around the globe, women make up the majority of the world's poor. This is due, in part, to gender constraints that in some places deny women access to basic financial services, like savings accounts.

Today, more than 1 billion women remain left outside of the formal financial system, and women-owned, small- and medium-sized enterprises face a $300 billion credit gap. A 2014 analysis found that closing the gender gap and access to credit for small- and medium-sized women-owned businesses would increase per capita GDP by 12 percent in developing countries. That is because when women exercise greater influence over finances, literally, everyone benefits.

Childhood survival rates, food security, children's education, economic opportunity for families, all of that increases. Investment in women yields results for entire communities. Indeed, countries with high female labor force participation rates are more resilient to economic shocks and suffer fewer slowdowns in economic growth.

A 2016 report estimated that achieving global gender parity in economic activity by 2025 would add as much as $28 trillion to annual GDP, an amount equal to the combined economies of the United States and China.

Confronting the barriers that keep women from being able to fully participate in their local markets is key to generating sustainable, economic growth. And this means not only expanding women's access to the financial system, but also, as cell phones become more and more available, expanding their access to new financial technology like mobile money.

The Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act addresses barriers to women's economic inclusion in developing countries by requiring that all USAID strategies and projects and activities be shaped by a gender analysis and by expanding the agency's microenterprise assistance authorities to support small-and medium-sized women-owned businesses. This is critical as small- and medium-sized enterprises create four out of five new jobs in developing economies.

So the bill is the result of the committee's extended focus on empowering women and girls through U.S. foreign policy, which has been the subject of five full committee hearings and other subcommittee hearings in recent Congresses. Our women's empowerment initiative has produced significant legislation including: the Girls Count Act of 2015, the Protecting Girls' Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act, and the Women, Peace, and Security Act of 2017, among others.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should invest our limited foreign assistance dollars wisely, and I have seen the good things that happen when we focus on empowering women. That is what this bill does, and I ask for my colleagues' support in helping to make it happen.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure, H.R. 5480, the Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act. I want to thank Mr. ROYCE and Ms. LOIS FRANKEL for their work on this bill.

This is an important bill that expands U.S. development policy to empower women entrepreneurs in developing countries. In 2016, the McKinsey Global Institute estimated that achieving global gender parity in economic activity could add as much as $28 trillion to the annual gross domestic product by the year 2025.

This bill will help unlock the productive power of women, and particularly women-owned small- and medium-sized enterprises. In the interest of time, I won't go into the details because we have excellent speakers on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this bill, which passed our committee by a unanimous bipartisan voice vote, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chairwoman emeritus on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I ask unanimous consent that she may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE for introducing

this important bipartisan measure before us today, and of course, congratulate both him and Ranking Member ENGEL, who work so well in bringing important legislation in a bipartisan manner to the floor every day.

This is H.R. 5480, the Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act, and I am a proud cosponsor of this bipartisan measure. We know that when women work, and the number of women in the workforce is increasing, there is a corresponding growth in economies.

The benefit that results from empowering women and expanding their economic activities are far reaching. They have a great society impact. From the household to communities, to local, State, and the Federal level, we would see drastic improvements if women not only had greater access, but greater influence over income and finances.

Yet, sadly, women continue to face seemingly insurmountable barriers that deter them from becoming full and equal members of society, particularly when it comes to access to formal financial institutions, and that is what this bill would do. It updates and expands USAID policies with respect to microenterprise assistance authority, to chip away at those barriers that exist now. It will also include support for small- and medium-sized enterprises. These are the real drivers of employment in so many places around the globe.

Also, it would provide women with greater access to economic activities. It will improve the working environment for women and support their property rights. It is a commonsense approach, Mr. Speaker. By increasing women's participation in the workforce around the world, we will be creating greater economic benefits with positive implications for all aspects of society.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support Mr. ROYCE's measure. I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), the lead Democratic sponsor of this bill.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, keeping peace in the world, reducing terrorism, creating safe environments where countries can be self-reliant and people can be prosperous is not just about more guns and bombs.

Addressing the root causes of global upheaval is an important task. It is an important task of USAID that calls itself the world's premier development agency, which leads me to thank Mr. ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their bipartisan leadership and for the other cosponsors of this legislation for this very important bill that we call the Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act, which recognizes that when girls and women of the world are free from violence, educated, and have access to tools for economic success, their communities are more safe, more economically vibrant, and more peaceful.

This is, of course, when women exert greater influence over household finances, economic outcomes for their families improve. The childhood survival rates go up, food security, and educational attainment increases for their children. Women actually place a greater emphasis on household savings, which improves a family's financial resiliency.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to comprehend the hardships and obstacles that women face globally. I think of a girl like Fatim, born in Mali. At just 8 months old, she was subjected to genital mutilation. By age 12, her father sold her for marriage to a man she had never met. She is among the one in three girls worldwide who will suffer gender-based violence.

I think of Nasha, a young Nigerian, desperate for an education, who walks miles, fearful of sexual violence or kidnapping just to get to class. She doesn't want to become one of the 130 million girls worldwide who are out of school; or Kamila, a woman in Pakistan who dreams of starting her own business and being able to care for her family, but discriminatory laws prevent her from owning property or accessing credit.

She is among the 1 billion women in the world excluded from the formal financial system. Given all of the roadblocks, it is not surprising that women and girls are the majority of the world's poor.

Here is the thing: Many of these cruel and unfair practices make the world poorer, too, as we have heard from my colleagues. According to the McKinsey Global Institute, a leading international private sector think tank, if we change this equation and we advance women's equality, we could add trillions to the global GDP in just years.

We are recognizing today that there is an undeniable link between women's economic success and global prosperity and peacefulness and security.

Now, this bill has several components. It makes it USAID policy to do the following: to reduce gender gaps in economic opportunity; to strive to eliminate gender-based violence; to support women's property rights; and to increase the capability of women and girls to determine their own future.

□ 1745

Next, the bill requires that 50 percent of USAID's resources for small- and medium-sized enterprises be targeted to reach enterprises owned, managed, and controlled by women. It codifies USAID's practice of shaping policy and activities through a gender analysis.

As important, to ensure that our development assistance is reaching women, this legislation mandates that USAID track and measure improvements in women's economic empowerment, including employment, access to financial services, enterprise development, earnings and control over income, and property and land rights.

Finally, this legislation also expands the scope of development assistance from microenterprises to small-and medium-sized enterprises to reflect changes in the field.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for joining me in support of this critical bill. Again, it is not about bombs, military, and guns. Remember this: when women succeed, when girls succeed, their nations succeed.

Mr. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for bringing this legislation, but especially my colleague, Congresswoman FRANKEL, for being such a champion for women's rights and issues not only in this country, but around the globe.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill, the Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act, which, as you have heard by those more eloquent than I, will help to ensure that women's economic development is a fundamental tenet of U.S. development policy.

Women tend to spend more of their money on family costs like education and healthcare than men do. Unfortunately, they lack access to financial services and must rely on riskier and less reliable means of borrowing and saving.

If global gender parity in economic activity were achieved, we could add as much as $28 trillion to the annual global GDP. That should be incentive enough for us to work to ensure that our government understands and has the capabilities to meet the unique economic needs of women, particularly since women represent more than half the world's population and a majority of the world's poor.

Now, in addition to serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am proud to be the co-chair of the Congressional Mongolian Caucus. We are working with the Mongolian Government to support the cashmere production industry to diversify its mining-dependent economy. Notably, an average of 90 percent of the workers in the Mongolian textile sector are female. So if we work to ensure that these women in the cashmere industry have the support, resources, and financial literacy to prosper, we will not only be boosting individual women, we will be boosting an entire economy and will be boosting Mongolia overall.

This is just one example where uplifting women can benefit an entire industry, a society, and a national prosperity, which, in turn, fosters democratic stability. As Lois has said, when women succeed, the world succeeds, so I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I invite my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Women and girls around the world must be included in and empowered by ongoing U.S. investments in diplomacy, development, and security. The Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act requires USAID to address gender-specific challenges across the world, and it expands support for small- and medium-sized enterprises that are owned, managed, and controlled by women. It also explicitly establishes that it is our national policy to support the empowerment of women worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill, which passed our committee by unanimous, bipartisan voice vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE and my friend from Florida, Congresswoman FRANKEL, for bringing forward this important bipartisan bill.

All countries of the world stand to benefit from the increased participation of women in their economies and in their societies at large.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote ''aye,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5480, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EAST ROSEBUD WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4645) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4645

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''East Rosebud Wild and Scenic Rivers Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) East Rosebud Creek is cherished by the people of Montana and visitors from across the United States for its clean water, spectacular natural setting, and outstanding recreational opportunities;

(2) recreational activities, including fishing, hunting, camping, paddling, hiking, rock climbing, and wildlife watching, on East Rosebud Creek and the surrounding land generate millions of dollars annually for the local economy;

(3) East Rosebud Creek—

(A) is a national treasure;

(B) possesses outstandingly remarkable values; and

(C) merits the high level of protection afforded by the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.) in order to maintain the benefits provided by the Creek, as described in paragraphs (1) and (2), for future generations to enjoy; and

(4) designation of select public land segments of East Rosebud Creek under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.) would recognize the importance of maintaining the values of the Creek while preserving public access, respecting private property rights, allowing appropriate maintenance of existing infrastructure, and allowing historical uses of the Creek to continue.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to designate East Rosebud Creek in the State of Montana as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System to preserve and protect for present and future generations the outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, and geologic values of the Creek.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION OF WILD AND SCENIC RIVER SEGMENTS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(213) EAST ROSEBUD CREEK, MONTANA.—The portions of East Rosebud Creek in the State of Montana, consisting of—

''(A) the 13-mile segment exclusively on public land within the Custer National Forest from the source in the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness downstream to the point at which the Creek enters East Rosebud Lake, including the stream reach between Twin Outlets Lake and Fossil Lake, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a wild river; and

''(B) the 7-mile segment exclusively on public land within the Custer National Forest from immediately below, but not including, the outlet of East Rosebud Lake downstream to the point at which the Creek enters private property for the first time, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a recreational river.''.

(b) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in paragraph (213) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) (as added by subsection (a)) creates a protective perimeter or buffer zone outside the designated boundary of the river segment designated by that paragraph.

(2) OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.—The fact that an otherwise authorized activity or use can be seen or heard within the boundary of the river segment designated by paragraph (213) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) (as added by subsection (a)) shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the river segment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, East Rosebud Creek is located in Carbon County, Montana, just north of Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness in the Custer National Forest.

The bill before us designates a 13-mile segment of East Rosebud Creek, beginning at its source, the East Rosebud Lake, as a wild and scenic river. A second 7-mile segment from the outlet of East Rosebud Lake to the point where the waterway enters private property would be designated as a recreational river.

This legislation specifically applies only to the segments of the creek that lie within public lands. Important historical uses outside of the wild and scenic boundary are protected by this bill.

Finally, H.R. 4645 explicitly prevents the creation of a buffer zone to restrict land use outside of the designated area.

This legislation is the result of a compromise supported by a diverse coalition that includes local ranchers, sportsmen, conservationists, and business owners. Companion legislation has been introduced with the support of both Montana Senators.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I my consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill designates a 13-mile segment of East Rosebud Creek in the Custer National Forest as a wild river under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

This segment was nominated for designation in 1989, so 30 years later it finally comes to Congress, and we are moving forward with the recognition and protection it deserves.

The bill contributes to a proud legacy of preserving free and flowing rivers for future generations, and I want to extend my congratulations to the sponsor of the legislation and the entire Montana delegation for their fine work.

I know there are several bills that have been introduced by Democrats that seek to designate wild and scenic rivers in their districts. I hope we can move those along as well by working together to make sure these places also receive the appropriate attention as this particular one did.

For now, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to

the author of this measure, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, East Rosebud Creek is one of Montana's most picturesque and popular streams. It is located in Carbon County, Montana, just north of the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness in the Custer National Forest. It provides important habitat for fish and wildlife as well as a myriad of recreational activities, including hiking, fishing, hunting, kayaking, and climbing.

My bill designates a 13-mile section of East Rosebud Creek beginning at its source, the East Rosebud Lake, as a wild river. A second 7-mile section from the outlet of East Rosebud Lake to the point where the waterway enters private property would be designated as a recreational river.

This legislation specifically applies only to the segments of the creek that lie within public lands. Important historical uses outside of the wild and scenic river boundary are protected by this bill.

Finally, H.R. 4645 explicitly prevents the creation of a buffer zone to restrict land use outside of the designated area.

This legislation represents a great compromise that has earned support from a diverse coalition that includes local ranchers, sportsmen, conservationists, businesses owners, and others. Companion legislation has been introduced with the support of the entire Montana delegation, including both Senators.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4645.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING NATIONAL EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES MEMORIAL FOUNDATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1037) to authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1037

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation may establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to commemorate the commitment and service represented by emergency medical services.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—The establishment of the commemorative work under this section shall be in accordance with chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Commemorative Works Act'').

(c) PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal funds may not be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the commemorative work under this section.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES MEMORIAL FOUNDATION.—The National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the establishment of the commemorative work under this section.

(d) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If upon payment of all expenses for the establishment of the memorial (including the maintenance and preservation amount required by section 8906(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code), there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the commemorative work, the Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to the Secretary of the Interior for deposit in the account provided for in section 8906(b)(3) of title 40, United States Code.

(2) ON EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—If upon expiration of the authority for the commemorative work under section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the commemorative work, the Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to a separate account with the National Park Foundation for memorials, to be available to the Secretary of the Interior or Administrator (as appropriate) following the process provided in section 8906(b)(4) of title 40, United States Code, for accounts established under 8906(b)(2) or (3) of title 40, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, each year 850,000 EMS providers answer more than 30 million calls to serve 22 million patients in need at a moment's notice and without reservation. For these heroes who serve on the front lines of medicine, sacrifice is a part of their calling. EMTs and paramedics have a rate of injury that is about three times the national average for all occupations, and some pay the ultimate price in the service of helping others.

The men and women of the emergency medical services profession face danger every day to save lives and help their neighbors in crisis. They respond to incidents ranging from a single person's medical emergency to natural and manmade disasters, including terrorist attacks. But while their first responder peers in law enforcement and firefighting have been honored with national memorials, EMS providers have not. H.R. 1037 aims to change that.

The National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation exists to honor, recognize, and remember the commitment, service, and sacrifice of our Nation's EMS heroes. H.R. 1037 would authorize this foundation to place a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia to commemorate the commitment and service represented by the EMS community. The foundation will be solely responsible for funding the project, and no Federal funds will be required.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), who is the principal sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California for his words of support and also thank the gentleman from Arizona for the courtesy of yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express strong support for my bill, H.R. 1037, the National Emergency Medical Services Commemorative Work Act. This bipartisan legislation will create a National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative memorial located here on Federal land in Washington, D.C., that will highlight and honor the commitment and sacrifice of emergency medical personnel across the United States.

As the chairman noted, each year, there are 850,000 first responders of the emergency medical services who answer over 30 million calls while serving 22 million Americans who are in need of lifesaving care.

Americans rely on the courage and selfless sacrifice of the men and women of the emergency medical services, and we all deeply appreciate their commitment to maintaining safety and medical security in our country.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, this memorial will serve as a symbol of their sacrifice during the darkest moments in our Nation's history.

For example, this September will mark the 17th anniversary of the attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City. On that day, within minutes of the attack, more than 100 EMS units and dozens of private ambulances raced to the site, setting up triage centers to treat the wounded. Of the nearly 3,000 victims that died on September 11th, 10 were courageous EMS personnel.

More than a decade later, in my home city of Boston, Massachusetts,

EMS providers were literally on site within seconds of the explosions during the 2013 Boston Marathon bombings. As a result of their swift and well-coordinated rescue efforts, led by my dear friend and South Boston native, the late Boston EMS special ops director Captain Bob ''Sarge'' Haley, EMS personnel were able to treat the 260 people who were injured.

Lauded for his skills in designing and implementing world-class special ops measures in the city of Boston, Captain Sarge Haley's leadership during the events of that day no doubt saved dozens of lives and is just another example of the sacrifice and heroism that H.R. 1037 seeks to memorialize.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, EMS personnel have been first on site for some of our Nation's deadliest mass shootings. During the Las Vegas shooting at the Route 91 Harvest music festival last fall, EMT Brittany Speer, who was attending the event with her family, set up a triage center after the shooting occurred.

For years, EMS providers like Ms. Speer have treated and transported victims in a professional and compassionate manner. This efficient and effective response is a result of countless mass casualty exercises that EMS personnel undertake.

Mr. Speaker, this memorial is long overdue. These examples are just a small fraction of the countless instances in which EMS personnel have sacrificed and served our Nation. Every day, EMS personnel are exposed to countless risks and dangers in order to provide critical care for those who are in need.

It is proper to recognize the efforts of our dedicated EMS first responders and memorialize the personal sacrifice made by more than 600 members of the Nation's emergency medical service and, in turn, by their families and loved ones.

As Members of Congress, we should pass this bipartisan bill and begin the creation of the commemorative memorial to EMS personnel. These individuals have rightfully earned this recognition, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand as one and pass H.R. 1037. Again, I thank the gentleman from California for his support.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for bringing this bill to us. I urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1037, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

JUAB COUNTY CONVEYANCE ACT OF 2018

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3777) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain National Forest System land containing the Nephi Work Center in Juab County, Utah, to Juab County, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3777

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Juab County Conveyance Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. LAND CONVEYANCE, NEPHI WORK CENTER, JUAB COUNTY, UTAH.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—Subject to valid existing rights, if the County submits a written request to the Secretary not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey, without consideration and by quitclaim deed, to the County all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of National Forest System land, including improvements thereon, described in subsection (b).

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The parcel of National Forest System land and improvements to be conveyed under subsection (a) is the Nephi Work Center at 740 South Main Street, Nephi, Utah, which consists of approximately 2.17 acres within Nephi Plat B Block of the Nephi Townsite Survey as Parcels #XA00-0545-1111 and #XA00-0545-2, and is identified on the map entitled ''Nephi Plat B'' and dated May 6, 1981.

(2) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practical after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a map and legal description of the parcel described in paragraph (1).

(B) MINOR MODIFICATIONS.—The map and legal description submitted under this paragraph shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may make minor modifications of any clerical or typographical errors in the map or the legal description.

(C) COPY ON FILE.—A copy of the map and the legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate field offices of the U.S. Forest Service.

(c) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the National Forest System land to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(d) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—As a condition for the conveyance under subsection (a), the County shall pay the reasonable costs incurred by the Secretary for—

(1) the survey required by subsection (c); and

(2) any environmental or administrative analysis required by law related to the conveyance.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under subsection (a) is subject to any other terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(f) TIME FOR COMPLETION OF CONVEYANCE.—The Secretary shall complete the conveyance under subsection (a) not later than one year after the date on which the County submits the written request described in subsection (a).

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means Juab County, Utah.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3777, introduced by Congresswoman MIA LOVE, would authorize the transfer of approximately 2.6 acres of U.S. Forest Service land and improvements in the city of Nephi to Juab County, Utah. The bill would require the county to pay all conveyance costs, including the cost of environmental analysis and surveying.

This land has been designated by the U.S. Forest Service for administrative disposal since 2013. Under an agreement with the Forest Service, the county fire department houses its mitigation program on this site.

On August 15, 2017, the county requested the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer this property to the county, which intends to use the land to house its wildlands fire team and equipment, with plans to construct a new fire station on the property.

As fires continue to rage across the West, Congress should take every opportunity to give local communities the resources and support they need to combat these catastrophic events.

While this transfer represents just two ten-thousandths of 1 percent of the 1.5 million acres of Federal land in Juab County, the new fire station it will facilitate could mean the difference between suppression and conflagration when wildfire threatens Juab County.

The legislation would also improve fire response services to surrounding communities and the Federal lands, since Juab County plans to use this land to house its wildlands fire team equipment.

There is strong local support from the county and its elected officials for this conveyance. By ensuring that the surrounding communities and public lands have the emergency response resources they need to respond to catastrophic wildfire, H.R. 3777 furthers the important local-Federal partnership

that is critical to restoring the Federal Government as a good neighbor to the communities it impacts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

At the markup of H.R. 3777, we voiced our concerns that the conveyance authorized by this bill does not include any standard requirements such as, if it is sold, fair market value; if it is conveyed, a reversionary clause. Unfortunately, the majority rejected our amendment to include a reversionary clause.

We recognize that this property was identified as suitable for administrative disposal, but that designation doesn't mean that it is worthless. We are not being greedy or unreasonable, just mindful of history and precedent.

With that said, we recognize how important this conveyance is to the county, and we will save this particular fight for another day.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this bill is being considered today. This bill is both timely and extremely important to my constituents.

This summer, tens of thousands of acres have burned throughout Utah. Unfortunately, many regions in the State remain at high risk due to prolonged drought. One of these regions is Juab County, which sits within my district.

Juab County consists of more than 2 million acres of land, much of which is covered with dry, flammable vegetation. The county is also experiencing a years-long drought. In fact, last year, the USDA designated the county as a disaster area due to the damages caused by the drought.

More than 70 percent of Juab is controlled by the Federal Government. While significant Federal ownership and control of land in Utah is often a source of contention, Juab County has developed a cooperative and constructive relationship with their local Federal partners.

The Forest Service currently owns a small property, just over 2 acres, within the town of Nephi, the county seat of Juab County. It has been vacant and unused for years and was identified as available for disposal several years ago. This property is known as the Nephi Work Center.

My bill, the Juab County Conveyance Act, would simply convey this property to the county. Juab intends to use this property to house their wildlands fire team, which is part of their special service fire district. This would enable the county to more effectively mitigate fire risks and protect Juab County residents and both Forest Service and BLM land within the county.

As a former mayor who has dealt with fires in and around my community, including on public lands, I want to do all I can to help my constituents. This bill will benefit both the county and Federal agencies that own and manage lands within the county.

We are talking about a city of about 1,000 people fighting fires on millions of acres. We just want to do everything we can to make sure we get to the fires as soon as possible and help not just protect costs, but the homes and the livelihoods of the families that live there.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3777, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GILA RIVER INDIAN COMMUNITY FEDERAL RIGHTS-OF-WAY, EASEMENTS AND BOUNDARY CLARIFICATION ACT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4032) to confirm undocumented Federal rights-of-way or easements on the Gila River Indian Reservation, clarify the northern boundary of the Gila River Indian Community's Reservation, to take certain land located in Maricopa County and Pinal County, Arizona, into trust for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4032

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Gila River Indian Community Federal Rights-of-Way, Easements and Boundary Clarification Act''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) establish, ratify, document, and confirm the Federal electrical, irrigation, and road rights-of-way and easements that exist within the exterior boundaries of the Reservation as of the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) establish a fixed location of the northern boundary of the Reservation and to provide for the Secretary of the Interior to ensure that the northern boundary is resurveyed and marked in conformance with the public system of surveys;

(3) authorize and direct the Secretary to place certain lands into trust for the benefit of the Community;

(4) substitute the benefits provided under this Act to the Community, its members and allottees for any claims that the Community, its members and allottees may have had in connection with alleged failures relating to the northern boundary of the Reservation and the documentation and management of Federal rights-of-way on the Reservation; and

(5) authorize the funds necessary for the United States to meet the obligations under this Act.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ALLOTTEE.—The term ''allottee'' means a person who holds a beneficial real property interest in an Indian allotment that is—

(A) located within the exterior boundaries of the Reservation; and

(B) held in trust by the United States.

(2) COMMUNITY.—The term ''Community'' means the Gila River Indian Community, a government composed of members of the Pima Tribe and the Maricopa Tribe and organized under section 16 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 5123).

(3) DISPUTED AREA.—The term ''Disputed Area'' means the land north of the Harrington Survey line and south of the middle of the Salt River (as it currently flows).

(4) EXECUTIVE ORDER.—The term ''Executive Order'' means the Executive order executed by President R.B. Hayes on June 14, 1879.

(5) FEDERAL AND TRIBAL FACILITIES.—The term ''Federal and Tribal Facilities'' means any and all structures, improvements, and appurtenances associated with roadways, canals, power lines, and other projects constructed for the benefit of the Community and its members. Thus, ''Federal and Tribal Facilities'' refers to—

(A) Indian Reservation Road (IRR) transportation facilities, including public roads, bridges, drainage structures, culverts, ferry routes, marine terminals, transit facilities, boardwalks, pedestrian paths, trails, and their appurtenances, and other transportation facilities, as designated by the Community and the Secretary and defined in section 170.5 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations;

(B) Federal irrigation facilities included in the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the irrigation project authorized under the Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 475), including all structures and appurtenant works within the San Carlos Irrigation Project for the delivery, diversion, and storage of irrigation water, as defined in section 171.100 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(C) Federal electric distribution facilities included in the San Carlos Irrigation Project—Electric Services, including all structures and appurtenant works for the delivery of electric power on the Reservation that are part of that project.

(6) LOWER SONORAN LANDS.—The term ''Lower Sonoran Lands'' means the approximately 3,400 acres of land—

(A) owned by the United States and administered by the Secretary through the Bureau of Land Management that have been identified and designated for disposal by the Bureau of Land Management under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) in the Lower Sonoran Resource Management Plan (September 2012);

(B) located in Sections 1, 2, 3, 11, and 12, Township 2 South, Range 1 West, contiguous to the northwest boundary of the Community's existing Reservation; and portions of Sections 16 and 17, Township 5 South, Range 5 East, contiguous to the southern boundary of the Community's existing Reservation; and

(C) that the Community shall acquire pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(7) HARRINGTON SURVEY.—The term ''Harrington Survey'' means the Dependent Resurvey of a Portion of Township 1 North, Range 1 East, Gila and Salt River Meridian, Arizona, Gila River Indian Reservation, conducted by Guy P.

Harrington, as shown on the plat and described in the field notes at Book 3384, approved September 2, 1920, and officially filed on November 3, 1920, on file with the Bureau of Land Management.

(8) RESERVATION.—The term ''Reservation'' means the land located within the exterior boundaries of the reservation created under sections 3 and 4 of the Act of February 28, 1859 (11 Stat. 401, chapter LXVI), and Executive orders of August 31, 1876, June 14, 1879, May 5, 1882, November 15, 1883, July 31, 1911, June 2, 1913, August 27, 1914, and July 19, 1915, and any other lands placed in trust for the benefit of the Community.

(9) ROW, EASEMENTS, AND FEDERAL AND TRIBAL FACILITIES MAP.—The term ''ROW, Easements, and Federal and Tribal Facilities Map'' means the map depicting the Federal rights-of-way, easements, and Federal and Tribal facilities that exist within the exterior boundaries of the Reservation on the date of enactment of this Act, which map is submitted to Congress as part of the Congressional record accompanying this Act.

(10) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. LAND INTO TRUST FOR BENEFIT OF THE COMMUNITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall take the Lower Sonoran Lands into trust for the benefit of the Community, after the Community—

(1) conveys to the Secretary all right, title, and interest of the Community in and to the Lower Sonoran Lands;

(2) submits to the Secretary a request to take the Lower Sonoran Lands into trust for the benefit of the Community;

(3) conducts a survey (to the satisfaction of the Secretary) to determine the exact acreage and legal description of the Lower Sonoran Lands, if the Secretary determines a survey is necessary; and

(4) pays all costs of any survey conducted under paragraph (3).

(b) AVAILABILITY OF LOWER SONORAN LANDS MAP.—Not later than 180 days after the Lower Sonoran Lands are taken into trust under subsection (a), the map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Secretary.

(c) LANDS TAKEN INTO TRUST AS PART OF RESERVATION.—After the date on which the Lower Sonoran Lands are taken into trust under subsection (a), those lands shall be treated as part of the Reservation.

(d) GAMING.—Class II and class III gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) shall not be allowed at any time on the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

(e) DESCRIPTION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall cause the full metes-and-bounds description of the Lower Sonoran Lands to be published in the Federal Register. The description shall, on publication, constitute the official description of the Lower Sonoran Lands.

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF FIXED NORTHERN BOUNDARY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Northern boundary of the Reservation created by the Executive Order is hereby modified in accordance with this section and shall be fixed, permanent, and not ambulatory.

(b) MODIFICATION OF NORTH BOUNDARY.—That portion of the Reservation boundary created by the Executive Order as along the middle of the Salt River shall be modified to be a fixed and permanent boundary as established by the Harrington Survey of the north boundary of the Reservation, as shown on the plat and described in the field notes.

(c) RESURVEY AND MARKING.—Subject to available appropriations, the Secretary shall ensure that the modified Reservation boundary as described in subsection (b) is surveyed and clearly marked in conformance with the public system of surveys.

(d) EFFECT.—The Reservation boundary as modified and resurveyed by subsections (b) and (c) shall become the north boundary of the Reservation in all respects and upon all the same terms as if such lands had been included in the Executive Order. No other portion of the Reservation boundary shall be affected by this Act except as specifically set forth in this Act.

(e) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register this modification and the resurvey of the Community's reservation boundary, as set forth in subsections (b) and (c), which shall constitute the fixed northern boundary of the Reservation.

SEC. 6. SATISFACTION AND SUBSTITUTION OF CLAIMS.

(a) INTENT OF CONGRESS.—It is the intent of Congress to provide to the Community, its members, and allottees benefits that are equivalent to or exceed the claims the Community, its members, and allottees may possess as of the date of the enactment of this Act, taking into consideration—

(1) the potential risks, cost, and time delay associated with litigation;

(2) the cultural and historic significance of the Lower Sonoran Lands to the Community, its members, and allottees;

(3) the benefit to the Community, its members, and allottees associated with having a fixed northern boundary of the Reservation;

(4) the benefits that will accrue to the Community, its members, and allottees resulting from the legal confirmation of Federal electrical, irrigation, and road rights-of-way as provided under this Act; and

(5) the availability of appropriations under this Act.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The benefits realized by the Community, its members, and allottees under this Act shall be in complete replacement of and substitution for, and full satisfaction of all claims that the Community, its members, and allottees may have had against the United States—

(1) relating to the United States alleged failure to legally establish and document Federal rights-of-way on the Reservation through the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) for the United States alleged failure to establish, maintain and defend the Community's northern boundary of the Reservation through the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall become effective on the later of the date on which the Secretary—

(1) publishes in the Federal Register the notice required under section 4(e);

(2) publishes in the Federal Register the notice required under section 5(e); and

(3) completes the surveys for the Federal rights-of-way required under this Act.

SEC. 7. FEDERAL RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

(a) ESTABLISHED, RATIFIED, AND CONFIRMED.—All of the rights-of-way depicted in the ROW, Easements, and Federal and Tribal Facilities Map accompanying this Act are hereby established, ratified, and confirmed. The specific position and dimensions of such rights-of-way are to be determined following a survey conducted in accordance with section 8.

(b) RECORDATION.—All of the rights-of-way established, ratified, and confirmed in subsection (a) shall be recorded with the Land Titles and Records Office following each survey conducted in accordance with section 8.

(c) GRANTEE OR APPLICANT.—The Federal Government shall be considered the grantee or applicant for any and all rights-of-way established pursuant to this Act.

(d) CANCELLATION.—Any rights-of-way established by this Act may be cancelled pursuant to sections 404–409 of title 25, Federal Code of Regulations, or upon written request by the Community to the Secretary to remove the rights-of-way from the ROW, Easements, and Federal and Tribal Facilities Map subject to otherwise applicable law regarding rights-of-way on the Reservation. Any request for cancellation action by the Community shall be formally documented by tribal resolution.

(e) OTHER INTERESTS IN LAND.—Notwithstanding any law, the granting of any rights-of-way or easement other than those depicted in the ROW, Easements, and Federal and Tribal Facilities Map accompanying this Act, or any future additions, expansions or modifications of any of the rights-of-way or easement established, ratified, and confirmed in subsection (a), may only be done in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations. All other rights-of-ways or easements on the Reservation shall be valid only to the extent that they have been established in accordance with applicable Federal statute and regulation specifically governing rights-of-ways or easements on Indian lands.

SEC. 8. SURVEY.

(a) COMPLETION AND PUBLICATION.—Not later than 6 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall undertake and complete a survey of each of the Federal rights-of-way established under this Act. A retroactive grant of easement shall be required upon completion of each survey of each of the Federal rights-of-way established under this Act. The Bureau of Indian Affairs shall cause the surveys undertaken pursuant to this Act to be published in the Federal Register.

(b) CONTRACT.—The Bureau of Indian Affairs is authorized, subject to appropriations, to contract for the survey of all Federal rights-of-way established pursuant to this Act to the Community or a third party.

(c) DELETIONS.—Upon completion of the surveys authorized and undertaken pursuant to subsection (a), the Community and the Bureau of Indian Affairs may determine that anomalies exist with respect to certain Federal rights-of-way such that deletion of such Federal right-of-way from the ROW, Easements, and Federal and Tribal Facilities Map is appropriate and such Federal right-of-way may be removed from the ROW, Easements, and Federal Tribal Facilities Map.

SEC. 9. HUNT HIGHWAY.

Nothing in this Act shall establish, terminate, or otherwise impact any right-of-way or easement associated with Hunt Highway in Pinal County, Arizona, including the portion of Hunt Highway that traverses the Reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of H.R. 4032, the Gila River Indian Community Federal-Rights-of-Way, Easements and Boundary Clarification Act, introduced by Congressman O'HALLERAN of Arizona.

The Gila River Indian Reservation was established in 1859 and later expanded by a series of executive orders

in Maricopa and Pinal Counties, Arizona. In 2006, the Tribe sued the Federal Government, alleging a breach of the United States' fiduciary duty for its failure to accurately survey the reservation's northwesterly boundary, resulting in the patenting of land along the Salt River to non-Indians.

The Tribe also asserted a failed duty to document rights-of-way across the reservation, collect rent, and account for the Tribe's and allottees' trust assets. Rather than litigate the case, the Obama administration settled with the Tribe in 2016.

The settlement provided that the United States would survey all the Federal rights-of-way on the reservation. It would also take approximately 3,400 acres of Bureau of Land Management land into trust for the Tribe, after the Tribe purchases the land for fair market value.

Finally, the settlement provided monetary damages of about $12.5 million from the judgment fund, an issue not addressed by this bill.

This legislation is needed to facilitate portions of the settlement by clarifying the northwestern boundary of the reservation, documenting the existing Federal rights-of-way on the reservation, and placing the 3,400 acres into trust after the Tribe buys the land from the Federal Government.

The bill is cosponsored by the entire Arizona delegation, and I commend their work to resolve this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support and urge passage of my legislation, H.R. 4032, the Gila River Indian Community Federal Rights-of-Way, Easements and Boundary Clarification Act.

I was proud to introduce this bipartisan legislation along with colleagues Congressmen Biggs, Gallego, and Gosar.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Tribal Nations were here prior to the formation of the United States. However, throughout history, many Federal laws were enacted that diminished land holdings and, as a result, reservation boundaries were often incorrectly adjusted.

The Federal Government often lacked the mechanisms to effectively keep track of the various rights-of-way that existed on Tribal lands. These challenges remain today and can be serious barriers to Tribal land use efforts for housing, economic development, and cultural purposes.

That is why I introduced my bill, which simply finalizes the settlement of longstanding issues related to the Federal Government's management of Tribal trust assets on the Gila River Indian Community.

□ 1815

The legislation provides for surveys of all the Federal rights-of-way on the reservation and establishes a map of those rights-of-way to aid the community in planning land use, including building homes, rebuilding schools, locating businesses, and ensuring access to cultural sites.

H.R. 4032 also clarifies the northwest boundary of the reservation, which will avoid a title dispute with the city of Phoenix. In exchange for giving up lands that are currently within the reservation boundary, the community will be able to purchase 3,400 acres of culturally relevant lands from the Bureau of Land Management and have those lands taken into trust.

H.R. 4032 is important to the Gila River Indian community, to local landowners, and nearby communities.

I would like to thank my colleagues across the aisle for supporting this legislation, as well as the chairman and ranking member. I look forward to working with my colleagues in Congress and the administration to ensure this settlement is fully implemented.

On behalf of our Arizona communities, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, necessary legislation.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a moment to acknowledge the Gila River Indian community, their leadership, which has worked tirelessly and in very good faith with the Federal Government in addressing the issues that led to these claims against the United States.

I would like to congratulate them on this hard work and their persistence, and I am happy that the passage of this bill will finally implement a final part of their settlement.

I also want to take time to thank my colleague and friend from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4032, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–834) on the resolution (H. Res. 1001) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 119) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S. 488, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3030, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4989, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

JOBS AND INVESTOR CONFIDENCE ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 488) to increase the threshold for disclosures required by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to compensatory benefit plans, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 4, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

YEAS—406

Abraham	Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)
Adams	Brooks (IN)	Comer
Aderholt	Brown (MD)	Comstock
Aguilar	Brownley (CA)	Conaway
Allen	Buchanan	Connolly
Amodei	Buck	Cook
Arrington	Bucshon	Cooper
Babin	Budd	Correa
Bacon	Burgess	Costa
Banks (IN)	Bustos	Courtney
Barletta	Byrne	Cramer
Barr	Calvert	Crawford
Barragán	Capuano	Crist
Barton	Carbajal	Crowley
Bass	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Beatty	Carter (GA)	Culberson
Bera	Carter (TX)	Cummings
Bergman	Cartwright	Curbelo (FL)
Beyer	Castor (FL)	Curtis
Biggs	Castro (TX)	Davidson
Bilirakis	Chabot	Davis (CA)
Bishop (MI)	Cheney	Davis, Danny
Bishop (UT)	Chu, Judy	Davis, Rodney
Black	Cicilline	DeFazio
Blackburn	Clark (MA)	DeGette
Blum	Clarke (NY)	Delaney
Blunt Rochester	Clay	DeLauro
Bonamici	Cleaver	DelBene
Bost	Cloud	Demings
Boyle, Brendan F.	Clyburn	Denham
	Coffman	DeSantis
Brady (PA)	Cohen	DeSaulnier
Brady (TX)	Cole	DesJarlais
Brat	Collins (GA)	Deutch

Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Lesko
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—4

Amash
Massie
Nadler
Schakowsky

NOT VOTING—18

Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Butterfield
Cárdenas
Costello (PA)
Ellison
Flores
Gallego
Garamendi
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
McCollum
Roby
Rooney, Francis
Shuster
Simpson
Speier
Walz

□ 1841

Messrs. KIHUEN, BACON, and CUMMINGS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to modernize U.S. markets and to promote capital formation, investor confidence, and economic growth, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIE WIESEL GENOCIDE AND ATROCITIES PREVENTION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3030) to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 5, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

YEAS—406

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cloud
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Lesko
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart

Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—5

Amash
Biggs
Jones
Massie
Sanford

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Butterfield
Cárdenas
Ellison
Flores
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Joyce (OH)
McNerney
Roby
Rooney, Francis
Shuster
Simpson
Speier
Titus
Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1848

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING DIPLOMATS FROM SURVEILLANCE THROUGH CONSUMER DEVICES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4989) to require the Department of State to establish a policy regarding the use of location-tracking consumer devices by employees at diplomatic and consular facilities, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

YEAS—412

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Lesko
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—16

Blumenauer
Butterfield
Cárdenas
Coffman
Ellison
Flores
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Joyce (OH)
MacArthur
Roby
Rooney, Francis
Shuster
Simpson
Speier
Walz

□ 1856

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote today on the House Amendment to S. 488, the JOBS and Investor Confidence Act of 2018 (Roll No. 333), I would have voted "aye."

Additionally, had I been present for the vote on H.R. 3030, the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocity Prevention Act of 2018 (Roll No. 334), I would have voted "aye."

Finally, had I been present for the vote on H.R. 4989, the Protecting Diplomats from Surveillance Through Consumer Devices Act (Roll No. 335), I would have voted "aye."

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the consideration of H.R. 6147, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 996 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 6147.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1858

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with Ms. CHENEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1900

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

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 6147, the fiscal year 2019 Interior, Environment, and Financial Services and General Government appropriations bills. This package continues the House's important work on our annual government funding legislation. With the passage of this bill, the House will be halfway done with our fiscal year 2019 bills through the floor.

I want to thank, and I am sure Ranking Member LOWEY thanks both Chairman CALVERT and his ranking member, and Chairman GRAVES and his ranking member for their work with their colleagues.

These bills fund vital programs across the Federal Government, including those that make Americans safer, protect our Nation's resources, and create jobs. In addition to providing this necessary funding, the bills ensure that the Federal Government is working efficiently and in the best interest of the American taxpayers. This includes streamlining Federal agencies, reforming financial policies, and reducing burdensome regulatory red tape.

Both bills reflect American priorities. I would like to highlight just a few of these. The Interior and Environment appropriations bill, authored by Representative CALVERT of California, provides $35.3 billion for the EPA, the U.S. Forest Service, and the Department of the Interior and other programs that promote our natural heritage.

Within this total, the bill prioritizes funding to fight in preventing devastating wildfires, fully funding the 10-year average for suppression costs. The bill also targets critical resources to major infrastructure that will improve the lives of Americans, boosting funding to ensure communities have access to safe drinking water, and accelerates the cleanup of Superfund sites. This is especially important as we have more than 1,300 national priority sites awaiting urgent attention to address hazardous materials threatening the health of Americans across the country. I appreciate Chairman CALVERT's efforts in this area.

The Interior bill continues funding for other programs that manage our national resources and cultural heritage, like the National Park Service, the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, the Chemical Safety Board, and the Smithsonian Institution.

Beyond these important investments, the bill rightsizes regulatory programs to ensure that the government is working to support American families and their communities.

This also includes addressing EPA's regulatory agenda and supporting the administration's proposal to reshape its workforce. This will enable the agency to focus on its core duties, while reducing unnecessary spending.

The second bill in this package also works to reduce waste across government. The Financial Services appropriations bill, authored by Representative GRAVES of Georgia, totals $23.4 billion which, like the Interior bill, is equal to fiscal year 2018 levels.

This bill prioritizes effective programs that improve our national security and expands economic opportunity while finding efficiencies, governmentwide, and while stopping harmful overregulation.

This bill also supports America's small businesses by providing loans and resources that will help us grow and thrive. It also provides stability for our financial system, and protects consumers, and investors.

This bill also improves accountability of the American taxpayer by directing the Internal Revenue Service funding towards customer service and stopping the misuse of funding within the agency.

Another priority is law enforcement. This bill also provides funding to fight the opioid abuse epidemic, protects our financial institutions from cyber crime, and supports our Federal courts.

I would like to commend all the committee members on the Appropriations Committee who led the drafting of these bills, particularly Chairman GRAVES and his Ranking Member, MIKE QUIGLEY, and Interior Chairman KEN CALVERT and his Ranking Member, BETTY MCCOLLUM, along with their subcommittee members and their professional staff that did a remarkable job.

I am pleased that the House is taking the next step forward on our appropriations bill this evening.

I reserve the balance of my time.

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
Management of Lands and Resources					
Land Resources:					
Soil, water and air management	43,609	---	43,609	---	+43,609
Rangeland management	81,000	82,116	82,116	+1,116	---
Forestry management	10,135	9,527	10,135	---	+608
Riparian management	21,321	---	21,321	---	+21,321
Cultural resources management	17,131	15,383	17,131	---	+1,748
Wild horse and burro management	75,000	66,719	90,000	+15,000	+23,281
Subtotal	248,196	173,745	264,312	+16,116	+90,567
Wildlife and Fisheries:					
Wildlife management	103,281	---	103,281	---	+103,281
Fisheries management	12,530	---	12,530	---	+12,530
Subtotal	115,811	---	115,811	---	+115,811
Threatened and endangered species	21,567	---	21,567	---	+21,567
Wildlife and Aquatic Habitat Management:					
Wildlife habitat management	---	81,753	---	---	-81,753
Aquatic habitat management	---	37,664	---	---	-37,664
Subtotal	---	119,417	---	---	-119,417
Recreation Management:					
Wilderness management	18,264	11,871	18,264	---	+6,393
Recreation resources management	54,465	53,234	55,465	+1,000	+2,231
Subtotal	72,729	65,105	73,729	+1,000	+8,624
Energy and Minerals:					
Oil and gas management	85,947	83,101	85,947	---	+2,846
Oil and gas permit processing	7,365	5,737	5,737	-1,628	---
Oil and gas inspection and enforcement	48,385	48,385	48,385	---	---
Subtotal, Oil and gas	141,697	137,223	140,069	-1,628	+2,846
Coal management	11,868	19,533	19,533	+7,665	---
Other mineral resources	12,043	12,167	12,167	+124	---
Renewable energy	28,320	16,043	28,320	---	+12,277
Subtotal, Energy and Minerals	193,928	184,966	200,089	+6,161	+15,123
Realty and Ownership Management:					
Alaska conveyance	22,000	13,580	22,000	---	+8,420
Cadastral, lands, and realty management	52,480	48,290	51,480	-1,000	+3,190
Subtotal	74,480	61,870	73,480	-1,000	+11,610
Resource Protection and Maintenance:					
Resource management planning	60,125	36,131	62,125	+2,000	+25,994
Abandoned mine lands	20,036	---	20,036	---	+20,036
Resource protection and law enforcement	27,616	24,166	29,000	+1,384	+4,834
Hazardous materials management	15,463	---	15,463	---	+15,463
Abandoned minelands and hazardous materials management	---	13,260	---	---	-13,260
Subtotal	123,240	73,557	126,624	+3,384	+53,067
Transportation and Facilities Maintenance:					
Annual maintenance	39,125	33,613	40,000	+875	+6,387
Deferred maintenance	79,201	24,886	114,201	+35,000	+89,315
Subtotal	118,326	58,499	154,201	+35,875	+95,702

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Workforce and Organizational Support:					
Administrative support	58,694	47,072	58,694	---	+11,622
Bureauwide fixed costs	93,176	96,480	96,480	+3,304	---
Information technology management	26,077	23,653	26,077	---	+2,424
Subtotal	177,947	167,205	181,251	+3,304	+14,046
National landscape conservation system, base program	36,819	26,260	36,819	---	+10,559
Communication site management	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Offsetting collections	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	---	---
Subtotal, Management of lands and resources	1,183,043	930,624	1,247,883	+64,840	+317,259
Mining Law Administration:					
Administration	39,696	39,696	39,696	---	---
Offsetting collections	-56,696	-59,000	-59,000	-2,304	---
Subtotal, Mining Law Administration	-17,000	-19,304	-19,304	-2,304	---
Total, Management of Lands and Resources	1,166,043	911,320	1,228,579	+62,536	+317,259
Construction					
Rescission	---	-5,465	---	---	+5,465
Land Acquisition					
Acquisitions	13,300	---	6,000	-7,300	+6,000
Acquisition Management	2,000	1,996	1,996	-4	---
Recreational Access	8,000	---	8,000	---	+8,000
Emergencies, Hardships, and Inholdings	1,616	1,396	1,396	-220	---
Subtotal	24,916	3,392	17,392	-7,524	+14,000
Rescission	---	-10,000	---	---	+10,000
Total, Land Acquisition	24,916	-6,608	17,392	-7,524	+24,000
Oregon and California Grant Lands					
Western Oregon resources management	94,445	---	---	-94,445	---
Oregon and California grant lands management	---	82,222	95,224	+95,224	+13,002
Western Oregon information and resource data systems	1,798	1,327	1,798	---	+471
Western Oregon transportation & facilities maintenance	9,628	6,118	9,628	---	+3,510
Western Oregon construction and acquisition	335	364	335	---	-29
Western Oregon national monument	779	---	---	-779	---
Total, Oregon and California Grant Lands	106,985	90,031	106,985	---	+16,954
Range Improvements					
Current appropriations	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
Service Charges, Deposits, and Forfeitures					
Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures	24,595	25,850	25,850	+1,255	---
Offsetting fees	-24,595	-25,850	-25,850	-1,255	---
Total, Service Charges, Deposits & Forfeitures	---	---	---	---	---

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Miscellaneous Trust Funds and Permanent Operating Funds					
Current appropriations	24,000	24,000	24,000	---	---
TOTAL, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT	1,331,944	1,023,278	1,386,956	+55,012	+363,678
(Mandatory)	(34,000)	(34,000)	(34,000)	---	---
(Discretionary)	(1,297,944)	(989,278)	(1,352,956)	(+55,012)	(+363,678)
UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE					
Resource Management					
Ecological Services:					
Listing	18,818	10,941	10,941	-7,877	---
Planning and consultation	105,579	98,828	108,169	+2,590	+9,341
Conservation and restoration	32,396	21,187	34,031	+1,635	+12,844
(National Wetlands Inventory)	(3,471)	(3,447)	(3,471)	---	(+24)
(Coastal Barrier Resources Act)	(1,390)	(1,381)	(1,390)	---	(+9)
Recovery	91,032	80,820	96,520	+5,488	+15,700
Subtotal	247,825	211,776	249,661	+1,836	+37,885
Habitat conservation:					
Partners for fish and wildlife	51,633	35,765	51,870	+237	+16,105
Coastal programs	13,375	6,512	13,420	+45	+6,908
Subtotal	65,008	42,277	65,290	+282	+23,013
National Wildlife Refuge System:					
Wildlife and habitat management	233,392	228,332	234,244	+852	+5,912
Visitor services	73,319	71,267	73,795	+476	+2,528
Refuge law enforcement	38,054	37,983	38,322	+268	+339
Conservation planning	2,523	---	2,523	---	+2,523
Refuge maintenance	139,469	135,487	139,889	+420	+4,402
Subtotal	486,757	473,069	488,773	+2,016	+15,704
Conservation and Enforcement:					
Migratory bird management	48,421	46,290	46,113	-2,308	-177
Law enforcement	77,053	69,453	77,380	+327	+7,927
International affairs	15,816	14,484	15,895	+79	+1,411
Subtotal	141,290	130,227	139,388	-1,902	+9,161
Fish and Aquatic Conservation:					
National fish hatchery system operations	55,822	49,979	56,107	+285	+6,128
Maintenance and equipment	22,920	19,808	22,965	+45	+3,157
Aquatic habitat and species conservation	85,885	64,106	84,244	-1,641	+20,138
Subtotal	164,627	133,893	163,316	-1,311	+29,423
Cooperative landscape conservation	12,988	---	12,988	---	+12,988
Science Support:					
Adaptive science	10,517	---	10,517	---	+10,517
Service science	6,750	---	6,750	---	+6,750
Subtotal	17,267	---	17,267	---	+17,267

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
General Operations:					
Central office operations	36,965	43,049	39,720	+2,755	-3,329
Regional office operations	33,574	32,860	32,860	-714	---
Servicewide bill paying	36,365	36,528	36,528	+163	---
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation	7,022	5,009	12,022	+5,000	+7,013
National Conservation Training Center	29,314	21,956	27,758	-1,556	+5,802
Aviation Management	---	---	3,237	+3,237	+3,237
Subtotal	143,240	139,402	152,125	+8,885	+12,723
Total, Resource Management	1,279,002	1,130,644	1,288,808	+9,806	+158,164
Construction					
Construction and rehabilitation:					
Line item construction projects	9,093	9,093	7,293	-1,800	-1,800
Bridge and dam safety programs	1,972	1,232	1,972	---	+740
Nationwide engineering service	5,475	5,421	5,508	+33	+87
Deferred maintenance	50,000	---	44,961	-5,039	+44,961
Subtotal	66,540	15,746	59,734	-6,806	+43,988
Rescission	---	-2,000	---	---	+2,000
Total, Construction	66,540	13,746	59,734	-6,806	+45,988
Land Acquisition					
Acquisitions	31,250	---	22,000	-9,250	+22,000
Acquisition Management	12,773	9,615	9,615	-3,158	---
Recreational Access	2,500	---	2,500	---	+2,500
Emergencies, Hardships, and Inholdings	5,351	1,641	2,626	-2,725	+985
Exchanges	1,500	697	697	-803	---
Land Protection Planning	465	---	---	-465	---
Highlands Conservation Act Grants	10,000	---	10,000	---	+10,000
Subtotal	63,839	11,953	47,438	-16,401	+35,485
Rescission	---	-5,000	---	---	+5,000
Total, Land Acquisition	63,839	6,953	47,438	-16,401	+40,485
Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund					
Grants and administration:					
Conservation grants	12,508	---	12,508	---	+12,508
HCP assistance grants	7,485	---	7,485	---	+7,485
Administration	2,702	---	2,702	---	+2,702
Subtotal	22,695	---	22,695	---	+22,695
Land acquisition:					
Species recovery land acquisition	11,162	---	11,162	---	+11,162
HCP land acquisition grants to states	19,638	---	19,638	---	+19,638
Subtotal	30,800	---	30,800	---	+30,800
Total, Cooperatiave Endangered Species Conservation Fund	53,495	---	53,495	---	+53,495
National Wildlife Refuge Fund					
Payments in lieu of taxes	13,228	---	13,228	---	+13,228
North American Wetlands Conservation Fund					
North American Wetlands Conservation Fund	40,000	33,600	42,000	+2,000	+8,400

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation					
Migratory bird grants	3,910	3,900	3,910	---	+10
Multinational Species Conservation Fund					
African elephant conservation fund	2,582	1,401	2,582	---	+1,181
Asian elephant conservation fund	1,557	845	1,557	---	+712
Rhinoceros and tiger conservation fund	3,440	1,865	3,440	---	+1,575
Great ape conservation fund	1,975	1,071	1,975	---	+904
Marine turtle conservation fund	1,507	818	1,507	---	+689
Total, Multinational Species Conservation Fund	11,061	6,000	11,061	---	+5,061
State and Tribal Wildlife Grants					
State wildlife grants (formula)	53,000	31,286	53,000	---	+21,714
State wildlife grants (competitive)	6,362	---	6,362	---	+6,362
Tribal wildlife grants	4,209	---	4,209	---	+4,209
Total, State and tribal wildlife grants	63,571	31,286	63,571	---	+32,285
TOTAL, U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE	1,594,646	1,226,129	1,583,245	-11,401	+357,116
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE					
Operation of the National Park System					
Park Management:					
Resource stewardship	334,437	327,223	334,437	---	+7,214
Visitor services	255,683	258,115	255,683	---	-2,432
Park protection	362,226	365,766	362,226	---	-3,540
Facility operations and maintenance	810,019	781,963	850,019	+40,000	+68,056
Park support	536,032	506,617	540,012	+3,980	+33,395
Subtotal	2,298,397	2,239,684	2,342,377	+43,980	+102,693
External administrative costs	179,572	185,433	185,433	+5,861	---
Total, Operation of the National Park System	2,477,969	2,425,117	2,527,810	+49,841	+102,693
National Recreation and Preservation					
Natural programs	14,170	11,139	14,170	---	+3,031
Cultural programs	25,062	19,333	25,062	---	+5,729
International park affairs	1,648	970	1,648	---	+678
Environmental and compliance review	433	387	433	---	+46
Grant administration	2,004	---	2,004	---	+2,004
Heritage Partnership Programs	20,321	370	20,321	---	+19,951
Total, National Recreation and Preservation	63,638	32,199	63,638	---	+31,439
Historic Preservation Fund					
State historic preservation offices	48,925	26,934	48,925	---	+21,991
Tribal grants	11,485	5,738	11,485	---	+5,747
Competitive grants	13,500	---	13,500	---	+13,500
Save America's Treasures grants	13,000	---	13,000	---	+13,000
Historic Revitalization grants	5,000	---	---	-5,000	---
Grants to Historically Black Colleges and Universities	5,000	---	5,000	---	+5,000
Total, Historic Preservation Fund	96,910	32,672	91,910	-5,000	+59,238

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Construction					
General Program:					
Line item construction and maintenance	137,011	157,011	157,011	+20,000	---
Emergency and unscheduled	3,848	3,829	3,829	-19	---
Housing	2,200	2,187	2,187	-13	---
Dam safety	1,247	1,240	1,240	-7	---
Equipment replacement	13,474	8,408	8,408	-5,066	---
Planning, construction	12,711	17,453	17,453	+4,742	---
Construction program management	38,713	41,000	41,000	+2,287	---
General management plans	12,500	10,205	10,205	-2,295	---
General program increase	138,000	---	125,000	-13,000	+125,000
Total, Construction	359,704	241,333	366,333	+6,629	+125,000
Land and Water Conservation Fund (rescission of contract authority)	---	-28,140	---	---	+28,140
Land Acquisition and State Assistance					
Assistance to States:					
State conservation grants (formula)	100,000	---	100,000	---	+100,000
State conservation grants (competitive)	20,000	---	20,000	---	+20,000
Administrative expenses	4,006	---	4,006	---	+4,006
Subtotal	124,006	---	124,006	---	+124,006
National Park Service:					
Acquisitions	26,400	---	22,000	-4,400	+22,000
Acquisition Management	9,679	8,788	8,788	-891	---
Recreational Access	2,000	---	1,000	-1,000	+1,000
Emergencies, Hardships, Relocations, and Deficiencies	3,928	---	2,500	-1,428	+2,500
Inholdings, Donations, and Exchanges	4,928	---	4,069	-859	+4,069
American Battlefield Protection Program	10,000	---	10,000	---	+10,000
Subtotal	56,935	8,788	48,357	-8,578	+39,569
Subtotal, Land Acquisition and State Assistance	180,941	8,788	172,363	-8,578	+163,575
Rescission	---	-10,000	---	---	+10,000
Total, Land Acquisition and State Assistance	180,941	-1,212	172,363	-8,578	+173,575
Centennial Challenge	23,000	---	30,000	+7,000	+30,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE	3,202,162	2,701,969	3,252,054	+49,892	+550,085
UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY					
Surveys, Investigations, and Research					
Ecosystems:					
Status and trends	20,473	11,325	18,873	-1,600	+7,548
Fisheries: Aquatic and endangered resources	20,136	9,701	20,136	---	+10,435
Wildlife: Terrestrial and endangered resources	46,007	33,440	44,507	-1,500	+11,067
Terrestrial, Freshwater and marine environments	36,415	24,569	36,415	---	+11,846
Invasive species	17,330	17,096	18,530	+1,200	+1,434
Cooperative research units	17,371	---	19,287	+1,916	+19,287
Total, Ecosystems	157,732	96,131	157,748	+16	+61,617

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Land Resources:					
National Land Imaging	93,094	75,514	98,894	+5,800	+23,380
Land change science	34,070	14,739	34,070	---	+19,331
National and regional climate adaptation science centers	25,335	12,989	25,335	---	+12,346
Total, Land Resources	152,499	103,242	158,299	+5,800	+55,057
Energy, Minerals, and Environmental Health:					
Mineral and Energy Resources:					
Minerals resources	49,371	58,226	58,226	+8,855	---
Energy resources	30,872	25,879	25,879	-4,993	---
Subtotal	80,243	84,105	84,105	+3,862	---
Environmental Health:					
Contaminant biology	10,197	---	10,197	---	+10,197
Toxic substances hydrology	12,398	---	12,598	+200	+12,598
Subtotal	22,595	---	22,795	+200	+22,795
Total, Energy, Minerals, and Environmental Health	102,838	84,105	106,900	+4,062	+22,795
Natural Hazards:					
Earthquake hazards	83,403	50,999	83,403	---	+32,404
Volcano hazards	42,621	22,306	32,766	-9,855	+10,460
Landslide hazards	3,538	3,511	3,688	+150	+177
Global seismographic network	6,653	4,937	6,653	---	+1,716
Geomagnetism	1,888	---	1,888	---	+1,888
Coastal/Marine Hazards and Resources	40,510	35,549	41,710	+1,200	+6,161
Total, Natural Hazards	178,613	117,302	170,108	-8,505	+52,806
Water Resources:					
Water Availability and Use Science Program	46,052	30,351	46,302	+250	+15,951
Groundwater and Streamflow Information Program	74,173	64,915	86,673	+12,500	+21,758
National Water Quality Program	90,829	69,656	91,648	+819	+21,992
Water Resources Research Act Program	6,500	---	6,500	---	+6,500
Total, Water Resources	217,554	164,922	231,123	+13,569	+66,201
Core Science Systems:					
Science, synthesis, analysis, and research	24,051	19,010	24,051	---	+5,041
National cooperative geological mapping	24,397	22,390	25,397	+1,000	+3,007
National Geospatial Program	67,854	50,878	69,654	+1,800	+18,776
Total, Core Science Systems	116,302	92,278	119,102	+2,800	+26,824
Science Support:					
Administration and Management	80,881	69,534	81,681	+800	+12,147
Information Services	21,947	19,716	21,947	---	+2,231
Total, Science Support	102,828	89,250	103,628	+800	+14,378
Facilities:					
Rental payments and operations & maintenance	104,927	105,219	105,219	+292	---
Deferred maintenance and capital improvement	15,164	7,231	15,164	---	+7,933
Total, Facilities	120,091	112,450	120,383	+292	+7,933
TOTAL, UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY	1,148,457	859,680	1,167,291	+18,834	+307,611

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT					
Ocean Energy Management					
Renewable energy	21,676	20,720	21,676	---	+956
Conventional energy	58,123	61,799	61,799	+3,676	---
Environmental assessment	73,834	79,774	79,774	+5,940	---
Executive direction	17,367	16,973	16,973	-394	---
Subtotal	171,000	179,266	180,222	+9,222	+956
Offsetting rental receipts	-55,374	-47,455	-47,455	+7,919	---
Cost recovery fees	-1,460	-2,361	-2,361	-901	---
Subtotal, offsetting collections	-56,834	-49,816	-49,816	+7,018	---
TOTAL, BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT	114,166	129,450	130,406	+16,240	+956
BUREAU OF SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT					
Offshore Safety and Environmental Enforcement					
Environmental enforcement	4,453	4,674	4,674	+221	---
Operations, safety and regulation	148,454	146,340	148,454	---	+2,114
Administrative operations	16,768	18,129	16,768	---	-1,361
Executive direction	16,736	18,097	16,736	---	-1,361
Subtotal	186,411	187,240	186,632	+221	-608
Offsetting rental receipts	-23,732	-20,338	-20,338	+3,394	---
Inspection fees	-50,000	-43,765	-41,765	+8,235	+2,000
Cost recovery fees	-4,139	-3,786	-3,786	+353	---
Subtotal, offsetting collections	-77,871	-67,889	-65,889	+11,982	+2,000
Total, Offshore Safety and Environmental Enforcement	108,540	119,351	120,743	+12,203	+1,392
Oil Spill Research					
Oil spill research	14,899	12,700	14,899	---	+2,199
TOTAL, BUREAU OF SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT	123,439	132,051	135,642	+12,203	+3,591
OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT					
Regulation and Technology					
Environmental protection	88,562	73,877	86,548	-2,014	+12,671
Permit fees	40	40	40	---	---
Offsetting collections	-40	-40	-40	---	---
Technology development and transfer	12,801	13,232	13,232	+431	---
Financial management	505	495	495	-10	---
Executive direction	13,936	13,694	13,694	-242	---
Civil penalties (indefinite)	100	100	100	---	---
Subtotal	115,904	101,398	114,069	-1,835	+12,671
Civil penalties (offsetting collections)	-100	-100	-100	---	---
Total, Regulation and Technology	115,804	101,298	113,969	-1,835	+12,671

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund					
Environmental restoration	9,480	6,383	9,480	---	+3,097
Technology development and transfer	3,544	2,508	3,544	---	+1,036
Financial management	5,182	5,144	5,182	---	+38
Executive direction	6,466	6,340	6,340	-126	---
Subtotal	24,672	20,375	24,546	-126	+4,171
State grants	115,000	---	90,000	-25,000	+90,000
Total, Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund	139,672	20,375	114,546	-25,126	+94,171
TOTAL, OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT	255,476	121,673	228,515	-26,961	+106,842
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION					
Operation of Indian Programs					
Tribal Government:					
Aid to tribal government	28,698	24,326	28,902	+204	+4,576
Consolidated tribal government program	75,429	72,634	75,839	+410	+3,205
Self governance compacts	165,069	157,790	166,225	+1,156	+8,435
New tribes	1,120	1,120	1,120	---	---
Small and needy tribes	4,448	---	4,448	---	+4,448
Road maintenance	34,653	28,318	38,288	+3,635	+9,970
Tribal government program oversight	8,550	7,326	8,616	+66	+1,290
Subtotal	317,967	291,514	323,438	+5,471	+31,924
Human Services:					
Social services	52,832	32,864	53,084	+252	+20,220
Welfare assistance	76,000	65,794	76,000	---	+10,206
Indian child welfare act	19,080	13,696	19,154	+74	+5,458
Housing improvement program	9,708	---	9,708	---	+9,708
Human services tribal design	263	259	270	+7	+11
Human services program oversight	3,180	2,745	3,200	+20	+455
Subtotal	161,063	115,358	161,416	+353	+46,058
Trust - Natural Resources Management:					
Natural resources, general	4,882	4,866	6,919	+2,037	+2,053
Irrigation operations and maintenance	14,009	9,134	14,023	+14	+4,889
Rights protection implementation	40,161	24,737	40,273	+112	+15,536
Tribal management/development program	11,652	8,660	12,036	+384	+3,376
Endangered species	2,693	1,306	2,697	+4	+1,391
Cooperative landscape conservation	9,956	---	9,956	---	+9,956
Integrated resource information program	2,971	2,576	2,974	+3	+398
Agriculture and range	31,096	27,977	31,251	+155	+3,274
Forestry	54,877	48,872	55,236	+359	+6,364
Water resources	10,581	8,567	10,614	+33	+2,047
Fish, wildlife and parks	15,260	11,436	15,287	+27	+3,851
Resource management program oversight	6,064	5,293	6,104	+40	+811
Subtotal	204,202	153,424	207,370	+3,168	+53,946
Trust - Real Estate Services	129,841	105,484	130,680	+839	+25,196

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Education:					
Elementary and secondary programs (forward funded):					
ISEP formula funds	402,906	378,055	404,165	+1,259	+26,110
ISEP program adjustments	5,457	2,617	5,479	+22	+2,862
Education program enhancements	12,248	6,341	12,278	+30	+5,937
Tribal education departments	2,500	---	2,500	---	+2,500
Student transportation	56,285	50,802	58,913	+2,628	+8,111
Early child and family development	18,810	---	18,810	---	+18,810
Tribal grant support costs	81,036	73,973	82,223	+1,187	+8,250
Subtotal	579,242	511,788	584,368	+5,126	+72,580
Post secondary programs (forward funded):					
Tribal colleges and universities	69,793	65,664	72,793	+3,000	+7,129
Tribal technical colleges	7,505	6,464	7,855	+350	+1,391
Haskell & SIPI	16,885	---	24,542	+7,657	+24,542
Subtotal	94,183	72,128	105,190	+11,007	+33,062
Subtotal, forward funded education	673,425	583,916	689,558	+16,133	+105,642
Elementary and secondary programs:					
Facilities operations	66,608	60,405	76,795	+10,187	+16,390
Facilities maintenance	59,552	53,723	59,774	+222	+6,051
Juvenile detention center education	500	---	500	---	+500
Johnson O'Malley assistance grants	14,903	---	14,903	---	+14,903
Subtotal	141,563	114,128	151,972	+10,409	+37,844
Post secondary programs:					
Haskell & SIPI	22,513	19,376	---	-22,513	-19,376
Tribal colleges and universities supplements	1,220	1,148	1,220	---	+72
Scholarships & adult education	34,996	---	34,996	---	+34,996
Special higher education scholarships	2,992	---	2,992	---	+2,992
Science post graduate scholarship fund	2,450	---	2,450	---	+2,450
Subtotal	64,171	20,524	41,658	-22,513	+21,134
Education management:					
Education program management	24,957	15,575	25,053	+96	+9,478
Education IT	10,297	7,707	10,302	+5	+2,595
Subtotal	35,254	23,282	35,355	+101	+12,073
Subtotal, Education	914,413	741,850	918,543	+4,130	+176,693
Public Safety and Justice:					
Law enforcement:					
Criminal investigations and police services	211,632	190,753	215,059	+3,427	+24,306
Detention/corrections	100,456	94,027	100,982	+526	+6,955
Inspections/internal affairs	3,510	3,335	3,528	+18	+193
Law enforcement special initiatives	10,368	8,659	10,412	+44	+1,753
Indian police academy	4,902	4,665	4,925	+23	+260
Tribal justice support	22,264	7,233	22,271	+7	+15,038
VAWA	(2,000)	---	(2,000)	---	(+2,000)
PL 280 courts	(13,000)	---	(13,000)	---	(+13,000)
Law enforcement program management	6,530	5,381	6,555	+25	+1,174
Facilities operations and maintenance	13,657	12,596	14,849	+1,192	+2,253
Tribal courts	30,618	22,110	38,744	+8,126	+16,634
Fire protection	1,583	1,372	1,590	+7	+218
Subtotal	405,520	350,131	418,915	+13,395	+68,784
Community and economic development	46,447	35,826	51,579	+5,132	+15,753
Executive direction and administrative services	231,747	209,409	224,880	-6,867	+15,471
(Amounts available until expended, account-wide)	(53,991)	(35,598)	(54,174)	(+183)	(+18,576)
Total, Operation of Indian Programs	2,411,200	2,002,996	2,436,821	+25,621	+433,825

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Contract Support Costs					
Contract support costs	236,600	242,000	242,000	+5,400	---
Indian self-determination fund	5,000	5,000	5,000	---	---
Total, Contract Support Costs	241,600	247,000	247,000	+5,400	---
Construction					
Education	238,245	72,851	238,250	+5	+165,399
Public safety and justice	35,309	10,421	35,310	+1	+24,889
Resources management	67,192	38,026	67,231	+39	+29,205
General administration	13,367	11,990	13,694	+327	+1,704
Subtotal	354,113	133,288	354,485	+372	+221,197
Rescission	---	-21,367	---	---	+21,367
Total, Construction	354,113	111,921	354,485	+372	+242,564
Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians					
Land Settlements:					
White Earth Land Settlement Act (Admin) (P.L.99-264)	625	---	625	---	+625
Hoopa-Yurok Settlement Act (P.L.100-580)	250	---	---	-250	---
Water Settlements:					
Pyramid Lake Water Rights Settlement (P.L.101-618)	142	---	142	---	+142
Navajo Water Resources Development Trust Fund (P.L.111-11)	4,011	---	4,011	---	+4,011
Navajo-Gallup Water Supply Project (P.L.111-11)	21,720	---	21,720	---	+21,720
Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement Act (P.L.114-322)	9,192	---	9,192	---	+9,192
Blackfeet Water Rights Settlement (P.L. 114-322)	19,517	---	14,367	-5,150	+14,367
Unallocated	---	45,644	---	---	-45,644
Total, Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians	55,457	45,644	50,057	-5,400	+4,413
Indian Guaranteed Loan Program Account					
Indian guaranteed loan program account	9,272	6,699	19,279	+10,007	+12,580
Administrative Provisions					
Rescission	-8,000	---	-4,000	+4,000	-4,000
TOTAL, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION	3,063,642	2,414,260	3,103,642	+40,000	+689,382
DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES					
Office of the Secretary					
Leadership and administration	105,405	107,368	107,368	+1,963	---
Management services	18,777	27,305	27,305	+8,528	---
Total, Office of the Secretary	124,182	134,673	134,673	+10,491	---

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Insular Affairs					
Assistance to Territories					
Territorial Assistance:					
Office of Insular Affairs	9,448	9,430	9,430	-18	---
Technical assistance	18,000	14,671	18,218	+218	+3,547
Maintenance assistance fund	4,000	1,023	4,000	---	+2,977
Brown tree snake	3,500	2,837	3,500	---	+663
Coral reef initiative and Natural Resources	2,200	946	2,000	-200	+1,054
Empowering Insular Communities	5,000	2,811	5,000	---	+2,189
Compact impact	4,000	---	4,000	---	+4,000
Subtotal, Territorial Assistance	46,148	31,718	46,148	---	+14,430
American Samoa operations grants	23,002	21,529	23,002	---	+1,473
Northern Marianas covenant grants	27,720	27,720	27,720	---	---
Total, Assistance to Territories	96,870	80,967	96,870	---	+15,903
(discretionary)	(69,150)	(53,247)	(69,150)	---	(+15,903)
(mandatory)	(27,720)	(27,720)	(27,720)	---	---
Compact of Free Association					
Compact of Free Association - Federal services	2,813	2,636	2,813	---	+177
Enewetak support	550	473	550	---	+77
Subtotal, Compact of Free Association	3,363	3,109	3,363	---	+254
Compact payments, Palau (Title I, General Provision)	123,824	---	---	-123,824	---
Total, Compact of Free Association	127,187	3,109	3,363	-123,824	+254
Total, Insular Affairs	224,057	84,076	100,233	-123,824	+16,157
(discretionary)	(196,337)	(56,356)	(72,513)	(-123,824)	(+16,157)
(mandatory)	(27,720)	(27,720)	(27,720)	---	---
Office of the Solicitor					
Legal services	59,951	58,996	58,996	-955	---
General administration	4,982	4,940	4,940	-42	---
Ethics	1,742	1,738	1,738	-4	---
Total, Office of the Solicitor	66,675	65,674	65,674	-1,001	---
Office of Inspector General					
Audit and investigations	38,538	39,522	39,522	+984	---
Administrative services and information management	12,485	12,964	12,964	+479	---
Total, Office of Inspector General	51,023	52,486	52,486	+1,463	---
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians					
Federal Trust Programs					
Program operations, support, and improvements	117,712	102,370	108,995	-8,717	+6,625
(Office of Historical Accounting)	(18,990)	---	(19,016)	(+26)	(+19,016)
Executive direction	1,688	1,697	1,697	+9	---
Total, Federal Trust Programs	119,400	104,067	110,692	-8,708	+6,625

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation					
Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	---	3,000	3,000	+3,000	---
Total, Office of Special Trustee for American Indians	119,400	107,067	113,692	-5,708	+6,625
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES	585,337	443,976	466,758	-118,579	+22,782
(Discretionary)	(557,617)	(416,256)	(439,038)	(-118,579)	(+22,782)
(Mandatory)	(27,720)	(27,720)	(27,720)	---	---
DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS					
Wildland Fire Management					
Fire Operations:					
Preparedness	332,784	322,179	332,784	---	+10,605
Fire suppression	389,406	388,135	389,406	---	+1,271
Subtotal	389,406	388,135	389,406	---	+1,271
Subtotal, Fire operations	722,190	710,314	722,190	---	+11,876
Other Operations:					
Fuels Management	184,000	150,603	194,000	+10,000	+43,397
Burned area rehabilitation	20,470	9,467	20,470	---	+11,003
Fire facilities	18,427	---	---	-18,427	---
Joint fire science	3,000	---	3,000	---	+3,000
Subtotal, Other operations	225,897	160,070	217,470	-8,427	+57,400
Total, Wildland fire management	948,087	870,384	939,660	-8,427	+69,276
Total, all wildland fire accounts	948,087	870,384	939,660	-8,427	+69,276
Central Hazardous Materials Fund					
Central hazardous materials fund	10,010	2,000	10,010	---	+8,010
Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund					
Damage assessments	2,000	1,500	2,000	---	+500
Program management	2,192	1,000	2,100	-92	+1,100
Restoration support	2,575	1,900	2,667	+92	+767
Oil Spill Preparedness	1,000	200	1,000	---	+800
Total, Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund	7,767	4,600	7,767	---	+3,167
Working Capital Fund	62,370	56,735	58,778	-3,592	+2,043
Office of Natural Resources Revenue					
Natural Resources Revenue	137,757	137,505	137,505	-252	---
Payment in Lieu of Taxes					
Payments to local governments in lieu of taxes	---	465,000	500,000	+500,000	+35,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS	1,165,991	1,536,224	1,653,720	+487,729	+117,496

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Payments to local governments in lieu of taxes (PILT) (Sec. 118)	530,000	---	---	-530,000	---
TOTAL, TITLE I, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR	13,115,260	10,588,690	13,108,229	-7,031	+2,519,539
Appropriations	(13,123,260)	(10,670,662)	(13,112,229)	(-11,031)	(+2,441,567)
Rescissions	(-8,000)	(-53,832)	(-4,000)	(+4,000)	(+49,832)
Rescissions of contract authority	---	(-28,140)	---	---	(+28,140)
(Mandatory)	(61,720)	(61,720)	(61,720)	---	---
(Discretionary)	(13,053,540)	(10,526,970)	(13,046,509)	(-7,031)	(+2,519,539)
TITLE II - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY					
Science and Technology					
Clean Air	116,541	84,905	103,721	-12,820	+18,816
(Atmospheric Protection Program)	(8,018)	---	(7,136)	(-882)	(+7,136)
Enforcement	13,669	10,486	12,165	-1,504	+1,679
Homeland security	33,122	28,177	29,479	-3,643	+1,302
Indoor air and Radiation	5,997	4,666	5,337	-660	+671
IT / Data management / Security	3,089	2,725	2,749	-340	+24
Operations and administration	68,339	74,828	74,828	+6,489	---
Pesticide licensing	6,027	5,058	5,364	-663	+306
Research: Air and energy	91,906	30,711	81,796	-10,110	+51,085
Research: Chemical safety and sustainability	126,930	84,004	113,935	-12,995	+29,931
(Research: Computational toxicology)	(21,409)	(17,213)	(21,409)	---	(+4,196)
(Research: Endocrine disruptor)	(16,253)	(10,006)	(16,253)	---	(+6,247)
Research: National priorities	4,100	---	4,100	---	+4,100
Research: Safe and sustainable water resources	106,257	67,261	94,569	-11,688	+27,308
Research: Sustainable and healthy communities	134,327	52,549	119,551	-14,776	+67,002
Water: Human health protection	3,519	3,595	3,519	---	-76
Subtotal, Science and Technology	713,823	448,965	651,113	-62,710	+202,148
Rescission	-7,350	---	-7,350	---	-7,350
Total, Science and Technology	706,473	448,965	643,763	-62,710	+194,798
(by transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund)	(15,496)	(17,398)	(15,496)	---	(-1,902)
Environmental Programs and Management					
Brownfields	25,593	16,082	25,593	---	+9,511
Clean air	273,108	142,901	243,066	-30,042	+100,165
(Atmospheric Protection Program)	(95,436)	(13,542)	(84,938)	(-10,498)	(+71,396)
Compliance	101,665	86,374	90,482	-11,183	+4,108
Enforcement	240,637	197,280	214,167	-26,470	+16,887
(Environmental justice)	(6,737)	(2,000)	(5,995)	(-742)	(+3,995)
Environmental protection: National priorities	12,700	---	12,700	---	+12,700
Geographic programs:					
Great Lakes Restoration Initiative	300,000	30,000	300,000	---	+270,000
Chesapeake Bay	73,000	7,300	73,000	---	+65,700
San Franciso Bay	4,819	---	4,819	---	+4,819
Puget Sound	28,000	---	28,000	---	+28,000
Long Island Sound	12,000	---	12,000	---	+12,000
Gulf of Mexico	12,542	---	8,542	-4,000	+8,542
South Florida	1,704	---	1,704	---	+1,704

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Lake Champlain	8,399	---	4,399	-4,000	+4,399
Lake Pontchartrain	948	---	948	---	+948
Southern New England Estuaries	5,000	---	---	-5,000	---
Other geographic activities	1,445	---	1,445	---	+1,445
Subtotal	447,857	37,300	434,857	-13,000	+397,557
Homeland security	10,195	9,760	9,074	-1,121	-686
Indoor air and radiation	27,637	4,221	25,637	-2,000	+21,416
Information exchange / Outreach	126,538	85,586	112,619	-13,919	+27,033
(Children and other sensitive populations: Agency coordination)	(6,548)	(2,018)	(5,827)	(-721)	(+3,809)
(Environmental education)	(8,702)	---	---	(-8,702)	---
International programs	15,400	4,188	13,706	-1,694	+9,518
IT / Data management / Security	90,536	83,019	80,577	-9,959	-2,442
Legal/science/regulatory/economic review	111,414	100,652	99,158	-12,256	-1,494
Operations and administration	480,751	480,206	480,206	-545	---
Pesticide licensing	109,363	79,760	102,363	-7,000	+22,603
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)	109,377	73,851	104,000	-5,377	+30,149
Toxics risk review and prevention	92,521	58,626	92,521	---	+33,895
(Endocrine disruptors)	(7,553)	---	(7,553)	---	(+7,553)
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST)	11,295	5,615	9,826	-1,469	+4,211
Water: Ecosystems:					
National estuary program / Coastal waterways	26,723	---	26,723	---	+26,723
Wetlands	21,065	17,913	21,065	---	+3,152
Subtotal	47,788	17,913	47,788	---	+29,875
Water: Human health protection	98,507	80,543	87,671	-10,836	+7,128
Water quality protection	210,417	174,975	187,271	-23,146	+12,296
Subtotal, Environmental Programs and Management	2,643,299	1,738,852	2,473,282	-170,017	+734,430
Energy Star (legislative proposal)	---	46,000	---	---	-46,000
Offsetting collections, Energy Star (legislative proposal)	---	---	---	---	---
Rescission	-45,300	---	-40,000	+5,300	-40,000
Total, Environmental Programs and Management	2,597,999	1,784,852	2,433,282	-164,717	+648,430
Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System Fund					
E-Manifest System Fund	3,674	---	---	-3,674	---
Offsetting Collections	-3,674	---	---	+3,674	---
Total, Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System Fund	---	---	---	---	---
Office of Inspector General					
Audits, evaluations, and investigations	41,489	37,475	41,489	---	+4,014
(by transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund)	(8,778)	(8,718)	(8,778)	---	(+60)
Buildings and Facilities					
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel and infrastructure	6,676	6,176	6,176	-500	---
Operations and administration	27,791	33,377	33,377	+5,586	---
Total, Buildings and Facilities	34,467	39,553	39,553	+5,086	---
Hazardous Substance Superfund					
Audits, evaluations, and investigations	8,778	8,718	8,778	---	+60
Compliance	995	988	995	---	+7

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Enforcement	166,375	164,691	154,375	-12,000	-10,316
Homeland security	32,616	32,686	30,616	-2,000	-2,070
Indoor air and radiation	1,985	1,972	1,985	---	+13
Information exchange / Outreach	1,328	1,319	1,328	---	+9
IT /data management/security	14,485	18,906	14,485	---	-4,421
Legal/science/regulatory/economic review	1,253	577	1,253	---	+676
Operations and administration	128,105	124,700	123,105	-5,000	-1,595
Research: Chemical safety and sustainability	2,824	5,021	5,021	+2,197	---
Research: Sustainable communities	11,463	10,885	8,982	-2,481	-1,903
Superfund cleanup:					
Superfund: Emergency response and removal	181,306	181,306	181,306	---	---
Superfund: Emergency preparedness	7,636	7,584	7,636	---	+52
Superfund: Federal facilities	21,125	20,982	21,125	---	+143
Superfund: Remedial	511,673	508,495	566,100	+54,427	+57,605
Subtotal	721,740	718,367	776,167	+54,427	+57,800
Total, Hazardous Substance Superfund	1,091,947	1,088,830	1,127,090	+35,143	+38,260
(transfer out to Inspector General)	(-8,778)	(-8,718)	(-8,778)	---	(-60)
(transfer out to Science and Technology)	(-15,496)	(-17,398)	(-15,496)	---	(+1,902)
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund (LUST)					
Enforcement	620	589	620	---	+31
Operations and administration	1,352	1,331	1,352	---	+21
Research: Sustainable communities	320	320	320	---	---
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST)	89,649	45,292	89,649	---	+44,357
(LUST/UST)	(9,240)	(6,452)	(9,240)	---	(+2,788)
(LUST cooperative agreements)	(55,040)	(38,840)	(55,040)	---	(+16,200)
(Energy Policy Act grants)	(25,369)	---	(25,369)	---	(+25,369)
Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund	91,941	47,532	91,941	---	+44,409
Inland Oil Spill Program					
Compliance	139	---	139	---	+139
Enforcement	2,413	2,219	2,413	---	+194
Oil	14,409	12,273	14,409	---	+2,136
Operations and administration	584	665	584	---	-81
Research: Sustainable communities	664	516	664	---	+148
Total, Inland Oil Spill Program	18,209	15,673	18,209	---	+2,536
State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)					
Alaska Native villages	20,000	3,000	20,000	---	+17,000
Brownfields projects	80,000	62,000	80,000	---	+18,000
Clean water state revolving fund (SRF)	1,393,887	1,393,887	1,393,887	---	---
Diesel emissions grants	75,000	10,000	100,000	+25,000	+90,000
Drinking water state revolving fund (SRF)	863,233	863,233	863,233	---	---
Mexico border	10,000	---	10,000	---	+10,000
Targeted airshed grants	40,000	---	55,000	+15,000	+55,000
Water quality monitoring (P.L. 114-322)	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---
Subtotal, Infrastructure assistance grants	2,486,120	2,332,120	2,522,120	+36,000	+190,000
Categorical grants:					
Beaches protection	9,549	---	9,549	---	+9,549
Brownfields	47,745	31,791	47,745	---	+15,954
Environmental information	9,646	6,422	9,646	---	+3,224
Hazardous waste financial assistance	99,693	66,381	99,693	---	+33,312
Lead	14,049	---	14,049	---	+14,049
Nonpoint source (Sec. 319)	170,915	---	170,915	---	+170,915
Pesticides enforcement	18,050	10,531	18,050	---	+7,519
Pesticides program implementation	12,701	8,457	12,701	---	+4,244
Pollution control (Sec. 106)	230,806	153,683	230,806	---	+77,123
(Water quality monitoring)	(17,848)	(11,884)	(17,848)	---	(+5,964)

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Pollution prevention	4,765	---	4,765	---	+4,765
Public water system supervision	101,963	67,892	101,963	---	+34,071
Radon	8,051	---	8,051	---	+8,051
State and local air quality management	228,219	151,961	228,219	---	+76,258
Toxics substances compliance	4,919	3,276	4,919	---	+1,643
Tribal air quality management	12,829	8,963	12,829	---	+3,866
Tribal general assistance program	65,476	44,233	65,476	---	+21,243
Underground injection control (UIC)	10,506	6,995	10,506	---	+3,511
Underground storage tanks	1,498	---	1,498	---	+1,498
Wetlands program development	14,661	9,762	14,661	---	+4,899
Multipurpose grants	10,000	27,000	---	-10,000	-27,000
Subtotal, Categorical grants	1,076,041	597,347	1,066,041	-10,000	+468,694
Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants	3,562,161	2,929,467	3,588,161	+26,000	+658,694
Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Program					
Administrative Expenses	5,000	3,000	5,000	---	+2,000
Direct Loan Subsidy	5,000	17,000	45,000	+40,000	+28,000
Total, Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Program	10,000	20,000	50,000	+40,000	+30,000
Administrative Provisions					
Rescission	-96,198	-220,460	-75,000	+21,198	+145,460
TOTAL, TITLE II, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	8,058,488	6,191,887	7,958,488	-100,000	+1,766,601
Appropriations	(8,207,336)	(6,412,347)	(8,080,838)	(-126,498)	(+1,668,491)
Rescissions	(-148,848)	(-220,460)	(-122,350)	(+26,498)	(+98,110)
(By transfer)	(24,274)	(26,116)	(24,274)	---	(-1,842)
(Transfer out)	(-24,274)	(-26,116)	(-24,274)	---	(+1,842)
TITLE III - RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Under Secretary for Natural Resources and the Environment	875	875	875	---	---
FOREST SERVICE					
Forest and Rangeland Research					
Forest inventory and analysis	77,000	75,000	77,000	---	+2,000
Research and development programs	220,000	171,050	220,000	---	+48,950
Fire plan research and development	---	14,750	---	---	-14,750
Subtotal, Forest and Rangeland Research	297,000	260,800	297,000	---	+36,200
Unobligated balances (rescission)	---	-2,000	---	---	+2,000
Total, Forest and rangeland research	297,000	258,800	297,000	---	+38,200
State and Private Forestry					
Landscape scale restoration	14,000	---	10,000	-4,000	+10,000

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Forest Health Management:					
Federal lands forest health management	55,500	51,495	65,000	+9,500	+13,505
Cooperative lands forest health management	41,000	34,376	51,000	+10,000	+16,624
Subtotal	96,500	85,871	116,000	+19,500	+30,129
Cooperative Fire Assistance:					
State fire assistance (National Fire Capacity)	80,000	65,930	80,000	---	+14,070
Volunteer fire assistance (Rural Fire Capacity)	16,000	11,020	16,000	---	+4,980
Subtotal	96,000	76,950	96,000	---	+19,050
Cooperative Forestry:					
Forest stewardship (Working Forest Lands)	20,500	19,475	20,500	---	+1,025
Forest legacy	67,025	---	48,445	-18,580	+48,445
Community forest and open space conservation	4,000	---	4,000	---	+4,000
Urban and community forestry	28,500	---	30,000	+1,500	+30,000
Subtotal	120,025	19,475	102,945	-17,080	+83,470
International forestry	9,000	---	10,000	+1,000	+10,000
Subtotal, State and Private Forestry	335,525	182,296	334,945	-580	+152,649
Unobligated balances: Forest legacy (rescission)	-5,938	-4,000	---	+5,938	+4,000
Unobligated balances (rescission)	---	-6,000	---	---	+6,000
Subtotal	-5,938	-10,000	---	+5,938	+10,000
Total, State and Private Forestry	329,587	172,296	334,945	+5,358	+162,649
National Forest System					
Land management planning, assessment and monitoring	179,263	156,750	180,000	+737	+23,250
Recreation, heritage and wilderness	257,848	240,236	260,000	+2,152	+19,764
Grazing management	56,856	48,070	60,000	+3,144	+11,930
Hazardous Fuels	430,000	390,000	450,000	+20,000	+60,000
Forest products	366,000	341,165	380,000	+14,000	+38,835
Vegetation and watershed management	180,000	165,680	180,000	---	+14,320
Wildlife and fish habitat management	136,430	118,750	140,000	+3,570	+21,250
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund	40,000	---	40,000	---	+40,000
Minerals and geology management	74,200	64,600	75,000	+800	+10,400
Landownership management (Land Use Authorization and Access)	74,000	65,550	75,000	+1,000	+9,450
Law enforcement operations	129,153	129,153	132,000	+2,847	+2,847
Total, National Forest System	1,923,750	1,719,954	1,972,000	+48,250	+252,046
Capital Improvement and Maintenance					
Facilities	151,000	11,162	176,000	+25,000	+164,838
Roads	218,000	71,481	238,000	+20,000	+166,519
Trails	80,000	12,065	85,000	+5,000	+72,935
Subtotal, Capital improvement and maintenance	449,000	94,708	499,000	+50,000	+404,292
Deferral of road and trail fund payment	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	---	---
Total, Capital improvement and maintenance	434,000	79,708	484,000	+50,000	+404,292
Land Acquisition					
Acquisitions	50,035	---	21,061	-28,974	+21,061
Acquisition Management	7,352	---	7,000	-352	+7,000
Recreational Access	4,700	---	4,700	---	+4,700
Critical Inholdings/Wilderness	2,000	---	2,000	---	+2,000
Cash Equalization	250	---	---	-250	---
Subtotal	64,337	---	34,761	-29,576	+34,761

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Unobligated balances (rescission)	---	-17,000	---	---	+17,000
Total, Land Acquisition	64,337	-17,000	34,761	-29,576	+51,761
Acquisition of land for national forests, special acts	850	700	700	-150	---
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges	192	150	150	-42	---
Range betterment fund	2,065	1,700	1,700	-365	---
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research	45	45	45	---	---
Management of national forest lands for subsistence uses	2,500	1,850	1,850	-650	---
Wildland Fire Management					
Fire operations:					
Wildland fire preparedness	1,323,520	1,339,620	1,339,620	+16,100	---
Wildland fire suppression operations	1,056,818	1,165,366	1,165,366	+108,548	---
Additional suppression funding	500,000	---	500,000	---	+500,000
Subtotal, Fire operations	2,880,338	2,504,986	3,004,986	+124,648	+500,000
Subtotal, Wildland Fire Management	2,880,338	2,504,986	3,004,986	+124,648	+500,000
Rescission	---	-65,000	---	---	+65,000
Total, all wildland fire accounts	2,880,338	2,439,986	3,004,986	+124,648	+565,000
Total, Forest Service without Wildland Fire Management	3,054,326	2,218,203	3,127,151	+72,825	+908,948
TOTAL, FOREST SERVICE	5,934,664	4,658,189	6,132,137	+197,473	+1,473,948
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE					
Indian Health Services					
Clinical Services:					
Hospital and health clinics	2,045,128	2,189,688	2,170,257	+125,129	-19,431
Dental health	195,283	203,783	207,906	+12,623	+4,123
Mental health	99,900	105,169	106,752	+6,852	+1,583
Alcohol and substance abuse	227,788	235,286	238,560	+10,772	+3,274
Purchased/referred care	962,695	954,957	964,819	+2,124	+9,862
Indian Health Care Improvement Fund	72,280	---	125,666	+53,386	+125,666
Subtotal	3,603,074	3,688,883	3,813,960	+210,886	+125,077
Preventive Health:					
Public health nursing	85,043	87,023	90,540	+5,497	+3,517
Health education	19,871	---	20,568	+697	+20,568
Community health representatives	62,888	---	62,888	---	+62,888
Immunization (Alaska)	2,127	2,035	2,164	+37	+129
Subtotal	169,929	89,058	176,160	+6,231	+87,102
Other services:					
Urban Indian health	49,315	46,422	60,000	+10,685	+13,578
Indian health professions	49,363	43,394	70,765	+21,402	+27,371
Tribal management grant program	2,465	---	2,465	---	+2,465
Direct operations	72,338	73,431	73,431	+1,093	---
Self-governance	5,806	4,787	5,858	+52	+1,071
Subtotal	179,287	168,034	212,519	+33,232	+44,485
Total, Indian Health Services	3,952,290	3,945,975	4,202,639	+250,349	+256,664

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Special Diabetes Program for Indians					
Program costs (legislative proposal)	---	150,000	---	---	-150,000
Contract Support Costs					
Contract support	717,970	822,227	822,227	+104,257	---
Indian Health Facilities					
Maintenance and improvement	167,527	75,745	167,527	---	+91,782
Sanitation facilities construction	192,033	101,772	192,033	---	+90,261
Health care facilities construction	243,480	79,500	243,480	---	+163,980
Facilities and environmental health support	240,758	228,852	256,002	+15,244	+27,150
Equipment	23,706	19,952	23,706	---	+3,754
Total, Indian Health Facilities	867,504	505,821	882,748	+15,244	+376,927
TOTAL, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE	5,537,764	5,424,023	5,907,614	+369,850	+483,591
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH					
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	77,349	53,967	80,000	+2,651	+26,033
AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY					
Toxic substances and environmental public health	74,691	62,000	62,000	-12,691	---
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES	5,689,804	5,539,990	6,049,614	+359,810	+509,624
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES					
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	3,000	2,994	2,994	-6	---
CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	11,000	9,500	12,000	+1,000	+2,500
OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION					
Salaries and expenses	15,431	4,400	4,750	-10,681	+350
INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT					
Payment to the Institute	9,835	9,960	9,960	+125	---
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION					
Salaries and Expenses					
Museum and Research Institutes:					
National Air and Space Museum	20,110	20,110	20,110	---	---
Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory	24,593	24,593	24,593	---	---
Major scientific instrumentation	4,118	4,118	4,118	---	---
Universe Center	184	184	184	---	---
National Museum of Natural History	49,789	49,789	49,789	---	---
National Zoological Park	27,566	27,566	27,566	---	---
Smithsonian Environmental Research Center	4,227	4,227	4,227	---	---
Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute	14,486	14,486	14,486	---	---
Biodiversity Center	1,543	1,543	1,543	---	---

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Arthur M. Sackler Gallery/Freer Gallery of Art	6,273	6,273	6,273	---	---
Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage	3,084	3,184	3,184	+100	---
Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum	5,061	5,086	5,086	+25	---
Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden	4,687	4,544	4,544	-143	---
National Museum of African Art	4,654	4,654	4,654	---	---
World Cultures Center	792	792	792	---	---
Anacostia Community Museum	2,355	2,405	2,405	+50	---
Archives of American Art	1,933	1,933	1,933	---	---
National Museum of African American History and Culture	33,079	33,079	33,079	---	---
National Museum of American History	26,504	26,704	26,704	+200	---
National Museum of the American Indian	32,671	33,242	33,242	+571	---
National Portrait Gallery	6,556	6,556	6,556	---	---
Smithsonian American Art Museum	10,239	10,239	10,239	---	---
American Experience Center	600	550	550	-50	---
Subtotal, Museums and Research Institutes	285,104	285,857	285,857	+753	---
Mission enabling:					
Program support and outreach:					
Outreach	9,333	9,333	9,333	---	---
Communications	2,663	2,839	2,839	+176	---
Institution-wide programs	16,784	14,784	14,784	-2,000	---
Office of Exhibits Central	3,154	3,169	3,169	+15	---
Museum Support Center	1,906	1,906	1,906	---	---
Museum Conservation Institute	3,359	3,359	3,359	---	---
Smithsonian Institution Archives	2,408	2,423	2,423	+15	---
Smithsonian Institution Libraries	11,273	11,373	11,373	+100	---
Subtotal, Program support and outreach	50,880	49,186	49,186	-1,694	---
Office of Chief Information Officer	51,967	52,509	52,509	+542	---
Administration	36,314	36,405	36,405	+91	---
Inspector General	3,538	3,538	3,538	---	---
Facilities services:					
Facilities maintenance	77,045	82,045	82,045	+5,000	---
Facilities operations, security and support	226,596	228,404	228,404	+1,808	---
Subtotal, Facilities services	303,641	310,449	310,449	+6,808	---
Subtotal, Mission enabling	446,340	452,087	452,087	+5,747	---
Total, Salaries and expenses	731,444	737,944	737,944	+6,500	---
Facilities Capital					
Revitalization	281,603	202,500	300,500	+18,897	+98,000
Facilities planning and design	20,300	17,000	17,000	-3,300	---
Construction	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Total, Facilities Capital	311,903	219,500	317,500	+5,597	+98,000
TOTAL, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION	1,043,347	957,444	1,055,444	+12,097	+98,000
NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART					
Salaries and Expenses					
Care and utilization of art collections	46,368	44,954	46,368	---	+1,414
Operation and maintenance of buildings and grounds	35,854	35,091	35,854	---	+763
Protection of buildings, grounds and contents	26,558	27,283	26,558	---	-725
General administration	33,010	31,396	33,010	---	+1,614
Total, Salaries and Expenses	141,790	138,724	141,790	---	+3,066

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Repair, Restoration and Renovation of Buildings					
Base program	24,203	8,176	26,564	+2,361	+18,388
TOTAL, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART	165,993	146,900	168,354	+2,361	+21,454
JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS					
Operations and maintenance	23,740	24,490	24,490	+750	---
Capital repair and restoration	16,775	13,000	16,025	-750	+3,025
TOTAL, JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS	40,515	37,490	40,515	---	+3,025
WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS					
Salaries and expenses	12,000	7,474	12,000	---	+4,526
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES					
National Endowment for the Arts					
Grants and Administration					
Grants:					
Direct grants	64,819	---	64,819	---	+64,819
Challenge America grants	7,600	---	7,600	---	+7,600
Subtotal	72,419	---	72,419	---	+72,419
State partnerships:					
State and regional	37,996	---	40,000	+2,004	+40,000
Underserved set-aside	10,284	---	10,431	+147	+10,431
Subtotal	48,280	---	50,431	+2,151	+50,431
Subtotal, Grants	120,699	---	122,850	+2,151	+122,850
Program support	1,950	---	1,950	---	+1,950
Administration	30,200	28,949	30,200	---	+1,251
Total, Arts	152,849	28,949	155,000	+2,151	+126,051
National Endowment for the Humanities					
Grants and Administration					
Grants:					
Federal/State partnership	47,200	---	48,730	+1,530	+48,730
Preservation and access	19,000	---	19,000	---	+19,000
Public programs	14,000	---	14,000	---	+14,000
Research programs	15,000	---	15,000	---	+15,000
Education programs	12,750	---	12,750	---	+12,750
Program development	850	---	850	---	+850
Digital humanities initiatives	4,600	---	4,600	---	+4,600
Subtotal, Grants	113,400	---	114,930	+1,530	+114,930
Matching Grants:					
Treasury funds	2,200	---	2,200	---	+2,200
Challenge grants	9,100	13,537	9,100	---	-4,437
Subtotal, Matching grants	11,300	13,537	11,300	---	-2,237

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Administration	28,148	28,770	28,770	+622	---
Total, Humanities	152,848	42,307	155,000	+2,152	+112,693
TOTAL, NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES	305,697	71,256	310,000	+4,303	+238,744
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS					
Salaries and expenses	2,762	2,771	2,771	+9	---
NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS					
Grants	2,750	---	2,750	---	+2,750
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION					
Salaries and expenses	6,400	6,440	6,440	+40	---
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	8,099	7,948	8,099	---	+151
UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM					
Holocaust Memorial Museum	59,000	56,602	58,000	-1,000	+1,398
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	1,800	1,800	1,800	---	---
Construction	45,000	30,000	---	-45,000	-30,000
Total, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION	46,800	31,800	1,800	-45,000	-30,000
WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE CENTENNIAL COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	1,000	---	500	-500	+500
WORLD WAR I CENTENNIAL COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	7,000	6,000	3,000	-4,000	-3,000
TOTAL, TITLE III, RELATED AGENCIES	13,365,972	11,558,033	13,882,003	+516,031	+2,323,970
Appropriations	(13,371,910)	(11,652,033)	(13,882,003)	(+510,093)	(+2,229,970)
Rescissions	(-5,938)	(-94,000)	---	(+5,938)	(+94,000)
Emergency appropriations	---	---	---	---	---
TITLE IV - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Treatment of certain hospitals (Sec. 429)	8,000	---	---	-8,000	---
Infrastructure (Sec. 435)	766,000	---	365,000	-401,000	+365,000
TOTAL, TITLE IV, GENERAL PROVISIONS	774,000	---	365,000	-409,000	+365,000

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF REQUIREMENTS ACT OF 2017 (P.L. 115-72)					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
Wildland Fire Management (emergency)	184,500	---	---	-184,500	---
FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund (emergency)	342,000	---	---	-342,000	---
Total, Department of Agriculture	526,500	---	---	-526,500	---
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Department-Wide Programs					
Wildland Fire Management (emergency)	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
Total, Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements, 2017	576,500	---	---	-576,500	---
FURTHER ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF ACT, 2018 (P.L. 115-123)					
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
United States Fish and Wildlife Service					
Construction (emergency)	210,629	---	---	-210,629	---
National Park Service					
Historic Preservation Fund (emergency)	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
Construction (emergency)	207,600	---	---	-207,600	---
Total, National Park Service	257,600	---	---	-257,600	---
United States Geological Survey					
Surveys, Investigations, and Research (emergency)	42,246	---	---	-42,246	---
Departmental Offices					
Insular Affairs:					
Assistance to Territories (emergency)	3,000	---	---	-3,000	---
Office of Inspector General (emergency)	2,500	---	---	-2,500	---
Total, Departmental Offices	5,500	---	---	-5,500	---
Total, Department of the Interior	515,975	---	---	-515,975	---
Environmental Protection Agency					
Hazardous Substance Superfund (emergency)	6,200	---	---	-6,200	---
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund (emergency)	7,000	---	---	-7,000	---
State and Tribal Assistance Grants (emergency)	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
Total, Environmental Protection Agency	63,200	---	---	-63,200	---

DIVISION A - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2019 (H. R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
State and Private Forestry (emergency)	7,500	---	---	-7,500	---
National Forest System (emergency)	20,652	---	---	-20,652	---
Capital Improvement and Maintenance (emergency)	91,600	---	---	-91,600	---
Total, Department of Agriculture	119,752	---	---	-119,752	---
Total, Further Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief, 2018	698,927	---	---	-698,927	---
TOTAL, OTHER APPROPRIATIONS	1,275,427	---	---	-1,275,427	---
GRAND TOTAL	36,589,147	28,338,610	35,313,720	-1,275,427	+6,975,110
Appropriations	(35,476,506)	(28,735,042)	(35,440,070)	(-36,436)	(+6,705,028)
Rescissions	(-162,786)	(-368,292)	(-126,350)	(+36,436)	(+241,942)
Rescissions of contract authority	---	(-28,140)	---	---	(+28,140)
Emergency appropriations	(1,275,427)	---	---	(-1,275,427)	---
(By transfer)	(24,274)	(26,116)	(24,274)	---	(-1,842)
(Transfer out)	(-24,274)	(-26,116)	(-24,274)	---	(+1,842)
(Discretionary total)	(35,252,000)	(28,276,890)	(35,252,000)	---	(+6,975,110)

DIVISION B - FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019 (H.R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY					
Departmental Offices					
Salaries and Expenses	201,751	201,751	208,751	+7,000	+7,000
Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence	141,778	159,000	161,000	+19,222	+2,000
Cybersecurity Enhancement Account	24,000	25,208	25,208	+1,208	---
Department-wide Systems and Capital Investments Programs	4,426	4,000	8,000	+3,574	+4,000
Fund for America's Kids and Grandkids	---	---	585,000	+585,000	+585,000
Office of Inspector General	37,044	36,000	37,044	---	+1,044
Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration	169,634	161,113	170,834	+1,200	+9,721
Special Inspector General for TARP	34,000	17,500	28,800	-5,200	+11,300
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network	115,003	117,800	117,800	+2,797	---
Subtotal, Departmental Offices	727,636	722,372	1,342,437	+614,801	+620,065
Treasury Forfeiture Fund (rescission)	-702,000	---	---	+702,000	---
Treasury Forfeiture Fund (rescission) (temporary)	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Departmental Offices	25,636	722,372	1,342,437	+1,316,801	+620,065
Bureau of the Fiscal Service	338,280	330,837	338,280	---	+7,443
Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau	111,439	114,427	123,527	+12,088	+9,100
Community Development Financial Institutions Fund Program Account	250,000	14,000	216,000	-34,000	+202,000
Total, Department of the Treasury, non-IRS	725,355	1,181,636	2,020,244	+1,294,889	+838,608
Internal Revenue Service					
Taxpayer Services	2,506,554	2,241,000	2,491,554	-15,000	+250,554
Enforcement	4,860,000	4,628,000	4,860,000	---	+232,000
Program Integrity	---	204,643	---	---	-204,643
Subtotal	4,860,000	4,832,643	4,860,000	---	+27,357
Operations Support	3,634,000	4,155,796	3,988,000	+354,000	-167,796
Program Integrity	---	156,928	---	---	-156,928
Subtotal	3,634,000	4,312,724	3,988,000	+354,000	-324,724
Business Systems Modernization	110,000	110,000	200,000	+90,000	+90,000
General provision (sec. 113)	320,000	---	77,000	-243,000	+77,000
Total, Internal Revenue Service	11,430,554	11,496,367	11,616,554	+186,000	+120,187
Total, title I, Department of the Treasury	12,155,909	12,678,003	13,636,798	+1,480,889	+958,795
Appropriations	(12,857,909)	(12,316,432)	(13,636,798)	(+778,889)	(+1,320,366)
Rescissions	(-702,000)	---	---	(+702,000)	---
(Mandatory)	---	---	---	---	---
(Discretionary)	(12,155,909)	(12,678,003)	(13,636,798)	(+1,480,889)	(+958,795)

DIVISION B - FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019 (H.R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
The White House					
Salaries and Expenses	55,000	55,000	55,000	---	---
Executive Residence at the White House:					
Operating Expenses	12,917	13,081	13,081	+164	---
White House Repair and Restoration	750	750	750	---	---
Subtotal	13,667	13,831	13,831	+164	---
Council of Economic Advisers	4,187	4,187	4,187	---	---
National Security Council and Homeland Security Council	11,800	13,500	13,000	+1,200	-500
Office of Administration	100,000	100,000	100,000	---	---
Total, The White House	184,654	186,518	186,018	+1,364	-500
Office of Management and Budget	101,000	103,000	103,000	+2,000	---
Office of National Drug Control Policy					
Salaries and Expenses	18,400	17,400	17,400	-1,000	---
High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program	280,000	---	280,000	---	+280,000
Other Federal Drug Control Programs	117,093	11,843	118,327	+1,234	+106,484
Total, Office of National Drug Control Policy	415,493	29,243	415,727	+234	+386,484
Unanticipated Needs	798	1,000	1,000	+202	---
Information Technology Oversight and Reform	19,000	25,000	15,000	-4,000	-10,000
Special Assistance to the President and Official Residence of the Vice President:					
Salaries and Expenses	4,288	4,288	4,288	---	---
Operating Expenses	302	302	302	---	---
Subtotal	4,590	4,590	4,590	---	---
Total, title II, Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President	725,535	349,351	725,335	-200	+375,984
TITLE III - THE JUDICIARY					
Supreme Court of the United States					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Salaries of Justices	3,000	3,000	3,000	---	---
Other salaries and expenses	82,028	84,359	84,703	+2,675	+344
Subtotal	85,028	87,359	87,703	+2,675	+344
Care of the Building and Grounds	16,153	15,999	15,999	-154	---
Total, Supreme Court of the United States	101,181	103,358	103,702	+2,521	+344

DIVISION B - FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019 (H.R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Salaries of judges	3,000	4,000	4,000	+1,000	---
Other salaries and expenses	31,291	31,274	32,016	+725	+742
Total, United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit	34,291	35,274	36,016	+1,725	+742
United States Court of International Trade					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Salaries of judges	1,000	2,000	2,000	+1,000	---
Other salaries and expenses	18,889	19,070	19,450	+561	+380
Total, U.S. Court of International Trade	19,889	21,070	21,450	+1,561	+380
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Salaries of judges and bankruptcy judges	435,000	429,000	429,000	-6,000	---
Other salaries and expenses	5,099,061	5,132,543	5,167,961	+68,900	+35,418
Subtotal	5,534,061	5,561,543	5,596,961	+62,900	+35,418
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund	8,230	8,475	8,475	+245	---
Defender Services	1,078,713	1,141,489	1,142,427	+63,714	+938
Fees of Jurors and Commissioners	50,944	51,233	49,750	-1,194	-1,483
Court Security	586,999	602,309	604,460	+17,461	+2,151
Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services	7,258,947	7,365,049	7,402,073	+143,126	+37,024
Administrative Office of the United States Courts					
Salaries and Expenses	90,423	89,867	92,413	+1,990	+2,546
Federal Judicial Center					
Salaries and Expenses	29,265	29,064	29,819	+554	+755
United States Sentencing Commission					
Salaries and Expenses	18,699	18,548	18,548	-151	---
Total, title III, the Judiciary	7,552,695	7,662,230	7,704,021	+151,326	+41,791
(Mandatory)	(442,000)	(438,000)	(438,000)	(-4,000)	---
(Discretionary)	(7,110,695)	(7,224,230)	(7,266,021)	(+155,326)	(+41,791)

DIVISION B - FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019 (H.R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE IV - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
Federal Payment for Resident Tuition Support	40,000	---	30,000	-10,000	+30,000
Federal Payment for Emergency Planning and Security Costs in the District of Columbia	13,000	12,000	13,000	---	+1,000
Federal Payment to the District of Columbia Courts	265,400	244,939	288,280	+22,880	+43,341
Federal Payment for Defender Services in District of Columbia Courts	49,890	46,005	49,890	---	+3,885
Federal Payment to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia	244,298	256,724	256,724	+12,426	---
Federal Payment to the District of Columbia Public Defender Service	41,829	45,858	45,858	+4,029	---
Federal Payment to the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council	2,000	1,900	2,000	---	+100
Federal Payment for Judicial Commissions	565	565	565	---	---
Federal Payment for School Improvement	45,000	45,000	45,000	---	---
Federal Payment for the D.C. National Guard	435	435	435	---	---
Federal Payment for Testing and Treatment of HIV/AIDS	5,000	5,000	5,000	---	---
Federal Payment to the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority	14,000	---	---	-14,000	---
Total, Title IV, District of Columbia	721,417	658,426	736,752	+15,335	+78,326

DIVISION B - FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019 (H.R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE V - OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Administrative Conference of the United States	3,100	3,100	3,100	---	---
Consumer Product Safety Commission	126,000	123,450	127,000	+1,000	+3,550
Election Assistance Commission	10,100	9,200	10,100	---	+900
Election Reform Program	380,000	---	---	-380,000	---
Federal Communications Commission					
Salaries and Expenses	322,035	333,118	335,118	+13,083	+2,000
Offsetting fee collections	-322,035	-333,118	-335,118	-13,083	-2,000
Direct appropriation	---	---	---	---	---
General provision (sec. 511)	600,000	---	---	-600,000	---
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation					
Office of Inspector General (by transfer)	(39,136)	(42,982)	(42,982)	(+3,846)	---
Deposit Insurance Fund (transfer)	(-39,136)	(-42,982)	(-42,982)	(-3,846)	---
Federal Election Commission	71,250	71,250	71,250	---	---
Federal Labor Relations Authority	26,200	26,200	26,200	---	---
Federal Trade Commission					
Salaries and Expenses	306,317	309,700	311,700	+5,383	+2,000
Offsetting fee collections (mergers)	-126,000	-136,000	-136,000	-10,000	---
Offsetting fee collections (telephone)	-16,000	-17,000	-17,000	-1,000	---
Direct appropriation	164,317	156,700	158,700	-5,617	+2,000
General Services Administration					
Federal Buildings Fund					
Limitations on Availability of Revenue:					
Construction and acquisition of facilities	692,069	1,338,387	275,900	-416,169	-1,062,487
Repairs and alterations	666,335	909,746	679,934	+13,599	-229,812
Rental of space	5,493,768	5,430,345	5,430,345	-63,423	---
Building operations	2,221,766	2,253,195	2,248,395	+26,629	-4,800
Installment Acquisition Payments	---	200,000	---	---	-200,000
Subtotal, Limitations on Availability of Revenue	9,073,938	10,131,673	8,634,574	-439,364	-1,497,099
Rental income to fund	-9,950,519	-10,131,673	-10,131,673	-181,154	---
Total, Federal Buildings Fund	-876,581	---	-1,497,099	-620,518	-1,497,099
Government-wide Policy	53,499	65,835	60,000	+6,501	-5,835
Operating Expenses	45,645	49,440	49,440	+3,795	---
Civilian Board of Contract Appeals	8,795	9,301	9,301	+506	---
Office of Inspector General	65,000	67,000	67,000	+2,000	---
Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents	4,754	4,796	4,796	+42	---
Federal Citizen Services Fund	50,000	58,400	55,000	+5,000	-3,400
Technology Modernization Fund	100,000	210,000	150,000	+50,000	-60,000
Asset Proceeds and Space Management Fund	5,000	31,000	31,000	+26,000	---
Environmental Review Improvement Fund	1,000	6,070	6,070	+5,070	---
GSA - President's Management Council Workforce Fund	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
Total, General Services Administration	-542,888	551,842	-1,064,492	-521,604	-1,616,334
Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation	1,000	---	1,000	---	+1,000
Merit Systems Protection Board					
Salaries and Expenses	44,490	42,145	44,490	---	+2,345
Limitation on administrative expenses	2,345	2,345	2,345	---	---
Total, Merit Systems Protection Board	46,835	44,490	46,835	---	+2,345

DIVISION B - FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019 (H.R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation					
Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund	1,975	1,875	---	-1,975	-1,875
Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund	3,366	3,200	---	-3,366	-3,200
Total, Morris K. Udall and Stewart L Udall Foundation	5,341	5,075	---	-5,341	-5,075
National Archives and Records Administration					
Operating Expenses	384,911	365,105	372,400	-12,511	+7,295
Reduction of debt	-25,050	-27,224	-27,224	-2,174	---
Subtotal	359,861	337,881	345,176	-14,685	+7,295
Office of Inspector General	4,801	4,241	4,823	+22	+582
Repairs and Restoration	7,500	7,500	7,500	---	---
National Historical Publications and Records Commission Grants Program	6,000	---	6,000	---	+6,000
Total, National Archives and Records Administration	378,162	349,622	363,499	-14,663	+13,877
NCUA Community Development Revolving Loan Fund	2,000	---	2,000	---	+2,000
Office of Government Ethics	16,439	16,294	17,019	+580	+725
Office of Personnel Management					
Salaries and Expenses	129,341	132,172	132,172	+2,831	---
Limitation on administrative expenses	131,414	133,483	133,483	+2,069	---
Subtotal, Salaries and Expenses	260,755	265,655	265,655	+4,900	---
Office of Inspector General	5,000	5,000	5,000	---	---
Limitation on administrative expenses	25,000	25,265	25,265	+265	---
Subtotal, Office of Inspector General	30,000	30,265	30,265	+265	---
Total, Office of Personnel Management	290,755	295,920	295,920	+5,165	---

DIVISION B - FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019 (H.R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Special Counsel	26,535	26,252	26,252	-283	---
Postal Regulatory Commission	15,200	15,100	15,200	---	+100
Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board	8,000	5,000	5,000	-3,000	---
Public Buildings Reform Board	5,000	2,000	2,000	-3,000	---
Securities and Exchange Commission					
Salaries and Expenses	1,652,000	1,658,302	1,658,302	+6,302	---
SEC NYC Regional Office	---	40,750	37,189	+37,189	-3,561
Headquarters Lease	244,507	---	---	-244,507	---
Subtotal, Securities and Exchange Commission	1,896,507	1,699,052	1,695,491	-201,016	-3,561
SEC fees	-1,896,507	-1,699,052	-1,695,491	+201,016	+3,561
SEC Reserve Fund (rescission)	---	-25,000	---	---	+25,000
Selective Service System	22,900	26,400	26,000	+3,100	-400
Small Business Administration					
Salaries and expenses	268,500	265,000	268,500	---	+3,500
Entrepreneurial Development Programs	247,100	192,450	251,900	+4,800	+59,450
Office of Inspector General	19,900	21,900	21,900	+2,000	---
Office of Advocacy	9,120	9,120	9,120	---	---
Business Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy	3,438	4,000	4,000	+562	---
Guaranteed Loan Subsidy	---	-155,150	---	---	+155,150
Administrative expenses	152,782	155,150	155,150	+2,368	---
Total, Business loans program account	156,220	4,000	159,150	+2,930	+155,150
Disaster Loans Program Account:					
Administrative expenses	---	186,458	31,308	+31,308	-155,150
Disaster relief category	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Small Business Administration	700,840	678,928	741,878	+41,038	+62,950
General provision (rescission) (sec. 531)	---	---	---	---	---
United States Postal Service					
Payment to the Postal Service Fund	58,118	55,235	58,118	---	+2,883
Office of Inspector General	245,000	234,650	250,000	+5,000	+15,350
Total, United States Postal Service	303,118	289,885	308,118	+5,000	+18,233
United States Tax Court	50,740	55,563	51,515	+775	-4,048
Total, title V, Independent Agencies	2,710,944	2,727,271	1,234,094	-1,476,850	-1,493,177
Appropriations	(2,710,944)	(2,752,271)	(1,234,094)	(-1,476,850)	(-1,518,177)
Rescissions	---	(-25,000)	---	---	(+25,000)
(by transfer)	(39,136)	(42,982)	(42,982)	(+3,846)	---
(Discretionary)	(2,710,944)	(2,727,271)	(1,234,094)	(-1,476,850)	(-1,493,177)

DIVISION B - FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019 (H.R. 6147)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2018 Enacted	FY 2019 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VI - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Mandatory appropriations (sec. 619)	21,800,000	21,818,000	21,818,000	+18,000	---
PCA Oversight Board scholarships (sec. 620)	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
SBA 503 Unobligated balances (sec. 620)	-2,600	-50,000	-50,000	-47,400	---
Government-wide transfers (sec. 737)	---	3,000,000	---	---	-3,000,000
Total, title VI, General Provisions	21,798,400	24,768,000	21,768,000	-30,400	-3,000,000
TITLE IX - OTHER MATTERS					
Other matters	---	---	-126,000	-126,000	-126,000
Total, title IX, Other Matters	---	---	-126,000	-126,000	-126,000
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF REQUIREMENTS (P.L. 115-56)					
SBA, Disaster Loans Progam Account	450,000	---	---	-450,000	---
Total, Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements (P.L. 115-56)	450,000	---	---	-450,000	---
BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2018 (P.L. 115-123)					
GSA, Federal Buildings Fund (emergency)	126,951	---	---	-126,951	---
SBA, Office of Inspector General (emergency)	7,000	---	---	-7,000	---
SBA, Disaster Loans Program Account (emergency)	1,652,000	---	---	-1,652,000	---
Total, Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115-123)	1,785,951	---	---	-1,785,951	---
Total, Other Appropriations	2,235,951	---	---	-2,235,951	---
(emergency)	2,235,951	---	---	-2,235,951	---
Grand total	47,900,851	48,843,281	45,679,000	-2,221,851	-3,164,281
Appropriations	(46,369,500)	(48,556,710)	(45,729,000)	(-640,500)	(-2,827,710)
Rescissions	(-704,600)	(-75,000)	(-50,000)	(+654,600)	(+25,000)
Emergency	(2,235,951)	---	---	(-2,235,951)	---
(by transfer)	(39,136)	(42,982)	(42,982)	(+3,846)	---
Discretionary total (non-emergency)	23,422,900	26,587,281	23,423,000	+100	-3,164,281

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to the Interior, Environment, and Financial Services, and General Government minibus, that fails the American people by slashing environmental protection, rolling back consumer protections, and even cutting basic election security funding.

With bills this bad, it is no wonder Republicans have abandoned all pretense of regular order, grouped two unrelated appropriations bills together, and blocked numerous Democratic amendments.

These bills are the product of Republicans' misguided priorities. Instead of using the $18 billion increase in nondefense discretionary spending to create jobs and grow our economy, Republicans have chosen to waste those resources on an unnecessary border wall and cruel attacks on immigrant families.

We must do better. As much as it pains me to say, we should be following the Senate and producing bipartisan bills instead of wasting time on playing political games and taking show votes to appease the right wing of the Republican Conference.

Turning to the substance of the bills before us, it is absolutely outrageous that they would: Cut the Environmental Protection Agency by $100 million; slash clean water infrastructure grants by $300 million; sink $585 million into a black hole that is dressed up with a fancy name, the Fund for America's Kids and Grandkids, which is a ploy to not spend the entire financial services allocation; reduce investments in underserved communities through the Community Development Financial Institutions program by $34 million; and provide inadequate funding for small business loan programs and for investments that curb the opioid crisis.

However, the bill's worst cut is the zeroing out of election security grants.

On Friday, Special Counsel Robert Mueller indicted 12 Russian intelligence officers for their interference in the 2016 presidential election. The indictment describes, in great detail, the efforts Russia took to break into State election databases.

We have all heard the public warnings of our intelligence community that Russia will attempt to attack our democracy again. Yet, instead of helping States protect and fortify their election infrastructure from cyber hacking, this bill would eliminate election security grants entirely.

Additionally, numerous harmful policy riders strike at the heart of laws and rules that protect the air we breathe and the water we drink, threaten the survival of endangered species, attack a woman's right to choose, undermine democracy in the District of Columbia, and repeal important Dodd-Frank consumer protections.

These bills represent a divisive, partisan approach that threatens to leave American communities more polluted and American families more vulnerable to financial predators. We must do better.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairman, it is my distinct honor to bring to the House floor the fiscal year 2019 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

Before I go into details about the bill, I would like to commend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his leadership and support throughout this process.

As reported by the Appropriations Committee, the fiscal year 2019 Interior and Environment bill is funded at $35.252 billion, which is equal to the FY18 enacted level. We have made sincere efforts to prioritize critical needs within our subcommittee allocation and in reviewing more than 5,200 individual requests.

In the interest of time, I won't outline all the problems or programs and activities funded in this bill. I would like to point out a few highlights.

The bill provides robust wildland fire funding totaling $3.9 billion. It fully funds the 10-year average for wildland fire suppression costs and provides an additional $500 million in suppression funds for the Forest Service. The committee has also provided a $30 million increase over fiscal year 2018 for hazardous fuel reduction.

The bill provides $500 million in fiscal year 2019 for the Payments in Lieu of Taxes, PILT program, which is a top priority for many Members on both sides of the aisle.

The bill also makes critical investments in Indian Country, a top priority of this committee. This legislation honors our commitment to Native Americans with a particular emphasis on Indian health, law enforcement, education, and water settlements.

The bill fully funds contract support costs and Tribal grant school support costs; provides funding to staff newly constructed health facilities; improves public safety; significantly increases economic development; invests an additional $16 million in fiscal year 2019 to address needs of schools throughout the BIE system; and invests an additional $82 million to correct funding disparities across the Indian Healthcare System.

Overall, funding to EPA has been reduced by $100 million from fiscal year 2018, with reductions aimed at research and regulatory programs. Members from the Midwest will be pleased to know that the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative is maintained at the fiscal year 2018 enacted level of $300 million.

The bill continues to invest in water infrastructure and cleaning up contaminated land. These programs help create jobs and spur economic development in communities all across the Nation. The bill provides funds to leverage over $10 billion worth of investment in water infrastructure through the funding in the WIFIA program and the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Funds.

The bill also provides $3.2 billion for the National Park Service. It maintains, and builds upon, critical investments made in the fiscal year 2018 enacted bill to address longstanding park operations and deferred maintenance needs.

We have also attempted to address a number of concerns within the Fish and Wildlife Service accounts. The bill restores popular grant programs through fiscal year 2018 enacted levels. It also restores funds to combat international wildlife trafficking; protects fish hatcheries from cuts and closures; and continues funding to fight invasive mussels and Asian carp; and reduces the backlog of species that are recovered but not yet de-listed. We have also increased funds for the Recovery Challenge program, which we started in 2018 to challenge non-Federal partners to a more active role in recovering endangered species.

The bill also provides $360 million for Land and Water Conservation programs with bipartisan support.

Lastly, this bill makes significant investments toward critical deferred maintenance, construction, and infrastructure needs within the Department of the Interior, Forest Service, Indian Health Service, Smithsonian, as well as critical air and water infrastructure programs within the EPA.

In closing, I would like to thank staff on both sides of the aisle who have worked long hours on this legislation. On the minority side, I would like to thank Rita Culp, Jocelyn Hunn, and Rebecca Taylor.

On the majority side, I would like to thank Darren Benjamin, Betsy Bina, Jackie Kilroy, Kristin Richmond, Mac Cloyes, and Dave LesStrang from the committee staff, as well as Ian Foley, Rebecca Keightley, Tricia Evans and Dave Kennett from my personal staff.

To say the least, this has been a team effort.

□ 1915

Lastly, I would like to thank my good friend and ranking member, BETTY MCCOLLUM, for working with me to address a number of critical needs throughout the bill.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, while we may disagree on some issues, we are never disagreeable and we continue to work well together.

Madam Chair, it is a good bill. I urge its adoption.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

(Ms. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I would like to thank Ranking Member LOWEY as well as the full committee chair for their work, but I would like to give a special thanks to Chairman CALVERT and his staff, whom he mentioned by name, and of course my wonderful staff, including my personal staff, for working together using a collaborative approach to help us move forward.

The subcommittee has a challenging portfolio of issues, and I commend the chairman's efforts to maintain many of the fiscal year 2018 investments, such as addressing the backlog of deferred maintenance on Federal lands and investing in Indian Country. I want to express how sincerely proud I am of this subcommittee's nonpartisan approach to addressing the issues facing our Native American brothers and sisters.

I am pleased that the bill recommends an increase of $410 million over the fiscal year 2018 enacted level for programs critical to Indian Country.

The health, education, and safety of our Tribal communities is a Federal responsibility that our subcommittee takes very seriously, and that is the one bright spot in this bill; but, unfortunately, other important priorities for the American public did not fare as well.

Even though the fiscal year 2019 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee allocation is equal to the fiscal year 2018 enacted level, the majority is proposing a $100 million cut from the Environmental Protection Agency, which is just untenable.

The cuts in this bill would target air and water quality programs, reduce Federal funding to enforce the law against polluters, and, if enacted, they will undermine the EPA's ability to keep our families and communities healthy and to protect our environment for future generations.

We are at a defining moment in history. The Interior bill has an opportunity to make a global difference in the quality of life for generations to come, but, sadly, this bill is a mirror of the Trump administration's actions and disregard for the environment.

We cannot afford to ignore the overwhelming scientific evidence the planet is warming, sea levels are rising, and glaciers are melting. We must do more, not less, to pursue policies and programs that will put us on the right path to conserve and protect our natural resources and the planet we call home.

The bill before us also reduces funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund by $65 million from the fiscal year 2018 enacted level. This program has strong bipartisan support. It conserves natural areas and provides recreational opportunities in all 50 States.

The American people expect us to be good stewards of our public lands and wildlife, but this bill falls short on that commitment.

In addition to the irresponsible cuts to the EPA, I must express my concern and my disappointment to the 18 partisan riders in this bill that pander to special interests at the expense of the public good. These riders undermine clean water and clean air safeguards, jeopardize protection and recovery for vulnerable species, and even intercede in California water issues outside of the jurisdiction of the subcommittee.

The Senate has committed to work in a bipartisan manner to keep controversial policy riders out of their appropriations bills. I agree with that strategy and believe these policy issues should receive a full and transparent debate in the authorizing committees of jurisdiction. Congress must stop holding the government hostage over these ideological policy riders.

And, finally, it is impossible to talk about the bill that funds the Environmental Protection Agency without addressing the ethical problems that have plagued this administration and were embodied by the former EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt. There is ample evidence that the former Administrator was misusing Federal dollars for lavish expenses and prioritizing the interest of corporations over protecting America's families. Mr. Pruitt may be gone from the Agency, but Congress should be doing considerable oversight to ensure that a culture of transparency and accountability is restored at the EPA.

We should also be doing our best to ensure that every agency we fund is not abusing taxpayers' dollars. So I am deeply disappointed that my Republican colleagues voted down multiple amendments in our committee markup that would have held up our responsibility for oversight and adequately funded ongoing investigations. They also denied several more Democratic oversight amendments a chance to come to this floor for debate today.

Madam Chair, this bill fails the American people. It cuts environmental protections. It removes safeguards for our air and water and endangered species and allows rampant corruption in the executive branch to go unchecked. I know we can do better than this, and it is my hope we will do better after conference.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I thank Mrs. LOWEY for yielding.

So despite my current opposition, I intend to continue to work with the chairman through this year's appropriations process to produce a responsible bill that I know we can have both parties support in the end.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise tonight to fight for America's kids and grandkids. That is what we are here to do.

This fiscal year 2019 Financial Services and General Government Appropriations bill, as I will explain in a moment, reflects the public outcry over deficit spending and addresses those concerns on behalf of America's kids and grandkids.

Madam Chair, before I dive into those details, I want to thank Ranking Member QUIGLEY for his hard work and dedication to our work together as we have shepherded this committee through the process in this bill.

I want to mention a few of the bill's highlights.

This bill is a product of a very Member-driven process. We brought appropriators and authorizers together. We consulted other committees. We fostered personal Member-to-Member conversations to make sure that priorities in this bill were vetted and supported across jurisdictions. We held several public hearings and reviewed over 2,100 unique Member requests as we put this bill together.

As the bill passed out of this Appropriations Committee, it passed with bipartisan support. What more can you do on behalf of America's kids and grandkids?

As in past years, we aimed to provide the oversight and allocate taxpayer dollars with the greatest of care.

This bill includes resources to implement the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, which cuts taxes for families and businesses all across our country, spurring economic growth. The funding in our bill will help implement the law very quickly so American families can use the system without disruption whatsoever.

In addition, this bill prioritizes law enforcement, homeland security, and cybersecurity. For example, it provides record funding for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas and Drug-Free Communities programs.

It updates the legacy IT systems that are governmentwide—we have all seen it and we have heard about it—through the Technology Modernization Fund.

Similar to our landmark approach last year, this bill also includes major financial reforms. It cuts regulations, streamlines agency processes. In fact, this bill includes more than 20 pieces of legislation that have passed through this body with bipartisan support, in most cases with more than 270 votes.

Now, importantly, one of these reforms brings transparency and oversight to an agency we have all talked about, and that is to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, by bringing it under the authority of Congress and under the authority of the Appropriations Committee.

Now, with these kinds of reforms, this bill has earned a lot of support across our country. From the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Investment Company Institute, the American Bankers Association, Independent Community Bankers of America, National Association of Federally-Insured Credit Unions, and Credit Union National Association, in addition to the National Taxpayers Union and Citizens for Responsible Budgeting, this bill is bringing together a lot of different interests all across our country.

In closing, Madam Chair, I would like to highlight, really, what the heart of this bill is, the major feature of this bill.

If your district is anything like mine, you know the American people are frustrated. They are frustrated with Congress, and they are frustrated with this out-of-control spending. They see our annual deficits fuel our dangerous national debt. So it is time to try something different, and that is what we have done, because if we don't, we will stay stuck in this fiscal death spiral that we are in.

Now, after a lot of thought and effort, we came up with a very creative way to protect funding from being spent. The appropriations process does not make saving money easy, not at all. We all know that if a subcommittee such as mine doesn't spend everything, another subcommittee will come in and scoop it up and spend it somewhere else. This is just the way legislating is in Washington.

So we came up with something different, and we created a new fund in this bill called the Fund for America's Kids and Grandkids, which safeguards funds for America's future generations. In fact, it is like a savings account.

We put $585 million from this bill as an initial deposit into the savings account, and this money is protected. It cannot be spent until Treasury indicates that we have balanced our budget or we have a surplus.

Now, this deposit is only 2.5 percent. It is 2.5 percent of what we were allocated. That is 2½ pennies of every dollar that we spend. But this is a great step forward, and it is on behalf of America's kids and grandkids.

This approach causes us to think about what deficit spending truly means and in whose name we are borrowing the money and who ultimately is going to get stuck with this debt.

Establishing the Fund for America's Kids and Grandkids means we are appropriating with a new spirit here in Washington, D.C., and that is just because you can spend it doesn't mean you have to.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY), the ranking member of the Financial Services Subcommittee.

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

Madam Chair, I first want to thank Chairman GRAVES, whom I had the privilege of working with for a second year in managing this bill. Our discussions have been both passionate and productive, and I thank him for always allowing for vigorous debate throughout the process.

And, of course, I would again like to thank the staff on both sides for their work behind the scenes that went into preparing this bill for floor consideration. In particular, I would like to recognize and thank committee staff on the minority side, Lisa, Chris, Angela, Martha, as well as Doug from my personal office.

But with that said, I continue to strongly oppose the bill before us today.

Given its flat allocation of $23.4 billion, this bill does not adequately meet the growing needs of our small businesses, taxpayers, and middle class consumers and investors.

To be fair, I do want to acknowledge how pleased I was to see increased funding for the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, Federal Defender Services, and the Small Business Administration, three very different priorities, each critical in its own right; but this does not negate the cuts suffered by some of our most important agencies tasked with missions ranging from policing Wall Street to supporting investment in our most underserved communities.

After losing over a billion dollars in funding and 18,000 staff between 2010 and 2017, my friends in the majority have reversed course and have begun providing the IRS with additional funds to implement their new law, yet taxpayer service is cut by $15 million. GSA's funding for new construction is cut by over $400 million, and funds for major and basic repairs and alterations come in at $194 million below the requested amount.

The SEC, which is tasked with protecting investors and ensuring fairness in our capital markets, is cut by over $200 million, even though the Commission's budget is financed by industry fees.

The CDFI Fund, after receiving increased funding of $250 million in fiscal year 2018, was inexplicably cut by $59 million in the original draft. With an additional $25 million for CDFI approved in committee, it is still not enough. Failing to fully fund the program means fewer resources to spur economic growth and revitalization in our most underserved communities.

In addition to these cuts, the bill contains a long list of partisan riders, both old and new, blocking the IRS from enforcing the Johnson amendment and restricting the SEC from requiring companies to disclose political contributions. It would interfere in the local affairs of D.C. in an infinite number of ways, which simply must stop.

□ 1930

Let's talk about the business at hand. I was heartened to see Republicans speak out against the President's performance in Helsinki. The reaction to the President not understanding the full breadth and width of the Russian attack on our democratic process was extraordinary. The Russians attacked us. They will be back. Most likely, they probably never left. But those tweets are one thing. You have to put your dollars and your votes where your tweets are.

After providing the States with $380 million in grants to help fortify and protect election systems from cyber hacking, this bill zeroes out that fund for 2019. I have made this argument time and again, but it is worth repeating that the $380 million that has been allocated is a step in the right direction, but it is only a down payment. For a majority of the 13 States that still use voting machines with no paper trail, at most, the funds they receive only cover half the replacement costs. Forty States use old equipment, which cannot handle modern anti-cyber hacking software.

The entity that manages these grants, EAC, has announced that every State has requested funding, showing overwhelming demand for these resources. That is why I offered an amendment in the committee markup to restore funding for the program. Unfortunately, it failed in a party-line vote.

Let me emphasize, again: We must do more to protect our democratic process from those who wish us harm, not just for the upcoming midterms, but for 2020 and beyond.

Most States maxed out the amount of money they could request from this program. Obviously, many other States, I suspect, would be a little more enthusiastic if the President didn't tell them this was a witch hunt or a hoax.

So there is much more we can do toward that end. Let's remind ourselves of the last time we had an election debacle of this magnitude: Bush-Gore. This government spent $3.4 billion. Why? Because we treasure the democratic process. We want every vote to count, and we certainly don't want a foreign adversary to be able to detract from that.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Chair, I just ask my colleagues, let us join together. There was never a more important time to treasure our democracy and fund the programs that protect them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS), a member of the committee.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

I rise in full support of H.R. 6147 and commend Chairman CALVERT on this much-needed legislation.

Back in 1977, Congress established the Abandoned Mine Lands program to

use coal production revenues to fund critical reclamation efforts. Roll forward about 30 or 40 years, and I want to highlight one important part of the funding bill that is before us that will truly make a difference in many hard-hit coal States, including my home State of West Virginia.

A new AML pilot program is in this legislation. Back in 2016, and thanks to the leadership of Chairman Hal Rogers and Chairman CALVERT, we worked on establishing this AML pilot program to use some of these funds to help create job opportunities for displaced workers and help diversify the economy.

In the last 2 years, the AML pilot program has brought $80 million to West Virginia, bolstering our economy and creating new jobs. These funds are being put to good use and play a proactive role in diversifying our State's economy, and many other States'.

AML pilot funds, for example, are being used to support the Hatfield-McCoy Trail System, more than 700 miles of world-class ATV trails just in West Virginia. I recently took part in a ride along on one of the trails to see firsthand the economic benefits they have brought to West Virginia. The trails being developed using AML pilot funds will attract thousands of new visitors, bolstering job creation in Appalachia and unleashing our tourism potential.

These funds are also being used to expand municipal water services, which is critical for businesses and agricultural developments, as well as public health. The Coalfield Development Corporation, for example, is using AML pilot funds to build an aquaponics farm to grow sustainable commercial quantities of fish and vegetables.

Simply stated, our towns and counties and States need resources to provide for the future, and this bill does it. It helps us diversify the economies. It helps attract employers and create much-needed jobs, putting West Virginians and Americans back to work.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chairwoman, I thank Ranking Member LOWEY for yielding me this time.

Unfortunately, I must rise in strong opposition to this bill and its litany of hollow choices and some dangerous choices.

First, on election security, a day after President Trump told the whole world he believes Russian President Putin over our intelligence community, while claiming Russia didn't hack our 2016 election, this Republican bill provides zero election security grants to help our States prepare against likely cyber interference.

Congress, as the first branch of government, must live up to our constitutional obligation. Just months away from our 2018 elections, President Trump essentially green-lit Putin's ongoing attacks.

Does this body wish to be complicit as we head toward 2018 and 2020? This bill surely suggests so.

Further, this bill attacks clean water access by repealing the waters of the United States rule without any public input regarding a replacement. It puts America's waters and the health and well-being of the American people at even greater risk, and it is a disservice to our constituents.

I strongly oppose the rider that would block the Environmental Protection Agency from addressing waste from animal feeding operations under the Solid Waste Disposal Act. In my watershed, which drains the tristate, binational region of North America into the western end of Lake Erie, the equivalent of 42,500 boxcar loads of animal manure are locally generated every year. That is trainloads of feces over 400 miles long every year seeping into the tributaries to the lake system every year.

Additionally, the majority is far too eager to authorize massive corporate giveaways in this appropriations bill.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chairwoman, their so-called CHOICE Act guts essential safeguards that require banks to plan and prevent the kind of financial catastrophe we saw in 2008. The only people who haven't been brought to justice are the scoundrels on Wall Street who created the mess.

I hope our colleagues will join me in opposing this bill. And let me thank Chairmen FRELINGHUYSEN, GRAVES, and CALVERT, as well as Ranking Members LOWEY, MCCOLLUM, and QUIGLEY for their efforts on this bill. I know how hard it is to bring an appropriations bill to the floor, and I am sorry I cannot support this one.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairwoman, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. LANCE. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman CALVERT for his leadership on this legislation and for recognizing the critically important work of cleaning up Federal Superfund sites across the United States.

The remedial program for cleanups will see a $40 million increase in this package, bringing the Superfund total to $1.17 billion. This funding is well spent. One cleanup project in the congressional district I serve, the American Cyanamid Superfund site in Bridgewater, New Jersey, is a worthy project, indeed.

The American Cyanamid site has been a hazard for too long, and the project was placed on the Superfund list in 1983. It is time to have the 44,000 tons of hazardous waste on this site safely and permanently destroyed.

This is why we have a Superfund program and why the work of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Appropriations Committee is so important. Federal officials and resources with the know-how and expertise have tackled these problems in other parts of the country and now need to focus on Bridgewater and other worthy projects across the Nation.

This is a good project. I rise to call attention to its great merits and to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Chairman CALVERT, the committee, and the EPA for their involvement and support thus far.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman. I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey for expressing support for the Superfund program.

The Superfund program continues to be a priority of this committee. In the fiscal year 2018 omnibus, we provided a $66 million increase to the program to accelerate cleanup of Superfund sites and respond to the release of hazardous materials.

I look forward to working together through the 2019 process to ensure that the Superfund program receives necessary funding to clean up and revitalize our Nation's toxic sites, like the American Cyanamid site, so that they are returned to productive use.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chairwoman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I thank Ranking Member LOWEY for yielding me the time.

Madam Chair, I rise today as a member of the subcommittee in reluctant opposition to the bill before us. I want to thank the ranking member and the chairman for their hard work on this bill. I know that, in a truly bipartisan fashion, there has been an effort to address many issues that are important to me and to other Members.

For example, I appreciate that the committee has come together to fund a National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities at strong levels that will help support our local economies and protect important cultural institutions.

But the truth of the matter is that we will be voting on numerous amendments tonight that will add poison pill riders to the bill. They will gut our environmental protections and act as a straightforward assault on our country's air, water, and Federal lands.

The fact that so many of these harmful amendments were made in order by the Rules Committee is a telling statement of misplaced priorities. But even

more telling are the amendments that were not made in order. None of the amendments to protect our oceans was made in order. Not one of the 10 amendments offered to prevent the devastation of our oceans due to oil and gas drilling off our coasts was made in order.

We had Members from both sides of the aisle offering these amendments. We had Members from all across the country offering these amendments, and not one was allowed for full House debate, neither was an amendment I offered to push the administration on distributing appropriated funding that it has sat on without reason.

This administration created guidance for the Department of the Interior in December of last year, which added another layer of bureaucracy and review for already-approved projects. How ironic that a Republican administration would actually be purposefully adding bureaucracy that they so often rail against.

This has led to an unconscionable delay in getting funds out to the communities in Texas, Florida, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico that have been impacted by natural disasters, as well as other projects not related to hurricane relief.

As we enter our second month of the current hurricane season, our American citizens have yet to see the full relief that they are owed and that this Congress has provided for them. That is because of this administration's unnecessary delays.

Again, I know the work that has gone into the creation of this bill with funding levels from many programs that are vital in my home State of Maine. In Maine, we have a strong appreciation for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the United States Geological Survey. We love estuaries, wildlife refuges, and National parks, like the beloved Acadia National Park in Maine and our new Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument. This funding is critical, and I am proud to be on the subcommittee that funds all of these national treasures and vital programs.

But because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will spend the next few hours attempting to gut the Clean Air Act, eliminate the EPA methane rule, restrict the Endangered Species Act, zero out funds for diesel emissions reduction, and ban even the discussion of the cost of carbon in our Nation, I will not be able to support this bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition.

□ 1945

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), who is the chairman of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairman CALVERT along with our friend and neighbor, Congressman COOK, on this issue which is, quite frankly, a matter of survival for two communities in my district.

I submitted an amendment to this Appropriations bill to ensure the city of Banning and the community of Banning Heights can continue to receive water from a conveyance flume that they have relied on for over 100 years. The water from the flume provides 100 percent of the water for the community of Banning Heights and approximately 30 percent of the water for the city of Banning.

This isn't a small matter for these communities. In fact, I understand that during times when Banning Heights hadn't received water from the flume, the city of Banning has had to use temporary means to deliver an emergency supply of water to them.

This shouldn't even be an issue. The two communities have an undisputed water right and a historic right-of-way to maintain the flume that brings the water to the community. The flume was previously used by Southern California Edison under a hydroelectric permit with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. For more than a decade, Edison has been in the process of decommissioning this permit, and the city of Banning and Banning Heights are simply seeking to ensure that the flume can be repaired and maintained and continues to deliver water.

Earlier this month, the Forest Service issued a letter stating that they would require the inclusion of new instream flows as a contingency of the issuance of a special use permit just to allow the city to make repairs to the flume. This requirement would mean that in an average year, the two communities would receive no water from the flume on more than 100 days, I repeat, no water for nearly one-third of the year.

Additionally, during periods of drought, the Forest Service estimates that the communities could go more than 50 consecutive days during the summer months without water.

This is simply unacceptable.

While my amendment will not be debated on the floor today, I will continue to work with the Forest Service to resolve this situation in a way that protects the water rights of Banning and Banning Heights and makes sure that any new instream flows do not take away water from communities that need it.

Madam Chair, I thank Chairman CALVERT again for his attention to this. I ask the gentleman for his commitment to work with me to resolve this critical issue for my constituents.

Mr. CALVERT. I thank Mr. RUIZ for raising this issue. I would like to offer and continue working with the gentleman and the Forest Service to amicably and productively resolve the situation.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I reserve balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, we should be making investments that protect our communities and make it easier for working families to get ahead. This bill falls far short of those goals. It shows the majority is not serious about enacting spending bills on time and is rife with deficiencies from a tax on the environment and consumers to wasting hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars, and it fails to stand up to Russian aggression and protect our elections. Vote ''no.''

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I am pleased the House is taking the next step towards our Appropriations bills today. These bills maintain vital Federal responsibilities and reflect common American values.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–81 shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follow:

H.R. 6147

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Interior, Environment, Financial Services, and General Government Appropriations Act, 2019''.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For necessary expenses for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau, and assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to section 1010(a) of Public Law 96–487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), $1,247,883,000,

to remain available until expended, including all such amounts as are collected from permit processing fees, as authorized but made subject to future appropriation by section 35(d)(3)(A)(i) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191), except that amounts from permit processing fees may be used for any bureau-related expenses associated with the processing of oil and gas applications for permits to drill and related use of authorizations.

In addition, $39,696,000 is for Mining Law Administration program operations, including the cost of administering the mining claim fee program, to remain available until expended, to be reduced by amounts collected by the Bureau and credited to this appropriation from mining claim maintenance fees and location fees that are hereby authorized for fiscal year 2019, so as to result in a final appropriation estimated at not more than $1,247,883,000, and $2,000,000, to remain available until expended, from communication site rental fees established by the Bureau for the cost of administering communication site activities.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out sections 205, 206, and 318(d) of Public Law 94–579, including administrative expenses and acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, $17,392,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of lands or interests therein, including existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such grant lands; $106,985,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That 25 percent of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands is hereby made a charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be transferred to the General Fund in the Treasury in accordance with the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 2605).

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For rehabilitation, protection, and acquisition of lands and interests therein, and improvement of Federal rangelands pursuant to section 401 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1751), notwithstanding any other Act, sums equal to 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year under sections 3 and 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act (43 U.S.C. 315b, 315m) and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees and mineral leasing receipts from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior pursuant to law, but not less than $10,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed $600,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

For administrative expenses and other costs related to processing application documents and other authorizations for use and disposal of public lands and resources, for costs of providing copies of official public land documents, for monitoring construction, operation, and termination of facilities in conjunction with use authorizations, and for rehabilitation of damaged property, such amounts as may be collected under Public Law 94–579 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), and under section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185), to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary of section 305(a) of Public Law 94–579 (43 U.S.C. 1735(a)), any moneys that have been or will be received pursuant to that section, whether as a result of forfeiture, compromise, or settlement, if not appropriate for refund pursuant to section 305(c) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1735(c)), shall be available and may be expended under the authority of this Act by the Secretary to improve, protect, or rehabilitate any public lands administered through the Bureau of Land Management which have been damaged by the action of a resource developer, purchaser, permittee, or any unauthorized person, without regard to whether all moneys collected from each such action are used on the exact lands damaged which led to the action: Provided further, That any such moneys that are in excess of amounts needed to repair damage to the exact land for which funds were collected may be used to repair other damaged public lands.

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

In addition to amounts authorized to be expended under existing laws, there is hereby appropriated such amounts as may be contributed under section 307 of Public Law 94–579 (43 U.S.C. 1737), and such amounts as may be advanced for administrative costs, surveys, appraisals, and costs of making conveyances of omitted lands under section 211(b) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1721(b)), to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Bureau of Land Management may carry out the operations funded under this Act by direct expenditure, contracts, grants, cooperative agreements and reimbursable agreements with public and private entities, including with States. Appropriations for the Bureau shall be available for purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures, and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title; up to $100,000 for payments, at the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Bureau; miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate, not to exceed $10,000: Provided, That notwithstanding Public Law 90–620 (44 U.S.C. 501), the Bureau may, under cooperative cost-sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share the cost of printing either in cash or in services, and the Bureau determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards: Provided further, That projects to be funded pursuant to a written commitment by a State government to provide an identified amount of money in support of the project may be carried out by the Bureau on a reimbursable basis. Appropriations herein made shall not be available for the destruction of healthy, unadopted, wild horses and burros in the care of the Bureau or its contractors or for the sale of wild horses and burros that results in their destruction for processing into commercial products.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, as authorized by law, and for scientific and economic studies, general administration, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources, $1,288,808,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That not to exceed $10,941,000 shall be used for implementing subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533) (except for processing petitions, developing and issuing proposed and final regulations, and taking any other steps to implement actions described in subsection (c)(2)(A), (c)(2)(B)(i), or (c)(2)(B)(ii)): Provided further, That $12,022,000 shall be provided to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation pursuant to section 3709 of title 16, United States Code, for the benefit of, and in connection with, the activities and services of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvement, acquisition, or removal of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein; $59,734,000, to remain available until expended.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, $47,438,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended, of which, notwithstanding section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, not more than $10,000,000 shall be for land conservation partnerships authorized by the Highlands Conservation Act of 2004, including not to exceed $320,000 for administrative expenses: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated for specific land acquisition projects may be used to pay for any administrative overhead, planning or other management costs.

COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1535), $53,495,000, to remain available until expended, of which $22,695,000 is to be derived from the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund; and of which $30,800,000 is to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUND

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 17, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 715s), $13,228,000.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4401 et seq.), $42,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.), $3,910,000, to remain available until expended.

MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.), the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 (16 U.S.C. 4261 et seq.), the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), the Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), and the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004 (16 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.), $11,061,000, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND TRIBAL WILDLIFE GRANTS

For wildlife conservation grants to States and to the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and Indian tribes under the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, for the development and implementation of programs for the benefit of wildlife and their habitat, including species that are not hunted or fished, $63,571,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the amount provided herein, $4,209,000 is for a competitive grant program for Indian tribes not subject to the remaining provisions of this appropriation: Provided further, That $6,362,000 is for a competitive grant program to implement approved plans for States, territories, and other jurisdictions and at the discretion of affected

States, the regional Associations of fish and wildlife agencies, not subject to the remaining provisions of this appropriation: Provided further, That the Secretary shall, after deducting $10,571,000 and administrative expenses, apportion the amount provided herein in the following manner: (1) to the District of Columbia and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, each a sum equal to not more than one-half of 1 percent thereof; and (2) to Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, each a sum equal to not more than one-fourth of 1 percent thereof: Provided further, That the Secretary shall apportion the remaining amount in the following manner: (1) one-third of which is based on the ratio to which the land area of such State bears to the total land area of all such States; and (2) two-thirds of which is based on the ratio to which the population of such State bears to the total population of all such States: 3 Provided further, That the amounts apportioned under this paragraph shall be adjusted equitably so that no State shall be apportioned a sum which is less than 1 percent of the amount available for apportionment under this paragraph for any fiscal year or more than 5 percent of such amount: Provided further, That the Federal share of planning grants shall not exceed 75 percent of the total costs of such projects and the Federal share of implementation grants shall not exceed 65 percent of the total costs of such projects: Provided further, That the non-Federal share of such projects may not be derived from Federal grant programs: Provided further, That any amount apportioned in 2019 to any State, territory, or other jurisdiction that remains unobligated as of September 30, 2020, shall be reapportioned, together with funds appropriated in 2021, in the manner provided herein.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service may carry out the operations of Service programs by direct expenditure, contracts, grants, cooperative agreements and reimbursable agreements with public and private entities. Appropriations and funds available to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed $1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are consistent with their primary purpose; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Service and to which the United States has title, and which are used pursuant to law in connection with management, and investigation of fish and wildlife resources: Provided, That notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Service may, under cooperative cost sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share at least one-half the cost of printing either in cash or services and the Service determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards: Provided further, That the Service may accept donated aircraft as replacements for existing aircraft: Provided further, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, all fees collected for non-toxic shot review and approval shall be deposited under the heading ''United States Fish and Wildlife Service—Resource Management'' and shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation, to be used for expenses of processing of such non-toxic shot type or coating applications and revising regulations as necessary, and shall remain available until expended.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For expenses necessary for the management, operation, and maintenance of areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service and for the general administration of the National Park Service, $2,527,810,000, of which $10,032,000 for planning and interagency coordination in support of Everglades restoration and $149,461,000 for maintenance, repair, or rehabilitation projects for constructed assets and $166,575,000 for cyclic maintenance projects for constructed assets and cultural resources shall remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That funds appropriated under this heading in this Act are available for the purposes of section 5 of Public Law 95–348.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out recreation programs, natural programs, cultural programs, heritage partnership programs, environmental compliance, international park affairs, and grant administration, not otherwise provided for, $63,638,000.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary in carrying out the National Historic Preservation Act (division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code), $91,910,000, to be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund and to remain available until September 30, 2020, of which $13,000,000 shall be for Save America's Treasures grants for preservation of national significant sites, structures and artifacts as authorized by section 7303 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (54 U.S.C. 3089): Provided, That an individual Save America's Treasures grant shall be matched by non-Federal funds: Provided further, That individual projects shall only be eligible for one grant: Provided further, That all projects to be funded shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: Provided further, That of the funds provided for the Historic Preservation Fund, $500,000 is for competitive grants for the survey and nomination of properties to the National Register of Historic Places and as National Historic Landmarks associated with communities currently under-represented, as determined by the Secretary, $13,000,000 is for competitive grants to preserve the sites and stories of the Civil Rights movement, and $5,000,000 is for grants to Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Provided further, That such competitive grants shall be made without imposing the matching requirements in section 302902(b)(3) of title 54, United States Code, to States and Indian tribes as defined in chapter 3003 of such title, Native Hawaiian organizations, local governments, including Certified Local Governments, and non-profit organizations.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvements, repair, or replacement of physical facilities, and compliance and planning for programs and areas administered by the National Park Service, $366,333,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, for any project initially funded in fiscal year 2019 with a future phase indicated in the National Park Service 5-Year Line Item Construction Plan, a single procurement may be issued which includes the full scope of the project: Provided further, That the solicitation and contract shall contain the clause availability of funds found at 48 CFR 52.232–18: Provided further, That National Park Service Donations, Park Concessions Franchise Fees, and Recreation Fees may be made available for the cost of adjustments and changes within the original scope of effort for projects funded by the National Park Service Construction appropriation: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations, in accordance with current reprogramming thresholds, prior to making any charges authorized by this section.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

For expenses necessary to carry out chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of lands or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with the statutory authority applicable to the National Park Service, $172,363,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended, of which $124,006,000 is for the State assistance program and of which $10,000,000 shall be for the American Battlefield Protection Program grants as authorized by chapter 3081 of title 54, United States Code.

CENTENNIAL CHALLENGE

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of section 101701 of title 54, United States Code, relating to challenge cost share agreements, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended, for Centennial Challenge projects and programs: Provided, That not less than 50 percent of the total cost of each project or program shall be derived from non-Federal sources in the form of donated cash, assets, or a pledge of donation guaranteed by an irrevocable letter of credit.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to other uses set forth in section 101917(c)(2) of title 54, United States Code, franchise fees credited to a sub-account shall be available for expenditure by the Secretary, without further appropriation, for use at any unit within the National Park System to extinguish or reduce liability for Possessory Interest or leasehold surrender interest. Such funds may only be used for this purpose to the extent that the benefitting unit anticipated franchise fee receipts over the term of the contract at that unit exceed the amount of funds used to extinguish or reduce liability. Franchise fees at the benefitting unit shall be credited to the sub-account of the originating unit over a period not to exceed the term of a single contract at the benefitting unit, in the amount of funds so expended to extinguish or reduce liability.

For the costs of administration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund grants authorized by section 105(a)(2)(B) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–432), the National Park Service may retain up to 3 percent of the amounts which are authorized to be disbursed under such section, such retained amounts to remain available until expended.

National Park Service funds may be transferred to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Department of Transportation, for purposes authorized under 23 U.S.C. 204. Transfers may include a reasonable amount for FHWA administrative support costs.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the United States Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, hydrology, biology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by 43 U.S.C. 31, 1332, and 1340; classify lands as to their mineral and water resources; give engineering supervision to power permittees and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licensees; administer the minerals exploration program (30 U.S.C. 641); conduct inquiries into the economic conditions affecting mining and materials processing industries (30 U.S.C. 3, 21a, and 1603; 50 U.S.C. 98g(1)) and related purposes as authorized by law; and to publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; $1,167,291,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020; of which $84,337,000 shall remain available until expended for satellite operations; and of which $15,164,000 shall be available until expended for deferred maintenance and capital improvement projects that exceed $100,000 in cost: Provided, That none of the funds provided for the ecosystem research activity shall be used to conduct new surveys on private property, unless specifically authorized in

writing by the property owner: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of topographic mapping or water resources data collection and investigations carried on in cooperation with States and municipalities.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

From within the amount appropriated for activities of the United States Geological Survey such sums as are necessary shall be available for contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gauging stations, observation wells, and seismic equipment; expenses of the United States National Committee for Geological Sciences; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons employed by the Survey duly appointed to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts: Provided, That activities funded by appropriations herein made may be accomplished through the use of contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements as defined in section 6302 of title 31, United States Code: Provided further, That the United States Geological Survey may enter into contracts or cooperative agreements directly with individuals or indirectly with institutions or nonprofit organizations, without regard to 41 U.S.C. 6101, for the temporary or intermittent services of students or recent graduates, who shall be considered employees for the purpose of chapters 57 and 81 of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation for travel and work injuries, and chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, relating to tort claims, but shall not be considered to be Federal employees for any other purposes.

BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT

OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for granting and administering leases, easements, rights-of-way and agreements for use for oil and gas, other minerals, energy, and marine-related purposes on the Outer Continental Shelf and approving operations related thereto, as authorized by law; for environmental studies, as authorized by law; for implementing other laws and to the extent provided by Presidential or Secretarial delegation; and for matching grants or cooperative agreements, $180,222,000, of which $130,406,000 is to remain available until September 30, 2020, and of which $49,816,000 is to remain available until expended: Provided, That this total appropriation shall be reduced by amounts collected by the Secretary and credited to this appropriation from additions to receipts resulting from increases to lease rental rates in effect on August 5, 1993, and from cost recovery fees from activities conducted by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, including studies, assessments, analysis, and miscellaneous administrative activities: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such collections are received during the fiscal year, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2019 appropriation estimated at not more than $130,406,000: Provided further, That not to exceed $3,000 shall be available for reasonable expenses related to promoting volunteer beach and marine cleanup activities.

BUREAU OF SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT

OFFSHORE SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT

For expenses necessary for the regulation of operations related to leases, easements, rights-of-way and agreements for use for oil and gas, other minerals, energy, and marine-related purposes on the Outer Continental Shelf, as authorized by law; for enforcing and implementing laws and regulations as authorized by law and to the extent provided by Presidential or Secretarial delegation; and for matching grants or cooperative agreements, $144,867,000, of which $120,743,000 is to remain available until September 30, 2020, and of which $24,124,000 is to remain available until expended: Provided, That this total appropriation shall be reduced by amounts collected by the Secretary and credited to this appropriation from additions to receipts resulting from increases to lease rental rates in effect on August 5, 1993, and from cost recovery fees from activities conducted by the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, including studies, assessments, analysis, and miscellaneous administrative activities: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such collections are received during the fiscal year, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2019 appropriation estimated at not more than $120,743,000.

For an additional amount, $41,765,000, to remain available until expended, to be reduced by amounts collected by the Secretary and credited to this appropriation, which shall be derived from non-refundable inspection fees collected in fiscal year 2019, as provided in this Act: Provided, That to the extent that amounts realized from such inspection fees exceed $41,765,000, the amounts realized in excess of $41,765,000 shall be credited to this appropriation and remain available until expended: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2019, not less than 50 percent of the inspection fees expended by the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement will be used to fund personnel and mission-related costs to expand capacity and expedite the orderly development, subject to environmental safeguards, of the Outer Continental Shelf pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), including the review of applications for permits to drill.

OIL SPILL RESEARCH

For necessary expenses to carry out title I, section 1016, title IV, sections 4202 and 4303, title VII, and title VIII, section 8201 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $14,899,000, which shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

REGULATION AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95–87, $113,969,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That appropriations for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement may provide for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sponsored training: Provided further, That of the amounts made available under this heading and notwithstanding the Federal share limits contained in section 705 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1295), not to exceed $2,300,000 shall be for the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to any State with active coal mine operations within its borders that does not have an approved State regulatory program under section 503 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1253) for the purpose of developing a State program under such Act.

In addition, for costs to review, administer, and enforce permits issued by the Office pursuant to section 507 of Public Law 95–87 (30 U.S.C. 1257), $40,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That fees assessed and collected by the Office pursuant to such section 507 shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year, so as to result in a fiscal year 2019 appropriation estimated at not more than $113,969,000.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95–87, $24,546,000, to be derived from receipts of the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund and to remain available until expended: Provided, That pursuant to Public Law 97–365, the Department of the Interior is authorized to use up to 20 percent from the recovery of the delinquent debt owed to the United States Government to pay for contracts to collect these debts: Provided further, That funds made available under title IV of Public Law 95–87 may be used for any required non-Federal share of the cost of projects funded by the Federal Government for the purpose of environmental restoration related to treatment or abatement of acid mine drainage from abandoned mines: Provided further, That such projects must be consistent with the purposes and priorities of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act: Provided further, That amounts provided under this heading may be used for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sponsored training.

In addition, $90,000,000, to remain available until expended, for grants to States for reclamation of abandoned mine lands and other related activities in accordance with the terms and conditions in the report accompanying this Act: Provided, That such additional amount shall be used for economic and community development in conjunction with the priorities in section 403(a) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1233(a)): Provided further, That such additional amount shall be distributed in equal amounts to the 3 Appalachian States with the greatest amount of unfunded needs to meet the priorities described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such section: Provided further, That such additional amount shall be allocated to States within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION

OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary for the operation of Indian programs, as authorized by law, including the Snyder Act of November 2, 1921 (25 U.S.C. 13), the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2001–2019), and the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), $2,436,821,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, except as otherwise provided herein; of which not to exceed $8,500 may be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed $76,000,000 shall be for welfare assistance payments: Provided, That in cases of designated Federal disasters, the Secretary may exceed such cap, from the amounts provided herein, to provide for disaster relief to Indian communities affected by the disaster: Provided further, That federally recognized Indian tribes and tribal organizations of federally recognized Indian tribes may use their tribal priority allocations for unmet welfare assistance costs: Provided further, That not to exceed $689,558,000 for school operations costs of Bureau-funded schools and other education programs shall become available on July 1, 2019, and shall remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided further, That not to exceed $54,174,000 shall remain available until expended for housing improvement, road maintenance, attorney fees, litigation support, land

records improvement, and the Navajo-Hopi Settlement Program: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, including but not limited to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) and section 1128 of the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2008), not to exceed $82,223,000 within and only from such amounts made available for school operations shall be available for administrative cost grants associated with grants approved prior to July 1, 2019: Provided further, That any forestry funds allocated to a federally recognized tribe which remain unobligated as of September 30, 2020, may be transferred during fiscal year 2021 to an Indian forest land assistance account established for the benefit of the holder of the funds within the holder's trust fund account: Provided further, That any such unobligated balances not so transferred shall expire on September 30, 2021: Provided further, That in order to enhance the safety of Bureau field employees, the Bureau may use funds to purchase uniforms or other identifying articles of clothing for personnel: Provided further, That the Bureau of Indian Affairs may accept transfers of funds from U.S. Customs and Border Protection to supplement any other funding available for reconstruction or repair of roads owned by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as identified on the National Tribal Transportation Facility Inventory, 23 U.S.C. 202(b)(1): Provided further, That of the funds provided, not to exceed $2,000,000 is authorized for a demonstration project to pilot a lease agreement with a federally recognized Indian tribe agreeing to replace and own a Bureau of Indian Education funded school facility operated under Public Law 93–638 or Public Law 100–297: Provided further, That of the funds provided, $2,000,000 shall be to implement section 7(b) of Public Law 102–495 (106 Stat. 3173).

CONTRACT SUPPORT COSTS

For payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract support costs associated with Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act agreements with the Bureau of Indian Affairs for fiscal year 2019, such sums as may be necessary, which shall be available for obligation through September 30, 2020: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, no amounts made available under this heading shall be available for transfer to another budget account.

CONSTRUCTION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For construction, repair, improvement, and maintenance of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other facilities, including architectural and engineering services by contract; acquisition of lands, and interests in lands; and preparation of lands for farming, and for construction of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project pursuant to Public Law 87–483; $354,485,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such amounts as may be available for the construction of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project may be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation: Provided further, That not to exceed 6 percent of contract authority available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs from the Federal Highway Trust Fund may be used to cover the road program management costs of the Bureau: Provided further, That any funds provided for the Safety of Dams program pursuant to the Act of November 2, 1921 (25 U.S.C. 13), shall be made available on a nonreimbursable basis: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2019, in implementing new construction, replacement facilities construction, or facilities improvement and repair project grants in excess of $100,000 that are provided to grant schools under Public Law 100–297, the Secretary of the Interior shall use the Administrative and Audit Requirements and Cost Principles for Assistance Programs contained in part 12 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, as the regulatory requirements: Provided further, That such grants shall not be subject to section 12.61 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations; the Secretary and the grantee shall negotiate and determine a schedule of payments for the work to be performed: Provided further, That in considering grant applications, the Secretary shall consider whether such grantee would be deficient in assuring that the construction projects conform to applicable building standards and codes and Federal, tribal, or State health and safety standards as required by section 1125(b) of title XI of Public Law 95–561 (25 U.S.C. 2005(b)), with respect to organizational and financial management capabilities: Provided further, That if the Secretary declines a grant application, the Secretary shall follow the requirements contained in section 5206(f) of Public Law 100–297 (25 U.S.C. 2504(f)): Provided further, That any disputes between the Secretary and any grantee concerning a grant shall be subject to the disputes provision in section 5208(e) of Public Law 107–110 (25 U.S.C. 2507(e)): Provided further, That in order to ensure timely completion of construction projects, the Secretary may assume control of a project and all funds related to the project, if, within 18 months of the date of enactment of this Act, any grantee receiving funds appropriated in this Act or in any prior Act, has not completed the planning and design phase of the project and commenced construction: Provided further, That this appropriation may be reimbursed from the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians appropriation for the appropriate share of construction costs for space expansion needed in agency offices to meet trust reform implementation.

INDIAN LAND AND WATER CLAIM SETTLEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS PAYMENTS TO INDIANS

For payments and necessary administrative expenses for implementation of Indian land and water claim settlements pursuant to Public Laws 99–264, 100–580, 101–618, 111–11, 111–291, and 114–322, and for implementation of other land and water rights settlements, $50,057,000, to remain available until expended.

INDIAN GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans and insured loans, $19,279,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, of which $1,702,000 is for administrative expenses, as authorized by the Indian Financing Act of 1974: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed or insured, not to exceed $329,260,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

The Bureau of Indian Affairs may carry out the operation of Indian programs by direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts, and grants, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations.

Notwithstanding Public Law 87–279 (25 U.S.C. 15), the Bureau of Indian Affairs may contract for services in support of the management, operation, and maintenance of the Power Division of the San Carlos Irrigation Project.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for central office oversight and Executive Direction and Administrative Services (except executive direction and administrative services funding for Tribal Priority Allocations, regional offices, and facilities operations and maintenance) shall be available for contracts, grants, compacts, or cooperative agreements with the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the provisions of the Indian Self-Determination Act or the Tribal Self-Governance Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–413).

In the event any tribe returns appropriations made available by this Act to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, this action shall not diminish the Federal Government's trust responsibility to that tribe, or the government-to-government relationship between the United States and that tribe, or that tribe's ability to access future appropriations.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds available to the Bureau of Indian Education, other than the amounts provided herein for assistance to public schools under 25 U.S.C. 452 et seq., shall be available to support the operation of any elementary or secondary school in the State of Alaska.

No funds available to the Bureau of Indian Education shall be used to support expanded grades for any school or dormitory beyond the grade structure in place or approved by the Secretary of the Interior at each school in the Bureau of Indian Education school system as of October 1, 1995, except that the Secretary of the Interior may waive this prohibition to support expansion of up to one additional grade when the Secretary determines such waiver is needed to support accomplishment of the mission of the Bureau of Indian Education, or more than one grade to expand the elementary grade structure for Bureau-funded schools with a K-2 grade structure on October 1, 1996. Appropriations made available in this or any prior Act for schools funded by the Bureau shall be available, in accordance with the Bureau's funding formula, only to the schools in the Bureau school system as of September 1, 1996, and to any school or school program that was reinstated in fiscal year 2012. Funds made available under this Act may not be used to establish a charter school at a Bureau-funded school (as that term is defined in section 1141 of the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2021)), except that a charter school that is in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act and that has operated at a Bureau-funded school before September 1, 1999, may continue to operate during that period, but only if the charter school pays to the Bureau a pro rata share of funds to reimburse the Bureau for the use of the real and personal property (including buses and vans), the funds of the charter school are kept separate and apart from Bureau funds, and the Bureau does not assume any obligation for charter school programs of the State in which the school is located if the charter school loses such funding. Employees of Bureau-funded schools sharing a campus with a charter school and performing functions related to the charter school's operation and employees of a charter school shall not be treated as Federal employees for purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 113 of title I of appendix C of Public Law 106–113, if in fiscal year 2003 or 2004 a grantee received indirect and administrative costs pursuant to a distribution formula based on section 5(f) of Public Law 101–301, the Secretary shall continue to distribute indirect and administrative cost funds to such grantee using the section 5(f) distribution formula.

Funds available under this Act may not be used to establish satellite locations of schools in the Bureau school system as of September 1, 1996, except that the Secretary may waive this prohibition in order for an Indian tribe to provide language and cultural immersion educational programs for non-public schools located within the jurisdictional area of the tribal government which exclusively serve tribal members, do not include grades beyond those currently served at the existing Bureau-funded school, provide an educational environment with educator presence and academic facilities comparable to the Bureau-funded school, comply with all applicable Tribal, Federal, or State health and safety standards, and the Americans with Disabilities Act, and demonstrate the benefits of establishing operations at a satellite location in lieu of incurring extraordinary costs, such as for transportation or other impacts to

students such as those caused by busing students extended distances: Provided, That no funds available under this Act may be used to fund operations, maintenance, rehabilitation, construction or other facilities-related costs for such assets that are not owned by the Bureau: Provided further, That the term ''satellite school'' means a school location physically separated from the existing Bureau school by more than 50 miles but that forms part of the existing school in all other respects.

Of the unobligated balances available from appropriations made under the heading ''Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education'' prior to fiscal year 2014, $4,000,000 are permanently rescinded.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for management of the Department of the Interior and for grants and cooperative agreements, as authorized by law, $134,673,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020; of which not to exceed $15,000 may be for official reception and representation expenses; and of which up to $1,000,000 shall be available for workers compensation payments and unemployment compensation payments associated with the orderly closure of the United States Bureau of Mines; and of which $9,000,000 for the Appraisal and Valuation Services Office is to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and shall remain available until expended; and of which $9,704,000 for Indian land, mineral, and resource valuation activities shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That funds for Indian land, mineral, and resource valuation activities may, as needed, be transferred to and merged with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education ''Operation of Indian Programs'' account and the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians ''Federal Trust Programs'' account: Provided further, That funds made available through contracts or grants obligated during fiscal year 2019, as authorized by the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), shall remain available until expended by the contractor or grantee.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

For fiscal year 2019, up to $400,000 of the payments authorized by chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, may be retained for administrative expenses of the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Program: Provided, That the amounts provided under this Act specifically for the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program are the only amounts available for payments authorized under chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code: Provided further, That in the event the sums appropriated for any fiscal year for payments pursuant to this chapter are insufficient to make the full payments authorized by that chapter to all units of local government, then the payment to each local government shall be made proportionally: Provided further, That the Secretary may make adjustments to payment to individual units of local government to correct for prior overpayments or underpayments: Provided further, That no payment shall be made pursuant to that chapter to otherwise eligible units of local government if the computed amount of the payment is less than $100.

INSULAR AFFAIRS

ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for assistance to territories under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior and other jurisdictions identified in section 104(e) of Public Law 108–188, $96,870,000, of which: (1) $87,440,000 shall remain available until expended for territorial assistance, including general technical assistance, maintenance assistance, disaster assistance, coral reef initiative activities, and brown tree snake control and research; grants to the judiciary in American Samoa for compensation and expenses, as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1661(c)); grants to the Government of American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for construction and support of governmental functions; grants to the Government of the Virgin Islands, as authorized by law; grants to the Government of Guam, as authorized by law; and grants to the Government of the Northern Mariana Islands , as authorized by law (Public Law 94–241; 90 Stat. 272); and (2) $9,430,000 shall be available until September 30, 2020, for salaries and expenses of the Office of Insular Affairs: Provided, That all financial transactions of the territorial and local governments herein provided for, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or used by such governments, may be audited by the Government Accountability Office, at its discretion, in accordance with chapter 35 of title 31, United States Code: Provided further, That Northern Mariana Islands Covenant grant funding shall be provided according to those terms of the Agreement of the Special Representatives on Future United States Financial Assistance for the Northern Mariana Islands approved by Public Law 104–134: Provided further, That the funds for the program of operations and maintenance improvement are appropriated to institutionalize routine operations and maintenance improvement of capital infrastructure with territorial participation and cost sharing to be determined by the Secretary based on the grantee's commitment to timely maintenance of its capital assets: Provided further, That any appropriation for disaster assistance under this heading in this Act or previous appropriations Acts may be used as non–Federal matching funds for the purpose of hazard mitigation grants provided pursuant to section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c).

COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION

For grants and necessary expenses, $3,363,000, to remain available until expended, as provided for in sections 221(a)(2) and 233 of the Compact of Free Association for the Republic of Palau; and section 221(a)(2) of the Compacts of Free Association for the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia, as authorized by Public Law 99–658 and Public Law 108–188.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

At the request of the Governor of Guam, the Secretary may transfer discretionary funds or mandatory funds provided under section 104(e) of Public Law 108–188 and Public Law 104–134, that are allocated for Guam, to the Secretary of Agriculture for the subsidy cost of direct or guaranteed loans, plus not to exceed three percent of the amount of the subsidy transferred for the cost of loan administration, for the purposes authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 and section 306(a)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act for construction and repair projects in Guam, and such funds shall remain available until expended: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That such loans or loan guarantees may be made without regard to the population of the area, credit elsewhere requirements, and restrictions on the types of eligible entities under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 and section 306(a)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act: Provided further, That any funds transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be in addition to funds otherwise made available to make or guarantee loans under such authorities.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, $65,674,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, $52,486,000.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the operation of trust programs for Indians by direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts, and grants, $110,692,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $19,016,000 from this or any other Act, may be available for historical accounting: Provided, That funds for trust management improvements and litigation support may, as needed, be transferred to or merged with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education, ''Operation of Indian Programs'' account; the Office of the Solicitor, ''Salaries and Expenses'' account; and the Office of the Secretary, ''Departmental Operations'' account: Provided further, That funds made available through contracts or grants obligated during fiscal year 2019, as authorized by the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), shall remain available until expended by the contractor or grantee: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall not be required to provide a quarterly statement of performance for any Indian trust account that has not had activity for at least 15 months and has a balance of $15 or less: Provided further, That the Secretary shall issue an annual account statement and maintain a record of any such accounts and shall permit the balance in each such account to be withdrawn upon the express written request of the account holder: Provided further, That not to exceed $50,000 is available for the Secretary to make payments to correct administrative errors of either disbursements from or deposits to Individual Indian Money or Tribal accounts after September 30, 2002: Provided further, That erroneous payments that are recovered shall be credited to and remain available in this account for this purpose: Provided further, That the Secretary shall not be required to reconcile Special Deposit Accounts with a balance of less than $500 unless the Office of the Special Trustee receives proof of ownership from a Special Deposit Accounts claimant: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 102 of the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–412) or any other provision of law, the Secretary may aggregate the trust accounts of individuals whose whereabouts are unknown for a continuous period of at least five years and shall not be required to generate periodic statements of performance for the individual accounts: Provided further, That with respect to the eighth proviso, the Secretary shall continue to maintain sufficient records to determine the balance of the individual accounts, including any accrued interest and income, and such funds shall remain available to the individual account holders.

NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians to carry out the activities authorized by subsection 11(h) of Public Law 93–531, as most recently amended by Public Law 104–301, through direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts, and grants, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Office of the Special Trustee is further authorized to expend funds provided under this heading for the purpose of planning for an orderly closeout of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation.

DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for fire preparedness, fire suppression operations, fire science and research, emergency rehabilitation, fuels management activities, and rural fire assistance by the Department of the Interior, $939,660,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such funds are also available for repayment of advances to other appropriation accounts from which funds were previously transferred for such purposes: Provided further, That of the funds provided $194,000,000 is for fuels management activities: Provided further, That of the funds provided $20,470,000 is for burned area rehabilitation: Provided further, That persons hired pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1469 may be furnished subsistence and lodging without cost from funds available from this appropriation: Provided further, That notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 1856d, sums received by a bureau or office of the Department of the Interior for fire protection rendered pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1856 et seq., protection of United States property, may be credited to the appropriation from which funds were expended to provide that protection, and are available without fiscal year limitation: Provided further, That using the amounts designated under this title of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may enter into procurement contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements, for fuels management activities, and for training and monitoring associated with such fuels management activities on Federal land, or on adjacent non-Federal land for activities that benefit resources on Federal land: Provided further, That the costs of implementing any cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and any non-Federal entity may be shared, as mutually agreed on by the affected parties: Provided further, That notwithstanding requirements of the Competition in Contracting Act, the Secretary, for purposes of fuels management activities, may obtain maximum practicable competition among: (1) local private, nonprofit, or cooperative entities; (2) Youth Conservation Corps crews, Public Lands Corps (Public Law 109–154), or related partnerships with State, local, or nonprofit youth groups; (3) small or micro-businesses; or (4) other entities that will hire or train locally a significant percentage, defined as 50 percent or more, of the project workforce to complete such contracts: Provided further, That in implementing this section, the Secretary shall develop written guidance to field units to ensure accountability and consistent application of the authorities provided herein: Provided further, That funds appropriated under this heading may be used to reimburse the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service for the costs of carrying out their responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) to consult and conference, as required by section 7 of such Act, in connection with wildland fire management activities: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior may use wildland fire appropriations to enter into leases of real property with local governments, at or below fair market value, to construct capitalized improvements for fire facilities on such leased properties, including but not limited to fire guard stations, retardant stations, and other initial attack and fire support facilities, and to make advance payments for any such lease or for construction activity associated with the lease: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the transfer of funds appropriated for wildland fire management, in an aggregate amount not to exceed $50,000,000, between the Departments when such transfers would facilitate and expedite wildland fire management programs and projects: Provided further, That funds provided for wildfire suppression shall be available for support of Federal emergency response actions: Provided further, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for assistance to or through the Department of State in connection with forest and rangeland research, technical information, and assistance in foreign countries, and, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, shall be available to support forestry, wildland fire management, and related natural resource activities outside the United States and its territories and possessions, including technical assistance, education and training, and cooperation with United States and international organizations.

CENTRAL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS FUND

For necessary expenses of the Department of the Interior and any of its component offices and bureaus for the response action, including associated activities, performed pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), $10,010,000, to remain available until expended.

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT AND RESTORATION

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT FUND

To conduct natural resource damage assessment, restoration activities, and onshore oil spill preparedness by the Department of the Interior necessary to carry out the provisions of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), and 54 U.S.C. 100721 et seq., $7,767,000, to remain available until expended.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For the operation and maintenance of a departmental financial and business management system, information technology improvements of general benefit to the Department, cybersecurity, and the consolidation of facilities and operations throughout the Department, $58,778,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act or any other Act may be used to establish reserves in the Working Capital Fund account other than for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment without prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided further, That the Secretary may assess reasonable charges to State, local and tribal government employees for training services provided by the National Indian Program Training Center, other than training related to Public Law 93–638: Provided further, That the Secretary may lease or otherwise provide space and related facilities, equipment or professional services of the National Indian Program Training Center to State, local and tribal government employees or persons or organizations engaged in cultural, educational, or recreational activities (as defined in section 3306(a) of title 40, United States Code) at the prevailing rate for similar space, facilities, equipment, or services in the vicinity of the National Indian Program Training Center: Provided further, That all funds received pursuant to the two preceding provisos shall be credited to this account, shall be available until expended, and shall be used by the Secretary for necessary expenses of the National Indian Program Training Center: Provided further, That the Secretary may enter into grants and cooperative agreements to support the Office of Natural Resource Revenue's collection and disbursement of royalties, fees, and other mineral revenue proceeds, as authorized by law.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

There is hereby authorized for acquisition from available resources within the Working Capital Fund, aircraft which may be obtained by donation, purchase or through available excess surplus property: Provided, That existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft.

OFFICE OF NATURAL RESOURCES REVENUE

For necessary expenses for management of the collection and disbursement of royalties, fees, and other mineral revenue proceeds, and for grants and cooperative agreements, as authorized by law, $137,505,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020; of which $41,727,000 shall remain available until expended for the purpose of mineral revenue management activities: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, $15,000 shall be available for refunds of overpayments in connection with certain Indian leases in which the Secretary concurred with the claimed refund due, to pay amounts owed to Indian allottees or tribes, or to correct prior unrecoverable erroneous payments.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

For necessary expenses for payments authorized by chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, $500,000,000 shall be available for fiscal year 2019.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

EMERGENCY TRANSFER AUTHORITY—INTRA-BUREAU

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: Provided, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted: Provided further, That all funds used pursuant to this section must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation, which must be requested as promptly as possible.

EMERGENCY TRANSFER AUTHORITY—DEPARTMENT-WIDE

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer of any no year appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of wildland fires on or threatening lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; for the emergency rehabilitation of burned-over lands under its jurisdiction; for emergency actions related to potential or actual earthquakes, floods, volcanoes, storms, or other unavoidable causes; for contingency planning subsequent to actual oil spills; for response and natural resource damage assessment activities related to actual oil spills or releases of hazardous substances into the environment; for the prevention, suppression, and control of actual or potential grasshopper and Mormon cricket outbreaks on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, pursuant to the authority in section 417(b) of Public Law 106–224 (7 U.S.C. 7717(b)); for emergency reclamation projects under section 410 of Public Law 95–87; and shall transfer, from any no year funds available to the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, such funds as may be necessary to permit assumption of regulatory authority in the event a primacy State is not carrying out the regulatory provisions of the Surface Mining Act: Provided, That appropriations made in this title for wildland fire operations shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft, or other equipment in connection with their use for wildland fire operations, with such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of

receipt thereof: Provided further, That for wildland fire operations, no funds shall be made available under this authority until the Secretary determines that funds appropriated for ''wildland fire suppression'' shall be exhausted within 30 days: Provided further, That all funds used pursuant to this section must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation, which must be requested as promptly as possible: Provided further, That such replenishment funds shall be used to reimburse, on a pro rata basis, accounts from which emergency funds were transferred.

AUTHORIZED USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 103. Appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in this title shall be available for services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, when authorized by the Secretary, in total amount not to exceed $500,000; purchase and replacement of motor vehicles, including specially equipped law enforcement vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

AUTHORIZED USE OF FUNDS, INDIAN TRUST MANAGEMENT

SEC. 104. Appropriations made in this Act under the headings Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education, and Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians and any unobligated balances from prior appropriations Acts made under the same headings shall be available for expenditure or transfer for Indian trust management and reform activities. Total funding for historical accounting activities shall not exceed amounts specifically designated in this Act for such purpose.

REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

SEC. 105. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to redistribute any Tribal Priority Allocation funds, including tribal base funds, to alleviate tribal funding inequities by transferring funds to address identified, unmet needs, dual enrollment, overlapping service areas or inaccurate distribution methodologies. No tribe shall receive a reduction in Tribal Priority Allocation funds of more than 10 percent in fiscal year 2019. Under circumstances of dual enrollment, overlapping service areas or inaccurate distribution methodologies, the 10 percent limitation does not apply.

ELLIS, GOVERNORS, AND LIBERTY ISLANDS

SEC. 106. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire lands, waters, or interests therein including the use of all or part of any pier, dock, or landing within the State of New York and the State of New Jersey, for the purpose of operating and maintaining facilities in the support of transportation and accommodation of visitors to Ellis, Governors, and Liberty Islands, and of other program and administrative activities, by donation or with appropriated funds, including franchise fees (and other monetary consideration), or by exchange; and the Secretary is authorized to negotiate and enter into leases, subleases, concession contracts or other agreements for the use of such facilities on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine reasonable.

OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF INSPECTION FEES

SEC. 107. (a) In fiscal year 2019, the Secretary shall collect a nonrefundable inspection fee, which shall be deposited in the ''Offshore Safety and Environmental Enforcement'' account, from the designated operator for facilities subject to inspection under 43 U.S.C. 1348(c).

(b) Annual fees shall be collected for facilities that are above the waterline, excluding drilling rigs, and are in place at the start of the fiscal year. Fees for fiscal year 2019 shall be:

(1) $10,500 for facilities with no wells, but with processing equipment or gathering lines;

(2) $17,000 for facilities with 1 to 10 wells, with any combination of active or inactive wells; and

(3) $31,500 for facilities with more than 10 wells, with any combination of active or inactive wells.

(c) Fees for drilling rigs shall be assessed for all inspections completed in fiscal year 2019. Fees for fiscal year 2019 shall be:

(1) $30,500 per inspection for rigs operating in water depths of 500 feet or more; and

(2) $16,700 per inspection for rigs operating in water depths of less than 500 feet.

(d) The Secretary shall bill designated operators under subsection (b) within 60 days, with payment required within 30 days of billing. The Secretary shall bill designated operators under subsection (c) within 30 days of the end of the month in which the inspection occurred, with payment required within 30 days of billing.

BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT, REGULATION AND ENFORCEMENT REORGANIZATION

SEC. 108. The Secretary of the Interior, in order to implement a reorganization of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement, may transfer funds among and between the successor offices and bureaus affected by the reorganization only in conformance with the reprogramming guidelines described in the report accompanying this Act.

CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS FOR WILD HORSE AND BURRO HOLDING FACILITIES

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may enter into multiyear cooperative agreements with nonprofit organizations and other appropriate entities, and may enter into multiyear contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 3903 of title 41, United States Code (except that the 5-year term restriction in subsection (a) shall not apply), for the long-term care and maintenance of excess wild free roaming horses and burros by such organizations or entities on private land. Such cooperative agreements and contracts may not exceed 10 years, subject to renewal at the discretion of the Secretary.

MASS MARKING OF SALMONIDS

SEC. 110. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall, in carrying out its responsibilities to protect threatened and endangered species of salmon, implement a system of mass marking of salmonid stocks, intended for harvest, that are released from federally operated or federally financed hatcheries including but not limited to fish releases of coho, chinook, and steelhead species. Marked fish must have a visible mark that can be readily identified by commercial and recreational fishers.

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

SEC. 111. Paragraph (1) of section 122(a) of division E of Public Law 112–74 (125 Stat. 1013) is amended by striking ''fiscal years 2012 through 2022,'' in the first sentence and inserting ''fiscal year 2012 and each fiscal year thereafter,''.

CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS WITH INDIAN AFFAIRS

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 2019, in carrying out work involving cooperation with State, local, and tribal governments or any political subdivision thereof, Indian Affairs may record obligations against accounts receivable from any such entities, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available at the end of the fiscal year.

HUMANE TRANSFER OF EXCESS ANIMALS

SEC. 113. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may transfer excess wild horses or burros that have been removed from the public lands to other Federal, State, and local government agencies for use as work animals: Provided, That the Secretary may make any such transfer immediately upon request of such Federal, State, or local government agency: Provided further, That any excess animal transferred under this provision shall lose its status as a wild free-roaming horse or burro as defined in the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act: Provided further, That any Federal, State, or local government agency receiving excess wild horses or burros as authorized in this section shall not: destroy the horses or burros in a way that results in their destruction into commercial products; sell or otherwise transfer the horses or burros in a way that results in their destruction for processing into commercial products; or euthanize the horses or burros except upon the recommendation of a licensed veterinarian, in cases of severe injury, illness, or advanced age.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR EXPERIENCED SERVICES PROGRAM

SEC. 114. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to Federal grants and cooperative agreements, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make grants to, or enter into cooperative agreements with, private nonprofit organizations designated by the Secretary of Labor under title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 to utilize the talents of older Americans in programs authorized by other provisions of law administered by the Secretary and consistent with such provisions of law.

(b) Prior to awarding any grant or agreement under subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that the agreement would not—

(1) result in the displacement of individuals currently employed by the Department, including partial displacement through reduction of non-overtime hours, wages, or employment benefits;

(2) result in the use of an individual under the Department of the Interior Experienced Services Program for a job or function in a case in which a Federal employee is in a layoff status from the same or substantially equivalent job within the Department; or

(3) affect existing contracts for services.

SAGE-GROUSE

SEC. 115. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to write or issue pursuant to section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533)—

(1) a proposed rule for greater sage-grouse (Centrocercus urophasianus);

(2) a proposed rule for the Columbia basin distinct population segment of greater sage-grouse; or

(3) a final rule for the Bi-State distinct population segment of greater sage-grouse.

REISSUANCE OF FINAL RULES

SEC. 116. (a) The final rule published on September 10, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 55530) that was reinstated on March 3, 2017, by the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (No. 14-5300) and further republished on May 1, 2017 (82 Fed. Reg. 20284) that reinstates the removal of Federal protections for the gray wolf in Wyoming under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and this subsection, shall not be subject to judicial review.

(b) Before the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall reissue the final rule published on December 28, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 81666), without regard to any other provision of statute or regulation that applies to issuance of such rule. Such reissuance (including this subsection) shall not be subject to judicial review.

GRAY WOLVES RANGE-WIDE

SEC. 117. (a) Not later than the end of fiscal year 2019, and except as provided in subsection

(b), the Secretary of the Interior shall issue a rule to remove the gray wolf (Canis lupus) in each of the 48 contiguous States of the United States and the District of Columbia from the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife in section 17.11 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, without regard to any other provision of statute or regulation that applies to issuance of such rule.

(b) Such issuance (including this section)—

(1) shall not be subject to judicial review; and

(2) shall not affect the inclusion of the subspecies classified as the Mexican gray wolf (Canis lupus baileyi) of the species gray wolf (Canis lupus) in such list.

TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY

SEC. 118. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to enforce, refer for enforcement, or to assist any other agency in enforcing section 251 of title 25, United States Code.

CONTRIBUTION AUTHORITY

SEC. 119. Section 113 of Division G of Public Law 113–76 is amended by striking ''2019,'' and inserting ''2024,''.

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN HISTORIC DESIGNATION

SEC. 120. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to make a determination of eligibility or to list the Trestles Historic District, San Diego County, California, on the National Register of Historic Places.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE RETITLED; PAUL H. DOUGLAS TRAIL REDESIGNATION

SEC. 121. (a) INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKE SHORE RETITLED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Public Law 89–761 (16 U.S.C. 460u et seq.) is amended—

(A) by striking ''National Lakeshore'' and ''national lakeshore'' each place it appears and inserting ''National Park''; and

(B) by striking ''lakeshore'' each place it appears and inserting ''Park''.

(2) NONAPPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to—

(A) the title of the map referred to in the first section of Public Law 89–761 (16 U.S.C. 460u); and

(B) the title of the maps referred to in section 4 of Public Law 89–761 (16 U.S.C. 460u–3).

(b) PAUL H. DOUGLAS TRAIL REDESIGNATION.—The 1.6 mile trail within the Indiana Dunes National Park designated the ''Miller-Woods Trail'' is hereby redesignated as the ''Paul H. Douglas Trail''.

RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS RELATED TO WATER RIGHTS

SEC. 122. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used—

(1) to condition the issuance, renewal, amendment, or extension of any permit, approval, license, lease, allotment, easement, right-of-way, or other land use or occupancy agreement on the transfer of any water right, including sole and joint ownership, directly to the United States, or any impairment of title, in whole or in part, granted or otherwise recognized under State law, by Federal or State adjudication, decree, or other judgment, or pursuant to any interstate water compact; or

(2) to require any water user to apply for or acquire a water right in the name of the United States under State law as a condition of the issuance, renewal, amendment, or extension of any permit, approval, license, lease, allotment, easement, right-of-way, or other land use or occupancy agreement.

TITLE II

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For science and technology, including research and development activities, which shall include research and development activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980; necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses; procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; and other operating expenses in support of research and development, $651,113,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That of the funds included under this heading, $4,100,000 shall be for Research: National Priorities as specified in the report accompanying this Act: Provided further, That of unobligated balances from appropriations made available under this heading, $7,350,000 are permanently rescinded.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For environmental programs and management, including necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for personnel and related costs and travel expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; administrative costs of the brownfields program under the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2002; implementation of a coal combustion residual permit program under section 2301 of the Water and Waste Act of 2016; and not to exceed $19,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $2,473,282,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That of the amounts provided under this heading, the Chemical Risk Review and Reduction program project shall be allocated for this fiscal year, excluding the amount of any fees made available, not less than the amount of appropriations for that program project for fiscal year 2014: Provided further, That of the funds included under this heading, $12,700,000 shall be for Environmental Protection: National Priorities as specified in the report accompanying this Act: Provided further, That of the funds included under this heading, $434,857,000 shall be for Geographic Programs specified in the report accompanying this Act: Provided further, That of the unobligated balances from appropriations made available under this heading, $40,000,000 are permanently rescinded.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $41,489,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, $39,553,000, to remain available until expended.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), including sections 111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611) $1,127,090,000, to remain available until expended, consisting of such sums as are available in the Trust Fund on September 30, 2018, as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA) and up to $1,127,090,000 as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for purposes as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA: Provided, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $8,778,000 shall be paid to the ''Office of Inspector General'' appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2020, and $15,496,000 shall be paid to the ''Science and Technology'' appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2020.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, $91,941,000, to remain available until expended, of which $66,572,000 shall be for carrying out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act; $25,369,000 shall be for carrying out the other provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act specified in section 9508(c) of the Internal Revenue Code: Provided, That the Administrator is authorized to use appropriations made available under this heading to implement section 9013 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide financial assistance to federally recognized Indian tribes for the development and implementation of programs to manage underground storage tanks.

INLAND OIL SPILL PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $18,209,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For environmental programs and infrastructure assistance, including capitalization grants for State revolving funds and performance partnership grants, $3,588,161,000, to remain available until expended, of which—

(1) $1,393,887,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and of which $863,233,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act: Provided, That for fiscal year 2019, funds made available under this title to each State for Clean Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants and for Drinking Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants may, at the discretion of each State, be used for projects to address green infrastructure, water or energy efficiency improvements, or other environmentally innovative activities: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 603(d)(7) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the limitation on the amounts in a State water pollution control revolving fund that may be used by a State to administer the fund shall not apply to amounts included as principal in loans made by such fund in fiscal year 2019 and prior years where such amounts represent costs of administering the fund to the extent that such amounts are or were deemed reasonable by the Administrator, accounted for separately from other assets in the fund, and used for eligible purposes of the fund, including administration: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2019, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (g)(1), (h), and (l) of section 201 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, grants made under title II of such Act for American Samoa, Guam, the commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, the United States Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia may also be made for the purpose of providing assistance: (1) solely for facility plans, design activities, or plans, specifications, and estimates for any proposed project for the construction of treatment works; and (2) for the construction, repair, or replacement of privately owned treatment works serving one or more principal residences or small commercial establishments: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2019, notwithstanding the provisions of such subsections (g)(1), (h), and (l) of section 201 and section 518(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, funds reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act may also be used to provide assistance: (1) solely for facility

plans, design activities, or plans, specifications, and estimates for any proposed project for the construction of treatment works; and (2) for the construction, repair, or replacement of privately owned treatment works serving one or more principal residences or small commercial establishments: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2019, notwithstanding any provision of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and regulations issued pursuant thereof, up to a total of $2,000,000 of the funds reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) of such Act may also be used for grants for training, technical assistance, and educational programs relating to the operation and management of the treatment works specified in section 518(c) of such Act: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2019, funds reserved under section 518(c) of such Act shall be available for grants only to Indian tribes, as defined in section 518(h) of such Act and former Indian reservations in Oklahoma (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior) and Native Villages as defined in Public Law 92–203: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2019, notwithstanding the limitation on amounts in section 518(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, up to a total of 2 percent of the funds appropriated, or $30,000,000, whichever is greater, and notwithstanding the limitation on amounts in section 1452(i) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, up to a total of 2 percent of the funds appropriated, or $20,000,000, whichever is greater, for State Revolving Funds under such Acts may be reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) and section 1452(i) of such Acts: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2019, notwithstanding the amounts specified in section 205(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, up to 1.5 percent of the aggregate funds appropriated for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund program under the Act less any sums reserved under section 518(c) of the Act, may be reserved by the Administrator for grants made under title II of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, and United States Virgin Islands: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2019, notwithstanding the limitations on amounts specified in section 1452(j) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, up to 1.5 percent of the funds appropriated for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund programs under the Safe Drinking Water Act may be reserved by the Administrator for grants made under section 1452(j) of the Safe Drinking Water Act: Provided further, That 10 percent of the funds made available under this title to each State for Clean Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants and 20 percent of the funds made available under this title to each State for Drinking Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants shall be used by the State to provide additional subsidy to eligible recipients in the form of forgiveness of principal, negative interest loans, or grants (or any combination of these), and shall be so used by the State only where such funds are provided as initial financing for an eligible recipient or to buy, refinance, or restructure the debt obligations of eligible recipients only where such debt was incurred on or after the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) $10,000,000 shall be for architectural, engineering, planning, design, construction and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority water and wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border commission: Provided, That no funds provided by this appropriations Act to address the water, wastewater and other critical infrastructure needs of the colonias in the United States along the United States-Mexico border shall be made available to a county or municipal government unless that government has established an enforceable local ordinance, or other zoning rule, which prevents in that jurisdiction the development or construction of any additional colonia areas, or the development within an existing colonia the construction of any new home, business, or other structure which lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure;

(3) $20,000,000 shall be for grants to the State of Alaska to address drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages: Provided, That of these funds: (A) the State of Alaska shall provide a match of 25 percent; (B) no more than 5 percent of the funds may be used for administrative and overhead expenses; and (C) the State of Alaska shall make awards consistent with the Statewide priority list established in conjunction with the Agency and the U.S. Department of Agriculture for all water, sewer, waste disposal, and similar projects carried out by the State of Alaska that are funded under section 221 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1301) or the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) which shall allocate not less than 25 percent of the funds provided for projects in regional hub communities;

(4) $80,000,000 shall be to carry out section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), including grants, interagency agreements, and associated program support costs: Provided, That not more than 25 percent of the amount appropriated to carry out section 104(k) of CERCLA shall be used for site characterization, assessment, and remediation of facilities described in section 101(39)(D)(ii)(II) of CERCLA: Provided further, That at least 10 percent shall be allocated for assistance in persistent poverty counties: Provided further That for purposes of this section, the term ''persistent poverty counties'' means any county that has had 20 percent or more of its population living in poverty over the past 30 years, as measured by the 1990 and 2000 decennial censuses and the most recent Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates;

(5) $100,000,000 shall be for grants under title VII, subtitle G of the Energy Policy Act of 2005;

(6) $55,000,000 shall be for targeted airshed grants in accordance with the terms and conditions in the explanatory statement described in section 4 (in the matter preceding division A of this consolidated Act);

(7) $1,066,041,000 shall be for grants, including associated program support costs, to States, federally recognized tribes, interstate agencies, tribal consortia, and air pollution control agencies for multi-media or single media pollution prevention, control and abatement and related activities, including activities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this heading in Public Law 104–134, and for making grants under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for particulate matter monitoring and data collection activities subject to terms and conditions specified by the Administrator, of which: $47,745,000 shall be for carrying out section 128 of CERCLA; $9,646,000 shall be for Environmental Information Exchange Network grants, including associated program support costs; $1,498,000 shall be for grants to States under section 2007(f)(2) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, which shall be in addition to funds appropriated under the heading ''Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund Program'' to carry out the provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act specified in section 9508(c) of the Internal Revenue Code other than section 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act; $17,848,000 of the funds available for grants under section 106 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act shall be for State participation in national- and State-level statistical surveys of water resources and enhancements to State monitoring programs.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE AND INNOVATION PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans and for the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014, $45,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, including capitalized interest, and total loan principal, including capitalized interest, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $5,488,000,000.

In addition, fees authorized to be collected pursuant to sections 5029 and 5030 of the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 shall be deposited in this account, to remain available until expended, for the purposes provided in such sections.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, notwithstanding section 5033 of the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014, $5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS AND RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For fiscal year 2019, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 6303(1) and 6305(1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in carrying out the Agency's function to implement directly Federal environmental programs required or authorized by law in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, may award cooperative agreements to federally recognized Indian tribes or Intertribal consortia, if authorized by their member tribes, to assist the Administrator in implementing Federal environmental programs for Indian tribes required or authorized by law, except that no such cooperative agreements may be awarded from funds designated for State financial assistance agreements.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to collect and obligate pesticide registration service fees in accordance with section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended by Public Law 112–177, the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2012.

Notwithstanding section 33(d)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(d)(2)), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may assess fees under section 33 of FIFRA (7 U.S.C. 136w–8) for fiscal year 2019.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in addition to the activities specified in section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) (7 U.S.C. 136w–8), fees collected in this and prior fiscal years under such section shall be available for the following activities as they relate to pesticide licensing: processing and review of data submitted in association with a registration, information submitted pursuant to section 6(a)(2) of FIFRA, supplemental distributor labels, transfers of registrations and data compensation rights, additional uses registered by States under section 24(c) of FIFRA, data compensation petitions, review of minor amendments, and notifications; laboratory support and audits; administrative support; development of policy and guidance; rulemaking support; information collection activities; and the portions of salaries related to work in these areas.

The Administrator is authorized to transfer up to $300,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative under the heading ''Environmental Programs and Management'' to the head of any Federal department or agency, with the concurrence of such head, to carry out activities that would support the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement programs, projects, or activities; to enter into an interagency agreement with the head of such Federal department or agency to carry out these activities; and to make grants to governmental entities, nonprofit organizations, institutions,

and individuals for planning, research, monitoring, outreach, and implementation in furtherance of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to collect and obligate fees in accordance with section 26(b) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2625(b)) for fiscal year 2019.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to collect and obligate fees in accordance with section 3204 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6939g) for fiscal year 2019.

The Science and Technology, Environmental Programs and Management, Office of Inspector General, Hazardous Substance Superfund, and Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund Program Accounts, are available for the construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, provided that the cost does not exceed $150,000 per project.

For fiscal year 2019, and notwithstanding section 518(f) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1377(f)), the Administrator is authorized to use the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year under section 319 of the Act to make grants to Indian tribes pursuant to sections 319(h) and 518(e) of that Act.

Of the unobligated balances available for the ''State and Tribal Assistance Grants'' account, $75,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded: Provided, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Notwithstanding the limitations on amounts in section 320(i)(2)(B) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, not less than $1,500,000 of the funds made available under this title for the National Estuary Program shall be for making competitive awards described in section 320(g)(4).

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is not authorized to obligate or expend more than $50 of the funds made available under this title for the purchase of any individual fountain pen.

TITLE III

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, $875,000: Provided, That funds made available by this Act to any agency in the Natural Resources and Environment mission area for salaries and expenses are available to fund up to one administrative support staff for the office.

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses of forest and rangeland research as authorized by law, $297,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2020: Provided, That of the funds provided, $77,000,000 is for the forest inventory and analysis program.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For necessary expenses of cooperating with and providing technical and financial assistance to States, territories, possessions, and others, and for forest health management, and conducting an international program as authorized, $334,945,000, to remain available through September 30, 2020, as authorized by law; of which $48,445,000 is to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund to be used for the Forest Legacy Program, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, for management, protection, improvement, and utilization of the National Forest System, and for hazardous fuels management on or adjacent to such lands, $1,972,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2020: Provided, That of the funds provided, $40,000,000 shall be deposited in the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund for ecological restoration treatments as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 7303(f): Provided further, That of the funds provided, $380,000,000 shall be for forest products: Provided further, That of the funds provided, $450,000,000 shall be for hazardous fuels management activities, of which not to exceed $15,000,000 may be used to make grants, using any authorities available to the Forest Service under the ''State and Private Forestry'' appropriation, for the purpose of creating incentives for increased use of biomass from National Forest System lands: Provided further, That $15,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into procurement contracts or cooperative agreements or to issue grants for hazardous fuels management activities, and for training or monitoring associated with such hazardous fuels management activities on Federal land, or on non-Federal land if the Secretary determines such activities benefit resources on Federal land: Provided further, That funds made available to implement the Community Forestry Restoration Act, Public Law 106–393, title VI, shall be available for use on non-Federal lands in accordance with authorities made available to the Forest Service under the ''State and Private Forestry'' appropriations.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, $499,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2020, for construction, capital improvement, maintenance and acquisition of buildings and other facilities and infrastructure; and for construction, reconstruction, decommissioning of roads that are no longer needed, including unauthorized roads that are not part of the transportation system, and maintenance of forest roads and trails by the Forest Service as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 532–538 and 23 U.S.C. 101 and 205: Provided, That funds becoming available in fiscal year 2019 under the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501) shall be transferred to the General Fund of the Treasury and shall not be available for transfer or obligation for any other purpose unless the funds are appropriated.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the Forest Service, $34,761,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS SPECIAL ACTS

For acquisition of lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cache, Uinta, and Wasatch National Forests, Utah; the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; and the Angeles, San Bernardino, Sequoia, and Cleveland National Forests, California; and the Ozark-St. Francis and Ouachita National Forests, Arkansas; as authorized by law, $700,000, to be derived from forest receipts.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES

For acquisition of lands, such sums, to be derived from funds deposited by State, county, or municipal governments, public school districts, or other public school authorities, and for authorized expenditures from funds deposited by non-Federal parties pursuant to Land Sale and Exchange Acts, pursuant to the Act of December 4, 1967 (16 U.S.C. 484a), to remain available through September 30, 2020, (16 U.S.C. 516–617a, 555a; Public Law 96–586; Public Law 76–589, 76–591; and Public Law 78–310).

RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement, 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year, as fees for grazing domestic livestock on lands in National Forests in the 16 Western States, pursuant to section 401(b)(1) of Public Law 94–579, to remain available through September 30, 2020, of which not to exceed 6 percent shall be available for administrative expenses associated with on-the-ground range rehabilitation, protection, and improvements.

GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For expenses authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1643(b), $45,000, to remain available through September 30, 2020, to be derived from the fund established pursuant to the above Act.

MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS FOR SUBSISTENCE USES

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service to manage Federal lands in Alaska for subsistence uses under title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3111 et seq.), $1,850,000, to remain available through September 30, 2020.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for forest fire presuppression activities on National Forest System lands, for emergency wildland fire suppression on or adjacent to such lands or other lands under fire protection agreement, and for emergency rehabilitation of burned-over National Forest System lands and water, $3,004,986,000, to remain available through September 30, 2020: Provided, That such funds including unobligated balances under this heading, are available for repayment of advances from other appropriations accounts previously transferred for such purposes: Provided further, That any unobligated funds appropriated in a previous fiscal year for hazardous fuels management may be transferred to the ''National Forest System'' account: Provided further, That such funds shall be available to reimburse State and other cooperating entities for services provided in response to wildfire and other emergencies or disasters to the extent such reimbursements by the Forest Service for non-fire emergencies are fully repaid by the responsible emergency management agency: Provided further, That funds provided shall be available for support to Federal emergency response: Provided further, That the costs of implementing any cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and any non-Federal entity may be shared, as mutually agreed on by the affected parties: Provided further, That funds designated for wildfire suppression shall be assessed for cost pools on the same basis as such assessments are calculated against other agency programs.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FOREST SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (1) purchase of passenger motor vehicles; acquisition of passenger motor vehicles from excess sources, and hire of such vehicles; purchase, lease, operation, maintenance, and acquisition of aircraft to maintain the operable fleet for use in Forest Service wildland fire programs and other Forest Service programs; notwithstanding other provisions of law, existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft; (2) services pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2225, and not to exceed $100,000

for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; (3) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (7 U.S.C. 2250); (4) acquisition of land, waters, and interests therein pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 428a; (5) for expenses pursuant to the Volunteers in the National Forest Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 558a, 558d, and 558a note); (6) the cost of uniforms as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; and (7) for debt collection contracts in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3718(c).

Any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be transferred to the Wildland Fire Management appropriation for forest firefighting, emergency rehabilitation of burned-over or damaged lands or waters under its jurisdiction, and fire preparedness due to severe burning conditions upon the Secretary's notification of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that all fire suppression funds appropriated under the heading ''Wildland Fire Management'' will be obligated within 30 days: Provided, That all funds used pursuant to this paragraph must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation which must be requested as promptly as possible.

Not more than $50,000,000 of funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for expenditure or transfer to the Department of the Interior for wildland fire management, hazardous fuels management, and State fire assistance when such transfers would facilitate and expedite wildland fire management programs and projects.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Forest Service may transfer unobligated balances of discretionary funds appropriated to the Forest Service by this Act to or within the National Forest System Account, or reprogram funds to be used for the purposes of hazardous fuels management and urgent rehabilitation of burned-over National Forest System lands and water, such transferred funds shall remain available through September 30, 2020: Provided, That none of the funds transferred pursuant to this section shall be available for obligation without written notification to and the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress: Provided further, That this section does not apply to funds derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for assistance to or through the Agency for International Development in connection with forest and rangeland research, technical information, and assistance in foreign countries, and shall be available to support forestry and related natural resource activities outside the United States and its territories and possessions, including technical assistance, education and training, and cooperation with U.S., private, and international organizations. The Forest Service, acting for the International Program, may sign direct funding agreements with foreign governments and institutions as well as other domestic agencies (including the U.S. Agency for International Development, the Department of State, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation), U.S. private sector firms, institutions and organizations to provide technical assistance and training programs overseas on forestry and rangeland management.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for expenditure or transfer to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, for removal, preparation, and adoption of excess wild horses and burros from National Forest System lands, and for the performance of cadastral surveys to designate the boundaries of such lands.

None of the funds made available to the Forest Service in this Act or any other Act with respect to any fiscal year shall be subject to transfer under the provisions of section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257), section 442 of Public Law 106–224 (7 U.S.C. 7772), or section 10417(b) of Public Law 107–171 (7 U.S.C. 8316(b)).

None of the funds available to the Forest Service may be reprogrammed without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the reprogramming procedures contained in the report accompanying this Act.

Not more than $82,000,000 of funds available to the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund of the Department of Agriculture and not more than $14,500,000 of funds available to the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Department of Agriculture for Department Reimbursable Programs, commonly referred to as Greenbook charges. Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit or limit the use of reimbursable agreements requested by the Forest Service in order to obtain services from the Department of Agriculture's National Information Technology Center and the Department of Agriculture's International Technology Service.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, up to $5,000,000 shall be available for priority projects within the scope of the approved budget, which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps and shall be carried out under the authority of the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1721 et seq.).

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, $4,000 is available to the Chief of the Forest Service for official reception and representation expenses.

Pursuant to sections 405(b) and 410(b) of Public Law 101–593, of the funds available to the Forest Service, up to $3,000,000 may be advanced in a lump sum to the National Forest Foundation to aid conservation partnership projects in support of the Forest Service mission, without regard to when the Foundation incurs expenses, for projects on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: Provided, That of the Federal funds made available to the Foundation, no more than $300,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: Provided further, That the Foundation shall obtain, by the end of the period of Federal financial assistance, private contributions to match funds made available by the Forest Service on at least a one-for-one basis: Provided further, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a Federal or a non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for interactions with and providing technical assistance to rural communities and natural resource-based businesses for sustainable rural development purposes.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for payments to counties within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, pursuant to section 14(c)(1) and (2), and section 16(a)(2) of Public Law 99–663.

Any funds appropriated to the Forest Service may be used to meet the non-Federal share requirement in section 502(c) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056(c)(2)).

The Forest Service shall not assess funds for the purpose of performing fire, administrative, and other facilities maintenance and decommissioning.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service, not to exceed $500,000 may be used to reimburse the Office of the General Counsel (OGC), Department of Agriculture, for travel and related expenses incurred as a result of OGC assistance or participation requested by the Forest Service at meetings, training sessions, management reviews, land purchase negotiations and similar matters unrelated to civil litigation. Future budget justifications for both the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture should clearly display the sums previously transferred and the sums requested for transfer.

An eligible individual who is employed in any project funded under title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.) and administered by the Forest Service shall be considered to be a Federal employee for purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, through the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, the Forest Service shall report no later than 30 business days following the close of each fiscal quarter all current and prior year unobligated balances, by fiscal year, budget line item and account, to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry out the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Indian Health Service, $4,202,639,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, except as otherwise provided herein, together with payments received during the fiscal year pursuant to sections 231(b) and 233 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 238(b), 238b), for services furnished by the Indian Health Service: Provided, That funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through contracts, grant agreements, or any other agreements or compacts authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), shall be deemed to be obligated at the time of the grant or contract award and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: Provided further, That $2,000,000 shall be available for grants or contracts with public or private institutions to provide alcohol or drug treatment services to Indians, including alcohol detoxification services: Provided further, That $964,819,000 for Purchased/Referred Care, including $53,000,000 for the Indian Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund, shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That of the funds provided, up to $55,700,000 shall remain available until expended for implementation of the loan repayment program under section 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act: Provided further, That of the funds provided, $18,000,000 shall remain available until expended to supplement funds available for operational costs at tribal clinics operated under an Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act compact or contract where health care is delivered in space acquired through a full service lease, which is not eligible for maintenance and improvement and equipment funds from the Indian Health Service, and $58,000,000 shall be for costs related to or resulting from accreditation emergencies, of which up to $4,000,000 may be used to supplement amounts otherwise available for Purchased/Referred Care: Provided further, That the amounts collected by the Federal Government as authorized by sections 104 and 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613a and 1616a) during the preceding fiscal year for breach of contracts shall be deposited to the Fund authorized by section 108A of that Act (25 U.S.C. 1616a–1) and shall remain available until expended and, notwithstanding section 108A(c) of that Act (25 U.S.C. 1616a–1(c)), funds shall be available to make new awards under the loan repayment and scholarship programs under sections 104 and 108 of that Act (25 U.S.C. 1613a and 1616a): Provided further, That the amounts made available within this account for the Substance Abuse and Suicide Prevention Program, for the Domestic Violence Prevention Program, for the Zero Suicide Initiative, for the housing subsidy authority for civilian employees, for aftercare pilot programs at Youth Regional Treatment Centers, to improve collections from public and private insurance at Indian Health Service and tribally operated facilities, and for accreditation emergencies

shall be allocated at the discretion of the Director of the Indian Health Service and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That funds provided in this Act may be used for annual contracts and grants for which the performance period falls within 2 fiscal years, provided the total obligation is recorded in the year the funds are appropriated: Provided further, That the amounts collected by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under the authority of title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall remain available until expended for the purpose of achieving compliance with the applicable conditions and requirements of titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act, except for those related to the planning, design, or construction of new facilities: Provided further, That funding contained herein for scholarship programs under the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That amounts received by tribes and tribal organizations under title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall be reported and accounted for and available to the receiving tribes and tribal organizations until expended: Provided further, That the Bureau of Indian Affairs may collect from the Indian Health Service, and from tribes and tribal organizations operating health facilities pursuant to Public Law 93–638, such individually identifiable health information relating to disabled children as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out its functions under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.): Provided further, That of the funds provided, $125,666,000 is for the Indian Health Care Improvement Fund and may be used, as needed, to carry out activities typically funded under the Indian Health Facilities account: Provided further, That the accreditation emergency funds may be used, as needed, to carry out activities typically funded under the Indian Health Facilities account.

CONTRACT SUPPORT COSTS

For payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract support costs associated with Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act agreements with the Indian Health Service for fiscal year 2019, such sums as may be necessary, which shall be available for obligation through September 30, 2020: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, no amounts made available under this heading shall be available for transfer to another budget account.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, repair, maintenance, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites, purchase and erection of modular buildings, and purchases of trailers; and for provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a), the Indian Self-Determination Act, and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and for expenses necessary to carry out such Acts and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health and facilities support activities of the Indian Health Service, $882,748,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for the planning, design, construction, renovation or expansion of health facilities for the benefit of an Indian tribe or tribes may be used to purchase land on which such facilities will be located: Provided further, That not to exceed $500,000 may be used by the Indian Health Service to purchase TRANSAM equipment from the Department of Defense for distribution to the Indian Health Service and tribal facilities: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service may be used for sanitation facilities construction for new homes funded with grants by the housing programs of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development: Provided further, That not to exceed $2,700,000 from this account and the ''Indian Health Services'' account may be used by the Indian Health Service to obtain ambulances for the Indian Health Service and tribal facilities in conjunction with an existing interagency agreement between the Indian Health Service and the General Services Administration: Provided further, That not to exceed $500,000 may be placed in a Demolition Fund, to remain available until expended, and be used by the Indian Health Service for the demolition of Federal buildings.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations provided in this Act to the Indian Health Service shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 at rates not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior-level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of medical equipment; purchase of reprints; purchase, renovation and erection of modular buildings and renovation of existing facilities; payments for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary of Health and Human Services; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; and for expenses of attendance at meetings that relate to the functions or activities of the Indian Health Service: Provided, That in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, non-Indian patients may be extended health care at all tribally administered or Indian Health Service facilities, subject to charges, and the proceeds along with funds recovered under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651–2653) shall be credited to the account of the facility providing the service and shall be available without fiscal year limitation: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other law or regulation, funds transferred from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Indian Health Service shall be administered under Public Law 86–121, the Indian Sanitation Facilities Act and Public Law 93–638: Provided further, That funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service in this Act, except those used for administrative and program direction purposes, shall not be subject to limitations directed at curtailing Federal travel and transportation: Provided further, That none of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used for any assessments or charges by the Department of Health and Human Services unless identified in the budget justification and provided in this Act, or approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations through the reprogramming process: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds previously or herein made available to a tribe or tribal organization through a contract, grant, or agreement authorized by title I or title V of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 5321 et seq. (title I), 5381 et seq. (title V)), may be deobligated and reobligated to a self-determination contract under title I, or a self-governance agreement under title V of such Act and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: Provided further, That none of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used to implement the final rule published in the Federal Register on September 16, 1987, by the Department of Health and Human Services, relating to the eligibility for the health care services of the Indian Health Service until the Indian Health Service has submitted a budget request reflecting the increased costs associated with the proposed final rule, and such request has been included in an appropriations Act and enacted into law: Provided further, That with respect to functions transferred by the Indian Health Service to tribes or tribal organizations, the Indian Health Service is authorized to provide goods and services to those entities on a reimbursable basis, including payments in advance with subsequent adjustment, and the reimbursements received therefrom, along with the funds received from those entities pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act, may be credited to the same or subsequent appropriation account from which the funds were originally derived, with such amounts to remain available until expended: Provided further, That reimbursements for training, technical assistance, or services provided by the Indian Health Service will contain total costs, including direct, administrative, and overhead costs associated with the provision of goods, services, or technical assistance: Provided further, That the Indian Health Service may provide to civilian medical personnel serving in hospitals operated by the Indian Health Service housing allowances equivalent to those that would be provided to members of the Commissioned Corps of the United States Public Health Service serving in similar positions at such hospitals: Provided further, That the appropriation structure for the Indian Health Service may not be altered without advance notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For necessary expenses for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in carrying out activities set forth in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9660(a)) and section 126(g) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, $80,000,000.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH

For necessary expenses for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) in carrying out activities set forth in sections 104(i) and 111(c)(4) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) and section 3019 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, $62,000,000: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in lieu of performing a health assessment under section 104(i)(6) of CERCLA, the Administrator of ATSDR may conduct other appropriate health studies, evaluations, or activities, including, without limitation, biomedical testing, clinical evaluations, medical monitoring, and referral to accredited healthcare providers: Provided further, That in performing any such health assessment or health study, evaluation, or activity, the Administrator of ATSDR shall not be bound by the deadlines in section 104(i)(6)(A) of CERCLA: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for ATSDR to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during fiscal year 2019, and existing profiles may be updated as necessary.

OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For necessary expenses to continue functions assigned to the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1977, and not to exceed $750 for official reception and representation expenses, $2,994,000: Provided, That notwithstanding section 202 of

the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970, the Council shall consist of one member, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, serving as chairman and exercising all powers, functions, and duties of the Council.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in carrying out activities pursuant to section 112(r)(6) of the Clean Air Act, including hire of passenger vehicles, uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902, and for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376, $12,000,000: Provided, That the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (Board) shall have not more than three career Senior Executive Service positions: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the individual appointed to the position of Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) shall, by virtue of such appointment, also hold the position of Inspector General of the Board: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Inspector General of the Board shall utilize personnel of the Office of Inspector General of EPA in performing the duties of the Inspector General of the Board, and shall not appoint any individuals to positions within the Board.

OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation as authorized by Public Law 93–531, $4,750,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds provided in this or any other appropriations Act are to be used to relocate eligible individuals and groups including evictees from District 6, Hopi-partitioned lands residents, those in significantly substandard housing, and all others certified as eligible and not included in the preceding categories: Provided further, That none of the funds contained in this or any other Act may be used by the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation to evict any single Navajo or Navajo family who, as of November 30, 1985, was physically domiciled on the lands partitioned to the Hopi Tribe unless a new or replacement home is provided for such household: Provided further, That no relocatee will be provided with more than one new or replacement home: Provided further, That the Office shall relocate any certified eligible relocatees who have selected and received an approved homesite on the Navajo reservation or selected a replacement residence off the Navajo reservation or on the land acquired pursuant to section 11 of Public Law 93–531 (88 Stat. 1716).

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

PAYMENT TO THE INSTITUTE

For payment to the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development, as authorized by part A of title XV of Public Law 99–498 (20 U.S.C. 4411 et seq.), $9,960,000, which shall become available on July 1, 2019, and shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by law, including research in the fields of art, science, and history; development, preservation, and documentation of the National Collections; presentation of public exhibits and performances; collection, preparation, dissemination, and exchange of information and publications; conduct of education, training, and museum assistance programs; maintenance, alteration, operation, lease agreements of no more than 30 years, and protection of buildings, facilities, and approaches; not to exceed $100,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for employees, $737,944,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, except as otherwise provided herein; of which not to exceed $6,908,000 for the instrumentation program, collections acquisition, exhibition reinstallation, the National Museum of African American History and Culture, and the repatriation of skeletal remains program shall remain available until expended; and including such funds as may be necessary to support American overseas research centers: Provided, That funds appropriated herein are available for advance payments to independent contractors performing research services or participating in official Smithsonian presentations.

FACILITIES CAPITAL

For necessary expenses of repair, revitalization, and alteration of facilities owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institution, by contract or otherwise, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), and for construction, including necessary personnel, $317,500,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $10,000 shall be for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the upkeep and operations of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards, and uniforms, or allowances therefor, for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance, alteration, improvement, and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and purchase of services for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper, $141,790,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, of which not to exceed $3,640,000 for the special exhibition program shall remain available until expended.

REPAIR, RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of repair, restoration and renovation of buildings, grounds and facilities owned or occupied by the National Gallery of Art, by contract or otherwise, for operating lease agreements of no more than 10 years, with no extensions or renewals beyond the 10 years, that address space needs created by the ongoing renovations in the Master Facilities Plan, as authorized, $26,564,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and exterior repair or renovation of buildings of the National Gallery of Art may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses for the operation, maintenance and security of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, $24,490,000.

CAPITAL REPAIR AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses for capital repair and restoration of the existing features of the building and site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, $16,025,000, to remain available until expended.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 1356) including hire of passenger vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $12,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, $155,000,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts, including arts education and public outreach activities, through assistance to organizations and individuals pursuant to section 5 of the Act, for program support, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, $155,000,000 to remain available until expended, of which $143,700,000 shall be available for support of activities in the humanities, pursuant to section 7(c) of the Act and for administering the functions of the Act; and $11,300,000 shall be available to carry out the matching grants program pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Act, including $9,100,000 for the purposes of section 7(h): Provided, That appropriations for carrying out section 10(a)(2) shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, devises of money, and other property accepted by the chairman or by grantees of the National Endowment for the Humanities under the provisions of sections 11(a)(2)(B) and 11(a)(3)(B) during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

None of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used to process any grant or contract documents which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That funds from nonappropriated sources may be used as necessary for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts may approve grants of up to $10,000, if in the aggregate the amount of such grants does not exceed 5 percent of the sums appropriated for grantmaking purposes per year: Provided further, That such small grant actions are taken pursuant to the terms of an expressed and direct delegation of authority from the National Council on the Arts to the Chairperson.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Commission of Fine Arts under chapter 91 of title 40, United States Code, $2,771,000: Provided, That the Commission is authorized to charge fees to cover the full costs of its publications, and such fees shall be credited to this account as an offsetting collection, to remain available until expended without further

appropriation: Provided further, That the Commission is authorized to accept gifts, including objects, papers, artwork, drawings and artifacts, that pertain to the history and design of the Nation's Capital or the history and activities of the Commission of Fine Arts, for the purpose of artistic display, study, or education: Provided further, That one-tenth of one percent of the funds provided under this heading may be used for official reception and representation expenses.

NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses as authorized by Public Law 99–190 (20 U.S.C. 956a), $2,750,000.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Public Law 89–665), $6,440,000.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Capital Planning Commission under chapter 87 of title 40, United States Code, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $8,099,000: Provided, That one-quarter of 1 percent of the funds provided under this heading may be used for official reception and representational expenses associated with hosting international visitors engaged in the planning and physical development of world capitals.

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

For expenses of the Holocaust Memorial Museum, as authorized by Public Law 106–292 (36 U.S.C. 2301–2310), $58,000,000, of which $1,715,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2021, for the Museum's equipment replacement program; and of which $4,000,000 for the Museum's repair and rehabilitation program and $1,264,000 for the Museum's outreach initiatives program shall remain available until expended.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, $1,800,000, to remain available until expended.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Women's Suffrage Centennial Commission, as authorized by the Women's Suffrage Centennial Commission Act (section 431(a)(3) of division G of Public Law 115–31), $500,000, to remain available until expended.

WORLD WAR I CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Notwithstanding section 9 of the World War I Centennial Commission Act, as authorized by the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112–272) and the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), for necessary expenses of the World War I Centennial Commission, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That in addition to the authority provided by section 6(g) of such Act, the World War I Commission may accept money, in-kind personnel services, contractual support, or any appropriate support from any executive branch agency for activities of the Commission.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 401. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for any activity or the publication or distribution of literature that in any way tends to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal on which Congressional action is not complete other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in 18 U.S.C. 1913.

OBLIGATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 402. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

DISCLOSURE OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

SEC. 403. The amount and basis of estimated overhead charges, deductions, reserves or holdbacks, including working capital fund and cost pool charges, from programs, projects, activities and subactivities to support government-wide, departmental, agency, or bureau administrative functions or headquarters, regional, or central operations shall be presented in annual budget justifications and subject to approval by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Changes to such estimates shall be presented to the Committees on Appropriations for approval.

MINING APPLICATIONS

SEC. 404. (a) LIMITATION OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to accept or process applications for a patent for any mining or mill site claim located under the general mining laws.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of the Interior determines that, for the claim concerned (1) a patent application was filed with the Secretary on or before September 30, 1994; and (2) all requirements established under sections 2325 and 2326 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 29 and 30) for vein or lode claims, sections 2329, 2330, 2331, and 2333 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 35, 36, and 37) for placer claims, and section 2337 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 42) for mill site claims, as the case may be, were fully complied with by the applicant by that date.

(c) REPORT.—On September 30, 2020, the Secretary of the Interior shall file with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on actions taken by the Department under the plan submitted pursuant to section 314(c) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104–208).

(d) MINERAL EXAMINATIONS.—In order to process patent applications in a timely and responsible manner, upon the request of a patent applicant, the Secretary of the Interior shall allow the applicant to fund a qualified third-party contractor to be selected by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to conduct a mineral examination of the mining claims or mill sites contained in a patent application as set forth in subsection (b). The Bureau of Land Management shall have the sole responsibility to choose and pay the third-party contractor in accordance with the standard procedures employed by the Bureau of Land Management in the retention of third-party contractors.

CONTRACT SUPPORT COSTS, PRIOR YEAR LIMITATION

SEC. 405. Sections 405 and 406 of division F of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235) shall continue in effect in fiscal year 2019.

CONTRACT SUPPORT COSTS, FISCAL YEAR 2019 LIMITATION

SEC. 406. Amounts provided by this Act for fiscal year 2019 under the headings ''Department of Health and Human Services, Indian Health Service, Contract Support Costs'' and ''Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education, Contract Support Costs'' are the only amounts available for contract support costs arising out of self-determination or self-governance contracts, grants, compacts, or annual funding agreements for fiscal year 2019 with the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the Indian Health Service: Provided, That such amounts provided by this Act are not available for payment of claims for contract support costs for prior years, or for repayments of payments for settlements or judgments awarding contract support costs for prior years.

FOREST MANAGEMENT PLANS

SEC. 407. The Secretary of Agriculture shall not be considered to be in violation of subparagraph 6(f)(5)(A) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604(f)(5)(A)) solely because more than 15 years have passed without revision of the plan for a unit of the National Forest System. Nothing in this section exempts the Secretary from any other requirement of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.) or any other law: Provided, That if the Secretary is not acting expeditiously and in good faith, within the funding available, to revise a plan for a unit of the National Forest System, this section shall be void with respect to such plan and a court of proper jurisdiction may order completion of the plan on an accelerated basis.

PROHIBITION WITHIN NATIONAL MONUMENTS

SEC. 408. No funds provided in this Act may be expended to conduct preleasing, leasing and related activities under either the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) within the boundaries of a National Monument established pursuant to the Act of June 8, 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) as such boundary existed on January 20, 2001, except where such activities are allowed under the Presidential proclamation establishing such monument.

LIMITATION ON TAKINGS

SEC. 409. Unless otherwise provided herein, no funds appropriated in this Act for the acquisition of lands or interests in lands may be expended for the filing of declarations of taking or complaints in condemnation without the approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: Provided, That this provision shall not apply to funds appropriated to implement the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, or to funds appropriated for Federal assistance to the State of Florida to acquire lands for Everglades restoration purposes.

TIMBER SALE REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 410. No timber sale in Alaska's Region 10 shall be advertised if the indicated rate is deficit (defined as the value of the timber is not sufficient to cover all logging and stumpage costs and provide a normal profit and risk allowance under the Forest Service's appraisal process) when appraised using a residual value appraisal. The western red cedar timber from those sales which is surplus to the needs of the domestic processors in Alaska, shall be made available to domestic processors in the contiguous 48 United States at prevailing domestic prices. All additional western red cedar volume not sold to Alaska or contiguous 48 United States domestic processors may be exported to foreign markets at the election of the timber sale holder. All Alaska yellow cedar may be sold at prevailing export prices at the election of the timber sale holder.

PROHIBITION ON NO-BID CONTRACTS

SEC. 411. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to executive branch agencies may be used to enter into any Federal contract unless such contract is entered into in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 33 of title 41, United States Code, or Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless—

(1) Federal law specifically authorizes a contract to be entered into without regard for these requirements, including formula grants for States, or federally recognized Indian tribes; or

(2) such contract is authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance

Act (Public Law 93–638, 25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) or by any other Federal laws that specifically authorize a contract within an Indian tribe as defined in section 4(e) of that Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)); or

(3) such contract was awarded prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

POSTING OF REPORTS

SEC. 412. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to subsections (b) and (c), post on the public website of that agency any report required to be submitted by the Congress in this or any other Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or

(2) the report contains proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS GRANT GUIDELINES

SEC. 413. Of the funds provided to the National Endowment for the Arts—

(1) The Chairperson shall only award a grant to an individual if such grant is awarded to such individual for a literature fellowship, National Heritage Fellowship, or American Jazz Masters Fellowship.

(2) The Chairperson shall establish procedures to ensure that no funding provided through a grant, except a grant made to a State or local arts agency, or regional group, may be used to make a grant to any other organization or individual to conduct activity independent of the direct grant recipient. Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit payments made in exchange for goods and services.

(3) No grant shall be used for seasonal support to a group, unless the application is specific to the contents of the season, including identified programs or projects.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS PROGRAM PRIORITIES

SEC. 414. (a) In providing services or awarding financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 from funds appropriated under this Act, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts shall ensure that priority is given to providing services or awarding financial assistance for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that serve underserved populations.

(b) In this section:

(1) The term ''underserved population'' means a population of individuals, including urban minorities, who have historically been outside the purview of arts and humanities programs due to factors such as a high incidence of income below the poverty line or to geographic isolation.

(2) The term ''poverty line'' means the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved.

(c) In providing services and awarding financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 with funds appropriated by this Act, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts shall ensure that priority is given to providing services or awarding financial assistance for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that will encourage public knowledge, education, understanding, and appreciation of the arts.

(d) With funds appropriated by this Act to carry out section 5 of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965—

(1) the Chairperson shall establish a grant category for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that are of national impact or availability or are able to tour several States;

(2) the Chairperson shall not make grants exceeding 15 percent, in the aggregate, of such funds to any single State, excluding grants made under the authority of paragraph (1);

(3) the Chairperson shall report to the Congress annually and by State, on grants awarded by the Chairperson in each grant category under section 5 of such Act; and

(4) the Chairperson shall encourage the use of grants to improve and support community-based music performance and education.

STATUS OF BALANCES OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 415. The Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Forest Service, and the Indian Health Service shall provide the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate quarterly reports on the status of balances of appropriations including all uncommitted, committed, and unobligated funds in each program and activity.

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 416. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to promulgate or implement any regulation requiring the issuance of permits under title V of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7661 et seq.) for carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, water vapor, or methane emissions resulting from biological processes associated with livestock production.

GREENHOUSE GAS REPORTING RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 417. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to implement any provision in a rule, if that provision requires mandatory reporting of greenhouse gas emissions from manure management systems.

FUNDING PROHIBITION

SEC. 418. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to regulate the lead content of ammunition, ammunition components, or fishing tackle under the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) or any other law.

CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES

SEC. 419. Section 412 of Division E of Public Law 112–74 is amended by striking ''fiscal year 2019'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2020''.

CHESAPEAKE BAY INITIATIVE

SEC. 420. Section 502(c) of the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–312; 16 U.S.C. 461 note) is amended by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2020''.

EXTENSION OF GRAZING PERMITS

SEC. 421. The terms and conditions of section 325 of Public Law 108–108 (117 Stat. 1307), regarding grazing permits issued by the Forest Service on any lands not subject to administration under section 402 of the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act (43 U.S.C. 1752), shall remain in effect for fiscal year 2019.

FUNDING PROHIBITION

SEC. 422. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network is designed to block access to pornography websites.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, or adjudication activities.

FOREST SERVICE FACILITY REALIGNMENT AND ENHANCEMENT ACT

SEC. 423. Section 503(f) of the Forest Service Facility Realignment and Enhancement Act of 2005 (16 U.S.C. 580d note; Public Law 109–54) is amended by striking ''2018'' and inserting ''2019''.

USE OF AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL

SEC. 424. (a)(1) None of the funds made available by a State water pollution control revolving fund as authorized by section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12) shall be used for a project for the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of a public water system or treatment works unless all of the iron and steel products used in the project are produced in the United States.

(2) In this section, the term ''iron and steel'' products means the following products made primarily of iron or steel: lined or unlined pipes and fittings, manhole covers and other municipal castings, hydrants, tanks, flanges, pipe clamps and restraints, valves, structural steel, reinforced precast concrete, and construction materials.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply in any case or category of cases in which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (in this section referred to as the ''Administrator'') finds that—

(1) applying subsection (a) would be inconsistent with the public interest;

(2) iron and steel products are not produced in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available quantities and of a satisfactory quality; or

(3) inclusion of iron and steel products produced in the United States will increase the cost of the overall project by more than 25 percent.

(c) If the Administrator receives a request for a waiver under this section, the Administrator shall make available to the public on an informal basis a copy of the request and information available to the Administrator concerning the request, and shall allow for informal public input on the request for at least 15 days prior to making a finding based on the request. The Administrator shall make the request and accompanying information available by electronic means, including on the official public Internet Web site of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(d) This section shall be applied in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.

(e) The Administrator may retain up to 0.25 percent of the funds appropriated in this Act for the Clean and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds for carrying out the provisions described in subsection (a)(1) for management and oversight of the requirements of this section.

MIDWAY ISLAND

SEC. 425. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to destroy any buildings or structures on Midway Island that have been recommended by the United States Navy for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (54 U.S.C. 302101).

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER REAUTHORIZATION

SEC. 426. Section 13 of the John F. Kennedy Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76r) is amended by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

''(a) MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, AND SECURITY.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Board to carry out section 4(a)(1)(H), $24,490,000 for fiscal year 2019.

''(b) CAPITAL PROJECTS .—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Board to carry out subparagraphs (F) and (G) of section 4(a)(1), $16,025,000 for fiscal year 2019.''.

LOCAL COOPERATOR TRAINING AGREEMENTS AND TRANSFERS OF EXCESS EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES FOR WILDFIRES

SEC. 427. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into grants and cooperative agreements with volunteer fire departments, rural fire departments, rangeland fire protection associations, and similar organizations to provide for wildland fire training and equipment, including supplies and communication devices. Notwithstanding 121(c) of title 40, United States Code, or section 521 of title 40, United States Code, the Secretary is further authorized to transfer title to excess Department of the Interior firefighting equipment no longer needed to

carry out the functions of the Department's wildland fire management program to such organizations.

RECREATION FEE

SEC. 428. Section 810 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6809) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2019'' and inserting ''September 30, 2021''.

POLICIES RELATING TO BIOMASS ENERGY

SEC. 429. For fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter, to support the key role that forests in the United States can play in addressing the energy needs of the United States, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, consistent with their missions, jointly—

(1) ensure that Federal policy relating to forest bioenergy—

(A) is consistent across all Federal departments and agencies; and

(B) recognizes the full benefits of the use of forest biomass for energy, conservation, and responsible forest management; and

(2) establish clear and simple policies for the use of forest biomass as an energy solution, including policies that—

(A) reflect the carbon-neutrality of forest bioenergy and recognize biomass as a renewable energy source, provided the use of forest biomass for energy production does not cause conversion of forests to non-forest use.

(B) encourage private investment throughout the forest biomass supply chain, including in—

(i) working forests;

(ii) harvesting operations;

(iii) forest improvement operations;

(iv) forest bioenergy production;

(v) wood products manufacturing; or

(vi) paper manufacturing;

(C) encourage forest management to improve forest health; and

(D) recognize State initiatives to produce and use forest biomass.

CLARIFICATION OF EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 430. Notwithstanding section 404(f)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(2)), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require a permit for the discharge of dredged or fill material under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) for the activities identified in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of section 404(f)(1) of the Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A), (C)).

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 431. The final rule issued by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Army entitled ''Clean Water Rule: 'Definition of Waters of the United States' '' (80 Fed. Reg. 37053 (June 29, 2015)) is repealed, and, until such time as the Administrator and the Secretary issue a final rule after the date of enactment of this Act defining the scope of waters protected under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and such new final rule goes into effect, any regulation or policy revised under, or otherwise affected as a result of, the rule repealed by this section shall be applied as if that repealed rule had not been issued.

AGRICULTURAL NUTRIENTS

SEC. 432. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue any regulation under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) that applies to an animal feeding operation, including a concentrated animal feeding operation and a large concentrated animal feeding operation, as such terms are defined in section 122.23 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

HUNTING, FISHING, AND RECREATIONAL SHOOTING ON FEDERAL LAND

SEC. 433. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available by this or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used to prohibit the use of or access to Federal land (as such term is defined in section 3 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6502)) for hunting, fishing, or recreational shooting if such use or access—

(1) was not prohibited on such Federal land as of January 1, 2013; and

(2) was conducted in compliance with the resource management plan (as defined in section 101 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 6511)) applicable to such Federal land as of January 1, 2013.

(b) TEMPORARY CLOSURES ALLOWED.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may temporarily close, for a period not to exceed 30 days, Federal land managed by the Secretary to hunting, fishing, or recreational shooting if the Secretary determines that the temporary closure is necessary to accommodate a special event or for public safety reasons. The Secretary may extend a temporary closure for one additional 90-day period only if the Secretary determines the extension is necessary because of extraordinary weather conditions or for public safety reasons.

(c) AUTHORITY OF STATES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the several States to manage, control, or regulate fish and resident wildlife under State law or regulations.

AVAILABILITY OF VACANT GRAZING ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 434. The Secretary of the Interior, with respect to public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, and the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to the National Forest System lands, shall make vacant grazing allotments available to a holder of a grazing permit or lease issued by either Secretary if the lands covered by the permit or lease or other grazing lands used by the holder of the permit or lease are unusable because of drought or wildfire, as determined by the Secretary concerned. The terms and conditions contained in a permit or lease made available pursuant to this section shall be the same as the terms and conditions of the most recent permit or lease that was applicable to the vacant grazing allotment made available. Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) shall not apply with respect to any Federal agency action under this section.

INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 435. (a) For an additional amount for ''Environmental Protection Agency—Hazardous Substance Superfund'', $40,000,000, which shall be for the Superfund Remedial program, to remain available until expended, consisting of such sums as are available in the Trust Fund on September 30, 2018, as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA) and up to $40,000,000 as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for purposes as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA.

(b) For an additional amount for ''Environmental Protection Agency—State and Tribal Assistance Grants,'' $300,000,000 to remain available until expended, of which—

(1) $150,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and

(2) $150,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act.

(c) For an additional amount for ''Environmental Protection Agency—Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Program Account'', $25,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the cost of direct loans, for the cost of guaranteed loans, and for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, of which $3,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, may be used for such administrative expenses: Provided, That these additional funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, including capitalized interest, and total loan principal, including capitalized interest, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $2,683,000,000.

DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY

SEC. 436. (a) For fiscal year 2019, the Secretary of Agriculture may appoint, without regard to the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, other than sections 3303 and 3328 of such title, a qualified candidate described in subsection (b) directly to a position with the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service for which the candidate meets Office of Personnel Management qualification standards.

(b) Subsection (a) applies to a former resource assistant (as defined in section 203 of the Public Land Corps Act (16 U.S.C. 1722)) who completed a rigorous undergraduate or graduate summer internship with a land managing agency, such as the Forest Service Resource Assistant Program; successfully fulfilled the requirements of the internship program; and subsequently earned an undergraduate or graduate degree from an accredited institution of higher education.

(c) The direct hire authority under this section may not be exercised with respect to a specific qualified candidate after the end of the two-year period beginning on the date on which the candidate completed the undergraduate or graduate degree, as the case may be.

CALIFORNIA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 437. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Final Environmental Impact Report/Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California Water Fix (81 Fed. Reg. 96485 (Dec. 30, 2016)) and any resulting agency decision, record of decision, or similar determination shall hereafter not be subject to judicial review under any Federal or State law.

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR TRANSPLANTATION OR INTRODUCTION OF GRIZZLY BEARS INTO NORTH CASCADES ECOSYSTEM

SEC. 438. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the transplantation or introduction of grizzly bears into the North Cascades Ecosystem.

MANAGEMENT OF WILD HORSES OR BURROS

SEC. 439. Notwithstanding the first section and section 2(d) of Public Law 92–195 (16 U.S.C. 1331 and 1332(d)), the Secretary of the Interior may hereafter manage any group of wild horses or burros as a nonreproducing or single-sex herd, in whole or in part, including through chemical or surgical sterilization.

MARBLED MURRELET LONG TERM CONSERVATION STRATEGY

SEC. 440. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to approve, or require the development or implementation of, a Marbled Murrelet Long Term Conservation Strategy for the 1997 Washington State Trust Lands Habitat Conservation Plan that sets aside forested acres in excess of those identified as occupied habitat, existing old growth stands, stands that will become old growth within 70 years, and associated buffers.

LIMITATION ON JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CALIFORNIA WATER PROJECTS

SEC. 441. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Calfed Bay-Delta Authorization Act (title I of Public Law 108–361; 118 Stat. 1681), the water project described in chapter 5 of part 3 of division 6 of the California Water Code (sections 11550 et seq.) as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act and operated by the California Department of Water Resources, and all projects authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 26, 1937 (chapter 832; 50 Stat. 850) and all Acts amendatory or supplemental thereto, shall hereafter not be subject to judicial review.

OIL AND GAS ROYALTIES FROM ALASKA COASTAL PLAIN

SEC. 442. Section 20001(b) of Public Law 115–97 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)(A)—

(A) by striking ''50'' and inserting ''47''; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon ''and 3 percent shall be deposited into the Fund established in section 6 of Public Law 92–203 to be divided and distributed in the same manner as 'revenues' pursuant to section 7 of such Act''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) USE OF DISTRIBUTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts received as a distribution under paragraph (5)(A) shall be used for the purpose of providing for the social and economic needs of Natives (as defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602)).''.

REFERENCES TO ACT

SEC. 443. Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to ''this Act'' contained in this division shall be treated as referring only to the provisions of this division.

REFERENCES TO REPORT

SEC. 444. Any reference to a ''report accompanying this Act'' contained in this division shall be treated as a reference to House Report 115–765. The effect of such Report shall be limited to this division and shall apply for purposes of determining the allocation of funds provided by, and the implementation of, this division.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 445. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

This division may be cited as the ''Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2019''.

DIVISION B—FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Departmental Offices including operation and maintenance of the Treasury Building and Freedman's Bank Building; hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance, repairs, and improvements of, and purchase of commercial insurance policies for, real properties leased or owned overseas, when necessary for the performance of official business; executive direction program activities; international affairs and economic policy activities; domestic finance and tax policy activities, including technical assistance to Puerto Rico; and Treasury-wide management policies and programs activities, $208,751,000: Provided, That of the amount appropriated under this heading—

(1) not to exceed $700,000 is for official reception and representation expenses, of which necessary amounts shall be available for expenses to support activities of the Financial Action Task Force, and not to exceed $350,000 shall be available for other official reception and representation expenses;

(2) not to exceed $258,000 is for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate; and

(3) not to exceed $24,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020, for—

(A) the Treasury-wide Financial Statement Audit and Internal Control Program;

(B) information technology modernization requirements;

(C) the audit, oversight, and administration of the Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund;

(D) the development and implementation of programs within the Office of Critical Infrastructure Protection and Compliance Policy, including entering into cooperative agreements;

(E) operations and maintenance of facilities; and

(F) international operations.

OFFICE OF TERRORISM AND FINANCIAL INTELLIGENCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the necessary expenses of the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence to safeguard the financial system against illicit use and to combat rogue nations, terrorist facilitators, weapons of mass destruction proliferators, money launderers, drug kingpins, and other national security threats, $161,000,000: Provided, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, up to $10,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020.

CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT

For salaries and expenses for enhanced cybersecurity for systems operated by the Department of the Treasury, $25,208,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021: Provided, That such funds shall supplement and not supplant any other amounts made available to the Treasury offices and bureaus for cybersecurity: Provided further, That the Chief Information Officer of the individual offices and bureaus shall submit a spend plan for each investment to the Treasury Chief Information Officer for approval: Provided further, That the submitted spend plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Treasury Chief Information Officer prior to the obligation of funds under this heading: Provided further, That of the total amount made available under this heading $1,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses for the Treasury Chief Information Officer to provide oversight of the investments made under this heading: Provided further, That such funds shall supplement and not supplant any other amounts made available to the Treasury Chief Information Officer.

DEPARTMENT-WIDE SYSTEMS AND CAPITAL INVESTMENTS PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For development and acquisition of automatic data processing equipment, software, and services and for repairs and renovations to buildings owned by the Department of the Treasury, $8,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021: Provided, That these funds shall be transferred to accounts and in amounts as necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Department's offices, bureaus, and other organizations: Provided further, That this transfer authority shall be in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to support or supplement ''Internal Revenue Service, Operations Support'' or ''Internal Revenue Service, Business Systems Modernization''.

FUND FOR AMERICA'S KIDS AND GRANDKIDS

There is established in the Treasury a fund to be known as the ''Fund for America's Kids and Grandkids'' (the ''Fund''): Provided, That in addition to amounts otherwise made available by this Act, there is appropriated to the Fund $585,000,000 for the sole purpose of government efficiencies: Provided further, That amounts in the Fund may not be obligated until after the date that the Secretary of the Treasury certifies in the annual Financial Report of the United States Government that the Federal budget deficit equals $0 or that there is a budget surplus: Provided further, That no amounts may be transferred from the Fund.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $37,044,000, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General of the Treasury; of which up to $2,800,000 to remain available until September 30, 2020, shall be for audits and investigations conducted pursuant to section 1608 of the Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities, and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast States Act of 2012 (33 U.S.C. 1321 note); and of which not to exceed $1,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

TREASURY INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR TAX ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, including purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)); and services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Inspector General for Tax Administration; $170,834,000, of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020; of which not to exceed $6,000,000 shall be available for official travel expenses; of which not to exceed $500,000 shall be available for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General for Tax Administration; and of which not to exceed $1,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE TROUBLED ASSET RELIEF PROGRAM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Special Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–343), $28,800,000.

FINANCIAL CRIMES ENFORCEMENT NETWORK

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and training expenses of non-Federal and foreign government personnel to attend meetings and training concerned with domestic and foreign financial intelligence activities, law enforcement, and financial regulation; services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; not to exceed $12,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for assistance to Federal law enforcement agencies, with or without reimbursement, $117,800,000, of which not to exceed $34,335,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2021.

BUREAU OF THE FISCAL SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of operations of the Bureau of the Fiscal Service, $338,280,000; of which not to exceed $4,210,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021, is for information systems modernization initiatives; and of which $5,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

In addition, $165,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to reimburse administrative and personnel expenses for financial management of the Fund, as authorized by section 1012 of Public Law 101–380.

ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO TAX AND TRADE BUREAU

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of carrying out section 1111 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, including hire of passenger motor vehicles,

$123,527,000; of which not to exceed $6,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and of which not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for cooperative research and development programs for laboratory services; and provision of laboratory assistance to State and local agencies with or without reimbursement: Provided, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, $5,000,000 shall be for the costs of accelerating the processing of formula and label applications: Provided further, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, $5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, shall be for the costs associated with enforcement of the trade practice provisions of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act (27 U.S.C. 201 et seq.).

UNITED STATES MINT

UNITED STATES MINT PUBLIC ENTERPRISE FUND

Pursuant to section 5136 of title 31, United States Code, the United States Mint is provided funding through the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund for costs associated with the production of circulating coins, numismatic coins, and protective services, including both operating expenses and capital investments: Provided, That the aggregate amount of new liabilities and obligations incurred during fiscal year 2019 under such section 5136 for circulating coinage and protective service capital investments of the United States Mint shall not exceed $30,000,000.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

To carry out the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvements Act of 1994 (subtitle A of title I of Public Law 103–325), including services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for EX–3, $216,000,000. Of the amount appropriated under this heading—

(1) not less than $121,000,000, notwithstanding section 108(e) of Public Law 103–325 (12 U.S.C. 4707(e)) with regard to Small and/or Emerging Community Development Financial Institutions Assistance awards, is available until September 30, 2019, for financial assistance, technical assistance, training, and outreach under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 108(a)(1), respectively, of Public Law 103–325 (12 U.S.C. 4707(a)(1)(A) and (B)), of which up to $2,527,250 may be used for the cost of direct loans, and of which up to $3,000,000, notwithstanding subsection (d) of section 108 of Public Law 103–325 (12 U.S.C. 4707 (d)), may be available to provide financial assistance, technical assistance, training, and outreach to community development financial institutions to expand investments that benefit individuals with disabilities: Provided, That the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $25,000,000; Provided further, That with regard to financial assistance awards made pursuant to this paragraph, excluding those made to community development financial institutions to expand investments that benefit individuals with disabilities, priority shall be placed on providing assistance to community development financial institutions that have provided no less than 15 percent of their total financial products to recipients in persistent poverty counties, as measured by a three year average of their activity;

(2) not less than $13,000,000, notwithstanding section 108(e) of Public Law 103–325 (12 U.S.C. 4707(e)), is available until September 30, 2019, for financial assistance, technical assistance, training, and outreach programs designed to benefit Native American, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native communities and provided primarily through qualified community development lender organizations with experience and expertise in community development banking and lending in Indian country, Native American organizations, tribes and tribal organizations, and other suitable providers;

(3) not less than $19,000,000 is available until September 30, 2020, for the Bank Enterprise Award program;

(4) not less than $15,000,000, notwithstanding subsections (d) and (e) of section 108 of Public Law 103–325 (12 U.S.C. 4707(d) and (e)), is available until September 30, 2019, for a Healthy Food Financing Initiative to provide financial assistance, technical assistance, training, and outreach to community development financial institutions for the purpose of offering affordable financing and technical assistance to expand the availability of healthy food options in distressed communities;

(5) up to $23,000,000 is available until September 30, 2019, for administrative expenses, including administration of CDFI fund programs and the New Markets Tax Credit Program, of which not less than $1,000,000 is for development of tools to better assess and inform CDFI investment performance, and up to $300,000 is for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program; and

(6) during fiscal year 2019, none of the funds available under this heading are available for the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of commitments to guarantee bonds and notes under section 114A of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4713a): Provided, That commitments to guarantee bonds and notes under such section 114A shall not exceed $500,000,000: Provided further, That such section 114A shall remain in effect until December 31, 2019: Provided further, That of the funds awarded under this heading, not less than 10 percent shall be used for awards that support investments that serve populations living in persistent poverty counties: Provided further, That for the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph (1) above, the term ''persistent poverty counties'' means any county that has had 20 percent or more of its population living in poverty over the past 30 years, as measured by the 1990 and 2000 decennial censuses and the 2011–2015 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Census Bureau.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

TAXPAYER SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service to provide taxpayer services, including pre-filing assistance and education, filing and account services, taxpayer advocacy services, and other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner, $2,491,554,000, of which not less than $8,890,000 shall be for the Tax Counseling for the Elderly Program, of which not less than $12,000,000 shall be available for low-income taxpayer clinic grants, and of which not less than $15,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, shall be available for a Community Volunteer Income Tax Assistance matching grants program for tax return preparation assistance; of which not less than $207,000,000 shall be available for operating expenses of the Taxpayer Advocate Service: Provided, That of the amounts made available for the Taxpayer Advocate Service, not less than $5,000,000 shall be for identity theft and refund fraud casework.

ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for tax enforcement activities of the Internal Revenue Service to determine and collect owed taxes, to provide legal and litigation support, to conduct criminal investigations, to enforce criminal statutes related to violations of internal revenue laws and other financial crimes, to purchase and hire passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)), and to provide other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner, $4,860,000,000, of which not to exceed $50,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020, and of which not less than $60,257,000 shall be for the Interagency Crime and Drug Enforcement program.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service to support taxpayer services and enforcement programs, including rent payments; facilities services; printing; postage; physical security; headquarters and other IRS-wide administration activities; research and statistics of income; telecommunications; information technology development, enhancement, operations, maintenance, and security; the hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)); the operations of the Internal Revenue Service Oversight Board; and other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner; $3,988,000,000, of which not to exceed $50,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020; of which not to exceed $10,000,000 shall remain available until expended for acquisition of equipment and construction, repair and renovation of facilities; of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020, for research; of which not to exceed $20,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided, That not later than 30 days after the end of each quarter, the Internal Revenue Service shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the Comptroller General of the United States detailing the cost and schedule performance for its major information technology investments, including the purpose and life-cycle stages of the investments; the reasons for any cost and schedule variances; the risks of such investments and strategies the Internal Revenue Service is using to mitigate such risks; and the expected developmental milestones to be achieved and costs to be incurred in the next quarter: Provided further, That the Internal Revenue Service shall include, in its budget justification for fiscal year 2020, a summary of cost and schedule performance information for its major information technology systems.

BUSINESS SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service's business systems modernization program, $200,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021, for the capital asset acquisition of information technology systems, including management and related contractual costs of said acquisitions, including related Internal Revenue Service labor costs, and contractual costs associated with operations authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: Provided, That not later than 30 days after the end of each quarter, the Internal Revenue Service shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the Comptroller General of the United States detailing the cost and schedule performance for major information technology investments, including the purposes and life-cycle stages of the investments; the reasons for any cost and schedule variances; the risks of such investments and the strategies the Internal Revenue Service is using to mitigate such risks; and the expected developmental milestones to be achieved and costs to be incurred in the next quarter.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available in this Act to the Internal Revenue Service may be transferred to any other Internal Revenue Service appropriation upon the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 102. The Internal Revenue Service shall maintain an employee training program, which

shall include the following topics: taxpayers' rights, dealing courteously with taxpayers, cross-cultural relations, ethics, and the impartial application of tax law.

SEC. 103. The Internal Revenue Service shall institute and enforce policies and procedures that will safeguard the confidentiality of taxpayer information and protect taxpayers against identity theft.

SEC. 104. Funds made available by this or any other Act to the Internal Revenue Service shall be available for improved facilities and increased staffing to provide sufficient and effective 1–800 help line service for taxpayers. The Commissioner shall continue to make improvements to the Internal Revenue Service 1–800 help line service a priority and allocate resources necessary to enhance the response time to taxpayer communications, particularly with regard to victims of tax-related crimes.

SEC. 105. The Internal Revenue Service shall issue a notice of confirmation of any address change relating to an employer making employment tax payments, and such notice shall be sent to both the employer's former and new address and an officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service shall give special consideration to an offer-in-compromise from a taxpayer who has been the victim of fraud by a third party payroll tax preparer.

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used by the Internal Revenue Service to target citizens of the United States for exercising any right guaranteed under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Internal Revenue Service to target groups for regulatory scrutiny based on their ideological beliefs.

SEC. 108. None of funds made available by this Act to the Internal Revenue Service shall be obligated or expended on conferences that do not adhere to the procedures, verification processes, documentation requirements, and policies issued by the Chief Financial Officer, Human Capital Office, and Agency-Wide Shared Services as a result of the recommendations in the report published on May 31, 2013, by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration entitled ''Review of the August 2010 Small Business/Self-Employed Division's Conference in Anaheim, California'' (Reference Number 2013–10–037).

SEC. 109. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Internal Revenue Service may be obligated or expended—

(1) to make a payment to any employee under a bonus, award, or recognition program; or

(2) under any hiring or personnel selection process with respect to re-hiring a former employee, unless such program or process takes into account the conduct and Federal tax compliance of such employee or former employee.

SEC. 110. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to confidentiality and disclosure of returns and return information).

SEC. 111. Except to the extent provided in section 6014, 6020, or 6201(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, no funds in this or any other Act shall be available to the Secretary of the Treasury to provide to any person a proposed final return or statement for use by such person to satisfy a filing or reporting requirement under such Code.

SEC. 112. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Internal Revenue Service to deny tax exemption under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to a church, an integrated auxiliary of a church, or a convention or association of churches for participating in, or intervening in, any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office unless—

(1) the Commissioner of Internal Revenue determines that the exemption should be denied;

(2) not later than 30 days after such determination, the Commissioner notifies the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate of such determination; and

(3) such denial is effective not earlier than 90 days after the date of the notification under paragraph (2).

SEC. 113. In addition to the amounts otherwise made available in this Act for the Internal Revenue Service, $77,000,000, to be available until September 30, 2020, shall be transferred by the Commissioner to the ''Taxpayer Services'', ''Enforcement'', or ''Operations Support'' accounts of the Internal Revenue Service for an additional amount to be used solely for carrying out Public Law 115–97: Provided, That such funds shall not be available until the Commissioner submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a spending plan for such funds.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 114. Appropriations to the Department of the Treasury in this Act shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901), including maintenance, repairs, and cleaning; purchase of insurance for official motor vehicles operated in foreign countries; purchase of motor vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitations for vehicles purchased and used overseas for the current fiscal year; entering into contracts with the Department of State for the furnishing of health and medical services to employees and their dependents serving in foreign countries; and services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 115. Not to exceed 2 percent of any appropriations in this title made available under the headings ''Departmental Offices—Salaries and Expenses'', ''Office of Inspector General'', ''Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program'', ''Financial Crimes Enforcement Network'', ''Bureau of the Fiscal Service'', and ''Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau'' may be transferred between such appropriations upon the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided, That no transfer under this section may increase or decrease any such appropriation by more than 2 percent.

SEC. 116. Not to exceed 2 percent of any appropriation made available in this Act to the Internal Revenue Service may be transferred to the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration's appropriation upon the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided, That no transfer may increase or decrease any such appropriation by more than 2 percent.

SEC. 117. None of the funds appropriated in this Act or otherwise available to the Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Engraving and Printing may be used to redesign the $1 Federal Reserve note.

SEC. 118. The Secretary of the Treasury may transfer funds from the ''Bureau of the Fiscal Service-Salaries and Expenses'' to the Debt Collection Fund as necessary to cover the costs of debt collection: Provided, That such amounts shall be reimbursed to such salaries and expenses account from debt collections received in the Debt Collection Fund.

SEC. 119. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used by the United States Mint to construct or operate any museum without the explicit approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the House Committee on Financial Services, and the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SEC. 120. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act or source to the Department of the Treasury, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and the United States Mint, individually or collectively, may be used to consolidate any or all functions of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the United States Mint without the explicit approval of the House Committee on Financial Services; the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 121. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for the Department of the Treasury's intelligence or intelligence related activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2019 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.

SEC. 122. Not to exceed $5,000 shall be made available from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing's Industrial Revolving Fund for necessary official reception and representation expenses.

SEC. 123. The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a Capital Investment Plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 30 days following the submission of the annual budget submitted by the President: Provided, That such Capital Investment Plan shall include capital investment spending from all accounts within the Department of the Treasury, including but not limited to the Department-wide Systems and Capital Investment Programs account, Treasury Franchise Fund account, and the Treasury Forfeiture Fund account: Provided further, That such Capital Investment Plan shall include expenditures occurring in previous fiscal years for each capital investment project that has not been fully completed.

SEC. 124. Within 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit an itemized report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the amount of total funds charged to each office by the Franchise Fund including the amount charged for each service provided by the Franchise Fund to each office, a detailed description of the services, a detailed explanation of how each charge for each service is calculated, and a description of the role customers have in governing in the Franchise Fund.

SEC. 125. During fiscal year 2019 —

(1) none of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used by the Department of the Treasury, including the Internal Revenue Service, to issue, revise, or finalize any regulation, revenue ruling, or other guidance not limited to a particular taxpayer relating to the standard which is used to determine whether an organization is operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare for purposes of section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (including the proposed regulations published at 78 Fed. Reg. 71535 (November 29, 2013)); and

(2) the standard and definitions as in effect on January 1, 2010, which are used to make such determinations shall apply after the date of the enactment of this Act for purposes of determining status under section 501(c)(4) of such Code of organizations created on, before, or after such date.

SEC. 126. (a) Not later than 60 days after the end of each quarter, the Office of Financial Stability and the Office of Financial Research shall submit reports on their activities to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

(b) The reports required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the obligations made during the previous quarter by object class, office, and activity;

(2) the estimated obligations for the remainder of the fiscal year by object class, office, and activity;

(3) the number of full-time equivalents within each office during the previous quarter;

(4) the estimated number of full-time equivalents within each office for the remainder of the fiscal year; and

(5) actions taken to achieve the goals, objectives, and performance measures of each office.

(c) At the request of any such Committees specified in subsection (a), the Office of Financial Stability and the Office of Financial Research shall make officials available to testify on the contents of the reports required under subsection (a).

SEC. 127. Amounts made available under the heading ''Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence'' shall be available to reimburse the ''Departmental Offices—Salaries and Expenses'' account for expenses incurred in such account for reception and representation expenses to support activities of the Financial Action Task Force.

SEC. 128. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to approve, license, facilitate, authorize, or otherwise allow the use, purchase, trafficking, or import of property confiscated by the Cuban Government.

(b) In this section, the terms ''confiscated'', ''Cuban Government'', ''property'', and ''traffic'' have the meanings given such terms in paragraphs (4), (5), (12)(A), and (13), respectively, of section 4 of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6023).

SEC. 129. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to authorize a general license or approve a specific license under section 501.801 or 515.527 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, with respect to a mark, trade name, or commercial name that is the same as or substantially similar to a mark, trade name, or commercial name that was used in connection with a business or assets that were confiscated unless the original owner of the mark, trade name, or commercial name, or the bona-fide successor-in-interest has expressly consented.

(b) In this section, the term ''confiscated'' has a meaning given such term in section 4(4) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6023(4)).

SEC. 130. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be obligated or expended to provide for the enforcement of any rule, regulation, policy, or guideline implemented pursuant to the Department of the Treasury ''Guidance for United States Positions on MDBs Engaging with Developing Countries on Coal-Fired Power Generation'' dated October 29, 2013, when enforcement of such rule, regulation, policy, or guideline would prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting, the carrying out of any coal-fired or other power generation project the purpose of which is to increase exports of goods and services from the United States or prevent the loss of jobs from the United States.

SEC. 131. (a) Not later than 60 days after the end of each quarter, the Office of Financial Stability and the Office of Financial Research shall submit reports on their activities to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(b) The reports required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the obligations made during the previous quarter by object class, office, and activity;

(2) the estimated obligations for the remainder of the fiscal year by object class, office, and activity;

(3) the number of full-time equivalents within each office during the previous quarter;

(4) the estimated number of full-time equivalents within each office for the remainder of the fiscal year; and

(5) actions taken to achieve the goals, objectives, and performance measures of each office.

(c) At the request of any such Committees specified in subsection (a), the Office of Financial Stability and the Office of Financial Research shall make officials available to testify on the contents of the reports required under subsection (a).

SEC. 132. During fiscal year 2019, the Office of Financial Research shall provide for a public notice period of not less than 90 days before issuing any proposed report, rule, or regulation.

SEC. 133. (a) Section 155 of Public Law 111–203 is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''immediately''; and

(ii) by inserting ''as provided for in appropriation Acts'' after ''to the Office'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(2) In subsection (d), by striking the heading and inserting ''ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE.—''.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2019.I20 This title may be cited as the ''Department of the Treasury Appropriations Act, 2019''.

TITLE II

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the White House as authorized by law, including not to exceed $3,850,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 105; subsistence expenses as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 105, which shall be expended and accounted for as provided in that section; hire of passenger motor vehicles, and travel (not to exceed $100,000 to be expended and accounted for as provided by 3 U.S.C. 103); and not to exceed $19,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be available for allocation within the Executive Office of the President; and for necessary expenses of the Office of Policy Development, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 107, $55,000,000.

EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Executive Residence at the White House, $13,081,000, to be expended and accounted for as provided by 3 U.S.C. 105, 109, 110, and 112–114.

REIMBURSABLE EXPENSES

For the reimbursable expenses of the Executive Residence at the White House, such sums as may be necessary: Provided, That all reimbursable operating expenses of the Executive Residence shall be made in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, such amount for reimbursable operating expenses shall be the exclusive authority of the Executive Residence to incur obligations and to receive offsetting collections, for such expenses: Provided further, That the Executive Residence shall require each person sponsoring a reimbursable political event to pay in advance an amount equal to the estimated cost of the event, and all such advance payments shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended: Provided further, That the Executive Residence shall require the national committee of the political party of the President to maintain on deposit $25,000, to be separately accounted for and available for expenses relating to reimbursable political events sponsored by such committee during such fiscal year: Provided further, That the Executive Residence shall ensure that a written notice of any amount owed for a reimbursable operating expense under this paragraph is submitted to the person owing such amount within 60 days after such expense is incurred, and that such amount is collected within 30 days after the submission of such notice: Provided further, That the Executive Residence shall charge interest and assess penalties and other charges on any such amount that is not reimbursed within such 30 days, in accordance with the interest and penalty provisions applicable to an outstanding debt on a United States Government claim under 31 U.S.C. 3717: Provided further, That each such amount that is reimbursed, and any accompanying interest and charges, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: Provided further, That the Executive Residence shall prepare and submit to the Committees on Appropriations, by not later than 90 days after the end of the fiscal year covered by this Act, a report setting forth the reimbursable operating expenses of the Executive Residence during the preceding fiscal year, including the total amount of such expenses, the amount of such total that consists of reimbursable official and ceremonial events, the amount of such total that consists of reimbursable political events, and the portion of each such amount that has been reimbursed as of the date of the report: Provided further, That the Executive Residence shall maintain a system for the tracking of expenses related to reimbursable events within the Executive Residence that includes a standard for the classification of any such expense as political or nonpolitical: Provided further, That no provision of this paragraph may be construed to exempt the Executive Residence from any other applicable requirement of subchapter I or II of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code.

WHITE HOUSE REPAIR AND RESTORATION

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of the Executive Residence at the White House pursuant to 3 U.S.C. 105(d), $750,000, to remain available until expended, for required maintenance, resolution of safety and health issues, and continued preventative maintenance.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Council of Economic Advisers in carrying out its functions under the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1021 et seq.), $4,187,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL AND HOMELAND SECURITY COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Security Council and the Homeland Security Council, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $13,000,000.

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Administration, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 107, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $100,000,000, of which not to exceed $12,800,000 shall remain available until expended for continued modernization of information resources within the Executive Office of the President.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Management and Budget, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, to carry out the provisions of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, and to prepare and submit the budget of the United States Government, in

accordance with section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, $103,000,000, of which not to exceed $3,000 shall be available for official representation expenses: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act for the Office of Management and Budget may be used for the purpose of reviewing any agricultural marketing orders or any activities or regulations under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.): Provided further, That none of the funds made available for the Office of Management and Budget by this Act may be expended for the altering of the transcript of actual testimony of witnesses, except for testimony of officials of the Office of Management and Budget, before the Committees on Appropriations or their subcommittees: Provided further, That none of the funds made available for the Office of Management and Budget by this Act may be expended for the altering of the annual work plan developed by the Corps of Engineers for submission to the Committees on Appropriations: Provided further, That of the funds made available for the Office of Management and Budget by this Act, no less than three full-time equivalent senior staff position shall be dedicated solely to the Office of the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator: Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this or prior Acts shall be used, directly or indirectly, by the Office of Management and Budget, for evaluating or determining if water resource project or study reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers acting through the Secretary of the Army are in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and requirements relevant to the Civil Works water resource planning process: Provided further, That the Office of Management and Budget shall have not more than 60 days in which to perform budgetary policy reviews of water resource matters on which the Chief of Engineers has reported: Provided further, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall notify the appropriate authorizing and appropriating committees when the 60-day review is initiated: Provided further, That if water resource reports have not been transmitted to the appropriate authorizing and appropriating committees within 15 days after the end of the Office of Management and Budget review period based on the notification from the Director, Congress shall assume Office of Management and Budget concurrence with the report and act accordingly.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of National Drug Control Policy; for research activities pursuant to the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–469); not to exceed $10,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for participation in joint projects or in the provision of services on matters of mutual interest with nonprofit, research, or public organizations or agencies, with or without reimbursement, $17,400,000: Provided, That the Office is authorized to accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts, both real and personal, public and private, without fiscal year limitation, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Office.

FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS

HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of National Drug Control Policy's High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, $280,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, for drug control activities consistent with the approved strategy for each of the designated High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (''HIDTAs''), of which not less than 51 percent shall be transferred to State and local entities for drug control activities and shall be obligated not later than 120 days after enactment of this Act: Provided, That up to 49 percent may be transferred to Federal agencies and departments in amounts determined by the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, of which up to $2,700,000 may be used for auditing services and associated activities: Provided further, That, notwithstanding the requirements of Public Law 106–58, any unexpended funds obligated prior to fiscal year 2017 may be used for any other approved activities of that HIDTA, subject to reprogramming requirements: Provided further, That each HIDTA designated as of September 30, 2018, shall be funded at not less than the fiscal year 2018 base level, unless the Director submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate justification for changes to those levels based on clearly articulated priorities and published Office of National Drug Control Policy performance measures of effectiveness: Provided further, That the Director shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the initial allocation of fiscal year 2019 funding among HIDTAs not later than 45 days after enactment of this Act, and shall notify the Committees of planned uses of discretionary HIDTA funding, as determined in consultation with the HIDTA Directors, not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds so transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein and upon notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

OTHER FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For other drug control activities authorized by the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–469), $118,327,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be available as follows: $100,000,000 for the Drug-Free Communities Program, of which $2,000,000 shall be made available as directed by section 4 of Public Law 107–82, as amended by Public Law 109–469 (21 U.S.C. 1521 note); $2,000,000 for drug court training and technical assistance; $9,500,000 for anti-doping activities; $2,577,000 for the United States membership dues to the World Anti-Doping Agency; and $1,250,000 shall be made available as directed by section 1105 of Public Law 109–469; and $3,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for activities authorized by section 103 of Public Law 114–198: Provided, That amounts made available under this heading may be transferred to other Federal departments and agencies to carry out such activities.

UNANTICIPATED NEEDS

For expenses necessary to enable the President to meet unanticipated needs, in furtherance of the national interest, security, or defense which may arise at home or abroad during the current fiscal year, as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 108, $1,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OVERSIGHT AND REFORM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the furtherance of integrated, efficient, secure, and effective uses of information technology in the Federal Government, $15,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget may transfer these funds to one or more other agencies to carry out projects to meet these purposes.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE PRESIDENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to enable the Vice President to provide assistance to the President in connection with specially assigned functions; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 106, including subsistence expenses as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 106, which shall be expended and accounted for as provided in that section; and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $4,288,000.

OFFICIAL RESIDENCE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

OPERATING EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the care, operation, refurnishing, improvement, and to the extent not otherwise provided for, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the official residence of the Vice President; the hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $90,000 pursuant to 3 U.S.C. 106(b)(2), $302,000: Provided, That advances, repayments, or transfers from this appropriation may be made to any department or agency for expenses of carrying out such activities.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. From funds made available in this Act under the headings ''The White House'', ''Executive Residence at the White House'', ''White House Repair and Restoration'', ''Council of Economic Advisers'', ''National Security Council and Homeland Security Council'', ''Office of Administration'', ''Special Assistance to the President'', and ''Official Residence of the Vice President'', the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (or such other officer as the President may designate in writing), may, with advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, transfer not to exceed 10 percent of any such appropriation to any other such appropriation, to be merged with and available for the same time and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided, That the amount of an appropriation shall not be increased by more than 50 percent by such transfers: Provided further, That no amount shall be transferred from ''Special Assistance to the President'' or ''Official Residence of the Vice President'' without the approval of the Vice President.

SEC. 202. (a) During fiscal year 2019, any Executive order or Presidential memorandum issued or revoked by the President shall be accompanied by a written statement from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget on the budgetary impact, including costs, benefits, and revenues, of such order or memorandum.

(b) Any such statement shall include—

(1) a narrative summary of the budgetary impact of such order or memorandum on the Federal Government;

(2) the impact on mandatory and discretionary obligations and outlays as the result of such order or memorandum, listed by Federal agency, for each year in the 5-fiscal year period beginning in fiscal year 2019; and

(3) the impact on revenues of the Federal Government as the result of such order or memorandum over the 5-fiscal-year period beginning in fiscal year 2019.

(c) If an Executive order or Presidential memorandum is issued during fiscal year 2019 due to a national emergency, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget may issue the statement required by subsection (a) not later than 15 days after the date that such order or memorandum is issued.

(d) The requirement for cost estimates for Presidential memoranda shall only apply for Presidential memoranda estimated to have a regulatory cost in excess of $100,000,000.

This title may be cited as the ''Executive Office of the President Appropriations Act, 2019''.

TITLE III

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the operation of the Supreme Court, as required by law, excluding care of the building and grounds, including hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344; not to exceed $10,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for miscellaneous expenses, to be expended as the Chief Justice may approve, $84,703,000, of which $1,500,000 shall remain available until expended.

In addition, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary under current law for the salaries of the chief justice and associate justices of the court.

CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

For such expenditures as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry out the duties imposed upon the Architect by 40 U.S.C. 6111 and 6112, $15,999,000, to remain available until expended.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of officers and employees, and for necessary expenses of the court, as authorized by law, $32,016,000.

In addition, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary under current law for the salaries of the chief judge and judges of the court.

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of officers and employees of the court, services, and necessary expenses of the court, as authorized by law, $19,450,000.

In addition, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary under current law for the salaries of the chief judge and judges of the court.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the salaries of judges of the United States Court of Federal Claims, magistrate judges, and all other officers and employees of the Federal Judiciary not otherwise specifically provided for, necessary expenses of the courts, and the purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for Probation and Pretrial Services Office staff, as authorized by law, $5,167,961,000 (including the purchase of firearms and ammunition); of which not to exceed $27,817,000 shall remain available until expended for space alteration projects and for furniture and furnishings related to new space alteration and construction projects.

In addition, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary under current law for the salaries of circuit and district judges (including judges of the territorial courts of the United States), bankruptcy judges, and justices and judges retired from office or from regular active service.

In addition, for expenses of the United States Court of Federal Claims associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–660), not to exceed $8,475,000, to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

DEFENDER SERVICES

For the operation of Federal Defender organizations; the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed to represent persons under 18 U.S.C. 3006A and 3599, and for the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of persons furnishing investigative, expert, and other services for such representations as authorized by law; the compensation (in accordance with the maximums under 18 U.S.C. 3006A) and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed to assist the court in criminal cases where the defendant has waived representation by counsel; the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed to represent jurors in civil actions for the protection of their employment, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1875(d)(1); the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed under 18 U.S.C. 983(b)(1) in connection with certain judicial civil forfeiture proceedings; the compensation and reimbursement of travel expenses of guardians ad litem appointed under 18 U.S.C. 4100(b); and for necessary training and general administrative expenses, $1,142,427,000 to remain available until expended.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For fees and expenses of jurors as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1871 and 1876; compensation of jury commissioners as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1863; and compensation of commissioners appointed in condemnation cases pursuant to rule 71.1(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (28 U.S.C. Appendix Rule 71.1(h)), $49,750,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the compensation of land commissioners shall not exceed the daily equivalent of the highest rate payable under 5 U.S.C. 5332.

COURT SECURITY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the provision of protective guard services for United States courthouses and other facilities housing Federal court operations, and the procurement, installation, and maintenance of security systems and equipment for United States courthouses and other facilities housing Federal court operations, including building ingress-egress control, inspection of mail and packages, directed security patrols, perimeter security, basic security services provided by the Federal Protective Service, and other similar activities as authorized by section 1010 of the Judicial Improvement and Access to Justice Act (Public Law 100–702), $604,460,000, of which not to exceed $20,000,000 shall remain available until expended, to be expended directly or transferred to the United States Marshals Service, which shall be responsible for administering the Judicial Facility Security Program consistent with standards or guidelines agreed to by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the Attorney General.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts as authorized by law, including travel as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1345, hire of a passenger motor vehicle as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b), advertising and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $92,413,000, of which not to exceed $8,500 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Judicial Center, as authorized by Public Law 90–219, $29,819,000; of which $1,800,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2020, to provide education and training to Federal court personnel; and of which not to exceed $1,500 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of chapter 58 of title 28, United States Code, $18,548,000, of which not to exceed $1,000 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 301. Appropriations and authorizations made in this title which are available for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 302. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Judiciary in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except ''Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services, Defender Services'' and ''Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services, Fees of Jurors and Commissioners'', shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: Provided, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under sections 604 and 608 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in section 608.

SEC. 303. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the salaries and expenses appropriation for ''Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services'' shall be available for official reception and representation expenses of the Judicial Conference of the United States: Provided, That such available funds shall not exceed $11,000 and shall be administered by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in the capacity as Secretary of the Judicial Conference.

SEC. 304. Section 3315(a) of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting ''Federal'' for ''executive'' each place it appears.

SEC. 305. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. 561–569, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States Marshals Service shall provide, for such courthouses as its Director may designate in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, for purposes of a pilot program, the security services that 40 U.S.C. 1315 authorizes the Department of Homeland Security to provide, except for the services specified in 40 U.S.C. 1315(b)(2)(E). For building-specific security services at these courthouses, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall reimburse the United States Marshals Service rather than the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 306. (a) Section 203(c) of the Judicial Improvements Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–650; 28 U.S.C. 133 note), is amended in the second sentence (relating to the District of Kansas) following paragraph (12), by striking ''27 years and 6 months'' and inserting ''28 years and 6 months''.

(b) Section 406 of the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–115; 119 Stat. 2470; 28 U.S.C. 133 note) is amended in the second sentence (relating to the Eastern District of Missouri) by striking ''25 years and 6 months'' and inserting ''26 years and 6 months''.

(c) Section 312(c)(2) of the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (Public Law 107–273; 28 U.S.C. 133 note), is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by inserting after ''except in the case of'' the following: ''the northern district of Alabama,'';

(2) in the first sentence by inserting after ''the central district of California'' the following: '','';

(3) in the first sentence by striking ''16 years'' and inserting ''17 years'';

(4) by adding at the end of the first sentence the following: ''The first vacancy in the office of district judge in the northern district of Alabama occurring 16 years or more after the confirmation date of the judge named to fill the temporary district judgeship created in that district by this subsection, shall not be filled.'';

(5) in the third sentence (relating to the central District of California), by striking ''15 years and 6 months'' and inserting ''16 years and 6 months''; and

(6) in the fourth sentence (relating to the western district of North Carolina), by striking ''14 years'' and inserting ''15 years''.

This title may be cited as the ''Judiciary Appropriations Act, 2019''.

TITLE IV

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL FUNDS

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR RESIDENT TUITION SUPPORT

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia, to be deposited into a dedicated account, for a nationwide program to be administered by the Mayor, for District of Columbia resident tuition support, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such funds, including any interest accrued thereon, may be used on behalf of eligible District of Columbia residents to pay an amount based upon the difference between in-State and out-of-State tuition at public institutions of higher education, or to pay up to $2,500 each year at eligible private institutions of higher education: Provided further, That the awarding of such funds may be prioritized on the basis of a resident's academic merit, the income and need of eligible students and such other factors as may be authorized: Provided further, That the District of Columbia government shall maintain a dedicated account for the Resident Tuition Support Program that shall consist of the Federal funds appropriated to the Program in this Act and any subsequent appropriations, any unobligated balances from prior fiscal years, and any interest earned in this or any fiscal year: Provided further, That the account shall be under the control of the District of Columbia Chief Financial Officer, who shall use those funds solely for the purposes of carrying out the Resident Tuition Support Program: Provided further, That the Office of the Chief Financial Officer shall provide a quarterly financial report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for these funds showing, by object class, the expenditures made and the purpose therefor.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR EMERGENCY PLANNING AND SECURITY COSTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For a Federal payment of necessary expenses, as determined by the Mayor of the District of Columbia in written consultation with the elected county or city officials of surrounding jurisdictions, $13,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the costs of providing public safety at events related to the presence of the National Capital in the District of Columbia, including support requested by the Director of the United States Secret Service in carrying out protective duties under the direction of the Secretary of Homeland Security, and for the costs of providing support to respond to immediate and specific terrorist threats or attacks in the District of Columbia or surrounding jurisdictions.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

For salaries and expenses for the District of Columbia Courts, $288,280,000 to be allocated as follows: for the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, $14,670,000, of which not to exceed $2,500 is for official reception and representation expenses; for the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, $122,770,000, of which not to exceed $2,500 is for official reception and representation expenses; for the District of Columbia Court System, $77,016,000, of which not to exceed $2,500 is for official reception and representation expenses; and $73,824,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, for capital improvements for District of Columbia courthouse facilities: Provided, That funds made available for capital improvements shall be expended consistent with the District of Columbia Courts master plan study and facilities condition assessment: Provided further, That, in addition to the amounts appropriated herein, fees received by the District of Columbia Courts for administering bar examinations and processing District of Columbia bar admissions may be retained and credited to this appropriation, to remain available until expended, for salaries and expenses associated with such activities, notwithstanding section 450 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (D.C. Official Code, sec. 1–204.50): Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all amounts under this heading shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of other Federal agencies: Provided further, That 30 days after providing written notice to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the District of Columbia Courts may reallocate not more than $9,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading among the items and entities funded under this heading: Provided further, That the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration in the District of Columbia may, by regulation, establish a program substantially similar to the program set forth in subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 5, United States Code, for employees of the District of Columbia Courts.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR DEFENDER SERVICES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payments authorized under section 11–2604 and section 11–2605, D.C. Official Code (relating to representation provided under the District of Columbia Criminal Justice Act), payments for counsel appointed in proceedings in the Family Court of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia under chapter 23 of title 16, D.C. Official Code, or pursuant to contractual agreements to provide guardian ad litem representation, training, technical assistance, and such other services as are necessary to improve the quality of guardian ad litem representation, payments for counsel appointed in adoption proceedings under chapter 3 of title 16, D.C. Official Code, and payments authorized under section 21–2060, D.C. Official Code (relating to services provided under the District of Columbia Guardianship, Protective Proceedings, and Durable Power of Attorney Act of 1986), $49,890,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not more than $20,000,000 in unobligated funds provided in this account may be transferred to and merged with funds made available under the heading ''Federal Payment to the District of Columbia Courts,'' to be available for the same period and purposes as funds made available under that heading for capital improvements to District of Columbia courthouse facilities: Provided further, That funds provided under this heading shall be administered by the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration in the District of Columbia: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, this appropriation shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for expenses of other Federal agencies.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For salaries and expenses, including the transfer and hire of motor vehicles, of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, as authorized by the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, $256,724,000, of which not to exceed $2,000 is for official reception and representation expenses related to Community Supervision and Pretrial Services Agency programs, and of which not to exceed $25,000 is for dues and assessments relating to the implementation of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency Interstate Supervision Act of 2002: Provided, That, of the funds appropriated under this heading, $183,166,000 shall be for necessary expenses of Community Supervision and Sex Offender Registration, to include expenses relating to the supervision of adults subject to protection orders or the provision of services for or related to such persons, of which $5,919,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2021 for costs associated with relocation under a replacement lease for headquarters offices, field offices, and related facilities: Provided further, That, of the funds appropriated under this heading, $73,558,000 shall be available to the Pretrial Services Agency, of which $7,304,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2021 for costs associated with relocation under a replacement lease for headquarters offices, field offices, and related facilities: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all amounts under this heading shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of other Federal agencies: Provided further, That amounts under this heading may be used for programmatic incentives for defendants to successfully complete their terms of supervision.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE

For salaries and expenses, including the transfer and hire of motor vehicles, of the District of Columbia Public Defender Service, as authorized by the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, $45,858,000, of which $4,471,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2021 for costs associated with relocation under a replacement lease for headquarters offices, field offices, and related facilities: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all amounts under this heading shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of Federal agencies.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

For a Federal payment to the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended, to support

initiatives related to the coordination of Federal and local criminal justice resources in the District of Columbia.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR JUDICIAL COMMISSIONS

For a Federal payment, to remain available until September 30, 2020, to the Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure, $295,000, and for the Judicial Nomination Commission, $270,000.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

For a Federal payment for a school improvement program in the District of Columbia, $45,000,000, to remain available until expended, for payments authorized under the Scholarship for Opportunity and Results Act (division C of Public Law 112–10): Provided, That, to the extent that funds are available for opportunity scholarships and following the priorities included in section 3006 of such Act, the Secretary of Education shall make scholarships available to students eligible under section 3013(3) of such Act (Public Law 112–10; 125 Stat. 211) including students who were not offered a scholarship during any previous school year: Provided further, That within funds provided for opportunity scholarships up to $3,200,000 shall be for the activities specified in sections 3007(b) through 3007(d) and 3009 of such Act.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia National Guard, $435,000, to remain available until expended for the Major General David F. Wherley, Jr. District of Columbia National Guard Retention and College Access Program.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR TESTING AND TREATMENT OF HIV/AIDS

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia for the testing of individuals for, and the treatment of individuals with, human immunodeficiency virus and acquired immunodeficiency syndrome in the District of Columbia, $5,000,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

Local funds are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the current fiscal year out of the General Fund of the District of Columbia (''General Fund'') for programs and activities set forth under the heading ''PART A—SUMMARY OF EXPENSES'' and at the rate set forth under such heading, as included in the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request Act of 2018 submitted to Congress by the District of Columbia, as amended as of the date of enactment of this Act: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in section 450A of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (section 1–204.50a, D.C. Official Code), sections 816 and 817 of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2009 (secs. 47–369.01 and 47–369.02, D.C. Official Code), and provisions of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for operating expenses for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2019 under this heading shall not exceed the estimates included in the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request Act of 2018 submitted to Congress by the District of Columbia, as amended as of the date of enactment of this Act or the sum of the total revenues of the District of Columbia for such fiscal year: Provided further, That the amount appropriated may be increased by proceeds of one-time transactions, which are expended for emergency or unanticipated operating or capital needs: Provided further, That such increases shall be approved by enactment of local District law and shall comply with all reserve requirements contained in the District of Columbia Home Rule Act: Provided further, That the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia shall take such steps as are necessary to assure that the District of Columbia meets these requirements, including the apportioning by the Chief Financial Officer of the appropriations and funds made available to the District during fiscal year 2019, except that the Chief Financial Officer may not reprogram for operating expenses any funds derived from bonds, notes, or other obligations issued for capital projects.

This title may be cited as the ''District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2019''.

TITLE V

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Administrative Conference of the United States, authorized by 5 U.S.C. 591 et seq., $3,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019, of which not to exceed $1,000 is for official reception and representation expenses.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable under 5 U.S.C. 5376, purchase of nominal awards to recognize non-Federal officials' contributions to Commission activities, and not to exceed $8,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $127,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION—CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SEC. 501. During fiscal year 2019, none of the amounts made available by this Act may be used to finalize or implement the Safety Standard for Recreational Off-Highway Vehicles published by the Consumer Product Safety Commission in the Federal Register on November 19, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 68964) until after—

(1) the National Academy of Sciences, in consultation with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and the Department of Defense, completes a study to determine—

(A) the technical validity of the lateral stability and vehicle handling requirements proposed by such standard for purposes of reducing the risk of Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle (referred to in this section as ''ROV'') rollovers in the off-road environment, including the repeatability and reproducibility of testing for compliance with such requirements;

(B) the number of ROV rollovers that would be prevented if the proposed requirements were adopted;

(C) whether there is a technical basis for the proposal to provide information on a point-of-sale hangtag about a ROV's rollover resistance on a progressive scale; and

(D) the effect on the utility of ROVs used by the United States military if the proposed requirements were adopted; and

(2) a report containing the results of the study completed under paragraph (1) is delivered to—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–252), $10,100,000, of which $1,500,000 shall be transferred to the National Institute of Standards and Technology for election reform activities authorized under the Help America Vote Act of 2002.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Communications Commission, as authorized by law, including uniforms and allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; not to exceed $4,000 for official reception and representation expenses; purchase and hire of motor vehicles; special counsel fees; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $335,118,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That $335,118,000 of offsetting collections shall be assessed and collected pursuant to section 9 of title I of the Communications Act of 1934, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2019 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2019 appropriation estimated at $0: Provided further, That any offsetting collections received in excess of $335,118,000 in fiscal year 2019 shall not be available for obligation: Provided further, That remaining offsetting collections from prior years collected in excess of the amount specified for collection in each such year and otherwise becoming available on October 1, 2018, shall not be available for obligation: Provided further, That, notwithstanding 47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B), proceeds from the use of a competitive bidding system that may be retained and made available for obligation shall not exceed $130,284,000 for fiscal year 2019: Provided further, That, of the amount appropriated under this heading, not less than $11,064,000 shall be for the salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION—FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SEC. 510. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by the Federal Communications Commission to modify, amend, or change its rules or regulations for universal service support payments to implement the February 27, 2004 recommendations of the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service regarding single connection or primary line restrictions on universal service support payments.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $42,982,000, to be derived from the Deposit Insurance Fund or, only when appropriate, the FSLIC Resolution Fund.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, $71,250,000, of which not to exceed $5,000 shall be available for reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978, and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and including hire of experts and consultants, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and including official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed $1,500) and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $26,200,000:

Provided, That public members of the Federal Service Impasses Panel may be paid travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons employed intermittently in the Government service, and compensation as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: Provided further, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, funds received from fees charged to non-Federal participants at labor-management relations conferences shall be credited to and merged with this account, to be available without further appropriation for the costs of carrying out these conferences.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $311,700,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed $300,000 shall be available for use to contract with a person or persons for collection services in accordance with the terms of 31 U.S.C. 3718: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $136,000,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18a), regardless of the year of collection, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $17,000,000 in offsetting collections derived from fees sufficient to implement and enforce the Telemarketing Sales Rule, promulgated under the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act (15 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.), shall be credited to this account, and be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2019, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2019 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $158,700,000: Provided further, That none of the funds made available to the Federal Trade Commission may be used to implement subsection (e)(2)(B) of section 43 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831t).

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES

FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND

LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Amounts in the Fund, including revenues and collections deposited into the Fund, shall be available for necessary expenses of real property management and related activities not otherwise provided for, including operation, maintenance, and protection of federally owned and leased buildings; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving governmental agencies (including space adjustments and telecommunications relocation expenses) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of space; contractual services incident to cleaning or servicing buildings, and moving; repair and alteration of federally owned buildings, including grounds, approaches, and appurtenances; care and safeguarding of sites; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment; acquisition of buildings and sites by purchase, condemnation, or as otherwise authorized by law; acquisition of options to purchase buildings and sites; conversion and extension of federally owned buildings; preliminary planning and design of projects by contract or otherwise; construction of new buildings (including equipment for such buildings); and payment of principal, interest, and any other obligations for public buildings acquired by installment purchase and purchase contract; in the aggregate amount of $8,634,574,000, of which—

(1) $275,900,000 shall remain available until expended for construction and acquisition (including funds for sites and expenses, and associated design and construction services) as follows:

(A) $275,900,000 shall be for the Calexico, California, Calexico West Land Port of Entry;

Provided, That each of the foregoing limits of costs on new construction and acquisition projects may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected in other such projects, but not to exceed 10 percent of the amounts included in a transmitted prospectus, if required, unless advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations of a greater amount;

(2) $679,934,000 shall remain available until expended for repairs and alterations, including associated design and construction services, of which—

(A) $286,344,000 is for Major Repairs and Alterations;

(B) $312,090,000 is for Basic Repairs and Alterations; and

(C) $81,500,000 is for Special Emphasis Programs, of which—

(i) $30,000,000 is for Fire and Life Safety;

(ii) $11,500,000 is for Judiciary Capital Security; and

(iii) $40,000,000 is for Consolidation Activities:

Provided, That consolidation projects result in reduced annual rent paid by the tenant agency: Provided further, That no consolidation project exceed $10,000,000 in costs: Provided further, That consolidation projects are approved by each of the committees specified in section 3307(a) of title 40, United States Code: Provided further, That preference is given to consolidation projects that achieve a utilization rate of 130 usable square feet or less per person for office space: Provided further, That the obligation of funds under this paragraph for consolidation activities may not be made until 10 days after a proposed spending plan and explanation for each project to be undertaken, including estimated savings, has been submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate:

Provided, That funds made available in this or any previous Act in the Federal Buildings Fund for Repairs and Alterations shall, for prospectus projects, be limited to the amount identified for each project, except each project in this or any previous Act may be increased by an amount not to exceed 10 percent unless advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations of a greater amount: Provided further, That additional projects for which prospectuses have been fully approved may be funded under this category only if advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations: Provided further, That the amounts provided in this or any prior Act for ''Repairs and Alterations'' may be used to fund costs associated with implementing security improvements to buildings necessary to meet the minimum standards for security in accordance with current law and in compliance with the reprogramming guidelines of the appropriate Committees of the House and Senate: Provided further, That the difference between the funds appropriated and expended on any projects in this or any prior Act, under the heading ''Repairs and Alterations'', may be transferred to Basic Repairs and Alterations or used to fund authorized increases in prospectus projects: Provided further, That the amount provided in this or any prior Act for Basic Repairs and Alterations may be used to pay claims against the Government arising from any projects under the heading ''Repairs and Alterations'' or used to fund authorized increases in prospectus projects;

(3) $5,430,345,000 for rental of space to remain available until expended; and

(4) $2,248,395,000 for building operations to remain available until expended, of which $1,126,014,000 is for building services, and $1,122,381,000 is for salaries and expenses: Provided, That not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available under this paragraph for building operations may be transferred between and merged with such appropriations upon notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 percent by any such transfers: Provided further, That section 521 of this title shall not apply with respect to funds made available under this heading for building operations: Provided further, That the total amount of funds made available from this Fund to the General Services Administration shall not be available for expenses of any construction, repair, alteration and acquisition project for which a prospectus, if required by 40 U.S.C. 3307(a), has not been approved, except that necessary funds may be expended for each project for required expenses for the development of a proposed prospectus: Provided further, That funds available in the Federal Buildings Fund may be expended for emergency repairs when advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations: Provided further, That amounts necessary to provide reimbursable special services to other agencies under 40 U.S.C. 592(b)(2) and amounts to provide such reimbursable fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control as may be appropriate to enable the United States Secret Service to perform its protective functions pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3056, shall be available from such revenues and collections: Provided further, That revenues and collections and any other sums accruing to this Fund during fiscal year 2019, excluding reimbursements under 40 U.S.C. 592(b)(2), in excess of the aggregate new obligational authority authorized for Real Property Activities of the Federal Buildings Fund in this Act shall remain in the Fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

GENERAL ACTIVITIES

GOVERNMENT-WIDE POLICY

For expenses authorized by law, not otherwise provided for, for Government-wide policy and evaluation activities associated with the management of real and personal property assets and certain administrative services; Government-wide policy support responsibilities relating to acquisition, travel, motor vehicles, information technology management, and related technology activities; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; $60,000,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses authorized by law, not otherwise provided for, for Government-wide activities associated with utilization and donation of surplus personal property; disposal of real property; agency-wide policy direction, management, and communications; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; $49,440,000, of which $26,890,000 is for Real and Personal Property Management and Disposal; $22,550,000 is for the Office of the Administrator, of which not to exceed $7,500 is for official reception and representation expenses.

CIVILIAN BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS

For expenses authorized by law, not otherwise provided for, for the activities associated with the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals, $9,301,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General and service authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $67,000,000: Provided, That not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for payment for information and detection of fraud against the Government, including payment for recovery of stolen Government property: Provided further, That not to exceed $2,500 shall be available for awards to employees of other Federal agencies and private citizens in recognition of efforts and initiatives resulting in enhanced Office of Inspector General effectiveness.

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE STAFF FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (3 U.S.C. 102 note), and Public Law 95–138, $4,796,000.

FEDERAL CITIZEN SERVICES FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Products and Programs, including services authorized by 40 U.S.C. 323 and 44 U.S.C. 3604; and for necessary expenses in support of interagency projects that enable the Federal Government to enhance its ability to conduct activities electronically, through the development and implementation of innovative uses of information technology; $55,000,000, to be deposited into the Federal Citizen Services Fund: Provided, That the previous amount may be transferred to Federal agencies to carry out the purpose of the Federal Citizen Services Fund: Provided further, That the appropriations, revenues, reimbursements, and collections deposited into the Fund shall be available until expended for necessary expenses of Federal Citizen Services and other activities that enable the Federal Government to enhance its ability to conduct activities electronically in the aggregate amount not to exceed $100,000,000: Provided further, That appropriations, revenues, reimbursements, and collections accruing to this Fund during fiscal year 2019 in excess of such amount shall remain in the Fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts: Provided further, That any appropriations provided to the Electronic Government Fund that remain unobligated may be transferred to the Federal Citizen Services Fund: Provided further, That the transfer authorities provided herein shall be in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act.

TECHNOLOGY MODERNIZATION FUND

For the Technology Modernization Fund, $150,000,000, to remain available until expended, for technology-related modernization activities.

ASSET PROCEEDS AND SPACE MANAGEMENT FUND

For carrying out the purposes of the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–287), $31,000,000, to be deposited into the Asset Proceeds and Space Management Fund, to remain available until expended.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW IMPROVEMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of the Environmental Review Improvement Fund established pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4370m-8(d), $6,070,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 520. Funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 521. Funds in the Federal Buildings Fund made available for fiscal year 2019 for Federal Buildings Fund activities may be transferred between such activities only to the extent necessary to meet program requirements: Provided, That any proposed transfers shall be approved in advance by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 522. Except as otherwise provided in this title, funds made available by this Act shall be used to transmit a fiscal year 2019 request for United States Courthouse construction only if the request: (1) meets the design guide standards for construction as established and approved by the General Services Administration, the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the Office of Management and Budget; (2) reflects the priorities of the Judicial Conference of the United States as set out in its approved Courthouse Project Priorities plan; and (3) includes a standardized courtroom utilization study of each facility to be constructed, replaced, or expanded.

SEC. 523. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to increase the amount of occupiable square feet, provide cleaning services, security enhancements, or any other service usually provided through the Federal Buildings Fund, to any agency that does not pay the rate per square foot assessment for space and services as determined by the General Services Administration in consideration of the Public Buildings Amendments Act of 1972 (Public Law 92–313).

SEC. 524. From funds made available under the heading ''Federal Buildings Fund, Limitations on Availability of Revenue'', claims against the Government of less than $250,000 arising from direct construction projects and acquisition of buildings may be liquidated from savings effected in other construction projects with prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 525. In any case in which the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate adopt a resolution granting lease authority pursuant to a prospectus transmitted to Congress by the Administrator of the General Services Administration under 40 U.S.C. 3307, the Administrator shall ensure that the delineated area of procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus for all lease agreements, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to each of such committees and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate prior to exercising any lease authority provided in the resolution.

SEC. 526. With respect to each project funded under the heading ''Major Repairs and Alterations'' or ''Judiciary Capital Security Program'', and with respect to E-Government projects funded under the heading ''Federal Citizen Services Fund'', the Administrator of General Services shall submit a spending plan and explanation for each project to be undertaken to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 527. The Administrator of General Services shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives not later than 30 days following implementation of the initiative established under (c)(2) of Section 846 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91; 41 U.S.C. 1901 note) containing a market analysis and an implementation strategy related to the requirements under subparagraph (h) of Section 846. The report shall address strategies and processes for proper government safeguards to data management and privacy for incorporation into the implementation of Section 846 to ensure a competitive environment.

HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For payment to the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation Trust Fund, established by section 10 of Public Law 93–642, $1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Merit Systems Protection Board pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978, the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, and the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 (5 U.S.C. 5509 note), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, hire of passenger motor vehicles, direct procurement of survey printing, and not to exceed $2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $44,490,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, and in addition not to exceed $2,345,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, for administrative expenses to adjudicate retirement appeals to be transferred from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund in amounts determined by the Merit Systems Protection Board.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in connection with the administration of the National Archives and Records Administration and archived Federal records and related activities, as provided by law, and for expenses necessary for the review and declassification of documents, the activities of the Public Interest Declassification Board, the operations and maintenance of the electronic records archives, the hire of passenger motor vehicles, and for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901), including maintenance, repairs, and cleaning, $372,400,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008, Public Law 110–409, 122 Stat. 4302–16 (2008), and the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), and for the hire of passenger motor vehicles, $4,823,000.

REPAIRS AND RESTORATION

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of archives facilities, and to provide adequate storage for holdings, $7,500,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION

GRANTS PROGRAM

For necessary expenses for allocations and grants for historical publications and records as authorized by 44 U.S.C. 2504, $6,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REVOLVING LOAN FUND

For the Community Development Revolving Loan Fund program as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 9812, 9822 and 9910, $2,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2020, for technical assistance to low-income designated credit unions.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Government Ethics pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, the Ethics Reform Act of 1989, and the Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act of 2012, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and not to exceed $1,500 for official reception and representation expenses, $17,019,000.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF TRUST FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978 and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; advances for reimbursements to applicable funds of OPM and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred under Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended; and payment of per diem and/or subsistence allowances to employees where Voting Rights Act activities require an employee to remain overnight at his or her post of duty, $132,172,000: Provided, That of the total amount made available under this heading, not to exceed $14,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020, for information technology infrastructure modernization and Trust Fund Federal Financial System migration or modernization, and shall be in addition to funds otherwise made available for such purposes upon submitting to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives the plan of expenditure as required by the ''Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017'': Provided further, That the amount made available by the previous proviso may not be obligated until the Director of the Office of Personnel Management submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 90 days of enactment a plan for expenditure of such amount, prepared in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Administrator of the United States Digital Service, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, that—

(1) identifies the full scope and cost of the IT systems remediation and stabilization project;

(2) meets the capital planning and investment control review requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget, including Circular A–11, part 7;

(3) includes a Major IT Business Case under the requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget Exhibit 300;

(4) complies with the acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Government;

(5) complies with all Office of Management and Budget, Department of Homeland Security and National Institute of Standards and Technology requirements related to securing the agency's information system as described in 44 U.S.C. 3554; and

(6) is reviewed and commented upon within 60 days of plan development by the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management, and such comments are submitted to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management before the date of such submission:

Provided further, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $639,018 may be made available for strengthening the capacity and capabilities of the acquisition workforce (as defined by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, as amended (41 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.)), including the recruitment, hiring, training, and retention of such workforce and information technology in support of acquisition workforce effectiveness or for management solutions to improve acquisition management; and in addition $133,483,000 for administrative expenses, to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of OPM without regard to other statutes, including direct procurement of printed materials, for the retirement and insurance programs: Provided further, That the provisions of this appropriation shall not affect the authority to use applicable trust funds as provided by sections 8348(a)(1)(B), 8958(f)(2)(A), 8988(f)(2)(A), and 9004(f)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit of OPM established pursuant to Executive Order No. 9358 of July 1, 1943, or any successor unit of like purpose: Provided further, That the President's Commission on White House Fellows, established by Executive Order No. 11183 of October 3, 1964, may, during fiscal year 2019, accept donations of money, property, and personal services: Provided further, That such donations, including those from prior years, may be used for the development of publicity materials to provide information about the White House Fellows, except that no such donations shall be accepted for travel or reimbursement of travel expenses, or for the salaries of employees of such Commission.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF TRUST FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, hire of passenger motor vehicles, $5,000,000, and in addition, not to exceed $25,265,000 for administrative expenses to audit, investigate, and provide other oversight of the Office of Personnel Management's retirement and insurance programs, to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of the Office of Personnel Management, as determined by the Inspector General: Provided, That the Inspector General is authorized to rent conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Special Counsel pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978, the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–454), the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 (Public Law 101–12) as amended by Public Law 107–304, the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–199), and the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–353), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, payment of fees and expenses for witnesses, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; $26,252,000.

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Postal Regulatory Commission in carrying out the provisions of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (Public Law 109–435), $15,200,000, to be derived by transfer from the Postal Service Fund and expended as authorized by section 603(a) of such Act.

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, as authorized by section 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee), $5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS REFORM BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Public Buildings Reform Board in carrying out the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–287), $2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Securities and Exchange Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and not to exceed $3,500 for official reception and representation expenses, $1,658,302,000, to remain available until expended; of which not less than $15,206,000 shall be for the Office of Inspector General; of which not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for a permanent secretariat for the International Organization of Securities Commissions; and of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for expenses for consultations and meetings hosted by the Commission with foreign governmental and other regulatory officials, members of their delegations and staffs to exchange views concerning securities matters, such expenses to include necessary logistic and administrative expenses and the expenses of Commission staff and foreign invitees in attendance including: (1) incidental expenses such as meals; (2) travel and transportation; and (3) related lodging or subsistence.

In addition to the foregoing appropriation, for costs associated with relocation under a replacement lease for the Commission's New York regional office facilities, not to exceed $37,189,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That for purposes of calculating the fee rate under section 31(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee(j)) for fiscal year 2019, all amounts appropriated under this heading shall be deemed to be the regular appropriation to the Commission for fiscal year 2019: Provided further, That fees and charges authorized by section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee) shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections: Provided further, That not to exceed $1,658,302,000 of such offsetting collections shall be available until expended for necessary expenses of this account and not to exceed $37,189,000 of such offsetting collections shall be available until expended for costs under this heading associated with relocation under a replacement lease for the Commission's New York regional office facilities: Provided further, That the total amount appropriated under this heading from the general fund for fiscal year 2019 shall be reduced as such offsetting fees

are received so as to result in a final total fiscal year 2019 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $0: Provided further, That if any amount of the appropriation for costs associated with relocation under a replacement lease for the Commission's New York regional office facilities is subsequently de-obligated by the Commission, such amount that was derived from the general fund shall be returned to the general fund, and such amounts that were derived from fees or assessments collected for such purpose shall be paid to each national securities exchange and national securities association, respectively, in proportion to any fees or assessments paid by such national securities exchange or national securities association under section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee) in fiscal year 2019.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Selective Service System, including expenses of attendance at meetings and of training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective Service System, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 4101–4118 for civilian employees; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and not to exceed $750 for official reception and representation expenses; $26,000,000: Provided, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1341, whenever the President deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be expended for or in connection with the induction of any person into the Armed Forces of the United States.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration, including hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by sections 1343 and 1344 of title 31, United States Code, and not to exceed $3,500 for official reception and representation expenses, $268,500,000, of which not less than $12,000,000 shall be available for examinations, reviews, and other lender oversight activities: Provided, That the Administrator is authorized to charge fees to cover the cost of publications developed by the Small Business Administration, and certain loan program activities, including fees authorized by section 5(b) of the Small Business Act: Provided further, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, revenues received from all such activities shall be credited to this account, to remain available until expended, for carrying out these purposes without further appropriations: Provided further, That the Small Business Administration may accept gifts in an amount not to exceed $4,000,000 and may co-sponsor activities, each in accordance with section 132(a) of division K of Public Law 108–447, during fiscal year 2019: Provided further, That $6,100,000 shall be available for the Loan Modernization and Accounting System, to be available until September 30, 2020: Provided further, That $3,000,000 shall be for the Federal and State Technology Partnership Program under section 34 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657d).

ENTREPRENEURIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses of programs supporting entrepreneurial and small business development, $251,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That $132,600,000 shall be available to fund grants for performance in fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2020 as authorized by section 21 of the Small Business Act: Provided further, That $31,600,000 shall be for marketing, management, and technical assistance under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(4)) by intermediaries that make microloans under the microloan program: Provided further, That $18,000,000 shall be available for grants to States to carry out export programs that assist small business concerns authorized under section 22(l) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649(l)).

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $21,900,000.

OFFICE OF ADVOCACY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Advocacy in carrying out the provisions of title II of Public Law 94–305 (15 U.S.C. 634a et seq.) and the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), $9,120,000, to remain available until expended.

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, $4,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That subject to section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, during fiscal year 2019 commitments to guarantee loans under section 503 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 shall not exceed $7,500,000,000: Provided further, That during fiscal year 2019 commitments for general business loans authorized under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act shall not exceed $30,000,000,000 for a combination of amortizing term loans and the aggregated maximum line of credit provided by revolving loans: Provided further, That during fiscal year 2019 commitments for loans authorized under subparagraph (C) of section 502(7) of The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 696(7)) shall not exceed $7,500,000,000: Provided further, That during fiscal year 2019 commitments to guarantee loans for debentures under section 303(b) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 shall not exceed $4,000,000,000: Provided further, That during fiscal year 2019, guarantees of trust certificates authorized by section 5(g) of the Small Business Act shall not exceed a principal amount of $12,000,000,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $155,150,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Salaries and Expenses.

DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program authorized by section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, $31,308,000, to be available until expended, of which $1,000,000 is for the Office of Inspector General of the Small Business Administration for audits and reviews of disaster loans and the disaster loan programs and shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for the Office of Inspector General; of which $22,308,000 is for direct administrative expenses of loan making and servicing to carry out the direct loan program, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Salaries and Expenses; and of which $9,000,000 is for indirect administrative expenses for the direct loan program, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Salaries and Expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING RESCISSION AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 530. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Small Business Administration in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: Provided, That any transfer pursuant to this paragraph shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 608 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 531. Of the unobligated balances from prior year appropriations available under the ''Business Loans Program Account'' heading for the Certified Development Company Program, $50,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded: Provided, That no amounts may be rescinded under this section from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 532. Section 12085 of Public Law 110–246 is repealed.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

PAYMENT TO THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND

For payment to the Postal Service Fund for revenue forgone on free and reduced rate mail, pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of section 2401 of title 39, United States Code, $58,118,000: Provided, That mail for overseas voting and mail for the blind shall continue to be free: Provided further, That 6-day delivery and rural delivery of mail shall continue at not less than the 1983 level: Provided further, That none of the funds made available to the Postal Service by this Act shall be used to implement any rule, regulation, or policy of charging any officer or employee of any State or local child support enforcement agency, or any individual participating in a State or local program of child support enforcement, a fee for information requested or provided concerning an address of a postal customer: Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be used to consolidate or close small rural and other small post offices: Provided further, That the Postal Service shall maintain and comply with service standards for First Class Mail and periodicals effective on July 1, 2012.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $250,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the Postal Service Fund and expended as authorized by section 603(b)(3) of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (Public Law 109–435).

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including contract reporting and other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $51,515,000, of which $500,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That travel expenses of the judges shall be paid upon the written certificate of the judge.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 601. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening

in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 602. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 603. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 604. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 605. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available for any activity or for paying the salary of any Government employee where funding an activity or paying a salary to a Government employee would result in a decision, determination, rule, regulation, or policy that would prohibit the enforcement of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307).

SEC. 606. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 607. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity that has been convicted of violating chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 608. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies or entities funded in this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2019, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury derived by the collection of fees and available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that: (1) creates a new program; (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity; (3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress; (4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by the Committee on Appropriations of either the House of Representatives or the Senate for a different purpose; (5) augments existing programs, projects, or activities in excess of $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; (6) reduces existing programs, projects, or activities by $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or (7) creates or reorganizes offices, programs, or activities unless prior approval is received from the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided, That prior to any significant reorganization or restructuring of offices, programs, or activities, each agency or entity funded in this Act shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided further, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency funded by this Act shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for the current fiscal year: Provided further, That at a minimum the report shall include: (1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level; (2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by object class and program, project, and activity as detailed in the budget appendix for the respective appropriation; and (3) an identification of items of special congressional interest: Provided further, That the amount appropriated or limited for salaries and expenses for an agency shall be reduced by $100,000 per day for each day after the required date that the report has not been submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 609. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2019 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2019 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2020, for each such account for the purposes authorized: Provided, That a request shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: Provided further, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines.

SEC. 610. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Executive Office of the President to request—

(1) any official background investigation report on any individual from the Federal Bureau of Investigation; or

(2) a determination with respect to the treatment of an organization as described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code from the Department of the Treasury or the Internal Revenue Service.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply—

(1) in the case of an official background investigation report, if such individual has given express written consent for such request not more than 6 months prior to the date of such request and during the same presidential administration; or

(2) if such request is required due to extraordinary circumstances involving national security.

SEC. 611. The cost accounting standards promulgated under chapter 15 of title 41, United States Code shall not apply with respect to a contract under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program established under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 612. For the purpose of resolving litigation and implementing any settlement agreements regarding the nonforeign area cost-of-living allowance program, the Office of Personnel Management may accept and utilize (without regard to any restriction on unanticipated travel expenses imposed in an Appropriations Act) funds made available to the Office of Personnel Management pursuant to court approval.

SEC. 613. No funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to pay for an abortion, or the administrative expenses in connection with any health plan under the Federal employees health benefits program which provides any benefits or coverage for abortions.

SEC. 614. The provision of section 613 shall not apply where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

SEC. 615. In order to promote Government access to commercial information technology, the restriction on purchasing nondomestic articles, materials, and supplies set forth in chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code (popularly known as the Buy American Act), shall not apply to the acquisition by the Federal Government of information technology (as defined in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code), that is a commercial item (as defined in section 103 of title 41, United States Code).

SEC. 616. Notwithstanding section 1353 of title 31, United States Code, no officer or employee of any regulatory agency or commission funded by this Act may accept on behalf of that agency, nor may such agency or commission accept, payment or reimbursement from a non-Federal entity for travel, subsistence, or related expenses for the purpose of enabling an officer or employee to attend and participate in any meeting or similar function relating to the official duties of the officer or employee when the entity offering payment or reimbursement is a person or entity subject to regulation by such agency or commission, or represents a person or entity subject to regulation by such agency or commission, unless the person or entity is an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

SEC. 617. Notwithstanding section 708 of this Act, funds made available to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission by this or any other Act may be used for the interagency funding and sponsorship of a joint advisory committee to advise on emerging regulatory issues.

SEC. 618. (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an Executive agency covered by this Act otherwise authorized to enter into contracts for either leases or the construction or alteration of real property for office, meeting, storage, or other space must consult with the General Services Administration before issuing a solicitation for offers of new leases or construction contracts, and in the case of succeeding leases, before entering into negotiations with the current lessor.

(2) Any such agency with authority to enter into an emergency lease may do so during any period declared by the President to require emergency leasing authority with respect to such agency.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term ''Executive agency covered by this Act'' means any Executive agency provided funds by this Act, but does not include the General Services Administration or the United States Postal Service.

SEC. 619. (a) There are appropriated for the following activities the amounts required under current law:

(1) Compensation of the President (3 U.S.C. 102).

(2) Payments to—

(A) the Judicial Officers' Retirement Fund (28 U.S.C. 377(o));

(B) the Judicial Survivors' Annuities Fund (28 U.S.C. 376(c)); and

(C) the United States Court of Federal Claims Judges' Retirement Fund (28 U.S.C. 178(l)).

(3) Payment of Government contributions—

(A) with respect to the health benefits of retired employees, as authorized by chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, and the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 849); and

(B) with respect to the life insurance benefits for employees retiring after December 31, 1989 (5 U.S.C. ch. 87).

(4) Payment to finance the unfunded liability of new and increased annuity benefits under the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (5 U.S.C. 8348).

(5) Payment of annuities authorized to be paid from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund by statutory provisions other than subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) Nothing in this section may be construed to exempt any amount appropriated by this section from any otherwise applicable limitation on the use of funds contained in this Act.

SEC. 620. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Federal Trade Commission to complete the draft report entitled ''Interagency Working Group on Food Marketed to Children: Preliminary Proposed Nutrition Principles to Guide Industry Self-Regulatory Efforts'' unless the Interagency Working Group on Food Marketed to Children complies with Executive Order No. 13563.

SEC. 621. None of the funds in this Act may be used for the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to award a contract, enter an extension of, or exercise an option on a contract to a contractor conducting the final quality review processes for background investigation fieldwork services or background investigation support services that, as of the date of the award of the contract, are being conducted by that contractor.

SEC. 622. (a) The head of each executive branch agency funded by this Act shall ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the agency has the authority to participate in decisions regarding the budget planning process related to information technology.

(b) Amounts appropriated for any executive branch agency funded by this Act that are available for information technology shall be allocated within the agency, consistent with the provisions of appropriations Acts and budget guidelines and recommendations from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in such manner as specified by, or approved by, the Chief Information Officer of the agency in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer of the agency and budget officials.

SEC. 623. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of chapter 29, 31, or 33 of title 44, United States Code.

SEC. 624. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by a governmental entity to require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service to the public or remote computing service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is in electronic storage with the provider (as such terms are defined in sections 2510 and 2711 of title 18, United States Code) in a manner that violates the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 625. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by the Federal Communications Commission to modify, amend, or change the rules or regulations of the Commission for universal service high-cost support for competitive eligible telecommunications carriers in a way that is inconsistent with paragraph (e)(5) or (e)(6) of section 54.307 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on July 15, 2015: Provided, That this section shall not prohibit the Commission from considering, developing, or adopting other support mechanisms as an alternative to Mobility Fund Phase II.

SEC. 626. No funds provided in this Act shall be used to deny an Inspector General funded under this Act timely access to any records, documents, or other materials available to the department or agency over which that Inspector General has responsibilities under the Inspector General Act of 1978, or to prevent or impede that Inspector General's access to such records, documents, or other materials, under any provision of law, except a provision of law that expressly refers to the Inspector General and expressly limits the Inspector General's right of access. A department or agency covered by this section shall provide its Inspector General with access to all such records, documents, and other materials in a timely manner. Each Inspector General shall ensure compliance with statutory limitations on disclosure relevant to the information provided by the establishment over which that Inspector General has responsibilities under the Inspector General Act of 1978. Each Inspector General covered by this section shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 5 calendar days any failures to comply with this requirement.

SEC. 627. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, adjudication activities, or other law enforcement- or victim assistance-related activity.

SEC. 628. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Securities and Exchange Commission to finalize, issue, or implement any rule, regulation, or order regarding the disclosure of political contributions, contributions to tax exempt organizations, or dues paid to trade associations.

SEC. 629. Title 44, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)(2) of section 2107, by striking ''the head of such agency has certified in writing to the Archivist'' and inserting ''the Archivist determines, after consulting with the head of such agency,''.

(2) In subsection (d) of section 2904, by striking the first instance of ''digital or electronic''.

(3) In subsection (e) of section 3303a, by striking ''the written consent of'' and inserting ''advance notice to''.

(4) In section 3308, by striking ''empower'' and inserting ''direct''.

SEC. 630. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the requirements in section 316(b)(4)(D) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30118(b)(4)(D)) that the solicitation of contributions from member corporations stockholders and executive or administrative personnel, and the families of such stockholders or personnel, by trade associations must be separately and specifically approved by the member corporation involved prior to such solicitation, and that such member corporation does not approve any such solicitation by more than one such trade association in any calendar year.

SEC. 631. (1) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to pay for an abortion or the administrative expenses in connection with a multi-State qualified health plan offered under a contract under section 1334 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18054) which provides any benefits or coverage for abortions.

(2) The provision of paragraph (1) shall not apply where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

SEC. 632. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Securities and Exchange Commission to propose, issue, implement, administer, or enforce any requirement that a solicitation of a proxy, consent, or authorization to vote a security of an issuer in an election of members of the board of directors of the issuer be made using a single ballot or card that lists both individuals nominated by (or on behalf of) the issuer and individuals nominated by (or on behalf of) other proponents and permits the person granting the proxy, consent, or authorization to select from individuals in both groups.

TITLE VII

GENERAL PROVISIONS—GOVERNMENT-WIDE

DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 701. No department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States receiving appropriated funds under this or any other Act for fiscal year 2019 shall obligate or expend any such funds, unless such department, agency, or instrumentality has in place, and will continue to administer in good faith, a written policy designed to ensure that all of its workplaces are free from the illegal use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances (as defined in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)) by the officers and employees of such department, agency, or instrumentality.

SEC. 702. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year in accordance with subsection 1343(c) of title 31, United States Code, for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of buses, ambulances, law enforcement vehicles, protective vehicles, and undercover surveillance vehicles), is hereby fixed at $19,947 except station wagons for which the maximum shall be $19,997: Provided, That these limits may be exceeded by not to exceed $7,250 for police-type vehicles: Provided further, That the limits set forth in this section may not be exceeded by more than 5 percent for electric or hybrid vehicles purchased for demonstration under the provisions of the Electric and Hybrid Vehicle Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1976: Provided further, That the limits set forth in this section may be exceeded by the incremental cost of clean alternative fuels vehicles acquired pursuant to Public Law 101–549 over the cost of comparable conventionally fueled vehicles: Provided further, That the limits set forth in this section shall not apply to any vehicle that is a commercial item and which operates on alternative fuel, including but not limited to electric, plug-in hybrid electric, and hydrogen fuel cell vehicles.

SEC. 703. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year available for expenses of travel, or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 5922–5924.

SEC. 704. Unless otherwise specified in law during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in the continental United States unless such person: (1) is a citizen of the United States; (2) is a person who is lawfully admitted for permanent residence and is seeking citizenship as outlined in 8 U.S.C. 1324b(a)(3)(B); (3) is a person who is admitted as a refugee under 8 U.S.C. 1157 or is granted asylum under 8 U.S.C. 1158 and has filed a declaration of intention to become a lawful permanent resident and then a citizen when eligible; or (4) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States: Provided, That for purposes of this section, affidavits signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this

section with respect to his or her status are being complied with: Provided further, That for purposes of subsections (2) and (3) such affidavits shall be submitted prior to employment and updated thereafter as necessary: Provided further, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction, shall be fined no more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: Provided further, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: Provided further, That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government: Provided further, That this section shall not apply to any person who is an officer or employee of the Government of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, or to international broadcasters employed by the Broadcasting Board of Governors, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed 60 days) as a result of emergencies: Provided further, That this section does not apply to the employment as Wildland firefighters for not more than 120 days of nonresident aliens employed by the Department of the Interior or the USDA Forest Service pursuant to an agreement with another country.

SEC. 705. Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for payment to the General Services Administration for charges for space and services and those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972 (86 Stat. 216), or other applicable law.

SEC. 706. In addition to funds provided in this or any other Act, all Federal agencies are authorized to receive and use funds resulting from the sale of materials, including Federal records disposed of pursuant to a records schedule recovered through recycling or waste prevention programs. Such funds shall be available until expended for the following purposes:

(1) Acquisition, waste reduction and prevention, and recycling programs as described in Executive Order No. 13693 (March 19, 2015), including any such programs adopted prior to the effective date of the Executive order.

(2) Other Federal agency environmental management programs, including, but not limited to, the development and implementation of hazardous waste management and pollution prevention programs.

(3) Other employee programs as authorized by law or as deemed appropriate by the head of the Federal agency.

SEC. 707. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to chapter 91 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 3109; and the objects specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: Provided, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 708. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be available for interagency financing of boards (except Federal Executive Boards), commissions, councils, committees, or similar groups (whether or not they are interagency entities) which do not have a prior and specific statutory approval to receive financial support from more than one agency or instrumentality.

SEC. 709. None of the funds made available pursuant to the provisions of this or any other Act shall be used to implement, administer, or enforce any regulation which has been disapproved pursuant to a joint resolution duly adopted in accordance with the applicable law of the United States.

SEC. 710. During the period in which the head of any department or agency, or any other officer or civilian employee of the Federal Government appointed by the President of the United States, holds office, no funds may be obligated or expended in excess of $5,000 to furnish or redecorate the office of such department head, agency head, officer, or employee, or to purchase furniture or make improvements for any such office, unless advance notice of such furnishing or redecoration is transmitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate. For the purposes of this section, the term ''office'' shall include the entire suite of offices assigned to the individual, as well as any other space used primarily by the individual or the use of which is directly controlled by the individual.

SEC. 711. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1346, or section 708 of this Act, funds made available for the current fiscal year by this or any other Act shall be available for the interagency funding of national security and emergency preparedness telecommunications initiatives which benefit multiple Federal departments, agencies, or entities, as provided by Executive Order No. 13618 (July 6, 2012).

SEC. 712. (a) None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be obligated or expended by any department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Federal Government to pay the salaries or expenses of any individual appointed to a position of a confidential or policy-determining character that is excepted from the competitive service under section 3302 of title 5, United States Code, (pursuant to schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations) unless the head of the applicable department, agency, or other instrumentality employing such schedule C individual certifies to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management that the schedule C position occupied by the individual was not created solely or primarily in order to detail the individual to the White House.

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to Federal employees or members of the armed forces detailed to or from an element of the intelligence community (as that term is defined under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4))).

SEC. 713. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be available for the payment of the salary of any officer or employee of the Federal Government, who—

(1) prohibits or prevents, or attempts or threatens to prohibit or prevent, any other officer or employee of the Federal Government from having any direct oral or written communication or contact with any Member, committee, or subcommittee of the Congress in connection with any matter pertaining to the employment of such other officer or employee or pertaining to the department or agency of such other officer or employee in any way, irrespective of whether such communication or contact is at the initiative of such other officer or employee or in response to the request or inquiry of such Member, committee, or subcommittee; or

(2) removes, suspends from duty without pay, demotes, reduces in rank, seniority, status, pay, or performance or efficiency rating, denies promotion to, relocates, reassigns, transfers, disciplines, or discriminates in regard to any employment right, entitlement, or benefit, or any term or condition of employment of, any other officer or employee of the Federal Government, or attempts or threatens to commit any of the foregoing actions with respect to such other officer or employee, by reason of any communication or contact of such other officer or employee with any Member, committee, or subcommittee of the Congress as described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 714. (a) None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training that—

(1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;

(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;

(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;

(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or ''new age'' belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N–915.022, dated September 2, 1988; or

(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants' personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict, or otherwise preclude an agency from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.

SEC. 715. No part of any funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used by an agency of the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for the preparation, distribution or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television, or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress, except in presentation to the Congress itself.

SEC. 716. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act may be used by an agency to provide a Federal employee's home address to any labor organization except when the employee has authorized such disclosure or when such disclosure has been ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 717. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to provide any non-public information such as mailing, telephone or electronic mailing lists to any person or any organization outside of the Federal Government without the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 718. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used directly or indirectly, including by private contractor, for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not heretofore authorized by Congress.

SEC. 719. (a) In this section, the term ''agency''—

(1) means an Executive agency, as defined under 5 U.S.C. 105; and

(2) includes a military department, as defined under section 102 of such title, the United States Postal Service, and the Postal Regulatory Commission.

(b) Unless authorized in accordance with law or regulations to use such time for other

purposes, an employee of an agency shall use official time in an honest effort to perform official duties. An employee not under a leave system, including a Presidential appointee exempted under 5 U.S.C. 6301(2), has an obligation to expend an honest effort and a reasonable proportion of such employee's time in the performance of official duties.

SEC. 720. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1346 and section 708 of this Act, funds made available for the current fiscal year by this or any other Act to any department or agency, which is a member of the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB), shall be available to finance an appropriate share of FASAB administrative costs.

SEC. 721. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1346 and section 708 of this Act, the head of each Executive department and agency is hereby authorized to transfer to or reimburse ''General Services Administration, Government-wide Policy'' with the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, funds made available for the current fiscal year by this or any other Act, including rebates from charge card and other contracts: Provided, That these funds shall be administered by the Administrator of General Services to support Government-wide and other multi-agency financial, information technology, procurement, and other management innovations, initiatives, and activities, including improving coordination and reducing duplication, as approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the appropriate interagency and multi-agency groups designated by the Director (including the President's Management Council for overall management improvement initiatives, the Chief Financial Officers Council for financial management initiatives, the Chief Information Officers Council for information technology initiatives, the Chief Human Capital Officers Council for human capital initiatives, the Chief Acquisition Officers Council for procurement initiatives, and the Performance Improvement Council for performance improvement initiatives): Provided further, That the total funds transferred or reimbursed shall not exceed $15,000,000 to improve coordination, reduce duplication, and for other activities related to Federal Government Priority Goals established by 31 U.S.C. 1120, and not to exceed $17,000,000 for Government-Wide innovations, initiatives, and activities: Provided further, That the funds transferred to or for reimbursement of ''General Services Administration, Government-wide Policy'' during fiscal year 2019 shall remain available for obligation through September 30, 2020: Provided further, That such transfers or reimbursements may only be made after 15 days following notification of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 722. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a woman may breastfeed her child at any location in a Federal building or on Federal property, if the woman and her child are otherwise authorized to be present at the location.

SEC. 723. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1346, or section 708 of this Act, funds made available for the current fiscal year by this or any other Act shall be available for the interagency funding of specific projects, workshops, studies, and similar efforts to carry out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Council (authorized by Executive Order No. 12881), which benefit multiple Federal departments, agencies, or entities: Provided, That the Office of Management and Budget shall provide a report describing the budget of and resources connected with the National Science and Technology Council to the Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Science and Technology, and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation 90 days after enactment of this Act.

SEC. 724. Any request for proposals, solicitation, grant application, form, notification, press release, or other publications involving the distribution of Federal funds shall comply with any relevant requirements in part 200 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations: Provided, That this section shall apply to direct payments, formula funds, and grants received by a State receiving Federal funds.

SEC. 725. (a) PROHIBITION OF FEDERAL AGENCY MONITORING OF INDIVIDUALS' INTERNET USE.—None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used by any Federal agency—

(1) to collect, review, or create any aggregation of data, derived from any means, that includes any personally identifiable information relating to an individual's access to or use of any Federal Government Internet site of the agency; or

(2) to enter into any agreement with a third party (including another government agency) to collect, review, or obtain any aggregation of data, derived from any means, that includes any personally identifiable information relating to an individual's access to or use of any nongovernmental Internet site.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitations established in subsection (a) shall not apply to—

(1) any record of aggregate data that does not identify particular persons;

(2) any voluntary submission of personally identifiable information;

(3) any action taken for law enforcement, regulatory, or supervisory purposes, in accordance with applicable law; or

(4) any action described in subsection (a)(1) that is a system security action taken by the operator of an Internet site and is necessarily incident to providing the Internet site services or to protecting the rights or property of the provider of the Internet site.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) The term ''regulatory'' means agency actions to implement, interpret or enforce authorities provided in law.

(2) The term ''supervisory'' means examinations of the agency's supervised institutions, including assessing safety and soundness, overall financial condition, management practices and policies and compliance with applicable standards as provided in law.

SEC. 726. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to enter into or renew a contract which includes a provision providing prescription drug coverage, except where the contract also includes a provision for contraceptive coverage.

(b) Nothing in this section shall apply to a contract with—

(1) any of the following religious plans:

(A) Personal Care's HMO; and

(B) OSF HealthPlans, Inc.; and

(2) any existing or future plan, if the carrier for the plan objects to such coverage on the basis of religious beliefs.

(c) In implementing this section, any plan that enters into or renews a contract under this section may not subject any individual to discrimination on the basis that the individual refuses to prescribe or otherwise provide for contraceptives because such activities would be contrary to the individual's religious beliefs or moral convictions.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require coverage of abortion or abortion-related services.

SEC. 727. The United States is committed to ensuring the health of its Olympic, Pan American, and Paralympic athletes, and supports the strict adherence to anti-doping in sport through testing, adjudication, education, and research as performed by nationally recognized oversight authorities.

SEC. 728. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for official travel to Federal departments and agencies may be used by such departments and agencies, if consistent with Office of Management and Budget Circular A–126 regarding official travel for Government personnel, to participate in the fractional aircraft ownership pilot program.

SEC. 729. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no executive branch agency shall purchase, construct, or lease any additional facilities, except within or contiguous to existing locations, to be used for the purpose of conducting Federal law enforcement training without the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, except that the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is authorized to obtain the temporary use of additional facilities by lease, contract, or other agreement for training which cannot be accommodated in existing Center facilities.

SEC. 730. Unless otherwise authorized by existing law, none of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be used by an executive branch agency to produce any prepackaged news story intended for broadcast or distribution in the United States, unless the story includes a clear notification within the text or audio of the prepackaged news story that the prepackaged news story was prepared or funded by that executive branch agency.

SEC. 731. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 552a of title 5, United States Code (popularly known as the Privacy Act), and regulations implementing that section.

SEC. 732. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used for any Federal Government contract with any foreign incorporated entity which is treated as an inverted domestic corporation under section 835(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(b)) or any subsidiary of such an entity.

(b) WAIVERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any Secretary shall waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such Secretary if the Secretary determines that the waiver is required in the interest of national security.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Any Secretary issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall report such issuance to Congress.

(c) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply to any Federal Government contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act, or to any task order issued pursuant to such contract.

SEC. 733. During fiscal year 2019, for each employee who—

(1) retires under section 8336(d)(2) or 8414(b)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code; or

(2) retires under any other provision of subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of such title 5 and receives a payment as an incentive to separate, the separating agency shall remit to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund an amount equal to the Office of Personnel Management's average unit cost of processing a retirement claim for the preceding fiscal year. Such amounts shall be available until expended to the Office of Personnel Management and shall be deemed to be an administrative expense under section 8348(a)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 734. (a) None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to recommend or require any entity submitting

an offer for a Federal contract to disclose any of the following information as a condition of submitting the offer:

(1) Any payment consisting of a contribution, expenditure, independent expenditure, or disbursement for an electioneering communication that is made by the entity, its officers or directors, or any of its affiliates or subsidiaries to a candidate for election for Federal office or to a political committee, or that is otherwise made with respect to any election for Federal office.

(2) Any disbursement of funds (other than a payment described in paragraph (1)) made by the entity, its officers or directors, or any of its affiliates or subsidiaries to any person with the intent or the reasonable expectation that the person will use the funds to make a payment described in paragraph (1).

(b) In this section, each of the terms ''contribution'', ''expenditure'', ''independent expenditure'', ''electioneering communication'', ''candidate'', ''election'', and ''Federal office'' has the meaning given such term in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.).

SEC. 735. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to pay for the painting of a portrait of an officer or employee of the Federal government, including the President, the Vice President, a member of Congress (including a Delegate or a Resident Commissioner to Congress), the head of an executive branch agency (as defined in section 133 of title 41, United States Code), or the head of an office of the legislative branch.

SEC. 736. (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as otherwise provided in this section, no part of any of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 2019, by this or any other Act, may be used to pay any prevailing rate employee described in section 5342(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code—

(A) during the period from the date of expiration of the limitation imposed by the comparable section for the previous fiscal years until the normal effective date of the applicable wage survey adjustment that is to take effect in fiscal year 2019, in an amount that exceeds the rate payable for the applicable grade and step of the applicable wage schedule in accordance with such section; and

(B) during the period consisting of the remainder of fiscal year 2019, in an amount that exceeds, as a result of a wage survey adjustment, the rate payable under subparagraph (A) by more than the sum of—

(i) the percentage adjustment taking effect in fiscal year 2019 under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule; and

(ii) the difference between the overall average percentage of the locality-based comparability payments taking effect in fiscal year 2019 under section 5304 of such title (whether by adjustment or otherwise), and the overall average percentage of such payments which was effective in the previous fiscal year under such section.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no prevailing rate employee described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 5342(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, and no employee covered by section 5348 of such title, may be paid during the periods for which paragraph (1) is in effect at a rate that exceeds the rates that would be payable under paragraph (1) were paragraph (1) applicable to such employee.

(3) For the purposes of this subsection, the rates payable to an employee who is covered by this subsection and who is paid from a schedule not in existence on September 30, 2018, shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management.

(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rates of premium pay for employees subject to this subsection may not be changed from the rates in effect on September 30, 2018, except to the extent determined by the Office of Personnel Management to be consistent with the purpose of this subsection.

(5) This subsection shall apply with respect to pay for service performed after September 30, 2017.

(6) For the purpose of administering any provision of law (including any rule or regulation that provides premium pay, retirement, life insurance, or any other employee benefit) that requires any deduction or contribution, or that imposes any requirement or limitation on the basis of a rate of salary or basic pay, the rate of salary or basic pay payable after the application of this subsection shall be treated as the rate of salary or basic pay.

(7) Nothing in this subsection shall be considered to permit or require the payment to any employee covered by this subsection at a rate in excess of the rate that would be payable were this subsection not in effect.

(8) The Office of Personnel Management may provide for exceptions to the limitations imposed by this subsection if the Office determines that such exceptions are necessary to ensure the recruitment or retention of qualified employees.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the adjustment in rates of basic pay for the statutory pay systems that take place in fiscal year 2019 under sections 5344 and 5348 of title 5, United States Code, shall be—

(1) not less than the percentage received by employees in the same location whose rates of basic pay are adjusted pursuant to the statutory pay systems under sections 5303 and 5304 of title 5, United States Code: Provided, That prevailing rate employees at locations where there are no employees whose pay is increased pursuant to sections 5303 and 5304 of title 5, United States Code, and prevailing rate employees described in section 5343(a)(5) of title 5, United States Code, shall be considered to be located in the pay locality designated as ''Rest of United States'' pursuant to section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of this subsection; and

(2) effective as of the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning after September 30, 2018.

SEC. 737. (a) The head of any Executive branch department, agency, board, commission, or office funded by this or any other appropriations Act shall submit annual reports to the Inspector General or senior ethics official for any entity without an Inspector General, regarding the costs and contracting procedures related to each conference held by any such department, agency, board, commission, or office during fiscal year 2019 for which the cost to the United States Government was more than $100,000.

(b) Each report submitted shall include, for each conference described in subsection (a) held during the applicable period—

(1) a description of its purpose;

(2) the number of participants attending;

(3) a detailed statement of the costs to the United States Government, including—

(A) the cost of any food or beverages;

(B) the cost of any audio-visual services;

(C) the cost of employee or contractor travel to and from the conference; and

(D) a discussion of the methodology used to determine which costs relate to the conference; and

(4) a description of the contracting procedures used including—

(A) whether contracts were awarded on a competitive basis; and

(B) a discussion of any cost comparison conducted by the departmental component or office in evaluating potential contractors for the conference.

(c) Within 15 days after the end of a quarter, the head of any such department, agency, board, commission, or office shall notify the Inspector General or senior ethics official for any entity without an Inspector General, of the date, location, and number of employees attending a conference held by any Executive branch department, agency, board, commission, or office funded by this or any other appropriations Act during fiscal year 2019 for which the cost to the United States Government was more than $20,000.

(d) A grant or contract funded by amounts appropriated by this or any other appropriations Act may not be used for the purpose of defraying the costs of a conference described in subsection (c) that is not directly and programmatically related to the purpose for which the grant or contract was awarded, such as a conference held in connection with planning, training, assessment, review, or other routine purposes related to a project funded by the grant or contract.

(e) None of the funds made available in this or any other appropriations Act may be used for travel and conference activities that are not in compliance with Office of Management and Budget Memorandum M–12–12 dated May 11, 2012 or any subsequent revisions to that memorandum.

SEC. 738. None of the funds made available in this or any other appropriations Act may be used to increase, eliminate, or reduce funding for a program, project, or activity as proposed in the President's budget request for a fiscal year until such proposed change is subsequently enacted in an appropriation Act, or unless such change is made pursuant to the reprogramming or transfer provisions of this or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 739. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to implement, administer, enforce, or apply the rule entitled ''Competitive Area'' published by the Office of Personnel Management in the Federal Register on April 15, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 2019 0 et seq.).

SEC. 740. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be available for a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement with an entity that requires employees or contractors of such entity seeking to report fraud, waste, or abuse to sign internal confidentiality agreements or statements prohibiting or otherwise restricting such employees or contractors from lawfully reporting such waste, fraud, or abuse to a designated investigative or law enforcement representative of a Federal department or agency authorized to receive such information.

(b) The limitation in subsection (a) shall not contravene requirements applicable to Standard Form 312, Form 4414, or any other form issued by a Federal department or agency governing the nondisclosure of classified information.

SEC. 741. (a) No funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to implement or enforce the agreements in Standard Forms 312 and 4414 of the Government or any other nondisclosure policy, form, or agreement if such policy, form, or agreement does not contain the following provisions: ''These provisions are consistent with and do not supersede, conflict with, or otherwise alter the employee obligations, rights, or liabilities created by existing statute or Executive order relating to (1) classified information, (2) communications to Congress, (3) the reporting to an Inspector General of a violation of any law, rule, or regulation, or mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety, or (4) any other whistleblower protection. The

definitions, requirements, obligations, rights, sanctions, and liabilities created by controlling Executive orders and statutory provisions are incorporated into this agreement and are controlling.'': Provided, That notwithstanding the preceding provision of this section, a nondisclosure policy form or agreement that is to be executed by a person connected with the conduct of an intelligence or intelligence-related activity, other than an employee or officer of the United States Government, may contain provisions appropriate to the particular activity for which such document is to be used. Such form or agreement shall, at a minimum, require that the person will not disclose any classified information received in the course of such activity unless specifically authorized to do so by the United States Government. Such nondisclosure forms shall also make it clear that they do not bar disclosures to Congress, or to an authorized official of an executive agency or the Department of Justice, that are essential to reporting a substantial violation of law.

(b) A nondisclosure agreement may continue to be implemented and enforced notwithstanding subsection (a) if it complies with the requirements for such agreement that were in effect when the agreement was entered into.

(c) No funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to implement or enforce any agreement entered into during fiscal year 2014 which does not contain substantially similar language to that required in subsection (a).

SEC. 742. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless a Federal agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 743. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless a Federal agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 744. (a) During fiscal year 2019, on the date on which a request is made for a transfer of funds in accordance with section 1017 of Public Law 111–203, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate of such request.

(b) Any notification required by this section shall be made available on the Bureau's public Web site.

SEC. 745. If, for fiscal year 2019, new budget authority provided in appropriations Acts exceeds the discretionary spending limit for any category set forth in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 due to estimating differences with the Congressional Budget Office, an adjustment to the discretionary spending limit in such category for fiscal year 2019 shall be made by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in the amount of the excess but the total of all such adjustments shall not exceed 0.2 percent of the sum of the adjusted discretionary spending limits for all categories for that fiscal year.

SEC. 746. None of the funds made available under this or any other Act may be used to implement or enforce Executive Order No. 13690, Establishing a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input, including any related rules, interim final rules, or guidance.

SEC. 747. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce a rule issued pursuant to section 13(p) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

SEC. 748. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to plan for, begin, continue, complete, process, or approve a public-private competition under the Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76.

SEC. 749. Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to ''this Act'' contained in any title other than title IV or VIII shall not apply to such title IV or VIII.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 801. There are appropriated from the applicable funds of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary for making refunds and for the payment of legal settlements or judgments that have been entered against the District of Columbia government.

SEC. 802. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes or implementation of any policy including boycott designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress or any State legislature.

SEC. 803. (a) None of the Federal funds provided under this Act to the agencies funded by this Act, both Federal and District government agencies, that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2019, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditures for an agency through a reprogramming of funds which—

(1) creates new programs;

(2) eliminates a program, project, or responsibility center;

(3) establishes or changes allocations specifically denied, limited or increased under this Act;

(4) increases funds or personnel by any means for any program, project, or responsibility center for which funds have been denied or restricted;

(5) re-establishes any program or project previously deferred through reprogramming;

(6) augments any existing program, project, or responsibility center through a reprogramming of funds in excess of $3,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or

(7) increases by 20 percent or more personnel assigned to a specific program, project or responsibility center,

unless prior approval is received from the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(b) The District of Columbia government is authorized to approve and execute reprogramming and transfer requests of local funds under this title through November 7, 2019.

SEC. 804. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act may be used by the District of Columbia to provide for salaries, expenses, or other costs associated with the offices of United States Senator or United States Representative under section 4(d) of the District of Columbia Statehood Constitutional Convention Initiatives of 1979 (D.C. Law 3–171; D.C. Official Code, sec. 1–123).

SEC. 805. Except as otherwise provided in this section, none of the funds made available by this Act or by any other Act may be used to provide any officer or employee of the District of Columbia with an official vehicle unless the officer or employee uses the vehicle only in the performance of the officer's or employee's official duties. For purposes of this section, the term ''official duties'' does not include travel between the officer's or employee's residence and workplace, except in the case of—

(1) an officer or employee of the Metropolitan Police Department who resides in the District of Columbia or is otherwise designated by the Chief of the Department;

(2) at the discretion of the Fire Chief, an officer or employee of the District of Columbia Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department who resides in the District of Columbia and is on call 24 hours a day;

(3) at the discretion of the Director of the Department of Corrections, an officer or employee of the District of Columbia Department of Corrections who resides in the District of Columbia and is on call 24 hours a day;

(4) at the discretion of the Chief Medical Examiner, an officer or employee of the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner who resides in the District of Columbia and is on call 24 hours a day;

(5) at the discretion of the Director of the Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency, an officer or employee of the Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency who resides in the District of Columbia and is on call 24 hours a day;

(6) the Mayor of the District of Columbia; and

(7) the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 806. (a) None of the Federal funds contained in this Act may be used by the District of Columbia Attorney General or any other officer or entity of the District government to provide assistance for any petition drive or civil action which seeks to require Congress to provide for voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia.

(b) Nothing in this section bars the District of Columbia Attorney General from reviewing or commenting on briefs in private lawsuits, or from consulting with officials of the District government regarding such lawsuits.

SEC. 807. None of the Federal funds contained in this Act may be used to distribute any needle or syringe for the purpose of preventing the spread of blood borne pathogens in any location that has been determined by the local public health or local law enforcement authorities to be inappropriate for such distribution, or used for the operation of a supervised drug consumption facility that permits the consumption of any substance listed in Schedule I of section 202 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812) onsite.

SEC. 808. Nothing in this Act may be construed to prevent the Council or Mayor of the District of Columbia from addressing the issue of the provision of contraceptive coverage by health insurance plans, but it is the

intent of Congress that any legislation enacted on such issue should include a ''conscience clause'' which provides exceptions for religious beliefs and moral convictions.

SEC. 809. (a) None of the Federal funds contained in this Act may be used to enact or carry out any law, rule, or regulation to legalize or otherwise reduce penalties associated with the possession, use, or distribution of any schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) or any tetrahydrocannabinols derivative.

(b) No funds available for obligation or expenditure by the District of Columbia government under any authority may be used to enact any law, rule, or regulation to legalize or otherwise reduce penalties associated with the possession, use, or distribution of any schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) or any tetrahydrocannabinols derivative for recreational purposes.

SEC. 810. No funds available for obligation or expenditure by the District of Columbia government under any authority shall be expended for any abortion except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or where the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

SEC. 811. (a) No later than 30 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Financial Officer for the District of Columbia shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Mayor, and the Council of the District of Columbia, a revised appropriated funds operating budget in the format of the budget that the District of Columbia government submitted pursuant to section 442 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (D.C. Official Code, sec. 1–204.42), for all agencies of the District of Columbia government for fiscal year 2019 that is in the total amount of the approved appropriation and that realigns all budgeted data for personal services and other-than-personal services, respectively, with anticipated actual expenditures.

(b) This section shall apply only to an agency for which the Chief Financial Officer for the District of Columbia certifies that a reallocation is required to address unanticipated changes in program requirements.

SEC. 812. No later than 30 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Financial Officer for the District of Columbia shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Mayor, and the Council for the District of Columbia, a revised appropriated funds operating budget for the District of Columbia Public Schools that aligns schools budgets to actual enrollment. The revised appropriated funds budget shall be in the format of the budget that the District of Columbia government submitted pursuant to section 442 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (D.C. Official Code, sec. 1–204.42).

SEC. 813. (a) Amounts appropriated in this Act as operating funds may be transferred to the District of Columbia's enterprise and capital funds and such amounts, once transferred, shall retain appropriation authority consistent with the provisions of this Act.

(b) The District of Columbia government is authorized to reprogram or transfer for operating expenses any local funds transferred or reprogrammed in this or the four prior fiscal years from operating funds to capital funds, and such amounts, once transferred or reprogrammed, shall retain appropriation authority consistent with the provisions of this Act.

(c) The District of Columbia government may not transfer or reprogram for operating expenses any funds derived from bonds, notes, or other obligations issued for capital projects.

SEC. 814. None of the Federal funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 815. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law or under this Act, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2019 from appropriations of Federal funds made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2019 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2020, for each such account for the purposes authorized: Provided, That a request shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: Provided further, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines outlined in section 803 of this Act.

SEC. 816. (a)(1) During fiscal year 2020, during a period in which neither a District of Columbia continuing resolution or a regular District of Columbia appropriation bill is in effect, local funds are appropriated in the amount provided for any project or activity for which local funds are provided in the Act referred to in paragraph (2) (subject to any modifications enacted by the District of Columbia as of the beginning of the period during which this subsection is in effect) at the rate set forth by such Act.

(2) The Act referred to in this paragraph is the Act of the Council of the District of Columbia pursuant to which a proposed budget is approved for fiscal year 2020 which (subject to the requirements of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act) will constitute the local portion of the annual budget for the District of Columbia government for fiscal year 2020 for purposes of section 446 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1–204.46, D.C. Official Code).

(b) Appropriations made by subsection (a) shall cease to be available—

(1) during any period in which a District of Columbia continuing resolution for fiscal year 2020 is in effect; or

(2) upon the enactment into law of the regular District of Columbia appropriation bill for fiscal year 2020.

(c) An appropriation made by subsection (a) is provided under the authority and conditions as provided under this Act and shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by this Act.

(d) An appropriation made by subsection (a) shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for such project or activity during the portion of fiscal year 2020 for which this section applies to such project or activity.

(e) This section shall not apply to a project or activity during any period of fiscal year 2020 if any other provision of law (other than an authorization of appropriations)—

(1) makes an appropriation, makes funds available, or grants authority for such project or activity to continue for such period; or

(2) specifically provides that no appropriation shall be made, no funds shall be made available, or no authority shall be granted for such project or activity to continue for such period.

(f) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect obligations of the government of the District of Columbia mandated by other law.

SEC. 817. (a) No funds available for obligation or expenditure by the District of Columbia government under any authority may be used to enact any act, resolution, rule, regulation, guidance, or other law to permit any person to carry out any activity, or to reduce the penalties imposed with respect to any activity, to which subsection (a) of section 3 of the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act of 1997 (42 U.S.C. 14402) applies (taking into consideration subsection (b) of such section).

(b) Effective February 18, 2017, the Death With Dignity Act of 2016 (D.C. Law 21–182) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 818. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (D.C. Law 20–261) or to implement any rule or regulation promulgated to carry out such Act.

SEC. 819. (a) Effective with respect to fiscal year 2013 and each succeeding fiscal year, the Local Budget Autonomy Amendment Act of 2012 (D.C. Law 19–321) is hereby repealed, and any provision of law amended or repealed by such Act shall be restored or revived as if such Act had not been enacted into law.

(b)(1) Section 450 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1–204.50, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''The General Fund'' and inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—The General Fund''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) APPLICATION OF FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as creating a continuing appropriation of the General Fund described in subsection (a). All funds provided for the District of Columbia shall be appropriated on an annual fiscal year basis through the Federal appropriations process. For each fiscal year, the District shall be subject to all applicable requirements of subchapter III of chapter 13 and subchapter II of chapter 15 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Anti-Deficiency Act'), the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, and all other requirements and restrictions applicable to appropriations for such fiscal year.''.

(2) Section 603(a) of such Act (sec. 1–206.03(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) by striking ''existing''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '', or as authorizing the District of Columbia to make any such change.''.

(3) The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act.

SEC. 820. Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to ''this Act'' contained in this title or in title IV shall be treated as referring only to the provisions of this title or of title IV.

TITLE IX

FINANCIAL REFORM

Subtitle A—Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act

Subtitle B—Credit Access and Inclusion Act

Subtitle C—Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales and Brokerage Simplification Act

Subtitle D—Mortgage Choice Act

Subtitle E—Fair Investment Opportunities for Professional Experts Act

Subtitle F—Fostering Innovation Act

(b) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—Section 623(c) of the Consumer Credit Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s–2(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) subsection (f) of this section, including any regulations issued thereunder; or''.

(c) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the impact of furnishing information pursuant to subsection (f) of section 623 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s–2) (as added by this subtitle) on consumers.

Subtitle C—Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales and Brokerage Simplification Act

REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS

SEC. 904. Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(13) REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an M&A broker shall be exempt from registration under this section.

''(B) EXCLUDED ACTIVITIES.—An M&A broker is not exempt from registration under this paragraph if such broker does any of the following:

''(i) Directly or indirectly, in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, receives, holds, transmits, or has custody of the funds or securities to be exchanged by the parties to the transaction.

''(ii) Engages on behalf of an issuer in a public offering of any class of securities that is registered, or is required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the issuer files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

''(iii) Engages on behalf of any party in a transaction involving a shell company, other than a business combination related shell company.

''(iv) Directly, or indirectly through any of its affiliates, provides financing related to the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company.

''(v) Assists any party to obtain financing from an unaffiliated third party without—

''(I) complying with all other applicable laws in connection with such assistance, including, if applicable, Regulation T (12 C.F.R. 220 et seq.); and

''(II) disclosing any compensation in writing to the party.

''(vi) Represents both the buyer and the seller in the same transaction without providing clear written disclosure as to the parties the broker represents and obtaining written consent from both parties to the joint representation.

''(vii) Facilitates a transaction with a group of buyers formed with the assistance of the M&A broker to acquire the eligible privately held company.

''(viii) Engages in a transaction involving the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company to a passive buyer or group of passive buyers. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a buyer that is actively involved in managing the acquired company is not a passive buyer, regardless of whether such buyer is itself owned by passive beneficial owners.

''(ix) Binds a party to a transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company.

''(C) DISQUALIFICATIONS.—An M&A broker is not exempt from registration under this paragraph if such broker is subject to—

''(i) suspension or revocation of registration under paragraph (4);

''(ii) a statutory disqualification described in section 3(a)(39);

''(iii) a disqualification under the rules adopted by the Commission under section 926 of the Investor Protection and Securities Reform Act of 2010 (15 U.S.C. 77d note); or

''(iv) a final order described in paragraph (4)(H).

''(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit any other authority of the Commission to exempt any person, or any class of persons, from any provision of this title, or from any provision of any rule or regulation thereunder.

''(E) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) BUSINESS COMBINATION RELATED SHELL COMPANY.—The term 'business combination related shell company' means a shell company that is formed by an entity that is not a shell company—

''(I) solely for the purpose of changing the corporate domicile of that entity solely within the United States; or

''(II) solely for the purpose of completing a business combination transaction (as defined under section 230.165(f) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations) among one or more entities other than the company itself, none of which is a shell company.

''(ii) CONTROL.—The term 'control' means the power, directly or indirectly, to direct the management or policies of a company, whether through ownership of securities, by contract, or otherwise. There is a presumption of control for any person who—

''(I) is a director, general partner, member or manager of a limited liability company, or corporate officer of a corporation or limited liability company, and exercises executive responsibility (or has similar status or functions);

''(II) has the right to vote 25 percent or more of a class of voting securities or the power to sell or direct the sale of 25 percent or more of a class of voting securities; or

''(III) in the case of a partnership or limited liability company, has the right to receive upon dissolution, or has contributed, 25 percent or more of the capital.

''(iii) ELIGIBLE PRIVATELY HELD COMPANY.—The term 'eligible privately held company' means a privately held company that meets both of the following conditions:

''(I) The company does not have any class of securities registered, or required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the company files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

''(II) In the fiscal year ending immediately before the fiscal year in which the services of the M&A broker are initially engaged with respect to the securities transaction, the company meets either or both of the following conditions (determined in accordance with the historical financial accounting records of the company):

''(aa) The earnings of the company before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization are less than $25,000,000.

''(bb) The gross revenues of the company are less than $250,000,000.

For purposes of this subclause, the Commission may by rule modify the dollar figures if the Commission determines that such a modification is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

''(iv) M&A BROKER.—The term 'M&A broker' means a broker, and any person associated with a broker, engaged in the business of effecting securities transactions solely in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, regardless of whether the broker acts on behalf of a seller or buyer, through the purchase, sale, exchange, issuance, repurchase, or redemption of, or a business combination involving, securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, if the broker reasonably believes that—

''(I) upon consummation of the transaction, any person acquiring securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, acting alone or in concert, will control and, directly or indirectly, will be active in the management of the eligible privately held company or the business conducted with the assets of the eligible privately held company; and

''(II) if any person is offered securities in exchange for securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, such person will, prior to becoming legally bound to consummate the transaction, receive or have reasonable access to the most recent fiscal year-end financial statements of the issuer of the securities as customarily prepared by the management of the issuer in the normal course of operations and, if the financial statements of the issuer are audited, reviewed, or compiled, any related statement by the independent accountant, a balance sheet dated not more than 120 days before the date of the offer, and information pertaining to the management, business, results of operations for the period covered by the foregoing financial statements, and material loss contingencies of the issuer.

''(v) SHELL COMPANY.—The term 'shell company' means a company that at the time of a transaction with an eligible privately held company—

''(I) has no or nominal operations; and

''(II) has—

''(aa) no or nominal assets;

''(bb) assets consisting solely of cash and cash equivalents; or

''(cc) assets consisting of any amount of cash and cash equivalents and nominal other assets.

''(F) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2018, and every 5 years thereafter, each dollar amount in subparagraph (E)(ii)(II) shall be adjusted by—

''(I) dividing the annual value of the Employment Cost Index For Wages and Salaries, Private Industry Workers (or any successor index), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the adjustment is being made by the annual value of such index (or successor) for the calendar year ending December 31, 2012; and

''(II) multiplying such dollar amount by the quotient obtained under subclause (I).

''(ii) ROUNDING.—Each dollar amount determined under clause (i) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100,000.''.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 905. This subtitle and any amendment made by this subtitle shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle D—Mortgage Choice Act

DEFINITION OF POINTS AND FEES

SEC. 906. (a) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 103 OF TILA.—Section 103(bb)(4) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602(bb)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''paragraph (1)(B)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(A) and section 129C'';

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by inserting ''and insurance'' after ''taxes'';

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting '', except as retained by a creditor or its affiliate as a result of their participation in an affiliated business arrangement (as defined in section 2(7) of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2602(7))'' after ''compensation''; and

(C) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

''(iii) the charge is—

''(I) a bona fide third-party charge not retained by the mortgage originator, creditor, or an affiliate of the creditor or mortgage originator; or

''(II) a charge set forth in section 106(e)(1);''; and

(3) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) by striking ''accident,''; and

(B) by striking ''or any payments'' and inserting ''and any payments''.

(b) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 129C OF TILA.—Section 129C of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5)(C), by striking ''103'' and all that follows through ''or mortgage originator'' and inserting ''103(bb)(4)''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(i), by striking ''103'' and all that follows through ''or mortgage originator)'' and inserting ''103(bb)(4)''.

RULEMAKING

SEC. 907. Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall issue final regulations to carry out the amendments made by this subtitle, and such regulations shall be effective upon issuance.

Subtitle E—Fair Investment Opportunities for Professional Experts Act

DEFINITION OF ACCREDITED INVESTOR

SEC. 908. (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(a)(15) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)(15) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (F), respectively; and

(2) in subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon, and inserting after such subparagraph the following:

''(B) any natural person whose individual net worth, or joint net worth with that person's spouse, exceeds $1,000,000 (which amount, along with the amounts set forth in subparagraph (C), shall be adjusted for inflation by the Commission every 5 years to the nearest $10,000 to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) where, for purposes of calculating net worth under this subparagraph—

''(i) the person's primary residence shall not be included as an asset;

''(ii) indebtedness that is secured by the person's primary residence, up to the estimated fair market value of the primary residence at the time of the sale of securities, shall not be included as a liability (except that if the amount of such indebtedness outstanding at the time of sale of securities exceeds the amount outstanding 60 days before such time, other than as a result of the acquisition of the primary residence, the amount of such excess shall be included as a liability); and

''(iii) indebtedness that is secured by the person's primary residence in excess of the estimated fair market value of the primary residence at the time of the sale of securities shall be included as a liability;

''(C) any natural person who had an individual income in excess of $200,000 in each of the 2 most recent years or joint income with that person's spouse in excess of $300,000 in each of those years and has a reasonable expectation of reaching the same income level in the current year;

''(D) any natural person who is currently licensed or registered as a broker or investment adviser by the Commission, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, or an equivalent self-regulatory organization (as defined in section 3(a)(26) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934), or the securities division of a State or the equivalent State division responsible for licensing or registration of individuals in connection with securities activities;

''(E) any natural person the Commission determines, by regulation, to have demonstrable education or job experience to qualify such person as having professional knowledge of a subject related to a particular investment, and whose education or job experience is verified by the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority or an equivalent self-regulatory organization (as defined in section 3(a)(26) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934); or''.

(b) RULEMAKING.—The Commission shall revise the definition of accredited investor under Regulation D (17 C.F.R. 230.501 et seq.) to conform with the amendments made by subsection (a).

Subtitle F—Fostering Innovation Act

TEMPORARY EXEMPTION FOR LOW-REVENUE ISSUERS

SEC. 909. Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7262) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) TEMPORARY EXEMPTION FOR LOW-REVENUE ISSUERS.—

''(1) LOW-REVENUE EXEMPTION.—Subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to an audit report prepared for an issuer that—

''(A) ceased to be an emerging growth company on the last day of the fiscal year of the issuer following the fifth anniversary of the date of the first sale of common equity securities of the issuer pursuant to an effective registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933;

''(B) had average annual gross revenues of less than $50,000,000 as of its most recently completed fiscal year; and

''(C) is not a large accelerated filer.

''(2) EXPIRATION OF TEMPORARY EXEMPTION.—An issuer ceases to be eligible for the exemption described under paragraph (1) at the earliest of—

''(A) the last day of the fiscal year of the issuer following the tenth anniversary of the date of the first sale of common equity securities of the issuer pursuant to an effective registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933;

''(B) the last day of the fiscal year of the issuer during which the average annual gross revenues of the issuer exceed $50,000,000; or

''(C) the date on which the issuer becomes a large accelerated filer.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

''(A) AVERAGE ANNUAL GROSS REVENUES.—The term 'average annual gross revenues' means the total gross revenues of an issuer over its most recently completed three fiscal years divided by three.

''(B) EMERGING GROWTH COMPANY.—The term 'emerging growth company' has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c).

''(C) LARGE ACCELERATED FILER.—The term 'large accelerated filer' has the meaning given that term under section 240.12b–2 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.''.

Subtitle G—End Banking for Human Traffickers Act

INCREASING THE ROLE OF THE FINANCIAL INDUSTRY IN COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

SEC. 910. (a) TREASURY AS A MEMBER OF THE PRESIDENT'S INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE TO MONITOR AND COMBAT TRAFFICKING.—Section 105(b) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(b)) is amended by inserting ''the Secretary of the Treasury,'' after ''the Secretary of Education,''.

(b) REQUIRED REVIEW OF PROCEDURES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Financial Institutions Examination Council, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the private sector, and appropriate law enforcement agencies, shall—

(1) review and enhance training and examinations procedures to improve the capabilities of anti-money laundering and countering the financing of terrorism programs to detect financial transactions relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons;

(2) review and enhance procedures for referring potential cases relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons to the appropriate law enforcement agency; and

(3) determine, as appropriate, whether requirements for financial institutions are sufficient to detect and deter money laundering relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(c) INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS TARGETING MONEY LAUNDERING RELATED TO HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall submit to the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the head of each appropriate Federal banking agency—

(A) an analysis of anti-money laundering efforts of the United States Government and United States financial institutions relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons; and

(B) appropriate legislative, administrative, and other recommendations to strengthen efforts against money laundering relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(2) REQUIRED RECOMMENDATIONS.—The recommendations under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) feedback from financial institutions on best practices of successful programs to combat severe forms of trafficking in persons currently in place that may be suitable for broader adoption by similarly situated financial institutions;

(B) feedback from stakeholders, including victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons and financial institutions, on policy proposals derived from the analysis conducted by the task force referred to in paragraph (1) that would enhance the efforts and programs of financial institutions to detect and deter money laundering relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons, including any recommended changes to internal policies, procedures, and controls relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons;

(C) any recommended changes to training programs at financial institutions to better equip employees to deter and detect money laundering relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons;

(D) any recommended changes to expand information sharing relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons among financial institutions and between such financial institutions, appropriate law enforcement agencies, and appropriate Federal agencies; and

(E) recommended changes, if necessary, to existing statutory law to more effectively detect and deter money laundering relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons, where such money laundering involves the use of emerging technologies and virtual currencies.

(d) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to grant rulemaking authority to the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term ''appropriate Federal banking agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 3(q) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(q));

(2) the term ''severe forms of trafficking in persons'' has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

(3) the term ''Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking'' means the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking established by the President pursuant to section 105 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103); and

(4) the term ''law enforcement agency'' means an agency of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal or civil law.

COORDINATION OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING ISSUES BY THE OFFICE OF TERRORISM AND FINANCIAL INTELLIGENCE

SEC. 911. (a) FUNCTIONS.—Section 312(a)(4) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) as subparagraphs (F), (G), and (H), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

''(E) combating illicit financing relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons;''.

(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—Section 312(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—The Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Undersecretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, shall designate an office within the OTFI that shall coordinate efforts to combat the illicit financing of severe forms of trafficking in persons with—

''(A) other offices of the Department of the Treasury;

''(B) other Federal agencies, including—

''(i) the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons of the Department of State; and

''(ii) the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking;

''(C) State and local law enforcement agencies; and

''(D) foreign governments.''.

(c) DEFINITION.—Section 312(a) of title 31, United States Code, as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'severe forms of trafficking in persons' has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).''.

ADDITIONAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT UNDER THE TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000

SEC. 912. Section 105(d)(7) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(7)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting ''the Committee on Financial Services,'' after ''the Committee on Foreign Affairs,''; and

(B) by inserting ''the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,'' after ''the Committee on Foreign Relations,'';

(2) in subparagraph (Q)(vii), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in subparagraph (R), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(S) the efforts of the United States to eliminate money laundering relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons and the number of investigations, arrests, indictments, and convictions in money laundering cases with a nexus to severe forms of trafficking in persons.''.

MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING

SEC. 913. Section 108(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7106(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(13) Whether the government of the country, consistent with the capacity of the country, has in effect a framework to prevent financial transactions involving the proceeds of severe forms of trafficking in persons, and is taking steps to implement such a framework, including by investigating, prosecuting, convicting, and sentencing individuals who attempt or conduct such transactions.''.

Subtitle H—Investing in Main Street Act

INVESTMENT IN SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES

SEC. 914. Section 302(b) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 682(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the period the following: ''or, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, 15 percent of such capital and surplus'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the period the following: ''or, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, 15 percent of such capital and surplus''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'appropriate Federal banking agency' has the meaning given that term under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.''.

Subtitle I—Privacy Notification Technical Clarification Act

EXCEPTION TO ANNUAL NOTICE REQUIREMENT

SEC. 915. Section 503 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6803) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) ADDITIONAL EXCEPTION TO ANNUAL NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A vehicle financial company that has not changed its policies and practices with regard to disclosing nonpublic personal information from the policies and practices that were disclosed in the most recent disclosure sent to consumers in accordance with this section shall not be required to provide an annual disclosure under this section if—

''(A) the vehicle financial company makes its current policy available to consumers on its website and via mail upon written request sent to a designated address identified for the purpose of requesting the policy or upon telephone request made using a toll free consumer service telephone number;

''(B) the vehicle financial company conspicuously notifies consumers of the availability of the current policy, including—

''(i) with respect to consumers who are entitled to a periodic billing statement, a message on the front page of each periodic billing statement; and

''(ii) with respect to consumers who are not entitled to a periodic billing statement, through other reasonable means such as through a link on the landing page of the company's website or with other written communication, including electronic communication, sent to the consumer; and

''(C) the vehicle financial company—

''(i) provides consumers with the ability to opt out, subject to any exemption or exception provided under subsection (b)(2) or (e) of section 502 or under regulations prescribed under section 504(b), of having the consumer's nonpublic personal information disclosed to a nonaffiliated third party; and

''(ii) includes a description about where to locate the procedures for a consumer to select such opt out in each periodic billing statement sent to the consumer.

''(2) TREATMENT OF MULTIPLE POLICIES.—If a vehicle financial company maintains more than one set of policies described under paragraph (1) that vary depending on the consumer's account status or State of residence, the vehicle financial company may comply with the website posting requirement in paragraph (1)(A) by posting all of such policies to the public section of the vehicle financial company's website, with instructions for choosing the applicable policy.

''(3) VEHICLE FINANCIAL COMPANY DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'vehicle financial company' means—

''(A) a financial institution that—

''(i) is regularly engaged in the business of extending credit for the purchase of vehicles;

''(ii) is affiliated with a vehicle manufacturer; and

''(iii) only shares nonpublic personal information of consumers with nonaffiliated third parties that are vehicle dealers; or

''(B) a financial institution that—

''(i) regularly engages in the business of extending credit for the purchase or lease of vehicles from vehicle dealers; or

''(ii) purchases vehicle installment sales contracts or leases from vehicle dealers.''.

Subtitle II—Financial Institution Customer Protection Act

REQUIREMENTS FOR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT TERMINATION REQUESTS AND ORDERS

SEC. 916. (a) TERMINATION REQUESTS OR ORDERS MUST BE VALID.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An appropriate Federal banking agency may not formally or informally request or order a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or group of customer accounts or to otherwise restrict or discourage a depository institution from entering into or maintaining a banking relationship with a specific customer or group of customers unless—

(A) the agency has a valid reason for such request or order; and

(B) such reason is not based solely on reputation risk.

(2) TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency believes a specific customer or group of customers is, or is acting as a conduit for, an entity which—

(A) poses a threat to national security;

(B) is involved in terrorist financing;

(C) is an agency of the Government of Iran, North Korea, Syria, or any country listed from time to time on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list;

(D) is located in, or is subject to the jurisdiction of, any country specified in subparagraph (C); or

(E) does business with any entity described in subparagraph (C) or (D), unless the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the customer or group of customers has used due diligence to avoid doing business with any entity described in subparagraph (C) or (D),

such belief shall satisfy the requirement under paragraph (1).

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency formally or informally requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts, the agency shall—

(A) provide such request or order to the institution in writing; and

(B) accompany such request or order with a written justification for why such termination is needed, including any specific laws or regulations the agency believes are being violated by the customer or group of customers, if any.

(2) JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A justification described under paragraph (1)(B) may not be based solely on the reputation risk to the depository institution.

(c) CUSTOMER NOTICE.—

(1) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Except as provided under paragraph (2) or as otherwise prohibited from being disclosed by law, if an appropriate Federal banking agency orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts, the depository institution shall inform the specific customer or group of customers of the justification for the customer's account termination described under subsection (b).

(2) NOTICE PROHIBITED.—

(A) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN CASES OF NATIONAL SECURITY.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account or a group of customer accounts based on a belief that the customer or customers pose a threat to national security, or are otherwise described under subsection (a)(2), neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the customer or customers of the justification for the customer's account termination.

(B) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN OTHER CASES.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the notice required under paragraph (1) may interfere with an authorized criminal investigation, neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the specific customer or group of customers of the justification for the customer's account termination.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Each appropriate Federal banking agency shall issue an annual report to the Congress stating—

(1) the aggregate number of specific customer accounts that the agency requested or ordered a depository institution to terminate during the previous year; and

(2) the legal authority on which the agency relied in making such requests and orders and the frequency on which the agency relied on each such authority.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.—The term ''appropriate Federal banking agency'' means—

(A) the appropriate Federal banking agency, as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(2) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ''depository institution'' means—

(A) a depository institution, as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) an insured credit union.

Subtitle III—Encouraging Public Offerings Act

EXPANDING TESTING THE WATERS AND CONFIDENTIAL SUBMISSIONS

SEC. 917. The Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 5(d)—

(A) by striking ''Notwithstanding'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding'';

(B) by striking ''an emerging growth company or any person authorized to act on behalf of an emerging growth company'' and inserting ''an issuer or any person authorized to act on behalf of an issuer''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may issue regulations, subject to public notice and comment, to impose such other terms, conditions, or requirements on the engaging in oral or written communications described under paragraph (1) by an issuer other than an emerging growth company as the Commission determines appropriate.

''(B) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Prior to any rulemaking described under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing a list of the findings supporting the basis of such rulemaking.''; and

(2) in section 6(e)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES'' and inserting ''DRAFT REGISTRATION STATEMENTS'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and

(C) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) PRIOR TO INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERING.—Any issuer, prior to its initial public offering date, may confidentially submit to the Commission a draft registration statement, for confidential nonpublic review by the staff of the Commission prior to public filing, provided that the initial confidential submission and all amendments thereto shall be publicly filed with the Commission not later than 15 days before the date on which the issuer conducts a road show (as defined under section 230.433(h)(4) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations) or, in the absence of a road show, at least 15 days prior to the requested effective date of the registration statement.

''(2) WITHIN 1 YEAR AFTER INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERING OR EXCHANGE REGISTRATION.—Any issuer, within the 1-year period following its initial public offering or its registration of a security under section 12(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, may confidentially submit to the Commission a draft registration statement, for confidential nonpublic review by the staff of the Commission prior to public filing, provided that the initial confidential submission and all amendments thereto shall be publicly filed with the Commission not later than 15 days before the date on which the issuer conducts a road show (as defined under section 230.433(h)(4) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations) or, in the absence of a road show, at least 15 days prior to the requested effective date of the registration statement.

''(3) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may issue regulations, subject to public notice and comment, to impose such other terms, conditions, or requirements on the submission of draft registration statements described under this subsection by an issuer other than an emerging growth company as the Commission determines appropriate.

''(B) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Prior to any rulemaking described under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing a list of the findings supporting the basis of such rulemaking.''.

Subtitle IV—Risk-Based Credit Examination Act

RISK-BASED EXAMINATIONS OF NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED STATISTICAL RATING ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 918.

Section 15E(p)(3)(B) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–7(p)(3)(B)) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting '', as appropriate,'' after ''Each examination under subparagraph (A) shall include''.

Subtitle V—Protection of Source Code Act

PROCEDURE FOR OBTAINING CERTAIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

SEC. 919. (a) PERSONS UNDER SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—Section 8 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77h) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) PROCEDURE FOR OBTAINING CERTAIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—The Commission is not authorized to compel under this title a person to produce or furnish source code, including algorithmic trading source code or similar intellectual property that forms the basis for design of the source code, to the Commission unless the Commission first issues a subpoena.''.

(b) PERSONS UNDER THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—Section 23 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78w) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) PROCEDURE FOR OBTAINING CERTAIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—The Commission is not authorized to compel under this title a person to produce or furnish source code, including algorithmic trading source code or similar intellectual property that forms the basis for design of the source code, to the Commission unless the Commission first issues a subpoena.''.

(c) INVESTMENT COMPANIES.—Section 31 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–30) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) PROCEDURE FOR OBTAINING CERTAIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—The Commission is not authorized to compel under this title an investment company to produce or furnish source code, including algorithmic trading source code or similar intellectual property that forms the basis for design of the source code, to the Commission unless the Commission first issues a subpoena.''.

(d) INVESTMENT ADVISERS.—Section 204 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b–4) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) PROCEDURE FOR OBTAINING CERTAIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—The Commission is not authorized to compel under this title an investment adviser to produce or furnish source code, including algorithmic trading source code or similar intellectual property that forms the basis for design of the source code, to the Commission unless the Commission first issues a subpoena.''; and

(2) in the second subsection (d), by striking ''(d)'' and inserting ''(e)''.

Subtitle VI—Family Office Technical Correction Act

ACCREDITED INVESTOR CLARIFICATION

SEC. 920. (a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), any family office or a family client of a family office, as defined in section 275.202(a)(11)(G)–1 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, shall be deemed to be an accredited investor, as defined in Regulation D of the Securities and Exchange Commission (or any successor thereto) under the Securities Act of 1933.

(b) LIMITATION.—Subsection (a) only applies to a family office with assets under management in excess of $5,000,000, and a family office or a family client not formed for the specific purpose of acquiring the securities offered, and whose purchase is directed by a person who has such knowledge

and experience in financial and business matters that such person is capable of evaluating the merits and risks of the prospective investment.

Subtitle VII—Market Data Protection Act

INTERNAL RISK CONTROLS

SEC. 921. The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended—

(1) by inserting after section 4E the following:

''SEC. 4F. INTERNAL RISK CONTROLS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each of the following entities, in consultation with the Chief Economist, shall develop comprehensive internal risk control mechanisms to safeguard and govern the storage of all market data by such entity, all market data sharing agreements of such entity, and all academic research performed at such entity using market data:

''(1) The Commission.

''(2) Each national securities association registered pursuant to section 15A.

''(3) The operator of the consolidated audit trail created by a national market system plan approved pursuant to section 242.613 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

''(b) CONSOLIDATED AUDIT TRAIL PROHIBITED FROM ACCEPTING MARKET DATA UNTIL MECHANISMS DEVELOPED.—The operator described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) may not accept market data (or shall cease accepting market data) until the operator has developed the mechanisms required by such subsection. Any requirement for a person to provide market data to the operator shall not apply during any time when the operator is prohibited by this subsection from accepting such data.

''(c) TREATMENT OF PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED MECHANISMS.—The development of comprehensive internal risk control mechanisms required by subsection (a) may occur, in whole or in part, before the date of the enactment of this section, if such development and such mechanisms meet the requirements of such subsection (including consultation with the Chief Economist).''; and

(2) in section 3(a)—

(A) by redesignating the second paragraph (80) (relating to funding portals) as paragraph (81); and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(82) CHIEF ECONOMIST.—The term 'Chief Economist' means the Director of the Division of Economic and Risk Analysis, or an employee of the Commission with comparable authority, as determined by the Commission.''.

Subtitle VIII—Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act

SIFI DESIGNATION PROCESS

SEC. 922. Section 113 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5323) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (J), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (K) as subparagraph (L); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

''(K) the appropriateness of the imposition of prudential standards as opposed to other forms of regulation to mitigate the identified risks; and'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (J), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (K) as subparagraph (L);

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

''(K) the appropriateness of the imposition of prudential standards as opposed to other forms of regulation to mitigate the identified risks; and''; and

(3) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

''(d) REEVALUATION AND RESCISSION.—

''(1) ANNUAL REEVALUATION.—Not less frequently than annually, the Council shall reevaluate each determination made under subsections (a) and (b) with respect to a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors and shall—

''(A) provide written notice to the nonbank financial company being reevaluated and afford such company an opportunity to submit written materials, within such time as the Council determines to be appropriate (but which shall be not less than 30 days after the date of receipt by the company of such notice), to contest the determination, including materials concerning whether, in the company's view, material financial distress at the company, or the nature, scope, size, scale, concentration, interconnectedness, or mix of the activities of the company could pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States;

''(B) provide an opportunity for the nonbank financial company to meet with the Council to present the information described in subparagraph (A); and

''(C) if the Council does not rescind the determination, provide notice to the nonbank financial company, its primary financial regulatory agency and the primary financial regulatory agency of any of the company's significant subsidiaries of the reasons for the Council's decision, which notice shall address with specificity how the Council assessed the material factors presented by the company under subparagraphs (A) and (B).

''(2) PERIODIC REEVALUATION.—

''(A) REVIEW.—Every 5 years after the date of a final determination with respect to a nonbank financial company under subsection (a) or (b), as applicable, the nonbank financial company may submit a written request to the Council for a reevaluation of such determination. Upon receipt of such a request, the Council shall conduct a reevaluation of such determination and hold a vote on whether to rescind such determination.

''(B) PROCEDURES.—Upon receipt of a written request under paragraph (A), the Council shall fix a time (not earlier than 30 days after the date of receipt of the request) and place at which such company may appear, personally or through counsel, to—

''(i) submit written materials (which may include a plan to modify the company's business, structure, or operations, which shall specify the length of the implementation period); and

''(ii) provide oral testimony and oral argument before the members of the Council.

''(C) TREATMENT OF PLAN.—If the company submits a plan in accordance with subparagraph (B)(i), the Council shall consider whether the plan, if implemented, would cause the company to no longer meet the standards for a final determination under subsection (a) or (b), as applicable. The Council shall provide the nonbank financial company an opportunity to revise the plan after consultation with the Council.

''(D) EXPLANATION FOR CERTAIN COMPANIES.—With respect to a reevaluation under this paragraph where the determination being reevaluated was made before the date of enactment of this paragraph, the nonbank financial company may require the Council, as part of such reevaluation, to explain with specificity the basis for such determination.

''(3) RESCISSION OF DETERMINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Council, by a vote of not fewer than ⅔ of the voting members then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson, determines under this subsection that a nonbank financial company no longer meets the standards for a final determination under subsection (a) or (b), as applicable, the Council shall rescind such determination.

''(B) APPROVAL OF COMPANY PLAN.—Approval by the Council of a plan submitted or revised in accordance with paragraph (2) shall require a vote of not fewer than ⅔ of the voting members then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson. If such plan is approved by the Council, the company shall implement the plan during the period identified in the plan, except that the Council, in its sole discretion and upon request from the company, may grant one or more extensions of the implementation period. After the end of the implementation period, including any extensions granted by the Council, the Council shall proceed to a vote as described under subparagraph (A).'';

(4) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

''(e) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPOSED DETERMINATION, NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING, AND FINAL DETERMINATION.—

''(1) NOTICE OF IDENTIFICATION FOR INITIAL EVALUATION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR VOLUNTARY SUBMISSION.—Upon identifying a nonbank financial company for comprehensive analysis of the potential for the nonbank company to pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States, the Council shall provide the nonbank financial company with—

''(A) written notice that explains with specificity the basis for so identifying the company, a copy of which shall be provided to the company's primary financial regulatory agency;

''(B) an opportunity to submit written materials for consideration by the Council as part of the Council's initial evaluation of the risk profile and characteristics of the company;

''(C) an opportunity to meet with the Council to discuss the Council's analysis; and

''(D) a list of the public sources of information being considered by the Council as part of such analysis.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS BEFORE MAKING A PROPOSED DETERMINATION.—Before making a proposed determination with respect to a nonbank financial company under paragraph (3), the Council shall—

''(A) by a vote of not fewer than ⅔ of the voting members then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson, approve a resolution that identifies with specificity any risks to the financial stability of the United States the Council has identified relating to the nonbank financial company;

''(B) with respect to nonbank financial company with a primary financial regulatory agency, provide a copy of the resolution described under subparagraph (A) to the primary financial regulatory agency and provide such agency with at least 180 days from the receipt of the resolution to—

''(i) consider the risks identified in the resolution; and

''(ii) provide a written response to the Council that includes its assessment of the risks identified and the degree to which they are or could be addressed by existing regulation and, as appropriate, issue proposed regulations or undertake other regulatory action to mitigate the identified risks;

''(C) provide the nonbank financial company with written notice that the Council—

''(i) is considering whether to make a proposed determination with respect to the nonbank financial company under subsection (a) or (b), as applicable, which notice explains with specificity the basis for the

Council's consideration, including any aspects of the company's operations or activities that are a primary focus for the Council; or

''(ii) has determined not to subject the company to further review, which action shall not preclude the Council from issuing a notice to the company under subparagraph (1)(A) at a future time; and

''(D) in the case of a notice to the nonbank financial company under subparagraph (C)(i), provide the company with—

''(i) an opportunity to meet with the Council to discuss the Council's analysis;

''(ii) an opportunity to submit written materials, within such time as the Council deems appropriate (but not less than 30 days after the date of receipt by the company of the notice described under clause (i)), to the Council to inform the Council's consideration of the nonbank financial company for a proposed determination, including materials concerning the company's views as to whether it satisfies the standard for determination set forth in subsection (a) or (b), as applicable;

''(iii) an explanation of how any request by the Council for information from the nonbank financial company relates to potential risks to the financial stability of the United States and the Council's analysis of the company;

''(iv) written notice when the Council deems its evidentiary record regarding such nonbank financial company to be complete; and

''(v) an opportunity to meet with the members of the Council.

''(3) PROPOSED DETERMINATION.—

''(A) VOTING.—The Council may, by a vote of not fewer than ⅔ of the voting members then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson, propose to make a determination in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) or (b), as applicable, with respect to a nonbank financial company.

''(B) DEADLINE FOR MAKING A PROPOSED DETERMINATION.—With respect to a nonbank financial company provided with a written notice under paragraph (2)(C)(i), if the Council does not provide the company with the written notice of a proposed determination described under paragraph (4) within the 180-day period following the date on which the Council notifies the company under paragraph (2)(C) that the evidentiary record is complete, the Council may not make such a proposed determination with respect to such company unless the Council repeats the procedures described under paragraph (2).

''(C) REVIEW OF ACTIONS OF PRIMARY FINANCIAL REGULATORY AGENCY.—With respect to a nonbank financial company with a primary financial regulatory agency, the Council may not vote under subparagraph (A) to make a proposed determination unless—

''(i) the Council first determines that any proposed regulations or other regulatory actions taken by the primary financial regulatory agency after receipt of the resolution described under paragraph (2)(A) are insufficient to mitigate the risks identified in the resolution;

''(ii) the primary financial regulatory agency has notified the Council that the agency has no proposed regulations or other regulatory actions to mitigate the risks identified in the resolution; or

''(iii) the period allowed by the Council under paragraph (2)(B) has elapsed and the primary financial regulatory agency has taken no action in response to the resolution.

''(4) NOTICE OF PROPOSED DETERMINATION.—The Council shall—

''(A) provide to a nonbank financial company written notice of a proposed determination of the Council, including an explanation of the basis of the proposed determination of the Council, that a nonbank financial company shall be supervised by the Board of Governors and shall be subject to prudential standards in accordance with this title, an explanation of the specific risks to the financial stability of the United States presented by the nonbank financial company, and a detailed explanation of why existing regulations or other regulatory action by the company's primary financial regulatory agency, if any, is insufficient to mitigate such risk; and

''(B) provide the primary financial regulatory agency of the nonbank financial company a copy of the nonpublic written explanation of the Council's proposed determination.

''(5) HEARING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of any notice of a proposed determination under paragraph (4), the nonbank financial company may request, in writing, an opportunity for a written or oral hearing before the Council to contest the proposed determination, including the opportunity to present a plan to modify the company's business, structure, or operations in order to mitigate the risks identified in the notice, and which plan shall also include any steps the company expects to take during the implementation period to mitigate such risks.

''(B) GRANT OF HEARING.—Upon receipt of a timely request, the Council shall fix a time (not earlier than 30 days after the date of receipt of the request) and place at which such company may appear, personally or through counsel, to—

''(i) submit written materials (which may include a plan to modify the company's business, structure, or operations); or

''(ii) provide oral testimony and oral argument to the members of the Council.

''(6) COUNCIL CONSIDERATION OF COMPANY PLAN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a nonbank financial company submits a plan in accordance with paragraph (5), the Council shall, prior to making a final determination—

''(i) consider whether the plan, if implemented, would mitigate the risks identified in the notice under paragraph (4); and

''(ii) provide the nonbank financial company an opportunity to revise the plan after consultation with the Council.

''(B) VOTING.—Approval by the Council of a plan submitted under paragraph (5) or revised under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall require a vote of not fewer than ⅔ of the voting members then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson.

''(C) IMPLEMENTATION OF APPROVED PLAN.—With respect to a nonbank financial company's plan approved by the Council under subparagraph (B), the company shall have one year to implement the plan, except that the Council, in its sole discretion and upon request from the nonbank financial company, may grant one or more extensions of the implementation period.

''(D) OVERSIGHT OF IMPLEMENTATION.—

''(i) PERIODIC REPORTS.—The Council, acting through the Office of Financial Research, may require the submission of periodic reports from a nonbank financial company for the purpose of evaluating the company's progress in implementing a plan approved by the Council under subparagraph (B).

''(ii) INSPECTIONS.—The Council may direct the primary financial regulatory agency of a nonbank financial company or its subsidiaries (or, if none, the Board of Governors) to inspect the company or its subsidiaries for the purpose of evaluating the implementation of the company's plan.

''(E) AUTHORITY TO RESCIND APPROVAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—During the implementation period described under subparagraph (C), including any extensions granted by the Council, the Council shall retain the authority to rescind its approval of the plan if the Council finds, by a vote of not fewer than ⅔ of the voting members then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson, that the company's implementation of the plan is no longer sufficient to mitigate or prevent the risks identified in the resolution described under paragraph (2)(A).

''(ii) FINAL DETERMINATION VOTE.—The Council may proceed to a vote on final determination under subsection (a) or (b), as applicable, not earlier than 10 days after providing the nonbank financial company with written notice that the Council has rescinded the approval of the company's plan pursuant to clause (i).

''(F) ACTIONS AFTER IMPLEMENTATION.—

''(i) EVALUATION OF IMPLEMENTATION.—After the end of the implementation period described under subparagraph (C), including any extensions granted by the Council, the Council shall consider whether the plan, as implemented by the nonbank financial company, adequately mitigates or prevents the risks identified in the resolution described under paragraph (2)(A).

''(ii) VOTING.—If, after performing an evaluation under clause (i), not fewer than ⅔ of the voting members of the Council then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson, determine that the plan, as implemented, adequately mitigates or prevents the identified risks, the Council shall not make a final determination under subsection (a) or (b), as applicable, with respect to the nonbank financial company and shall notify the company of the Council's decision to take no further action.

''(7) FINAL COUNCIL DECISIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of a hearing under paragraph (5), the Council shall notify the nonbank financial company of—

''(i) a final determination under subsection (a) or (b), as applicable;

''(ii) the Council's approval of a plan submitted by the nonbank financial company under paragraph (5) or revised under paragraph (6); or

''(iii) the Council's decision to take no further action with respect to the nonbank financial company.

''(B) EXPLANATORY STATEMENT.—A final determination of the Council, under subsection (a) or (b), shall contain a statement of the basis for the decision of the Council, including the reasons why the Council rejected any plan by the nonbank financial company submitted under paragraph (5) or revised under paragraph (6).

''(C) NOTICE TO PRIMARY FINANCIAL REGULATORY AGENCY.—In the case of a final determination under subsection (a) or (b), the Council shall provide the primary financial regulatory agency of the nonbank financial company a copy of the nonpublic written explanation of the Council's final determination.'';

(5) in subsection (g), strike ''before the Council makes any final determination'' and insert ''from the outset of the Council's consideration of the company, including before the Council makes any proposed or final determination''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(j) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.—The Council shall—

''(1) in each case where a nonbank financial company has been notified that it is subject to the Council's review and the company has publicly disclosed such fact, confirm that the nonbank financial company is subject to the Council's review, in response to a request from a third party;

''(2) upon making a final determination, publicly provide a written explanation of the basis for its decision with sufficient detail to provide the public with an understanding of the specific bases of the Council's determination, including any assumptions related thereof, subject to the requirements of section 112(d)(5);

''(3) include, in the annual report required by section 112, the number of nonbank financial companies from the previous year subject to preliminary analysis, further review, and subject to a proposed or final determination; and

''(4) within 90 days after the enactment of this subsection, publish information regarding its methodology for calculating any quantitative thresholds or other metrics used to identify nonbank financial companies for analysis by the Council.

''(k) PERIODIC ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF DESIGNATIONS.—

''(1) ASSESSMENT.—Every five years after the date of enactment of this section, the Council shall—

''(A) conduct a study of the Council's determinations that nonbank financial companies shall be supervised by the Board of Governors and shall be subject to prudential standards; and

''(B) comprehensively assess the impact of such determinations on the companies for which such determinations were made and the wider economy, including whether such determinations are having the intended result of improving the financial stability of the United States.

''(2) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after completing a study required under paragraph (1), the Council shall issue a report to the Congress that—

''(A) describes all findings and conclusions made by the Council in carrying out such study; and

''(B) identifies whether any of the Council's determinations should be rescinded or whether related regulations or regulatory guidance should be modified, streamlined, expanded, or repealed.''.

RULE OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 923. None of the amendments made by this subtitle may be construed as limiting the Financial Stability Oversight Council's emergency powers under section 113(f) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5323(f)).

Subtitle IX—Expanding Access to Capital for Rural Job Creators Act

ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR RURAL-AREA SMALL BUSINESSES

SEC. 925.

Section 4(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph(4)(C), by inserting ''rural-area small businesses,'' after ''women-owned small businesses,''; and

(2) in paragraph (6)(B)(iii), by inserting ''rural-area small businesses,'' after ''women-owned small businesses,''.

Subtitle X—Volcker Rule Regulatory Harmonization Act

RULEMAKING AUTHORITY UNDER THE VOLCKER RULE

SEC. 926.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 13(b) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) RULEMAKING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board may, as appropriate, consult with the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Securities and Exchange Commission, or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to adopt rules or guidance to carry out this section, as provided in subparagraph (B).

''(B) RULEMAKING REQUIREMENTS.—In adopting a rule or guidance under subparagraph (A), the Board—

''(i) shall consider the findings of the report required in paragraph (1) and, as appropriate, subsequent reports;

''(ii) shall assure, to the extent possible, that such rule or guidance provide for consistent application and implementation of the applicable provisions of this section to avoid providing advantages or imposing disadvantages to the companies affected by this subsection and to protect the safety and soundness of banking entities and nonbank financial companies supervised by the Board; and

''(iii) shall include requirements to ensure compliance with this section, such as requirements regarding internal controls and recordkeeping.

''(C) AUTHORITY.—The Board shall have sole authority to issue and amend rules under this section after the date of the enactment of this paragraph.

''(D) CONFORMING AUTHORITY.—

''(i) CONTINUITY OF REGULATIONS.—Any rules or guidance issued under this section prior to the date of enactment of this paragraph shall continue in effect until the Board issues a successor rule or guidance, or amends such rule or guidance, pursuant to subparagraph (C).

''(ii) APPLICABLE GUIDANCE.—In performing examinations or other supervisory duties, the appropriate Federal banking agencies, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, as appropriate, shall update any applicable policies and procedures to ensure that such policies and procedures are consistent (to the extent practicable) with any rules or guidance issued pursuant to subparagraph (C).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 13 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851) is amended—

(1) by striking ''the appropriate Federal banking agencies, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission,'' each place it appears and inserting ''the Board'';

(2) by striking ''appropriate Federal banking agencies, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission'' each place it appears and inserting ''Board'';

(3) in subsection (c)(5), by striking ''Notwithstanding paragraph (2)'' and all that follows through ''provided in subsection (b)(2),'' and inserting ''The Board shall have the authority''; and

(4) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (F)(ii)—

(i) by striking ''the appropriate Federal banking agencies'' and inserting ''the Board''; and

(ii) by striking ''have not jointly'' and inserting ''has not''; and

(B) in subparagraph (G)(viii), by striking ''appropriate Federal banking agencies, the Securities and Exchange Commission, or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission,'' and inserting ''Board,''.

ENFORCEMENT; ANTI-EVASION

SEC. 927. (a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 13 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) ENFORCEMENT; ANTI-EVASION.—

''(1) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law except for any rules or guidance issued under subsection (b)(2), whenever the appropriate Federal banking agency has reasonable cause to believe that a banking entity or nonbank financial company supervised by the Board has made an investment or engaged in an activity in a manner that either violates the restrictions under this section, or that functions as an evasion of the requirements of this section (including through an abuse of any permitted activity), such appropriate Federal banking agency shall order, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, the banking entity or nonbank financial company supervised by the Board to terminate the activity and, as relevant, dispose of the investment.

''(2) SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION AND COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law except for any rules or guidance issued under subsection (b)(2), whenever the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, as appropriate, has reasonable cause to believe that a covered nonbank financial company for which the respective agency is the primary Federal regulator has made an investment or engaged in an activity in a manner that either violates the restrictions under this section, or that functions as an evasion of the requirements of this section (including through an abuse of any permitted activity), the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, as appropriate, shall order, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, the covered nonbank financial company to terminate the activity and, as relevant, dispose of the investment.

''(B) COVERED NONBANK FINANCIAL COMPANY DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'covered nonbank financial company' means a nonbank financial company (as defined in section 102 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010) supervised by the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, as appropriate.''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to abrogate, reduce, or eliminate the backup authority of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation authority under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811), or Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991.

EXCLUSION OF COMMUNITY BANKS FROM VOLCKER RULE

SEC. 928. Section 13(h)(1) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851(h)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) as clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(3) in the matter preceding clause (i), as so redesignated, in the second sentence, by striking ''institution that functions solely in a trust or fiduciary capacity, if—'' and inserting the following: ''institution—

''(A) that functions solely in a trust or fiduciary capacity, if—'';

(4) in clause (iv)(II), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) that does not have and is not controlled by a company that has—

''(i) more than $10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets; and

''(ii) total trading assets and trading liabilities, as reported on the most recent applicable regulatory filing filed by the institution, that are more than 5 percent of total consolidated assets.''.

Subtitle XI—Financial Institution Living Will Improvement Act

LIVING WILL REFORMS

SEC. 929. (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 165(d) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5365(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''periodically'' and inserting ''every 2 years''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''The Board'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board'';

(B) by striking ''shall review'' and inserting the following: ''shall—

''(i) review'';

(C) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date the company submits the resolution plan, provide feedback to the company on such plan.

''(B) DISCLOSURE OF ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK.—The Board of Governors and the Corporation shall publicly disclose the assessment framework that is used to review information under this paragraph.''.

(b) TREATMENT OF OTHER RESOLUTION PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an appropriate Federal banking agency that requires a banking organization to submit to the agency a resolution plan not described under section 165(d) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act—

(A) the respective agency shall ensure that the review of such resolution plan is consistent with the requirements contained in the amendments made by this subtitle;

(B) the agency may not require the submission of such a resolution plan more often than every 2 years; and

(C) paragraphs (6) and (7) of such section 165(d) shall apply to such a resolution plan.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

(A) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.—The term ''appropriate Federal banking agency''—

(i) has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; and

(ii) means the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(B) BANKING ORGANIZATION.—The term ''banking organization'' means—

(i) an insured depository institution;

(ii) an insured credit union;

(iii) a depository institution holding company;

(iv) a company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of section 8 of the International Banking Act; and

(v) a U.S. intermediate holding company established by a foreign banking organization pursuant to section 252.153 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(C) INSURED CREDIT UNION.—The term ''insured credit union'' has the meaning given that term under section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act.

(D) OTHER BANKING TERMS.—The terms ''depository institution holding company'' and ''insured depository institution'' have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subtitle, or any amendment made by this subtitle, shall be construed as limiting the authority of an appropriate Federal banking agency (as defined under subsection (b)(2)) to obtain information from an institution in connection with such agency's authority to examine or require reports from the institution.

Subtitle XII—Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act

AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

SEC. 930. Section 1003(3) of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3302(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) the term 'financial institution'—

''(A) means a commercial bank, a savings bank, a trust company, a savings association, a building and loan association, a homestead association, a cooperative bank, or a credit union; and

''(B) for purposes of sections 1012, 1013, and 1014, includes a nondepository covered person subject to supervision by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection under section 1024 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5514).''.

TIMELINESS OF EXAMINATION REPORTS

SEC. 931. The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1012. TIMELINESS OF EXAMINATION REPORTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) FINAL EXAMINATION REPORT.—A Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall provide a final examination report to a financial institution not later than 60 days after the later of—

''(A) the exit interview for an examination of the institution; or

''(B) the provision of additional information by the institution relating to the examination.

''(2) EXIT INTERVIEW.—If a financial institution is not subject to a resident examiner program, the exit interview shall occur not later than the end of the 9-month period beginning on the commencement of the examination, except that such period may be extended by the Federal financial institutions regulatory agency by providing written notice to the institution and the Independent Examination Review Director describing with particularity the reasons that a longer period is needed to complete the examination.

''(b) EXAMINATION MATERIALS.—Upon the request of a financial institution, the Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall include with the final report an appendix listing all examination or other factual information relied upon by the agency in support of a material supervisory determination.''.

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION REVIEW DIRECTOR

SEC. 932. The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.), as amended by section 931, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1013. OFFICE OF INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION REVIEW.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Council an Office of Independent Examination Review (the 'Office').

''(b) HEAD OF OFFICE.—There is established the position of the Independent Examination Review Director (the 'Director'), as the head of the Office. The Director shall be appointed by the Council and shall be independent from any member agency of the Council.

''(c) TERM.—The Director shall serve for a term of 5 years, and may be appointed to serve a subsequent 5-year term.

''(d) STAFFING.—The Director is authorized to hire staff to support the activities of the Office.

''(e) DUTIES.—The Director shall—

''(1) receive and, at the Director's discretion, investigate complaints from financial institutions, their representatives, or another entity acting on behalf of such institutions, concerning examinations, examination practices, or examination reports;

''(2) hold meetings, at least once every three months and in locations designed to encourage participation from all sections of the United States, with financial institutions, their representatives, or another entity acting on behalf of such institutions, to discuss examination procedures, examination practices, or examination policies;

''(3) in accordance with subsection (f), review examination procedures of the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to ensure that the written examination policies of those agencies are being followed in practice and adhere to the standards for consistency established by the Council;

''(4) conduct a continuing and regular review of examination quality assurance for all examination types conducted by the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies;

''(5) adjudicate any supervisory appeal initiated under section 1014; and

''(6) report annually to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and the Council, on the reviews carried out pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (4), including compliance with the requirements set forth in section 1012 regarding timeliness of examination reports, and the Council's recommendations for improvements in examination procedures, practices, and policies.

''(f) STANDARD FOR REVIEWING EXAMINATION PROCEDURES.—In conducting reviews pursuant to subsection (e)(4), the Director shall prioritize factors relating to the safety and soundness of the financial system of the United States.

''(g) REMOVAL.—If the Director is removed from office, the Council shall communicate in writing the reasons for any such removal to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate not later than 30 days before the removal.

''(h) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The Director shall keep confidential all meetings with, discussions with, and information provided by financial institutions.''.

RIGHT TO INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF MATERIAL SUPERVISORY DETERMINATIONS

SEC. 933. The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.), as amended by section 932, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1014. RIGHT TO INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF MATERIAL SUPERVISORY DETERMINATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A financial institution shall have the right to obtain an independent review of a material supervisory determination contained in a final report of examination.

''(b) NOTICE.—

''(1) TIMING.—A financial institution seeking review of a material supervisory determination under this section shall file a written notice with the Independent Examination Review Director (the 'Director') within 60 days after receiving the final report of examination that is the subject of such review.

''(2) IDENTIFICATION OF DETERMINATION.—The written notice shall identify the material supervisory determination that is the subject of the independent examination review, and a statement of the reasons why the institution believes that the determination is incorrect or should otherwise be modified.

''(3) INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO INSTITUTION.—Any information relied upon by the agency in the final report that is not in the possession of the financial institution may

be requested by the financial institution and shall be delivered promptly by the agency to the financial institution.

''(c) RIGHT TO HEARING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall determine the merits of the appeal on the record or, at the financial institution's election, shall refer the appeal to an Administrative Law Judge to conduct a confidential hearing pursuant to the procedures set forth under sections 556 and 557 of title 5, United States Code, which hearing shall take place not later than 60 days after the petition for review was received by the Director, and to issue a proposed decision to the Director based upon the record established at such hearing.

''(2) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—In rendering a determination or recommendation under this subsection, neither the Administrative Law Judge nor the Director shall defer to the opinions of the examiner or agency, but shall conduct a de novo review to independently determine the appropriateness of the agency's decision based upon the relevant statutes, regulations, and other appropriate guidance, as well as evidence adduced at any hearing.

''(d) FINAL DECISION.—A decision by the Director on an independent review under this section shall—

''(1) be made not later than 60 days after the record has been closed; and

''(2) subject to subsection (e), be deemed a final agency action and shall bind the agency whose supervisory determination was the subject of the review and the financial institution requesting the review.

''(e) LIMITED REVIEW BY FFIEC.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the agency whose supervisory determination was the subject of the review believes that the Director's decision under subsection (d) would pose an imminent threat to the safety and soundness of the financial institution, such agency may file a written notice seeking review of the Director's decision with the Council within 10 days of receiving the Director's decision.

''(2) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—In making a determination under this subsection, the Council shall conduct a review to determine whether there is substantial evidence that the Director's decision would pose an imminent threat to the safety and soundness of the financial institution.

''(3) FINAL DETERMINATION.—A determination by the Council shall—

''(A) be made not later than 30 days after the filing of the notice pursuant to paragraph (1); and

''(B) be deemed a final agency action and shall bind the agency whose supervisory determination was the subject of the review and the financial institution requesting the review.

''(f) RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A financial institution shall have the right to petition for review of final agency action under this section by filing a Petition for Review within 60 days of the Director's decision or the Council's decision in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit or the Circuit in which the financial institution is located.

''(g) REPORT.—The Director shall report annually to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate on actions taken under this section, including the types of issues that the Director has reviewed and the results of those reviews. In no case shall such a report contain information about individual financial institutions or any confidential or privileged information shared by financial institutions.

''(h) RETALIATION PROHIBITED.—A Federal financial institutions regulatory agency may not—

''(1) retaliate against a financial institution, including service providers, or any institution-affiliated party (as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act), for exercising appellate rights under this section; or

''(2) delay or deny any agency action that would benefit a financial institution or any institution-affiliated party on the basis that an appeal under this section is pending under this section.

''(i) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

''(1) to affect the right of a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency to take enforcement or other supervisory actions related to a material supervisory determination under review under this section; or

''(2) to prohibit the review under this section of a material supervisory determination with respect to which there is an ongoing enforcement or other supervisory action.''.

ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 934. (a) RIEGLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1994.—Section 309 of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4806) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting after ''appropriate Federal banking agency'' the following: '', the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection,'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the appellant from retaliation by agency examiners'' and inserting ''the insured depository institution or insured credit union from retaliation by the agencies referred to in subsection (a)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following flush-left text:

''For purposes of this subsection and subsection (e), retaliation includes delaying consideration of, or withholding approval of, any request, notice, or application that otherwise would have been approved, but for the exercise of the institution's or credit union's rights under this section.'';

(3) in subsection (e)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) ensure that appropriate safeguards exist for protecting the insured depository institution or insured credit union from retaliation by any agency referred to in subsection (a) for exercising its rights under this subsection.''; and

(4) in subsection (f)(1)(A)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) any issue specifically listed in an exam report as a matter requiring attention by the institution's management or board of directors; and

''(v) any suspension or removal of an institution's status as eligible for expedited processing of applications, requests, notices, or filings on the grounds of a supervisory or compliance concern, regardless of whether that concern has been cited as a basis for another material supervisory determination or matter requiring attention in an examination report, provided that the conduct at issue did not involve violation of any criminal law; and''.

(b) FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT.—Section 205(j) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1785(j)) is amended by inserting ''the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection,'' before ''the Administration'' each place such term appears.

(c) FEDERAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION COUNCIL ACT OF 1978.—The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1003, by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) the term 'Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies'—

''(A) means the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the National Credit Union Administration; and

''(B) for purposes of sections 1012, 1013, and 1014, includes the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection;''; and

(2) in section 1005, by striking ''One-fifth'' and inserting ''One-fourth''.

Subtitle XIII—TRID Improvement Act

AMENDMENTS TO MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 936. Section 4(a) of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2603(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''itemize all charges'' and inserting ''itemize all actual charges'';

(2) by striking ''and all charges imposed upon the seller in connection with the settlement and'' and inserting ''and the seller in connection with the settlement. Such forms''; and

(3) by inserting after ''or both.'' the following new sentence: ''Charges for any title insurance premium disclosed on such forms shall be equal to the amount charged for each individual title insurance policy, subject to any discounts as required by State regulation or the title company rate filings.''.

Subtitle XIV—Common Sense Credit Union Capital Relief Act

DELAY IN EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 938. Notwithstanding any effective date set forth in the rule issued by the National Credit Union Administration titled ''Risk-Based Capital'' (published at 80 Fed. Reg. 66626 (October 29, 2015)), such final rule shall take effect on January 1, 2021.

Subtitle XV—Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection–Inspector General Reform Act

APPOINTMENT OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SEC. 939. The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 8G—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection'';

(B) in subsection (c), by striking ''For purposes of implementing this section'' and all that follows through the end of the subsection; and

(C) in subsection (g)(3), by striking ''and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection''; and

(2) in section 12—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection;'' after ''the President of the Export-Import Bank;''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection,'' after ''the Export-Import Bank,''.

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

SEC. 940. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 1011 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5491) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR'' and inserting '', DEPUTY DIRECTOR, AND INSPECTOR GENERAL''; and

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

''(6) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—There is established the position of the Inspector General.''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''or Deputy Director'' each place it appears and inserting '', Deputy Director, or Inspector General''.

(b) HEARINGS.—Section 1016 of such Act is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR INSPECTOR GENERAL.—On a separate occasion from that described in subsection (a), the Inspector General of the Bureau shall appear, upon invitation, before the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives at hearings no less frequently than twice annually, at a date determined by the chairman of the respective committee, regarding the reports required under subsection (b) and the reports required under section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).''.

(c) FUNDING FOR OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Section 1017(a)(2) of such Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) FUNDING FOR OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Each fiscal year, the Bureau shall dedicate 2 percent of the funds transferred pursuant to paragraph (1) to the Office of the Inspector General.''.

(d) PARTICIPATION IN THE COUNCIL OF INSPECTORS GENERAL ON FINANCIAL OVERSIGHT.—Section 989E(a)(1) of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(J) The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.''.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 941. The amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TRANSITION PERIOD

SEC. 942. The Inspector General of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall serve in that position until the confirmation of an Inspector General for the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection. At that time, the Inspector General of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall become the Inspector General of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Subtitle XVI—BCFP on Appropriations

BUREAU APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 943.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2019.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection may not request, under section 1017 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, during fiscal year 2019 an amount that would result in the total amount requested by the Director during that fiscal year to exceed $485,000,000.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2020 AND THEREAFTER.—Effective as of the first day of fiscal year 2020, section 1017 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5497) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending the heading of such subsection to read as follows: ''BUDGET, FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, AND AUDIT.—'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(D) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F) of paragraph (1), as so redesignated;

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c);

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (c), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting the following:

''(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2020 to the Bureau from the combined earnings of the Federal Reserve System $485,000,000.''; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

Subtitle XVII—Stress Test Relief for Nonbanks

STRESS TEST RELIEF FOR NONBANKS

SEC. 944. Section 165(i)(2) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5365(i)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''are regulated by a primary Federal financial regulatory agency'' and inserting: ''whose primary financial regulatory agency is a Federal banking agency or the Federal Housing Finance Agency'';

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''Each Federal primary financial regulatory agency'' and inserting ''Each Federal banking agency and the Federal housing finance agency''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) SEC AND CFTC.—The Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission may each issue regulations requiring financial companies with respect to which they are the primary financial regulatory agency to conduct periodic analyses of the financial condition, including available liquidity, of such companies under adverse economic conditions.''.

Subtitle XVIII—Interaffiliate Language

INTERAFFILIATE TREATMENT WITH RESPECT TO INITIAL MARGIN REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 945.

Section 15F(e)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–10(e)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The requirements'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The requirements''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) INITIAL MARGIN REQUIREMENT.—The initial margin requirements imposed by rules adopted pursuant to paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii) shall not apply to any security-based swap in which—

''(i) one counterparty is a person in which the other counterparty, directly or indirectly, holds a majority ownership interest; or

''(ii) a third party, directly or indirectly, holds a majority ownership interest in both counterparties.''.

Subtitle XIX—Tailored Application of Prudential Standards

TAILORED APPLICATION OF PRUDENTIAL STANDARDS

SEC. 946.

Section 165(a)(2)(A) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5365(a)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: ''to ensure that companies with comparable risk profiles and business models are operating under a similar set of requirements''.

Subtitle XX—Authority to Remove Bureau Director

AUTHORITY TO REMOVE BUREAU DIRECTOR

SEC. 947.

Section 1011(c) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5491(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

Subtitle XXI—Congressional Review of Bureau Rulemaking

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF BUREAU RULEMAKING

SEC. 948.

Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF BUREAU RULEMAKING3

''§ 801. Congressional review

''(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Bureau shall satisfy the requirements of section 808 and shall publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which the rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, and cost-benefit analyses, and identify how the public can access such information online, and shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

''(i) a copy of the rule;

''(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

''(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C);

''(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

''(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

''(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Bureau shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

''(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any, including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs;

''(ii) the Bureau's actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of this title;

''(iii) the Bureau's actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995; and

''(iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

''(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the Bureau's compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

''(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

''(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

''(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

''(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

''(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

''(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

''(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

''(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

''(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

''(C) necessary for national security; or

''(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

''(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

''(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

''(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days; or

''(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 802 and 803 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

''(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

''(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

''(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day; or

''(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day,

after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

''(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

''(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

''(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

''§ 802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

''(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

''(A) bears no preamble;

''(B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.';

''(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.'; and

''(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

''(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

''(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days; and

''(B) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

''(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

''(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

''(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

''(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

''(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 801(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

''(2) with full recognition of the Constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''§ 803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

''(a) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on

the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the Senate, the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

''(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date; or

''(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

''(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

''(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

''(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

''(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

''§ 804. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter:

''(1) The term 'Bureau' means the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

''(2) The term 'major rule' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

''(A) an annual cost on the economy of $100,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;

''(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

''(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

''(3) The term 'nonmajor rule' means any rule that is not a major rule.

''(4) The term 'rule' has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term does not include—

''(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

''(B) any rule relating to Bureau management or personnel; or

''(C) any rule of Bureau organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-Bureau parties.

''(5) The term 'submission date or publication date', except as otherwise provided in this chapter, means—

''(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

''(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

''§ 805. Judicial review

''(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

''(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether the Bureau has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

''(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 802 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

''§ 806. Exemption for monetary policy

''Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

''§ 807. Effective date of certain rules

''Notwithstanding section 801—

''(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

''(2) any rule other than a major rule which the Bureau for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest,

shall take effect at such time as the Bureau determines.

''§ 808. Regulatory cut-go requirement

''In making any new rule, the Bureau shall identify a rule or rules that may be amended or repealed to completely offset any annual costs of the new rule to the United States economy. Before the new rule may take effect, the Bureau shall make each such repeal or amendment. In making such an amendment or repeal, the Bureau shall comply with the requirements of subchapter II of chapter 5, but the Bureau may consolidate proceedings under subchapter with proceedings on the new rule.

''§ 809. Review of rules currently in effect

''(a) ANNUAL REVIEW.—Beginning on the date that is 6 months after the date of enactment of this section and annually thereafter for the 9 years following, the Bureau shall designate not less than 10 percent of eligible rules made by the Bureau for review, and shall submit a report including each such eligible rule in the same manner as a report under section 801(a)(1). Section 801, section 802, and section 803 shall apply to each such rule, subject to subsection (c) of this section. No eligible rule previously designated may be designated again.

''(b) SUNSET FOR ELIGIBLE RULES NOT EXTENDED.—Beginning after the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this section, if Congress has not enacted a joint resolution of approval for that eligible rule, that eligible rule shall not continue in effect.

''(c) CONSOLIDATION; SEVERABILITY.—In applying sections 801, 802, and 803 to eligible rules under this section, the following shall apply:

''(1) The words 'take effect' shall be read as 'continue in effect'.

''(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), a single joint resolution of approval shall apply to all eligible rules in a report designated for a year, and the matter after the resolving clause of that joint resolution is as follows: 'That Congress approves the rules submitted by the ____ for the year ____.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

''(3) It shall be in order to consider any amendment that provides for specific conditions on which the approval of a particular eligible rule included in the joint resolution is contingent.

''(4) A member of either House may move that a separate joint resolution be required for a specified rule.

''(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'eligible rule' means a rule that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this section.''.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 949.

Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is

amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Any rules subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.''.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY OF RULES

SEC. 950.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine, as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) how many rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) of the Bureau were in effect;

(2) how many major rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) of the Bureau were in effect; and

(3) the total estimated economic cost imposed by all such rules.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 951.

Sections 948 and 949, and the amendments made by such sections, shall take effect beginning on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE X

EMAIL PRIVACY ACT

VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE CORRECTIONS

SEC. 1001. (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2702 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''divulge'' and inserting ''disclose''; and

(ii) by striking ''while in electronic storage by that service'' and inserting ''that is in electronic storage with or otherwise stored, held, or maintained by that service'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''to the public'';

(ii) by striking ''divulge'' and inserting ''disclose''; and

(iii) by striking ''which is carried or maintained on that service'' and inserting ''that is stored, held, or maintained by that service''; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''divulge'' and inserting ''disclose''; and

(ii) by striking ''a provider of'' and inserting ''a person or entity providing'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''wire or electronic'' before ''communication'';

(B) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) to an originator, addressee, or intended recipient of such communication, to the subscriber or customer on whose behalf the provider stores, holds, or maintains such communication, or to an agent of such addressee, intended recipient, subscriber, or customer;''; and

(C) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) with the lawful consent of the originator, addressee, or intended recipient of such communication, or of the subscriber or customer on whose behalf the provider stores, holds, or maintains such communication;'';

(3) in subsection (c) by inserting ''wire or electronic'' before ''communications'';

(4) in each of subsections (b) and (c), by striking ''divulge'' and inserting ''disclose''; and

(5) in subsection (c), by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) with the lawful consent of the subscriber or customer;''.

AMENDMENTS TO REQUIRED DISCLOSURE SECTION

SEC. 1002. Section 2703 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) through (c) and inserting the following:

''(a) CONTENTS OF WIRE OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS IN ELECTRONIC STORAGE.—Except as provided in subsections (i) and (j), a governmental entity may require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is in electronic storage with or otherwise stored, held, or maintained by that service only if the governmental entity obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that—

''(1) is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction; and

''(2) may indicate the date by which the provider must make the disclosure to the governmental entity.

In the absence of a date on the warrant indicating the date by which the provider must make disclosure to the governmental entity, the provider shall promptly respond to the warrant.

''(b) CONTENTS OF WIRE OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS IN A REMOTE COMPUTING SERVICE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (i) and (j), a governmental entity may require the disclosure by a provider of remote computing service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is stored, held, or maintained by that service only if the governmental entity obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that—

''(A) is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction; and

''(B) may indicate the date by which the provider must make the disclosure to the governmental entity.

In the absence of a date on the warrant indicating the date by which the provider must make disclosure to the governmental entity, the provider shall promptly respond to the warrant.

''(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) is applicable with respect to any wire or electronic communication that is stored, held, or maintained by the provider—

''(A) on behalf of, and received by means of electronic transmission from (or created by means of computer processing of communication received by means of electronic transmission from), a subscriber or customer of such remote computing service; and

''(B) solely for the purpose of providing storage or computer processing services to such subscriber or customer, if the provider is not authorized to access the contents of any such communications for purposes of providing any services other than storage or computer processing.

''(c) RECORDS CONCERNING ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION SERVICE OR REMOTE COMPUTING SERVICE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (i) and (j), a governmental entity may require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service of a record or other information pertaining to a subscriber to or customer of such service (not including the contents of wire or electronic communications), only—

''(A) if a governmental entity obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that—

''(i) is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction directing the disclosure; and

''(ii) may indicate the date by which the provider must make the disclosure to the governmental entity;

''(B) if a governmental entity obtains a court order directing the disclosure under subsection (d);

''(C) with the lawful consent of the subscriber or customer; or

''(D) as otherwise authorized in paragraph (2).

''(2) SUBSCRIBER OR CUSTOMER INFORMATION.—A provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service shall, in response to an administrative subpoena authorized by Federal or State statute, a grand jury, trial, or civil discovery subpoena, or any means available under paragraph (1), disclose to a governmental entity the—

''(A) name;

''(B) address;

''(C) local and long distance telephone connection records, or records of session times and durations;

''(D) length of service (including start date) and types of service used;

''(E) telephone or instrument number or other subscriber or customer number or identity, including any temporarily assigned network address; and

''(F) means and source of payment for such service (including any credit card or bank account number),

of a subscriber or customer of such service.

''(3) NOTICE NOT REQUIRED.—A governmental entity that receives records or information under this subsection is not required to provide notice to a subscriber or customer.'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking ''(b) or'';

(B) by striking ''the contents of a wire or electronic communication, or'';

(C) by striking ''sought,'' and inserting ''sought''; and

(D) by striking ''section'' and inserting ''subsection''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) NOTICE.—Except as provided in section 2705, a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service may notify a subscriber or customer of a receipt of a warrant, court order, subpoena, or request under subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) of this section.

''(i) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED TO LEGAL PROCESS.—Nothing in this section or in section 2702 shall limit the authority of a governmental entity to use an administrative subpoena authorized by Federal or State statute, a grand jury, trial, or civil discovery subpoena, or a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) by a court of competent jurisdiction to—

''(1) require an originator, addressee, or intended recipient of a wire or electronic communication to disclose a wire or electronic communication (including the contents of that communication) to the governmental entity;

''(2) require a person or entity that provides an electronic communication service to the officers, directors, employees, or

agents of the person or entity (for the purpose of carrying out their duties) to disclose a wire or electronic communication (including the contents of that communication) to or from the person or entity itself or to or from an officer, director, employee, or agent of the entity to a governmental entity, if the wire or electronic communication is stored, held, or maintained on an electronic communications system owned, operated, or controlled by the person or entity; or

''(3) require a person or entity that provides a remote computing service or electronic communication service to disclose a wire or electronic communication (including the contents of that communication) that advertises or promotes a product or service and that has been made readily accessible to the general public.

''(j) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED TO CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS.—Nothing in this section or in section 2702 shall limit the power of inquiry vested in the Congress by article I of the Constitution of the United States, including the authority to compel the production of a wire or electronic communication (including the contents of a wire or electronic communication) that is stored, held, or maintained by a person or entity that provides remote computing service or electronic communication service.''.

DELAYED NOTICE

SEC. 1003. Section 2705 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2705. Delayed notice

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A governmental entity acting under section 2703 may apply to a court for an order directing a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service to which a warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive under section 2703 is directed not to notify any other person of the existence of the warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive.

''(b) DETERMINATION.—A court shall grant a request for an order made under subsection (a) for delayed notification of up to 180 days if the court determines that there is reason to believe that notification of the existence of the warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive will likely result in—

''(1) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

''(2) flight from prosecution;

''(3) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

''(4) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

''(5) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

''(c) EXTENSION.—Upon request by a governmental entity, a court may grant one or more extensions, for periods of up to 180 days each, of an order granted in accordance with subsection (b).''.

RULE OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 1004. Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed to preclude the acquisition by the United States Government of—

(1) the contents of a wire or electronic communication pursuant to other lawful authorities, including the authorities under chapter 119 of title 18 (commonly known as the ''Wiretap Act''), the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), or any other provision of Federal law not specifically amended by this Act; or

(2) records or other information relating to a subscriber or customer of any electronic communication service or remote computing service (not including the content of such communications) pursuant to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), chapter 119 of title 18 (commonly known as the ''Wiretap Act''), or any other provision of Federal law not specifically amended by this Act.

TITLE XI

AMATEUR RADIO PARITY ACT

SEC. 1101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Amateur Radio Parity Act of 2018''.

SEC. 1102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) More than 730,000 radio amateurs in the United States are licensed by the Federal Communications Commission in the amateur radio services.

(2) Amateur radio, at no cost to taxpayers, provides a fertile ground for technical self-training in modern telecommunications, electronics technology, and emergency communications techniques and protocols.

(3) There is a strong Federal interest in the effective performance of amateur stations established at the residences of licensees. Such stations have been shown to be frequently and increasingly precluded by unreasonable private land use restrictions, including restrictive covenants.

(4) Federal Communications Commission regulations have for three decades prohibited the application to stations in the amateur service of State and local regulations that preclude or fail to reasonably accommodate amateur service communications, or that do not constitute the minimum practicable regulation to accomplish a legitimate State or local purpose. Commission policy has been and is to require States and localities to permit erection of a station antenna structure at heights and dimensions sufficient to accommodate amateur service communications.

(5) The Commission has sought guidance and direction from Congress with respect to the application of the Commission's limited preemption policy regarding amateur service communications to private land use restrictions, including restrictive covenants.

(6) There are aesthetic and common property considerations that are uniquely applicable to private land use regulations and the community associations obligated to enforce covenants, conditions, and restrictions in deed-restricted communities. These considerations are dissimilar to those applicable to State law and local ordinances regulating the same residential amateur radio facilities.

(7) In recognition of these considerations, a separate Federal policy than exists at section 97.15(b) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, is warranted concerning amateur service communications in deed-restricted communities.

(8) Community associations should fairly administer private land use regulations in the interest of their communities, while nevertheless permitting the installation and maintenance of effective outdoor amateur radio antennas. There exist antenna designs and installations that can be consistent with the aesthetics and physical characteristics of land and structures in community associations while accommodating communications in the amateur radio services.

SEC. 1103. APPLICATION OF PRIVATE LAND USE RESTRICTIONS TO AMATEUR STATIONS.

(a) AMENDMENT OF FCC RULES.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall amend section 97.15 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, by adding a new paragraph that prohibits the application to amateur stations of any private land use restriction, including a restrictive covenant, that—

(1) on its face or as applied, precludes communications in an amateur radio service;

(2) fails to permit a licensee in an amateur radio service to install and maintain an effective outdoor antenna on property under the exclusive use or control of the licensee; or

(3) does not constitute the minimum practicable restriction on such communications to accomplish the lawful purposes of a community association seeking to enforce such restriction.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—In amending its rules as required by subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) require any licensee in an amateur radio service to notify and obtain prior approval from a community association concerning installation of an outdoor antenna;

(2) permit a community association to prohibit installation of any antenna or antenna support structure by a licensee in an amateur radio service on common property not under the exclusive use or control of the licensee; and

(3) subject to the standards specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), permit a community association to establish reasonable written rules concerning height, location, size, and aesthetic impact of, and installation requirements for, outdoor antennas and support structures for the purpose of conducting communications in the amateur radio services.

SEC. 1104. AFFIRMATION OF LIMITED PREEMPTION OF STATE AND LOCAL LAND USE REGULATION.

The Federal Communications Commission may not change section 97.15(b) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, which shall remain applicable to State and local land use regulation of amateur service communications.

SEC. 1105. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION.—The term ''community association'' means any non-profit mandatory membership organization composed of owners of real estate described in a declaration of covenants or created pursuant to a covenant or other applicable law with respect to which a person, by virtue of the person's ownership of or interest in a unit or parcel, is obligated to pay for a share of real estate taxes, insurance premiums, maintenance, improvement, services, or other expenses related to common elements, other units, or any other real estate other than the unit or parcel described in the declaration.

(2) TERMS DEFINED IN REGULATIONS.—The terms ''amateur radio services'', ''amateur service'', and ''amateur station'' have the meanings given such terms in section 97.3 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.

TITLE XII

ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

REFERENCES TO ACT

SEC. 1201. Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to ''this Act'' contained in this division shall be treated as referring only to the provisions of this division.

REFERENCES TO REPORT

SEC. 1202. Any reference to a ''report accompanying this Act'' contained in this division shall be treated as a reference to House Report 115–792. The effect of such Report shall be limited to this division and shall apply for purposes of determining the allocation of funds provided by, and the implementation of, this division.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 1203. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

This division may be cited as the ''Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2019''.

The CHAIR. Are there any points of order against the bill?

No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115–830, and pro forma amendments described in section 2 of House Resolution 996.

Each further amendment printed in the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 2 of House Resolution 996, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,400,000)''.

Page 14, line 10, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,480,000)''.

Page 14, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,480,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Madam Chair, I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Chairman CALVERT for their efforts on this legislation and, in fact, the entire committee.

My amendment is simple. It reprioritizes taxpayer money by moving a small amount of funds from the Bureau of Land Management land acquisition account and redirecting them to the National Park Service maintenance backlog account.

Over the years, Congress has sent billions of dollars into these accounts, allowing the Federal Government to acquire roughly 640 million acres. Today the Federal Government owns about 28 percent of all the lands in the United States, including about 40 percent of the land in my home State of Arizona.

This ownership and the subsequent management of the 640 million acres comes at a great expense to the American taxpayer and poses overwhelming challenges for land managing agencies. The deferred maintenance backlog for the National Park Service—and I have here a list of those—totals nearly $12 billion. The National Mall alone is almost $800 million in deferred maintenance, and the Grand Canyon National Park is $350 million in deferred maintenance.

The list goes on and on.

Given these challenges, it defies logic that we would continue to spend millions of dollars to acquire more land that we can't pay to maintain.

So I instead incur just $1.4 million of the net yield on this with my amendment to start this process of paying for the backlog.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, investments in the Land and Water Conservation Fund support public land conservation and ensure access to all the outdoors for all Americans. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, all 50 States enjoy and appreciate access to this fund.

The House bill provides $360 million which is $65 million below the fiscal year 2018 level. So this account has already seen a cut.

So I think that the committee made it very clear. We are very concerned about deferred maintenance in the national parks. The FY18 budget provides a $40 million increase over the FY18 enacted levels for facility operations and maintenance.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I want to acknowledge, our members on both sides of the aisle support more land acquisition funding, not less. That said, both sides of the aisle also recognize the maintenance backlog of our national parks is unacceptable.

In this bill we tried to balance the bipartisan support for land acquisition with bipartisan support for maintaining and improving the conditions of facilities we already own.

The gentleman from Arizona thinks we should direct a bit more to the National Park Service maintenance, and there is no debate that those needs are there.

Madam Chair, I support the amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I believe I have the right to close, Madam Chair, so I reserve the balance of my time until closing.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Chair, we have a problem when we can't even agree on prioritizing $1.5 million additional money to maintain national parks. Washington, D.C., on the Mall alone, has $1 billion in maintenance backlog. And Arizona, for instance, has one-half billion dollars in maintenance. California has over $2 billion in maintenance backlog, and I could go on and on.

But that is not necessary because we all know that we need to re-fund the maintenance backlog, and I am only asking for $1.4 million of an additional $18 million that is going to the land acquisition fund.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, to the gentleman who is offering the amendment, I appreciate his goal of wanting to address backlog. I would love to address more of our national park's backlog. But as I pointed out, the Land and Water Conservation Fund also has broad bipartisan support and has already taken a cut of $65 million below the FY18 budget level. So increasing access to our public lands for hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities has bipartisan support, just as addressing the deferred maintenance.

So if we can see an increase in the 302(b) as we move forward in committee, I am sure the chairman would consider that, and I would be very much in support of working something out.

But at this point, I am adamantly opposed to cutting the Land and Water Conservation Fund any further.

With that, I would tell my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam 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 Arizona will be postponed.

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115–830.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000) (increased by $500,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Chair, my amendment would move $500,000 from the United States Fish and Wildlife general administration account to the National Wildlife Refuge program specifically for the wildlife and habitat management of invasive species.

This amendment is identical to an amendment I offered last year that passed this body by a voice vote, and I

urge my colleagues to support this amendment again this year.

Invasive species threaten native plant and animal species and their vital habitats. Currently, invasive species are the most frequently mentioned threat within the National Wildlife Refuge System Threats and Conflicts database and are a growing risk to our ecosystems.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is the only agency in the United States Government with the primary responsibility of the conservation of our Nation's fish, wildlife, and plants. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service manages more than 561 refuges encompassing more than 150 million acres of habitat within the National Wildlife Refuge System.

As of 2013, more than 2.4 million acres of the refuge system are impacted by invasive plants, including Lake Hatchineha in my home district in central Florida with approximately 1,715 invasive animal populations residing on the refuge lands. It is important we provide enough funds to enable the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to combat and reduce the harmful impact of invasive species.

Again, this amendment would increase funds to combat invasive species that threaten native species in their vital habitat.

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

□ 2000

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I am happy to accept the gentleman's amendment and to work with the rest of my colleagues to address a need for funding to battle the spread the harmful invasive species. I support an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from California for his support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LANCE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. LANCE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 2, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 8, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $3,850,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LANCE. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment increasing funding for the Delaware River Basin Restoration Program.

Protecting our Nation's water supply is one of the major accomplishments of this legislation, and the Delaware River is a strong priority for the country.

I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Chairman CALVERT for their support of this program and support of my bipartisan amendment I offer tonight with Congressman GOTTHEIMER, also of New Jersey.

The Delaware River supplies water to over 15 million people and serves as the major source of drinking water for New Jersey, New York, Delaware, and Pennsylvania. Indeed, of the major cities across the globe, New York is considered to have the best quality water, and that is due to the Delaware River Basin.

Federal policies governing our Nation's waterways affect every State and the lives and health of every American. The interstate commerce generated by these multistate natural resources is squarely an important Federal prerogative. But the Delaware River's national significance is only part of the story. This is a wise Federal investment.

The Delaware River Basin generates $25 billion annually in economic activity, including agriculture, recreation, and ecotourism. Protecting our water and contributing to at least 600,000 jobs and over $10 billion in annual wages gives taxpayers a return on the investment we make with this vote.

I have the honor of representing communities on the Delaware River in Hunterdon and Warren Counties in western New Jersey; and Congressman GOTTHEIMER, my Democratic cosponsor, also represents municipalities on the Delaware River in Warren and Sussex Counties.

The Delaware River is a national asset. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the Lance-Gottheimer amendment, and I am deeply grateful for the support of the committee chair and the subcommittee chair.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment even though I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I commend Ranking Member MCCOLLUM and Chairman CALVERT for their hard work on the Interior Appropriations bill, and also Ranking Member QUIGLEY and Chairman GRAVES for their work on the Financial Services Appropriations bill. But, unfortunately, I cannot support this misguided appropriations package.

The bill before us today fails to fund critical domestic programs that safeguard our air and water or to adequately secure our elections.

Last year, after an unprecedented attack on a democracy, we came to a bipartisan consensus on the need for funding election security and included $380 million in the Consolidated Appropriations Act. This year, the majority zeroed out the account for election security assistance.

Given the indictments handed down by Special Counsel Mueller last week and the disgraceful performance by the President of the United States in Helsinki yesterday, I cannot think of a more important account to fund than one for election security.

If the President of the United States is unwilling to stand up to Putin and defend our democracy, it is incumbent upon us as Members of a coequal branch of government to do so.

This bill fails the American people in so many crucial ways, but if it fails to protect our elections, we risk eroding the vital accountability that undergirds our democracy.

Madam Chair, we are at a critical juncture in our Nation's history. Will America continue our leadership in the world as a beacon of democracy and integrity, or will we cower and bow to Russia and refuse to protect our election systems from their proven desire to interfere with our elections? Sadly, the bill before us fails to provide the resources necessary to meet that moment.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this appropriations package but not the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

The Delaware River Conservation Program leverages Federal funding by at least 2 to 1. That is exactly the kind of public-private partnership we should be fostering throughout the enterprise. That is why I support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I think what the gentleman from New Jersey is talking about is something that I am supportive of, but I am not supportive of the offset.

As the gentleman is aware, our 302(b) allocation was level-funded, and the 2018 omnibus bill provided $5 million to implement the Delaware Basin Conservation Act in FY19. An additional $5 million is provided, so it is a total of $10 million.

The offset to the amendment is what I have an objection to, not the gentleman's goals. The offset the gentleman

uses does not require a one-for-one match. The offset that he is using in order to move forward would reduce Fish and Wildlife Service construction by $3.85 million, and it has already been cut by $6 million. So the total cut to Fish and Wildlife construction would be $10 million at the end of the gentleman's amendment.

At this time, I am going to object to the amendment, but I would work with the gentleman and the chair to not only get a higher 302(b) allocation, but to find a different offset.

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

Mr. LANCE. Madam Chair, unfortunately, the offset is larger than the increase because of the differences in outlay rates. Amendments must be outlay neutral, per House rules.

Due to the work of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Chairman CALVERT, the underlying bill already includes the second year of a 2-year, $100 million funding surge in Fish and Wildlife Service construction funding, making it one of the best offsets possible as an option.

This bipartisan amendment is crucial for preserving the Delaware River watershed, which is already subject to cuts in the Senate's Interior Appropriations bill.

Madam Chair, due to the importance of the Delaware River, I urge a ''yes'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, line 10, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $300,000) (increased by $300,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chair, again, this is a simple amendment which would designate $300,000 within the operation of the National Park System for the New England National Scenic Trail. This is an amendment which was offered last year and was adopted by voice vote in an en bloc amendment. Again, the language is absolutely identical.

By way of background, the New England Trail was designated as a National Scenic Trail in 2009, making it one of the newest of the Nation's 11 National Scenic Trails. The trail is 223 miles long and winds through 41 communities in Connecticut and Massachusetts. Amazingly, nearly 2 million people live within 10 miles of the trail, making it one of the most accessible National Scenic Trails for one of the most densely populated parts of the country.

It was passed in 2007. Congressman John Olver, RICHIE NEAL, JOHN LARSON, ROSA DELAURO, now-Senator CHRIS MURPHY, and I introduced and passed the law, the New England Scenic Trail Designation Act.

Unfortunately, the trail has been woefully underfunded for the last 5 years. The trail system has received an average of $127,000 in funding, which is split three ways between the Connecticut Forest and Park Association, the Appalachian Mountain Club, and the National Park Service.

Of the approximately $43,000 each entity receives, the vast majority goes to facility maintenance, volunteer coordination, community engagement, outreach to youth, and the trail's landowner hosts. Impressively, much of the work that is done is supported by volunteers who put in more than 5,000 hours of maintenance activity annually.

I would just note that the managers of the trail have done their best to leverage an impressive $1.53 million in non-Federal funding in 2015. So they actually have been very efficient and creative in terms of trying to leverage and maximize the support that is, again, far below what the national park trail feasibility study recommended back in 2005, when they recommended an annual budget of $271,000.

Again, this is an amazing trail that goes through New England landscapes such as long-distance vistas with rural towns as a backdrop, farmlands, forests, and large river valleys. It also travels through colonial historical landmarks and highlights a range of diverse ecosystems and natural resources: mountain ridges and summits, forested glades, and wetlands.

Again, I want to thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their support last year.

I would urge passage of this identical amendment. It is supported by my colleagues in the region.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I support the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I appreciate the Member's interest in the New England Scenic Trail and the National Park Service operations generally.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chair, silence is golden, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chair, this bipartisan amendment would restore $5 million to the National Park Service's Historic Preservation Fund to achieve level funding from the 2018 fiscal year.

This amendment continues the same spirit of bipartisanship that Congress displayed in 2016 when we reauthorized the Historic Preservation Fund through 2023 and that Congress displayed last year when we passed a similar amendment in this Chamber.

Since the Historic Preservation Fund's creation in 1966, Congress has allocated more than $2 billion to communities across the country to connect Americans to our history and to contribute to our sense of place.

Historic preservation projects prioritize local workers, create more jobs per dollar spent than other construction projects, and use fewer carbon emissions than building anew.

The Historic Preservation Fund includes funding for State historic preservation offices, which work with local communities to revitalize historic locations and protect American heritage. Importantly, State historic fund offices administer the historic rehabilitation tax credit, which, nationwide, has leveraged $131 billion in private investment and created 2.4 million jobs since its inception.

It is that kind of high return leverage that the Historic Preservation Fund achieves. That explains why the program received the funding level in the 2018 omnibus that Mr. BLUMENAUER seeks to restore.

I would note that the omnibus was a bipartisan and bicameral agreement which the chair and ranking member supported.

Again, this amendment does not seek to raise spending above the 2018 omnibus, which cleared both Houses with a healthy bipartisan vote and which was signed into law by President Trump last March.

Madam Chair, I urge passage of the Blumenauer amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

□ 2015

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, as the gentleman knows, I am a strong supporter of the National Park Service and the Historic Preservation Fund. While I have some concerns about the offset at the Office of the Secretary, this is a bipartisan amendment I can accept, and I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. SEWELL OF ALABAMA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115–830.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 15, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which would increase the funding for competitive grants to preserve the sites and stories of the civil rights movement by $2.5 million.

My district, the Seventh Congressional District, is also known as the Civil Rights District. Many historic events, from the bombing of the 16th Street Baptist Church, to the Children's March, to the Montgomery bus boycott, to Bloody Sunday, all took place in my district.

These events are of national significance, and we are fortunate that the National Park Service is working with States, local communities, and nonprofits to preserve and interpret these stories. I am so grateful that the National Park Service has a strong presence in my district, and I have seen firsthand that they not only preserve the sites and stories of our great American history, but they also bring economic revitalization to the communities.

In my hometown of Selma, Alabama, the National Park Service Selma Interpretive Center brings tourism dollars to a rural Black Belt county that would otherwise not have such economic development.

In Birmingham, the civil rights monument is already playing a critical role in the downtown redevelopment. In fact, for every dollar invested in the national parks, $10 is generated in national economic activity.

The National Park Service also supports more than a quarter million private sector jobs. Therefore, I believe that making a small, additional investment in the Historic Preservation Fund will yield great dividends and results in economic revitalization in communities across this country.

The civil rights preservation fund has benefited civil rights sites from Iowa, to Nevada, to Massachusetts, and beyond. Grant projects from these additional funds would help provide for interpretation, education, surveys, oral history documentation, as well as physical preservation. It will also help lesser known civil rights sites get known.

The National Park Service's own 2008 study found that civil rights history and landmarks are underrepresented in the National Park System, so this grant will also give us an opportunity to increase the amount of money and funds that we give for historic preservation of civil rights sites.

From reconstruction, to the era of Jim Crow, to the birth of the civil rights movement, to the current struggle for equality and justice, there is so much history that deserves to be preserved and interpreted for the benefit of future generations.

I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. CALVERT, and the ranking member, Ms. MCCOLLUM, for their help in preserving civil rights sites all across the United States. Now is the time to do that preservation.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), my friend, the Democratic assistant leader, who will also support increasing the Historic Preservation Fund.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Sewell amendment. This proposal would increase funding for grants from the Historic Preservation Fund to preserve the sites and tell the stories of the civil rights movement.

I want to thank my colleague TERRI SEWELL for her leadership on this issue, and I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support of this program in the past.

First funded in fiscal year 2016, this program has met a great need in rural communities across our Nation that are struggling to preserve and protect their legacies.

Last year, the program funded a $500,000 grant to preserve Trinity United Methodist Church, which will help secure the church's legacy and preserve its history for future generations. I was a student at South Carolina State University in Orangeburg, South Carolina, during this time, and I know well the role that Trinity played in our meetings and our rallies, many of them attended by luminaries like Martin Luther King, Jr., Roy Wilkins, Thurgood Marshall, and many others.

This is but one example of several successful grants in South Carolina and throughout the Nation. There is much more work to be done to fully preserve this history.

Madam Chair, I strongly support this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, to the gentlewoman, my colleague on the House Intelligence Committee, this is certainly an amendment I can accept. The gentlewoman and I have a history over the years of working together on this program, and I am happy to continue it.

Madam Chair, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Chair, I want to personally thank Chairman CALVERT as well as Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for working closely with me on this amendment.

Madam Chair, I urge all my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115–830.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman and ranking member, Mr. CALVERT and Ms. MCCOLLUM, for their leadership on these issues of preservation.

The Jackson Lee amendment increases grant funding by $500,000 so that organizations interested in historical preservation, especially in underrepresented communities, have the ability to study, survey, and nominate properties to the National Register of Historic Places.

Due to lack of resources, certain communities are underrepresented in this process, so this amendment ensures that they have a greater opportunity.

The Jackson Lee amendment ensures that sites important to our American history are no longer overlooked due to mere lack of resources. It accomplishes this goal by promoting research that uncovers information to assist in telling the full American story.

Historical places create connections to our heritage that help understand our past, appreciate our triumphs, and learn from our mistakes. And they cover all of the cultural backgrounds, from African Americans, to Anglos, to Hispanics, and to Asians, all in this wonderful, diverse country who have had a story to tell, as well as Native Americans and many others.

Such stories might otherwise be lost because urban renewal and out-migration of Blacks destroyed or led to the abandonment of many African American communities. Preservation helps recognize, save, revitalize, and protect Americans' historic places, build communities, and foster education and pride.

I am reminded of Freedmen's Town in my home city and Emancipation Park, which was the first park bought in the entire State of Texas by freed slaves.

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

Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of Jackson Lee Amendment No. 8 to Division A of H.R. 6147, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2019.

This Jackson Lee Amendment increases grant funding by $500 thousand so that organizations interested in historical preservation, especially in underrepresented communities, have the ability to study, survey, and nominate properties to the National Register of Historic Places.

Due to lack of resources, certain communities are underrepresented in this process so this amendment ensures that is no longer the case.

This Jackson Lee Amendment ensures that sites important to our American history are no longer overlooked due to mere lack of resources, it accomplishes this goal by promoting research that uncovers information to assist in telling the full American story.

Historical places create connections to our heritage that help us understand our past, appreciate our triumphs, and learn from our mistakes.

Madam Chair, by understanding and designating landmarks we stimulate local revitalization and foster interest in places that otherwise may go unnoticed, despite cultural and historic significance.

By preserving historic sites that tell the story of Americans in this country, we draw attention to the contributions of both ordinary and extraordinary people.

Such stories might otherwise be lost because urban renewal and the out-migration of blacks destroyed or led to the abandonment of many African American communities.

Preservation helps to recognize, save, revitalize and protect America's historic places, build communities, and foster education and pride.

The Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) provides matching grants to State and Tribal historic preservation offices.

These HPF grants are used to pay for research and surveys of historic sites, training for staff, and the work involved in nominating these sites to the National Register of Historic Places.

In short, it makes preservation possible to communities that otherwise would not have the means to engage in the nominating process.

The Jackson Lee amendment is essential because it provides funds to preserve sites that are directly connected to the Civil Rights Movement.

For example, earlier this year I introduced H.R. 4745, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act that seeks a federal designation of the Emancipation National Historic Trail.

The Emancipation National Historic Trail extends approximately 51 miles and marks the migration of newly freed slaves, who, upon learning of the Emancipation Proclamation two years after the President had signed it into law, departed from what is now the Osterman Building and Reedy Chapel in Galveston, and charted a course along Texas State Highway 3 and Interstate Highway 45 North to Freedmen's Town and Emancipation Park in Houston.

Increasing grant funding for this program would make projects like the Emancipation Trail possible.

Madam Chair, it is imperative that we preserve and codify the historical record and memorialize significant events of our past.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for Jackson Lee Amendment No. 8 to Division A of H.R. 6147 as it is vital that we support the preservation of important sites.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I have no objections and urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for that, and I want to give an example that earlier this year I introduced H.R. 4745, the Emancipation National Historic Trail Act, that seeks Federal designation of the Emancipation National Historic Trail, that it would extend 51 miles and mark the migration of newly freed slaves. But, more importantly, it takes us from Captain Granger in Galveston, who brought the slaves in Texas who were freed in 1865, 2 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, and it tracks the historic markers all the way to Freedmen's Town and Emancipation Park.

This is an opportunity not only for the communities to be joined together but, again, to reemphasize history that is intertwined. A study shows the connection between culture, heritage, and tourism, and that 37 percent of global tourism has a cultural motivation, and 57 percent of travelers are strongly influenced by history and culture in their choice of holiday destination. This will help underserved communities.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. CLYBURN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 15, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Chair, this amendment would increase by $2 million the Historic Preservation Fund to restore and preserve buildings and sites on the campuses of Historically Black Colleges and Universities. It is offset by a minor reduction in the administration account for the Department of the Interior.

Most HBCUs were founded after the Civil War to provide higher education to African Americans, most of whom were newly freed from slavery. These institutions continue to serve a vital purpose and have deep historical connections with African Americans and American history. Most of them have sites and structures of historical significance that are in dire need of restoration and preservation.

Early in my tenure in Congress, I worked with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus and in leadership of this committee and the Committee on Natural Resources to authorize and appropriate funds to the GAO to study the breadth of this issue. The GAO identified 712 endangered historic buildings at an approximate cost of restoration of $755 million.

My amendment today will increase the funding in the bill for this important program by $2 million, to a total of $7 million, still $3 million below the level authorized by the House-passed bill.

I have seen the transformational power of historic preservation in my congressional district, where buildings like Ministers' Hall at Claflin University and Chappelle Auditorium at Allen University were restored after decades of abandonment to their original glory as iconic institutions of their communities.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Chair, I rise today as a supporter and cosponsor of this amendment, which would add $2 million for the Historic Preservation Fund grants for Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

HBCUs have always been a hub for bright, young African Americans to come together and to promote both individual development and community development.

These institutions are national treasures, and their legacy and history deserves to be protected for the benefit of future generations. The Historic Preservation Fund grants for HBCUs are a perfect tool to help these institutions protect their historic civil rights sites and buildings, and I look forward to continuing to work with the 14 HBCUs in my home State of Alabama to seek these funds.

Madam Chair, I again thank Assistant Leader CLYBURN for his leadership on this matter over the years. I thank him for the opportunity to speak on this amendment. I also thank the chairman and ranking member.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Chair, may I ask how much time I have left.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I am honored to stand up and support Historically Black Colleges and Universities and, as has been pointed out, the important role that they play in our education system. Adding additional resources to preserve these structures on these campuses is necessary to maintain them.

Madam Chair, I am very honored to represent many people from the Oromo community who are proud alumni from HBCUs. I stand with the gentleman to make sure that we have the resources needed for African American preservation and history, not only to have passed along our appreciation of our Nation's history to future generations, but to give the next generation great buildings to be educated in.

□ 2030

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Chair, I thank Ranking Member MCCOLLUM. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Ms. SEWELL, and Congresswoman ADAMS for their support of this legislation.

As a proud graduate of an HBCU, with a daughter who is an HBCU graduate, I am very much supportive of restoring and preserving the tremendous history of these institutions.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, the gentleman and I have a history over the years of working together to support HBCUs. I thank the gentleman for working with me on this issue and with the ranking member, and I urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 115–830.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman and the ranking member of this committee for their commitment to historic preservation.

Since 1837, Historically Black Colleges and Universities have served the needs of higher education for the African American community. The first HBCUs were established in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Missouri, and Tennessee.

After the Civil War, there was an influx of HBCU establishments throughout the Southeast, Midwest, and Southwest. The Jackson Lee amendment provides an additional $1 million for the Historic Preservation Fund, and within that fund to be allocated to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, institutions that are uniquely American, fundamentally historical, and distinctly beneficial to the American culture and history.

In my State of Texas, it joins with any number of States throughout the United States in the North, the South, the East, and the West. Interestingly, these schools are not relegated to the South. They are actually all over the United States, and they are older structures. For those of us who visited these schools, we recognize the importance of continuing to preserve their historic structure.

I mentioned earlier that there are great results in funding and profits for those who can provide historic opportunities for travelers to visit.

In 2017, Congress appropriated $4 million for the Historic Preservation Fund to rehabilitate historic structures on campuses of HBCUs that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places either individually or as contributing to the National Register of Historic Places. I can assure you that these are great assets to America. The projects must meet major program selection criteria, and all work must meet the Secretary of the Interior's standards and guidelines for archeology and historic preservation.

Simply, what we are doing is allowing our history to be preserved. The network of more than 100 historic institutions, established as early as 1837 for former slaves and by former slaves and freedmen, contain repositories of important books, papers, and memorabilia of Black history.

Black history, as other history, is American history, and the opportunity to preserve it and to continue to expand the opportunity to improve buildings that will now educate this generation of students is an important role for us to play.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of Jackson Lee Amendment No. 10 to Division A of H.R. 6147, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Financial Services Appropriations Act of 2019.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 10 provides an additional $1,000,000 for the Historic Preservation Fund to be allocated to Historically Black Colleges and Universities—institutions that are uniquely American, fundamentally historical, and distinctly beneficial to American culture and history.

Since 1837, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) have served the needs of higher education for the African American community.

The first HBCUs were established in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Missouri, and Tennessee.

After the Civil War there was an influx of HBCU establishment throughout the Southeast, Midwest, and Southwest.

Since the 1990s, the National Park Service has awarded over $60 million in grants to over 80 of the remaining active HBCUs.

These grants work to preserve the historic structures on HBCU campuses, many of which are listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

In 2017, Congress appropriated $4 million from the Historic Preservation Fund to rehabilitate historic structures on campuses of HBCUs that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places either individually or as contributing to a National Register historic district.

Projects must meet major program selection criteria and all work must meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation.

HBCUs represent a significant place in American history.

This network of more than 100 historic institutions established as early as 1837 for former slaves and freedmen contain repositories of important books, papers and memorabilia of Black history.

In addition, HBCUs served as meeting places during the civil rights struggles of the 1900s.

Against substantial odds, HBCUs have played a unique role in transforming the landscape of higher education in the United States, and continue to prepare the African American professional and civic leaders needed by communities, employers and the nation.

In 2013, HBCUs comprised 3 percent of all four- and two-year colleges and universities, but enrolled 10 percent of African American

undergraduates, produced 18 percent of the nation's African American college graduates, and generated 25 percent of African Americans with bachelor degrees in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields.

Created to educate black students at a time when society had yet to integrate, historically black colleges and universities (HBCU's) have had an outsize impact on the success of the black community and therefore the American community as a whole.

HBCUs do not only educate—HBCUs have and will continue to fill an important role in education opportunity and engagement for millions of young people from diverse backgrounds.

Ensuring HBCUs receive the funds necessary to succeed enriches our culture as a nation and promotes a more complete history of our country to be preserved.

Emphasizing the importance of diversity is the best way to tell the complete story of the American experience, and when the American story is told by all of those who helped shape its success as a nation, we perpetuate American exceptionalism.

Madam Chair, our HBCUs are not just academic institutions, rather, incubators that stimulate black excellence that, more importantly, preserve the rich and true history of those of African descent—again, contributing to the fabric of American culture as a whole.

Texas Southern University, an outstanding HBCU, is a major contribution and asset to the 18th District, serving as a distinct example of the benefits that these institutions offer to the community.

HBCUs not only enjoy historical campuses, but they are also repositories of expertise on American History.

In a 1998 study, more than 100 HBCUs identified 712 historic properties that were owned by the schools in responses to a survey from the U.S. Government Office of Accountability.

Nearly half of those buildings, 323, are on the National Register of Historic Places indicating significance in American history, and the others were eligible for the national register based on surveys by state historic preservation officers or considered historic by the colleges and universities.

According to the surveys at that time, 103 HBCUs estimated $755 million in costs to restore and preserve the properties, such as improving accessibility to people with disabilities, roof replacement and removing lead-based paint or asbestos, both known for containing cancer-causing material.

Routine maintenance costs were not part of the estimates.

We, as a nation, have a responsibility to foster education, culture, knowledge, diversity and leadership; and with that, Mr. Chairman, we have a responsibility to ensure that HBCUs continue to serve as repositories of American History and thrive as academic institutions and continue to benefit society as a whole.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for Jackson Lee Amendment No. 10.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I am happy to continue to work with the gentlewoman from Texas on this program and others, and I have no objection.

Madam Chair, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I thank Mr. CALVERT, and, again, I thank the ranking member who has been so gracious.

I believe Texas Southern University—not as old as 1837—Prairie View A&M, and others throughout the Nation will benefit from preserving these historic buildings, and, as well, providing them as a source of learning for everyone around the Nation.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. OLSON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Chair, I rise as the designee of Congressman TED POE to speak on behalf of his amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $20,000,000)(increased by $20,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Chair, we have a class of American warships that haven't been built since World War II. They are called battleships.

America made 64 battleships. Only seven survived World War II. They are the *North Carolina*, *Alabama*, *Massachusetts*, *Iowa*, *New Jersey*, *Missouri*, and *Wisconsin*.

But one survived World War II and World War I. This ship is special. It is the *Battleship Texas*. She is over 104 years old. She was commissioned on March 12 of 1914. She patrolled the Atlantic during the First World War. She is the first American ship with anti-aircraft guns. She is the first battleship that had directors and rangekeepers to lock on with their 10 14-inch main batteries.

There she is today. She has made history in our Navy.

March 1919, Lieutenant Commander Edward McDonnell took a British Sopwith Camel off turret number 3, Naval aviation was born. The wings of gold started on the USS *Texas*.

The skipper of the *Texas* was so impressed. He noticed those planes could see splashes for the weapons. They could target with aircraft. That meant the *Texas* would be the first ship ever to launch planes to recover as spy mechanisms during a war.

The *Texas* was at Casco Bay, Maine, on December 7, 1941, the day Japan bombed Pearl Harbor. In the Atlantic Ocean, on October 23, 1942, as part of Operation Torch, the invasion of French Morocco, the *Texas* bombed and bombed and bombed the enemy.

June 6, 1944, at 5:50 a.m., the *Texas* roared to life with a constant bombardment of all the weapons—225 14-inch rounds hit the Germans in 34 minutes.

June 7, the next day, she is off the cliffs of Pointe Du Hoc where the rangers were in a dogfight for their lives being shot at from above. The *Texas* launched two Higgins boats, supplied the rangers with more weapons, and brought the wounded home.

That may have been a natural fit. And the command of those rangers was a Texan, a proud Texas Aggie, Earl Rudder.

On the beaches that day, my colleague, TED POE's father, Virgil Poe, heard the *Texas* roar and saw the flame come out of the big guns. When the war in Europe with Hitler went ashore, the *Texas* redeployed to the Pacific. On February 16, she pounded the Japanese on Iwo Jima for 3 straight days before the Marine Corps landed.

March 1945, 6 straight days of bombing Okinawa cleared the way for the Army and Marines to take that island back.

The *Texas* struck the Naval record as a registered vessel on April 20 of 1948. She was given to my home State, the State of *Texas*. She is now the flagship of the *Texas* Navy, Admiral TED POE's flagship. Our colleague, TED, is an admiral of the Texas Navy.

She is moored right where Texas won independence, the San Jacinto Monument, right there southwest of Houston, Texas. But sadly, inaction in D.C. and in Texas has done what the German Kaiser, General Mussolini, Adolf Hitler, and General Tojo could not do. The *Texas* is sinking. Rust and time are winning.

The *Texas* still has a heart of a warship. She twice set sail during Hurricane Ike. She and all these battleships deserve to be saved. It is time to heave up and trice up. Vote for this amendment, and save our battleships.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 19, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $250,000) (increased by $250,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my bipartisan amendment to H.R. 6147, the Interior Appropriations Act, which I am proud to introduce with my friend and colleague from Michigan, Congressman JOHN MOOLENAAR.

Our amendment would provide funding to continue and advance the great science that is being done in the U.S. Geological Survey's Fisheries Program. We need more research to protect important ecosystems, like the Great Lakes, from invasive species and better understand how to conserve and protect important fishery resources.

The Great Lakes Science Center, which is strategically located near access fishery resources in communities across the eight Great Lakes States, would be an appropriate recipient of these additional resources.

The Great Lakes are a way of life for so many across Michigan and many other States, including agriculture, commercial and sport fishing, transportation, shipping, power generation, recreation, and tourism.

Whether you live, work, or vacation on the Great Lakes, we all benefit in preserving and conserving the Great Lakes for future generations.

The Great Lakes Science Center would be able to adopt cutting-edge technologies to support fisheries management, native prey fish restoration, and invasive species control by deploying autonomous underwater systems to assess impacts of bottom-dwelling invasive species on economically important fisheries and recreational resources.

The Science Center would continue to do their work on piloting gene silencing techniques to control zebra and quagga mussels in lakes and rivers with nationwide applications.

Fisheries science has been broadly recognized as a national and regional priority for many years, and nearly every action in the past has been to either maintain or increase the funding for the USGS fisheries assessments in the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes Fishery Program also has enjoyed long bipartisan support from Congress.

□ 2045

The Great Lakes are a treasured national resource, with more than 20 percent of the world's freshwater, 9,000 miles of shoreline, and supporting a $16 billion outdoor recreation economy.

It is critical we maintain funding to continue the United States Geological Survey's research and to enhance exploration in cutting-edge technologies to support fisheries management, native prey fish restoration, and invasive species control that is being done at the Great Lakes Science Center.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I am happy to support the gentlewoman from Michigan in her quest. The Great Lakes Science Center has bipartisan support for the role it plays in protecting the economic and environmental health of the Great Lakes region.

Madam Chair, I support my colleague's amendment, urge an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman and I thank the ranking member, Representative MCCOLLUM, who shares the love of the Great Lakes with me.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 19, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $100,000) (increased by $100,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chair, this amendment designates $100,000 in funding to the United States Geological Survey so that they can create a searchable map showing occurrences of an iron sulfide material known as pyrrhotite nationwide.

Pyrrhotite is a material that has, unfortunately, shown up in concrete quarries in New England and Canada. When it is mixed into the aggregate poured into the foundations of homes, over a period of time, because it is an iron material and exposed to moisture, it actually rusts, expands, and cracks, basically causing a catastrophic collapse of the foundation.

In Connecticut, there are estimates that as high as 19,000 homes that have been infected with pyrrhotite material. It spread into western Massachusetts and three rivers in Quebec. The whole community of thousands of people have been devastated by the presence of this material.

The Trump administration and the Treasury Department actually recognized last November a property casualty loss tax guidance that allows homeowners who basically have to spend about $200,000 to repair their homes—because they have to lift the house, pull out the old foundation, and pour a new foundation—to claim it as a property casualty loss deduction.

Last month, Dr. Ben Carson from HUD came up and did a tour of these homes. It is a devastating occurrence, and it has potential nationwide consequences.

The United States Navy actually has a bidding process out right now through its SBIR program to come up with a testing mechanism. They calculate that they basically own about 300,000 structures throughout the United States. They want to have a system for testing for the presence of pyrrhotite.

I brought a picture, which shows the effects of the catastrophe. This is a home where the house was lifted. The material of the foundation is so badly compromised that the contractor can actually pull it apart by hand, it is that serious.

This amendment would allow the United States Geological Survey to create a searchable database nationally that would allow us to identify this. The Office of Congressional Affairs contacted our office and indicated that they do have the capacity to develop a national pyrrhotite map, but it is not in their current plan. This amendment, which is also supported by Mr. LARSON from Connecticut's First District, would direct that priority.

Madam Chair, I urge passage of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I support this amendment. I will work with the gentleman to address this issue with the United States Geological Survey and learn more about where this mineral occurs.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for his consideration of this amendment. It is a very serious problem and much appreciated in the New England area. I thank the ranking member, Ms. MCCOLLUM, for her support as well.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. GABBARD

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 115–830.

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 19, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,798,500)''.

Page 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,908,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Chair, this amendment would increase the United States Geological Survey's surveys, investigations, and research account by $4,798,500 to accommodate for impacts caused by recent volcanic eruptions. The offset for this modest increase comes from the Interior Secretary's administrative account.

On May 8, 2018, in my district, the Kilauea Volcano on the Big Island, Hawaii, began erupting. The volcanic activity and destruction has yet to stop or wane. It has destroyed over 700 homes, forcing thousands of people to evacuate, to seek emergency aid and shelter, and to somehow find a new future for their lives.

There has never been a more critical time where the United States Geological Survey's Volcano Hazards Program on Hawaii island has been sorely needed; however, their office was severely damaged by the seismic activity from the ongoing volcanic eruptions.

Hawaii island itself has seen hundreds of these types of seismic eruptions over the last month and a half. As a result, the staff currently occupy empty spaces at University of Hawaii at Hilo, like classrooms, or they telework, undermining their quality of work, with the staff potentially putting their lives at risk.

The United States Geological Survey provides essential information for the health, safety, and well-being of people all across the State of Hawaii, and in neighboring locations such as the Marshall Islands, which has been blanketed by volcanic smog following the Kilauea eruption.

To most effectively do their job, this team needs a workplace where they can house their equipment, conduct research, and most effectively uphold their mission, which is to enhance public safety and minimize social and economic disruption.

This amendment will provide the necessary resources for this team to at least temporarily relocate to a suitable location and continue to carry out their lifesaving historic work.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to help us immediately address this situation and pass our amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, it is my understanding that the United States Geological Survey is in its early stages of discussing temporary spaces but that, eventually, the United States Geological Survey may have to develop a long-term solution for the Hawaiian Volcano Observatory.

I encourage the Department of the Interior, the United States Geological Survey, and the National Park Service to work together to develop a plan for the future observatory because operating the HVO out of the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park was a cost-effective solution for many years.

Madam Chair, in the meantime, I certainly support my colleague's amendment. I urge an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support for this very timely and important resolution.

I have been on the ground there and have seen how the United States Geological Survey's HVO is literally monitoring the activity 24 hours a day, sending out realtime updates to people whose lives and homes and farms hang in the balance.

Unfortunately, the volcanic activity that we are seeing there right now is continuing at a very aggressive rate with no end in sight, so his support for this amendment comes at a critical time, and I really appreciate it on behalf of my constituents there.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 19, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $1,022,728)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my bipartisan amendment that would provide $1 million for the United States Geological Survey to eradicate grass carp in the Great Lakes. Grass carp are an invasive species, one of the four species of Asian carp that pose an immediate threat to the Great Lakes and its coastal wetlands.

Since being introduced in Lake Erie, the grass carp population has been increasing, threatening our coastal wetlands and our region's economy that relies so heavily on the health of the Great Lakes. Our coastal wetlands are important to Michigan's environment and the wildlife they serve as a natural water filter and habitat for fish and waterfowl.

Since 2010, the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, which has been supported by Democrats and Republicans in Congress, has helped to restore the wetlands the grass carp are now consuming. The immediate threat of grass carp in Lake Erie jeopardizes the investment and the goals of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

This amendment is simple. It empowers and funds the United States Geological Survey to track and monitor grass carp so that we can stop their spread in the Great Lakes.

By passing this amendment, the United States Geological Survey would have additional resources to find out where grass carp are breeding so we can know how to stop their invasion and remove them from the Great Lakes. Funding from this amendment will double our efforts in Lake Erie to ensure we protect our coastal wetlands, our wildlife, and the Great Lakes themselves. With this amendment, we have an opportunity to address this urgent threat of invasive species such as grass carp.

Madam Chair, I thank my friend from Michigan, Congressman WALBERG, for working with me on this bipartisan amendment. I also thank our friends on the Appropriations Committee—Congresswoman KAPTUR, Congressman JOYCE, and Congressman MOOLENAAR—who have also been involved and helped on this. And I, of course, thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their efforts in working with us on ensuring that this amendment receives fair consideration.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

The committee takes invasive species threats seriously. We spent a lot of time on Asian carp in our committee in prevention efforts throughout the bill. It is a bipartisan effort. Everyone is very concerned about this. We are talking about a bounty program, possibly, to go after these things. Let's go do it.

I accept the gentleman's amendment, but I will be working with him and the rest of my colleagues to ensure that Asian carp and grass carp control and prevention efforts are effectively coordinated across the agencies within our jurisdiction.

Madam Chair, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for his support, and I

thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their efforts in dealing with this really important issue. It is particularly important to those of us who live in the Great Lakes region, but it is important to all of us. This is really not only a question of maintaining this ecosystem, but it is important to our economy.

Madam Chair, I thank all of my colleagues for their support. I urge the passage of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2100

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF OHIO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 115–830.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio seek recognition?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The CHAIR. Does the gentleman have an amendment at the desk?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I do have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 27, line 10, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $30,000,000)''.

Page 68, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $30,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Does the gentleman have a modification to his amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The CHAIR. Will the gentleman submit his modification to the desk?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Amendment No. 17. Sixteen and 17 are being combined.

The CHAIR. Is the modification at the desk?

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Point of parliamentary inquiry. Could our side have an opportunity to look at the amendment? We haven't had an opportunity to see it. We do not know whether or not we would object. It might be a friendly amendment to us.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AMENDMENT NOS. 16 AND 17 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF OHIO EN BLOC

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that amendment Nos. 16 and 17 be considered en bloc.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF OHIO

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc consisting of amendment Nos. 16 and 17 printed in House Report 115–830, offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF OHIO

Page 27, line 10, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $30,000,000)''.

Page 68, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $30,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF OHIO

Page 27, line 19, strike ''3'' and insert ''6''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I thank the Chair for consideration of combining these two amendments.

The amendments before us today help restore and continue important grant funding that will provide level funding for the same number of States currently funded by the Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Economic Development Pilot Program, which is used for the reclamation of abandoned mine lands in conjunction with economic and community development and reuse goals.

These amendments are about ensuring the AML Economic Development Program continues to be appropriately funded and continues to afford the same grant opportunities to all currently eligible States. Similar amendments offered by Representative GRIFFITH have passed the House in the last 2 years, and the Senate FY19 Interior & Environment Appropriations bill contains similar language and funding amounts.

Funding for these economic reclamation grants was established in fiscal year 2016 by Chairman ROGERS, and it provided opportunities for some of the hard-hit areas of Appalachia to not only restore the land, but also allow additional appropriated funds to be used for economic purposes, and they helped provide a way to prepare the land for community development.

These amendments carry on that goal; they maintain the status quo. And let me stress the point: these amendments are not designed to take money away from the top three States receiving funding in the underlying bill.

Our intent is that the first three States will continue to receive the amount currently appropriated in the underlying bill. The additional money provided with these amendments are meant for the next three States and is to be divided equally, so that the next three States receive $10 million each, the same amount they have received over the last 2 years.

I have worked with the Appropriations Committee to ensure these amendments will do just that and that this additional support for one Appalachian community does not come at the expense of another.

I urge my colleagues to support these important amendments. They are important to not only Ohio, but to the many States and coal communities throughout Appalachia.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BUDD). The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment that takes more money from an already starved EPA account. This bill already severely cuts the Environmental Protection Agency's operating account by more than $100 million. The air we breathe and the water we drink are endangered by the funding and policy decisions that are made in this bill, and the consequences will be negatively felt in communities across this Nation.

It is unfortunate that our 302(b) allocation was level funded, and I am sorry to hear that the gentleman's account in which he is trying to restore funding also received a cut. I often know that cutting the EPA is an easy target for many of my colleagues across the aisle, Mr. Chair, but I want my colleagues to understand what this amendment would cut, if adopted.

This account funds programs that are important to both sides of the aisle: permitting construction projects across the country, toxic risk prevention, and a successful brownfields program, and even pesticide licensing.

I understand that the amendment would direct more funds to States in Appalachia who have suffered ravaging environmental costs caused by coal mining, and, once again, I want to stress that it is unfortunate that you are trying to restore funding that had been cut, but our allocation was very short.

Unfortunately, I cannot support any deeper cuts to the EPA because they will have consequences that will be felt by people all across the country, so I must oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman, and certainly we are prepared to accept the amendment.

I understand the gentleman's overall goals to continue funding for the AML pilot consistent with the fiscal year 2018 enacted bill that provided the funding for the six Appalachian States, and I know the economic devastation that has happened throughout that region.

This increase to the AML program by $30 million, so that Ohio, Alabama, and Virginia would receive $10 million each, equal to the fiscal 2010 enacted levels, could certainly help in those regions.

So we can accept this package of amendments at this time. I look forward to maintaining funding for the six States, with distribution similar to fiscal year 2018 and the final 2019 enacted bill. As such, I encourage my colleagues to adopt the amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I appreciate Chairman CALVERT's support as well, and the appropriators' hard work on this.

This was created by Hal Rogers. It is fascinating because what happens is that people say they want us to transition the economy in central Appalachia. This is one of the ways to do that, and it actually saves money.

We have a project in my district that we are close to getting finalized on this, where it would cost $6.7 million to clean up a site, if we did it the normal way. With this program, which we wish to continue, it will only cost the government about 2.5, $2.6 million, and we end up with a site that can be used again for economic development and jobs in Appalachia.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I will close. I want to reaffirm what my colleague from West Virginia said. This is important for economic development in communities in Appalachia. It will have a significant impact on economic development work throughout the region, while being offset by only a slight reduction in EPA's environmental programs and management account, totaling only 1.21 percent of that account.

So this is good legislation. It is a good bill for Appalachia, a good set of amendments for Appalachia. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear. I understand that this amendment would direct more funding to States in Appalachia who have suffered from the ravaging environment caused by coal mining, and that is a very noble goal, as I said before.

But at this time I have to oppose this amendment. Once again, I want to point out, we were level funded in our allocation in the Interior bill that we are debating today with amendments, and I cannot support any further deeper cuts to the EPA.

But as the chairman moves forward and as we go to conference, if we can start restoring some of the funds to the EPA, I would like to work with the gentleman to restore some of the funds to this also important program; but at this time I have to oppose.

Mr. 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 Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 31, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $36,000,000)(increased by $36,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chair, Arizona's First Congressional District is home to the largest population of Native Americans and Indian lands in the Nation.

Many of the Tribal governments that I represent face a public safety crisis. Nearly every Tribal community I visit is caught in the justice facility backlog, and it is having a serious impact on their ability to protect and serve their communities.

The backlog in unmet need for Tribal justice facilities has grown significantly since fiscal year 2014, when the Department of Justice unilaterally stopped new and replacement construction of Tribal justice buildings. All the while, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has kept condemning these types of buildings. This negligent lack of Federal coordination between agencies has resulted in communities being forced to go without essential infrastructure.

Tribal justice officials dedicate and risk their lives to provide basic law and order in Native American communities. However, as a former police officer, I can tell you, no justice system can function without a safe and secure facility to house these officers.

The San Carlos Apache Tribe's justice system is a devastating example of the backlog for justice facilities in Indian Country.

The BIA condemned the San Carlos Police and Courts Building known as BIA Building 86 in 2009. The Tribal police officers and courts worked for 6 additional years in a condemned building, until the Bureau of Indian Affairs provided them with temporary trailers, which had been intended to be used as classrooms and temporary housing in 2015.

Here we are, 3 years later, and this temporary fix is failing the San Carlos police and courts, as well as the entire community. The San Carlos Police Chief works in an office with cracks in the wall where he can see outside. The generator doesn't provide air conditioning to the police patrol or court sessions of trailers, and that is in Arizona. Water service is intermittent. There is not enough space for evidence storage. The floors can't securely support storage safes that include cash, drugs, and other evidence. I can go on and on.

It is clear that it is past time to provide the San Carlos Apache Tribe, and Tribes across the country, a permanent facility to safely house their police and courts.

□ 2115

I commend Appropriations for providing $18 million for replacement of new public safety and justice construction.

My amendment demonstrates the reality that the need is greater. It suggests a funding level of $36 million divided between replacement and new construction. This would help provide for the needs of communities like San Carlos, who have had their police and court facilities condemned by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Every law enforcement officer at the local, State, Tribal, and Federal levels risk their lives to protect and serve their community. If we can't give them the basic tools to do their jobs, our communities risk safety and justice for victims. We must do better.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment on behalf of these brave law enforcement officials, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I am happy to accept the gentleman's amendment and work with him and the rest of my colleagues to address the public safety and justice construction needs in Indian Country.

The ranking member and I have worked very closely together in Indian Country to recognize the shortcomings throughout Indian Country in Indian education, Indian healthcare, and certainly within the Indian public safety and justice problems that we are having throughout the United States.

Mr. Chair, I certainly support an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chair, I just want to thank the chair and the ranking member for all their commitment to Indian Country and for their support of this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. 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 31, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chair, across Indian Country, access to safe and clean drinking water is a major issue that we are obligated to address.

In the northwest corner of my district, the Hopi Tribe has a water system with over three times the Federal maximum standard for safe drinking water for arsenic. Let me repeat that: three times the amount of arsenic than the maximum standard considered safe.

Members of the Tribe have no choice but to use this unsafe water. This is beyond unacceptable in any community in America, but it is a fact of life for Tribes across the Nation.

No matter where you are born, no child or family in America should have to risk their health because they can't access clean water.

This basic lack of water infrastructure has limited many Tribes' ability to unleash their economic potential in rural communities across the country.

The Hopi Tribe has limited financial resources. In fact, it has an 80 percent unemployment rate. Our country's unemployment rate is 4 percent. It also has a mine that is potentially going to close that supplies 80 percent of its general funds.

They have not sat idly waiting for the Federal Government to fix the problem it created. The Tribe has launched the Hopi Arsenic Mitigation Project to directly address this challenge.

Through the project, the Tribe has identified arsenic-free wells and mapped the pipeline route that will deliver arsenic-free water to villages and towns across the reservation. All the Tribe needs to complete the project is construction funding.

Unfortunately, funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs Construction account has not been adequate enough to fund projects across country like Hopi's. That is why I am offering a commonsense amendment to increase BIA's construction funding by $10 million.

Increasing this funding for construction of water infrastructure will enable the BIA to assist communities in building water systems that will deliver clean drinking water to schools and homes, some for the first time.

This amendment is not only a wise investment for Tribal communities as they seek to develop their economies and attract investment, but it is also a moral imperative.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to increase access to clean water for tribal communities across the country.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I was happy to support the gentleman and accept the prior amendment, but this just goes too far.

I couldn't agree with the gentleman more that the Federal obligations for construction in Indian Country far outweigh the amount of money we have in the budget. That is why the Bureau of Indian Affairs Construction account has been and will continue to be a nonpartisan priority for the subcommittee, and we are certainly proud of the progress we have made so far, but I cannot support an offset on an account that also serves Indian Country and other underserved populations.

In addition to cutting the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs, this amendment is likely to cut the Office of Native American Relations, the Office of Small Disadvantaged Business Utilization, the Office of Civil Rights, and the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Again, while I agree with the increase, and I certainly don't disagree with the gentleman's intentions, I cannot in good conscience agree to this offset.

If we find money down the road in this process as the gentlewoman and I are going through the conference, this is something I would be very interested in looking at, but right now I must encourage a ''no'' vote.

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chair, I understand that this bill increases the BIA Construction funding levels from last year, but I must remind the gentleman that this program is still woefully underfunded considering the tremendous needs across the West and in rural communities.

Although I believe this amendment's offset is reasonable considering the basic immediate and dire needs of tribes across the country, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and I hope he will commit to working with me on a bipartisan basis going forward on this amendment to ensure our communities have meaningful access funding for clean water.

I clearly understand the impacts potentially to the Bureau, but I also understand that when you have 80 percent unemployment and the risk of losing 80 percent of your general fund, that there is no other alternative than to look for money here, and I would appreciate consideration in the future.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 115–830.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 38, line 21, insert after the dollar amount ''(decreased by $3,818,000)''.

Page 40, line 19, insert after the first dollar amount ''(increased by $3,818,000)''.

Page 40, line 19, insert after the second dollar amount ''(increased by $3,800,000)''.

Page 41, line 8, insert after the dollar amount ''(increased by $18,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I thank the committee for the opportunity to express my strong support for this amendment to the Department of Interior division of this bill.

This amendment amounts to a small uptick in critical funding for assistance to territories at the Department of Interior's Office of Insular Affairs, to the amount that has already been recommended by the majority in the Senate.

This is a modest uptick of just under $4 million in Federal support for Americans in insular territories of the United States, namely, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa. Nearly a half million Americans reside in these islands, which have been part of this great country for over a century.

Since then, the Federal Government has supported the territories largely through Department of Interior assistance activity, with funding channeled towards technical assistance to local governments and to assist in upgrading essential community facilities like schools and hospitals and critical infrastructure, including waste disposal and wastewater systems.

Even before two Category 5 hurricanes struck the Virgin Islands, our schools faced structural deficiencies not conducive to a healthy learning environment. Our hospitals face serious deferred maintenance issues due, in part, to their extremely high proportion of uncompensated care, because we face inequitable treatment in the Federal health programs like Medicaid and Medicare. There are few facilities for assisted living among a growing population of aging citizens.

Construction or repair to schools and hospitals account for much of the Capital Improvement Project expenditures that come directly out of this Assistance to Territories account.

I believe it is imperative that the Federal Government enhance its commitment to address the pressing needs of Americans living in the territories as we face grave natural disasters and security threats.

I continue to be concerned about the catastrophic impact of Hurricanes Irma and Maria to the Virgin Islands, especially in light of financial solvency issues, coupled with the anticipated amount of time before government industry and utilities are able to fully function and generate revenues.

There are also additional revenue losses and other operational needs stemming from passage of significant tax reforms last year. The Virgin Islands and most of the insular territories have mirror tax codes of the United States, meaning that when we make changes to the Federal Tax Code, they automatically apply as a tax code of the territories, with few exceptions.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act changes bring in a host of unintended new revenue and economic loss issues that the local governments of the territories will need significant technical assistance to mitigate. The U.S. territories are part of the United States, and jobs in these territories are American jobs. According to the Department of Labor, the unemployment rate in the Virgin Islands is currently at least 12 percent, three times the national rate.

The people living in American island territories are citizens of this great Nation and entitled to equality to the people living in the 48 contiguous States, Hawaii, and Alaska, but the Virgin Islands and other territories are not included in the same formula grants as other locations. We do not receive the same funding for grants, technical assistance, programs that provide jobs, or infrastructure.

A continuation of level funding to the small assistance account is highly inadvisable at this time, for the reasons I have outlined previously.

Americans residing in the U.S. territories may be the first to be hit by a major hurricane, but have no vote on the budget for FEMA or anything else. They continue to be severely tried, and in circumstances beyond their control. Please approve my amendment as a simple matter of fairness to them and equitable to the majority of the Senate's requests at this time.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, in light of the catastrophic hurricane season last year and the fact that we are already in the midst of another hurricane season right now, I suspect there is additional relief needed for the territories in the weeks and months ahead. So with this reality upon us, I am happy to accept the amendment.

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman, the ranking member, and the members of this committee for supporting this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 115–830.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 112, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, the intent of the amendment is to reserve funds for the Smithsonian to do an exhibit in conjunction with local groups and organizations focused on celebrating the United Nations International Decade for People of African Descent. I am so proud to offer this amendment.

Mr. Chair, January 1, 2015, through December 21, 2024, has been designated as the United Nations International Decade for People of African Descent, with the theme, ''People of African Descent: recognition, justice, and development'' by the United Nations General Assembly.

The population comprising the African diaspora is expansive, spanning across the globe from the Americas and the Caribbean, to Asia and Europe, with persons of African descent having a historic presence on every continent.

□ 2130

Around 200 million people identifying themselves as being of African descent live in the Americas. The goal of this initiative is for the United Nations and its member states, among others, to take advantage of the auspicious period of history by undertaking activities in the spirit of recognition, justice, and development for people of African descent around the globe.

Among the goals of this international initiative is to underscore the important endowments made by people of African descent to our world societies and to promote a greater knowledge of and respect for the diverse heritage, culture, and contributions of people of African descent to the development of societies.

Now, in this country, Mr. Chairman, the Smithsonian is uniquely positioned to celebrate the launch of this International Decade at the national level here in this country by creating temporary and maybe permanent exhibits that can help promote the cultural and artistic goals of the International Decade and to create an effective exhibit or series of exhibits across its museums on the contributions of African descendants in the United States, where Black history is inextricably and integrally woven since this country's founding and even before. Yes, Mr. Chairman, Africans explored these shores long before Columbus and archeological findings here do prove.

The Smithsonian has a history of undertaking efforts to commemorate and tell the story of the impact of African descendants on African American history, politics, culture, and society, including the opening of the Smithsonian National Museum of African American History and Culture.

The Smithsonian has a wealth of artifacts and holds the resources to put together a well-regarded national showcase to weave together a compelling and concise study and story of some of the most notable contributions across sectors of African descendants. Likewise, it can work with local organizations to borrow or make available artifacts, documents, and relics related to telling the story in a way that no other institution in our country can.

Simply put, the Smithsonian has the right mix of expertise, archives, and artifacts to help tell the story as well as the ability to work with local groups throughout our Nation that are guardians of some of these narratives but may not have the resources.

With these additional resources, it is hoped that the Smithsonian will partner with other State and local institutions to help create a story reflective of the U.N. International Decade for People of African Descent and promoting the history and heritage of people of African descent and their impact on our country here.

In an era of xenophobia and rising intolerance, now, more than ever, we need to join in helping to publicly recognize the culture, history, and heritage of people of African descent and their impact on the Nation and the world and have the International Decade for People of African Descent be more than an empty rhetorical platitude to African Americans on this shore.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, while I certainly have some concerns about

the offset, I am able to support my recent classmate's and colleague's amendment. As the gentlewoman knows, this bill has a strong history of supporting underrepresented communities, including African American and Tribal communities.

This bill funded the construction of the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture and continues to strongly support the operations of this very popular museum.

This bill maintains a strong bipartisan support for Tribal health, Tribal education, Tribal law enforcement, and numerous other priorities critical to Native Americans and Alaska Natives, and this bill supports underrepresented communities throughout the Historic Preservation Fund grants under the National Park Service.

Though we may have to turn the lights off at the Department of the Interior if we keep going on—he is a Navy SEAL; he will get by—I certainly urge the adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague, because we will turn the light on the contributions of Africans on this continent during this decade.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. WELCH. 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 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

Page 68, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,000,000)''.

Page 68, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, Lake Champlain is one of the natural wonders of New England and, indeed, an international treasure. It is a watershed that includes New York, Vermont, and the Province of Quebec.

To protect this unique natural and economic resource, Congress enacted legislation in 1990 under the bipartisan leadership of Democrat PATRICK LEAHY and Republican Jim Jeffords that led to the creation of the Lake Champlain Basin Program.

Over the years, the basin program has worked with private organizations, local communities, and individuals on both sides of the border to coordinate and fund efforts that benefit the Lake Champlain Basin's water quality, fisheries, wetlands, and wildlife recreation. It has been a great example of a locally driven program working from the ground up with the help of a Federal partner.

It has been a tremendous success, and the purpose of this amendment is to maintain the funding at the level that it was at before. I have joined 28 years later after Democratic Senator PATRICK LEAHY and Republican Jim Jeffords with my Republican colleague from across the lake, Representative STEFANIK, in this amendment. It is important to both sides of the lake and the Province of Quebec, who is not here represented, but here in heart.

So I ask for the support of this amendment, and I want to say to my colleague, ELISE STEFANIK, from across Lake Champlain, that we think the view of New York is beautiful, and we share a commitment to maintaining the beauty of that lake.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK).

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from across the lake, PETER WELCH.

This is truly a bipartisan issue, as Mr. WELCH identified. This is important to our local ecosystem. It is important to our recreation. It is important to our tourism. But it is also a job creator, bringing in new people to our region.

I love the views as I look across the lake to Vermont, and I know that we are really a joint economy around Lake Champlain.

I also want to thank Chairman CALVERT and the Appropriations Committee for their support of this important initiative in the Northeast. As I said, this is truly bipartisan, and it fully funds this important program.

So I thank Mr. CALVERT again and his staff, and I thank Mr. WELCH for being a true partner on this issue, which is locally driven and such a success story for our districts.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman as a good partner, as well, and I thank Mr. CALVERT for his consideration.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. VARGAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 115–830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 71, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 76, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to H.R. 6147, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2019. This amendment would increase funding for the U.S.-Mexico Border Water Infrastructure Program by $5 million.

As a Representative of California's entire U.S.-Mexico border, I have seen firsthand the positive impact these programs have on communities in my State and across all of the communities along the U.S. border.

The Tijuana River Valley is a beautiful transboundary watershed on both sides of the border with a mixture of agriculture, preserved habitats, and rural housing developments. Periodic rain in the region produces a steady stream of cross-border flows of wastewater, trash, and sediment from Tijuana into San Diego County. This has a devastating effect on border communities, including Imperial Beach, San Diego, and other residents in the Tijuana River Valley.

Last year, millions of gallons of sewage was discharged in the Tijuana River Valley after a heavy rain. This resulted in prolonged beach closures, which affected the quality of life and the public health of the people in these communities.

Border Patrol agents also experienced very severe health complications from exposure to sewage and to chemicals and toxic waste along the border. San Diego County-based military installations are also at risk of continued disruptions, which would affect their readiness to combat threats.

Residents across San Diego County have grown increasingly frustrated with the lack of progress on viable solutions. All too often, Tijuana's wastewater infrastructure is unable to handle the heavy rains, which result in sewage ending up on the U.S. side of the border.

The EPA's Border Water Infrastructure Program provides resources for communities to build and enhance current long-term protections and rehabilitation projects all along the entire U.S.-Mexico border.

The EPA investments in these wastewater projects are a key factor in significant water quality improvements in U.S. waterbodies, such as the Rio Grande, Santa Cruz River, the New River, and the Tijuana River. The program's funding has made significant progress addressing public beach health and the environmental impact of inadequate drinking water and wastewater infrastructure along the U.S.-Mexico border.

The 2,000-mile border between the United States and Mexico is one of the most complex and dynamic regions in the world, with a growing need to address the transborder environmental issues; so I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, don't get me wrong. I am not opposed to what the EPA is doing at the border to improve water quality, but I think it is important to note that the bill already provides $10 million for the program, equal to the fiscal year 2018 level, and did not support the elimination of the program as proposed in the President's budget.

As the gentleman knows, we are level-funded in this year's appropriation bill, so I wasn't able to get additional funds for some of these programs that I like. Because a $5 million reduction could significantly impact the work of the Secretary of the Interior—we have been chewing away at that all night—the programs under this jurisdiction, and other important offices funded by the account, I can't support the amendment.

I will continue to work with the ranking member as we move this through this process because I know the important work we have done in California and along the entire border. It is a good program, and I certainly support it, but I can't support this amendment at this time.

Mr. Chair, I must oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for those words, and I know that he wants to continue to work with us, and I look forward to that. I would just add that the situation is getting much worse, and I would also add that a number of these military installations that we are placing right along the border, especially the Special Forces that we have, the SEALS, I think are going to become more and more affected by this sewage that crosses the border.

Mr. Chair, I look forward to working with the chairman and the ranking member to see if we can find more money because this is a real problem in San Diego, 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. VARGAS).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY OF CONNECTICUT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 115–830.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. 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 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,000,000)''.

Page 71, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,000,000)''.

Page 77, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

□ 2145

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, Congressman MCKINLEY, for working with me on this amendment. Our amendment increases funding for State grants to assess or clean up brownfield sites by $7 million in fiscal year 2019.

Too many cities and towns across America with proud manufacturing legacies are now struggling with vacant brownfield properties. In my home State of Connecticut, the city of Meriden alone has at least $10 million worth of brownfield projects for which they have been unable to secure funding—and that is just one city in one State. Every single congressional district across this country is home to at least one brownfield site. In fact, some have hundreds.

The benefits of funding brownfield cleanups are enormous. For every $1 invested in brownfield redevelopment, 18 additional dollars are leveraged in outside investment. That is one of the highest leveraging of outside money of any Federal program.

Despite the clear, demonstrated value of Federal brownfield investments, the EPA has been forced to turn down very worthy projects due to lack of funding. In fact, the EPA has only been able to fund about one-quarter to one-third of the applications it receives. Between 2012 and 2017, over 1,600 applications for viable projects were turned down because of inadequate Federal funding.

The base bill before us today provides just $153 million for brownfields in fiscal year 2019—the very same amount that was enacted for 2018. For such an effective program that is in high demand all across the country, maintaining status quo funding for brownfield redevelopment is unwise and, frankly, unacceptable.

If the EPA had been able to fully fund the qualified brownfield projects from 2012 to 2017, an additional 54,000 jobs would have been created along with $10.3 billion in leveraged outside money.

Mr. Chairman, last November, 409 Members of this House voted to increase funding levels for the EPA's brownfields programs to $200 million plus an additional $50 million for the State response program. That is a total of $250 million authorized by this House as compared with $153 million we have before us tonight.

Mr. Chairman, 409 Members heeded calls from their cities and towns, mayors, county and regional officials and constituents who urgently want to restore their downtowns and communities putting former industrial sites back on to the tax rolls and creating jobs.

Dilapidated warehouses, abandoned factories, and former gas stations littered across our cities and towns are untapped economic opportunities just waiting to be redeveloped into productive uses like startup incubators, affordable housing, tech centers, and public green space.

Increased funding will return brownfields to productive uses, generate additional tax revenue, clean up the environment, grow jobs, and revitalize communities all across our country. Investing in our civic infrastructure is essential to moving this country forward.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for taking this amendment on.

When you think about it, we are only funding about 300 to 400 projects a year. But in testimony before our committee, there are 450,000 contaminated sites across America; and if we are only renovating 400 sites, you can imagine how many thousands of years it will take assuming no additional brownfield sites are developed as a result of this.

So this idea of grasping just $7 million I think is a fundamental way of trying to say: We need to do more in this effort; we need to put more funds in it.

I agree with the gentlewoman's remark. If $250 million was authorized, then we need to put more money in this if we are serious about brownfields and removing the stigma across our community.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia; and I want to thank the 409 Members who joined in urging support for this program which has proven to be one of the most effective in the Federal Government.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 115–830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 43, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would fully fund the Department of the Interior's Office of the Inspector General.

By my count, there are at least 14 Federal investigations that are either underway or completed into the current Secretary alone. That is more investigations than the last four Interior secretaries combined. Still more issues with the Secretary are under preliminary investigation. Even more have not been announced to this date. Interior's Office of the Inspector General is doing most, if not all, of that work.

Funding and staffing shortfalls resulting from flat funding or small cuts have caused the Office of Inspector General in recent months to forgo investigations altogether. Investigation requests from Congress and from tips originating within the Department of the Interior have either been rejected or are awaiting resources to be freed up in order to address them.

The Office of Inspector General is also referring a growing number of hotline complaints to the Interior Department for investigation, creating a situation in which the department is investigating itself. Half of those referred complaints involve allegations of ethics violations, sexual harassment, prohibited personnel practices, law enforcement misconduct, and reprisal. Untrained supervisors conduct many of these investigations without following standard protocols and without collecting sufficient evidence. Specially trained, experienced noncriminal investigators are needed to keep these investigations within the Office of Inspector General.

The Office of Inspector General's independence from the office they are examining is essential to their ability to conduct thorough, unadulterated investigations, inspections, or audits. Now is not the time to revert to the pre-Watergate days when an agency was in charge of investigating itself.

This amendment would provide five additional investigators to focus on administrative issues and up to six investigators in field offices which also lets the Office of Inspector General's criminal investigators focus on criminal misconduct instead of being pulled away to help in other areas.

There are particular risks that are being unaddressed because of current funding levels. The Department of the Interior paid out $10 billion in financial assistance and contracts in fiscal year '16 and '17. During that time, there was about a 16 percent drop in audits. Contracts and financial assistance are some of the highest risk areas in terms of the potential for waste, fraud, and abuse.

My amendment would also provide five new auditors for the Office of Inspector General which are needed to address contracts and financial assistance which is responsible for a disproportionate share of the Office of Inspector General's 20–1 return on investment.

I want to emphasize that. For every dollar we spend on the Interior's Office of Inspector General, according to the Partnership for Public Service, the taxpayer gets $20 back.

This amendment will help ensure that this scandal-ridden administration doesn't monopolize the Office of Inspector General's best people who are supposed to be rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse in the agency. If there was ever a time to fully fund the Office of Inspector General, it is now.

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

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, although I am a big fan of the Inspector General's Office, the current budget is funded at the budget request, and therefore I do not see us raising $2.5 million by raiding the Secretary of the Interior's operating account. I think it goes way too far.

I am glad to know that the gentleman from Arizona actually listened to our talking points on that. But I think at this point in time I would like to keep it exactly where it is.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to the amendment. As the gentleman mentioned, the bill already includes a $1.5 million increase for the Inspector General which is the amount that was requested. This transfer is not needed, and if enacted, it could affect the operations of the Department of the Interior.

For those reasons and others, I oppose this amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the figures in the delayed investigations, the deferred investigations and the need for additional auditors were all in the $5 million indication by the Office of Inspector General that that was what was needed in order to be able to comply with the demands of their office and the demands that the public and Congress have for assuring that all the agencies are running under the protocols, the procedures, and the laws that we insist they do so on.

Mr. Chairman, $2.5 million that is being requested in this amendment would bring that total to $5 million, which is the amount that the Inspector General has indicated is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote of approval on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, amendment No. 26.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 80, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, California continues to suffer devastating water shortages and inadequate clean drinking water. We must build new water storage.

My amendment would simply transfer $2 million into the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act administrative expenses account from the Department of the Interior Office of the Secretary account.

The base text of this bill has $3 million less for WIFIA administration than was provided for the fiscal year '18 and provides a $10 million increase for the Office of the Secretary account.

The WIFIA program is a vital program for water infrastructure. The program was established in the water resources 2014 bill and has been accepting loan applications for clean and drinking water projects.

Water storage projects and flood risk reduction infrastructure projects are eligible under section 3905 of 33 U.S.C. 52, but EPA has yet to establish a process for administering such loans.

The additional administrative resources in the amendment would allow

the WIFIA office to more quickly pursue financing of Bureau of Reclamation and Army Corps of Engineers projects.

It took 4 years—until April 2018—for WIFIA to issue its first loan for a wastewater project. This is an unacceptable timeframe for establishing an essential water financing program when the American Society of Civil Engineers scored our water infrastructure as a D grade last year.

The administration's infrastructure principles document recommends expanding WIFIA authorities to water storage projects which is the lifeblood of California's Central Valley and other reclamation States. We can't wait another 4 years for WIFIA to issue loans for these projects.

The Army Corps and EPA expect to execute a memorandum of understanding for financing projects very soon which will further strain WIFIA administrative resources. Additionally, the Senate has included a deadline for Reclamation and EPA to reach an MOU in their water resources bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is good policy which mirrors my New WATER Act, H.R. 434. This amendment is necessary for properly and effectively carrying out both MOUs.

In closing, California continues to suffer devastating water shortages and inadequate clean drinking water. Areas of California's Central Valley have not only had bad quality water, but some towns have no water at all. We must build new storage. This bill helps us to move that forward and expedite the process.

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

□ 2200

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 46, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 110, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chair, the Office of Navajo-Hopi Indian Relocation was established to compensate and build homes for those Navajo and Hopi impacted by the Federal Government's mandated changes of the reservation boundaries, which resulted in families being forced to move away from their homes.

My amendment opposes efforts in the underlying bill to prematurely close the Office of Navajo-Hopi Indian Relocation. The bill significantly cuts this office while preparing for its premature closure. I strongly oppose these cuts.

The agency has not completed its mission, and families continue to wait for the benefits they were promised. Closing the agency without providing the benefits to the affected families entitled to them would be a violation of our trust responsibility.

Once the agency's mission is complete, it is essential that the remaining land management responsibilities are passed to capable and responsible agencies that will work with stakeholders to ensure that the trust responsibility is taken seriously.

For this to occur, a comprehensive plan must be developed, and the plan must include meaningful input from both the Navajo Nation and the Hopi Tribe, and a thorough audit of the Office of Navajo-Hopi Indian Relocation.

I have concerns that preliminary discussions that have the Office of the Special Trustee assuming land management are premature, as the Office of the Special Trustee has no experience with land management or building housing.

While the details of the closure plan are worked out, it makes sense to continue funding the agency, so it can finish its mission and an orderly and agreeable closure plan can be developed.

The families impacted by relocation have suffered enough, and we have a responsibility to ensure that we solve the problem in an orderly way, not simply shift the responsibility.

My amendment simply shifts the funds that were provided to the Office of the Special Trustee, to assume land management responsibilities, back to the Office of Navajo-Hopi Indian Relocation where it can be used to build homes and review appeals until the agency mission is complete or a comprehensive closure plan is developed with significant Tribal input.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for their interest in this important issue, and I look forward to continuing to work with them toward a resolution that keeps the promises made and is inclusive of all impacted parties.

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

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to this amendment for several reasons.

The Navajo-Hopi Settlement Act of 1974 was intended to last 5 years. After that, the plan was to go ineffective. This program has lingered on for nearly four decades longer than it should have.

The Office of the Navajo-Hopi Relocation has indicated its intent to close by September 2018. Accordingly, we should not be reducing or even paying more money in fiscal year 2019 when they want to close the office in fiscal year 2018.

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chairman, I have personally gone around this process for a long time now, both before I came to Congress and during my tenure in Congress.

We have hundreds of families who still are in an appeals process. We have homes throughout both reservations that are simply in a deteriorated state. This is not spending more money. It is shifting money from one agency to another to allow us to continue to make sure that the needs of this relocation project are met.

The time limit of 5 years was extended time and time again because of the technical nature of this process and the difficulty in our mandated process to make this a whole system that worked. It hasn't worked. It needs to be worked on, but not until we have a comprehensive plan. There is no comprehensive plan. There is just an idea and a concept, but no comprehensive plan.

I will be glad to work with anybody on a comprehensive plan, but the idea that we just walk away from this right now without an agency that really knows what it is doing makes no sense at all.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, originally, this legislation was intended to help 1,000 families. We have helped more than 3,600 Navajo families and 27 Hopi families.

When we talk about the comprehensive plan, maybe we ought to get everybody in order to make sure that plan is acceptable by everybody before we keep throwing money at the problem.

Mr. Chair, once again, I am in opposition. Once again, it is four decades past its time. We don't get resolution on this aspect without putting some force behind it. There has to be finality to this. This cannot keep going on. Without putting some finality to the finances, we will see this continue over and over again.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out the Navajo and the Hopi have indicated precisely what

they want to do. They need the time to be able to recognize that there is a comprehensive plan for their future and the families that are impacted. It is not in place.

Mr. Chair, I request that my amendment be accepted, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (O'Halleran).

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. HECK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in House Report 115–830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 67, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)(increased by $500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Chairman, this is a straightforward amendment to ensure that the EPA is laser-focused on helping address the biggest source of water pollution in the United States: stormwater runoff.

Stormwater runoff is what happens when rain falls—we get a lot of that in Washington State—and it flows across roofs, parking lots, and streets. As that rainwater heads on its way to rivers, lakes, and bays, it picks up all sorts of toxic, nasty stuff like metals, oils, fertilizers, and pesticides, just to name a few.

Toxic stormwater has a direct effect on the health of our waterways and, more importantly, on our economy. Nowhere is that more clear, frankly, than in my home State of Washington and in the Puget Sound, which is, by water volume, the largest estuary in America.

We actually have video of polluted stormwater literally killing salmon in a matter of hours—not days or weeks, but hours—and our endangered southern resident orcas, which we are on the verge of losing altogether, are harmed both by having fewer salmon to lunch on and by absorbing the pollutants directly into their body.

We have made a lot of progress in this country in dealing with point-source pollution, but stormwater runoff is a lot tougher to deal with now. It is a lot more decentralized, and there are a lot of jurisdictions involved. It is going to require a lot of improvement in water infrastructure over time.

State and local governments are kind of stepping up to be sure to meet this challenge. They know the harms posed by stormwater, but their budgets are stretched thin. What they really need is a strong partner in the Federal Government.

That is part of why I am so glad the House just last night passed a companion bill to this, the Innovative Stormwater Infrastructure Act, on consent. It had strong, bipartisan support. It creates a task force at EPA comprised of Federal, State, and local governments, along with nonprofit and private partners to develop recommendations for finding some innovative ways to fund stormwater infrastructure.

But the recommendations coming out of that task force won't be very useful if we don't know more precisely what and how big the need is. That is why the Clean Watersheds Needs Survey is important. That is a survey that Congress actually required of the EPA to conduct under the Clean Water Act on a periodic basis. It is a comprehensive assessment of the outstanding need for stormwater and wastewater control facilities nationwide.

We know there is a need. In my State alone, we estimate that stormwater runoff can be solved with a $19 billion, with a B, infrastructure investment over the next generation.

The last survey that EPA did dates way back to 2012, and a lot has happened since, a lot of water under the bridge, pun intended.

To be clear, we are dealing with data that is 6 years old. In order to make sure our communities are able to deal with the problem, frankly, we need to have better and more current data. That is what this is about: good data, good science.

This is what this amendment seeks to do by ensuring the Clean Watersheds Needs Survey is prioritized by the EPA, no new money, just prioritized to get that done as required under the law. It is, frankly, not that large of an expenditure to undertake.

We have to make sure that the agency is in fact using every tool in its toolbox to help our communities address stormwater. I will say it again: The number one leading cause of water pollution in America is stormwater. Of course, that starts with being able to have a full picture of the problem we face.

Mr. Chairman, for this reason, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the interest in our Nation's water infrastructure needs.

Although this amendment does not do what the gentleman intends it to do, I think it is always important for Congress to have a clear understanding of what improvements need to be made to meet the quality goals of the Clean Water Act.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment I can accept, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Chair, however the chairman has journeyed to his conclusion, it is deeply appreciated. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. ADAMS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in House Report 115–830.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 68, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $742,000) (increased by $742,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Chair, I offer this amendment to underscore the importance of the EPA's Environmental Justice Program.

H.R. 6147 cuts more than $700,000 in funding from this important program that has made an incredible difference in many communities across the country, including in my State of North Carolina.

The Environmental Justice Program supports and empowers communities as they work to address significant environmental and public health issues at the local level.

□ 2215

In North Carolina, this program has provided funding for 13 different initiatives since 2001, including the Environmental Justice Education and Research Center at Shaw University, which engages high school and college students in environmental justice research; the Healthy Homes Greensboro collaborative, which works to reduce housing-related asthma hospitalizations in low-income, minority neighborhoods resulting from exposure to toxic chemicals; and Clean Energy Durham, which runs a volunteer-driven, neighbor-to-neighbor energy education program for low-income residents of Lee County.

Nationally, this program has helped do everything from cleaning contaminated soil on reservations to managing oil spills from an abandoned power plant in Cleveland.

This program has had a measurable benefit for the people who live closest to pollution sites. This is crucially important, as people of color and people with little means are often the most affected by environmental injustice.

In fact, the environmental justice movement began in Warren County, North Carolina. In 1982, a small, predominantly African American community in Warren County was designated to host a hazardous waste landfill. In response, the NAACP and others staged a massive protest. More than 500 civil rights activists were arrested during the nonviolent sit-in protesting the landfill. While their protests failed to prevent the landfill's construction, it did spark a movement, and it has served as a model for fighting against environmental injustice since.

The EPA's Environmental Justice Program helps communities fight against these same forces. It works to ensure that no group of people should bear a disproportionate share of negative environmental consequences from commercial operations or policies.

H.R. 6147 cuts more than $700,000 in funding from this program, and that is unacceptable. Funding for this program should be increased, and substantially more than the $6.7 million that was appropriated in fiscal year 2018.

Cutting out funding for this program neglects dozens of communities of color, subjecting them to filthy air, unsafe drinking water, and the health impacts that go along with that. This amendment simply highlights that fact and challenges that Congress must do better.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I appreciate my colleague's desire to show additional support for a program important to her constituents. Unfortunately, the amendment does not do what she intends it to do; therefore, I must oppose the amendment.

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman, but I respectfully disagree with my colleague.

The EPA's Environmental Justice Program provides substantial help to communities directly affected by pollution and negative environmental consequences.

Too often, it is communities of color or low-income communities that are disproportionately affected by negative environmental effects.

A study released this February by EPA scientists found that, in 46 States, communities of color are more likely to be exposed to higher levels of dangerous air pollution than White communities. Additionally, in 2012, a study by the NAACP found that coal-fired power plants are disproportionately concentrated near communities of color.

Thankfully, the Environmental Justice Program and their initiatives like the Environmental Justice Small Grants Program have helped to support and empower underserved communities across the Nation as they develop solutions to environmental pollution.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, the President's budget request for fiscal year 2018 proposed eliminating the Environmental Justice Program. Also, the RSE budget supports Representative SAM JOHNSON's H.R. 958, the Wasteful EPA Programs Elimination Act of 2017, which, among other things, would eliminate the Environmental Justice Program.

Mr. Chair, I ask for a ''no'' against this amendment.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. This amendment highlights the very need for more funding in the EPA's Environmental Justice Program.

As a Member of Congress, we should be appropriating adequate resources to ensure everyone—everyone—in this country enjoys the same degree of protection from environmental health hazards.

This is clearly another example of why the interior bill should not have received flat funding and 302(b) allocation and the impact of not having a more transparent process.

We should be standing up for our communities of color and for the children of color who are impacted by these hazardous pollutants to which they are subjected.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

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

Ms. ADAMS. 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 North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in House Report 115–830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 68, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $468,000)(increased by $468,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase funding for the National Estuary Program and Coastal Waterways Program by $468,000. It does so by removing and then reapplying $468,000 within the $2.4 billion appropriation for the Environmental Programs and Management Account within the Environmental Protection Agency.

This amendment is identical to an amendment I offered last year that passed this body by a voice vote, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment again this year.

Currently, the House Report accompanying this bill calls for a funding level of $26,723,000. This amendment will restore funding to the level that passed the House for the last 2 years.

This amendment is intended to increase funding for the National Estuary Program that protects and restores water quality and ecological integrity of estuaries of national significance. Currently, 20 estuaries located along the Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, and Pacific Coasts and Puerto Rico are designated as estuaries of national significance. Four of these estuaries are in my home State of Florida.

This program is efficient at leveraging funds to increase estuaries' ability to restore and protect ecosystems. The National Estuary Program has obtained more than $10 for every $1 provided by EPA, generating nearly $4 billion for on-the-ground efforts since 2003. This amendment will result in a real return on investment for the American people.

With more than half the U.S. population living within 100 miles of the coast, including the shores of estuaries, this amendment will result in an enhanced quality of life for those living along the coast, while maintaining a healthy ecosystem that supports endangered and threatened species.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's desire to show support for robust funding for the National Estuary Program. The FY19 bill provides $26.7 billion for the National Estuary Program, which is equal

to the FY18 enacted level. This is an amendment I can accept.

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from California for his support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in House Report 115–830.

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:

Page 68, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 68, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 71, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 78, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, 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 rise to offer my amendment to restore funding for the southern New England estuaries program.

I plan to offer and withdraw this amendment in hopes that we can continue this discussion and work out a solution that will continue support for this program that is deeply meaningful to our region.

I am honored to be joined in this amendment by Congressmen CICILLINE, KEATING, and KENNEDY, all of whom know how important this EPA funding is to Rhode Island and Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, estuaries support life. They are the fragile but vital ecosystems where saltwater and freshwater mix together, and they support a robust number of species. In Rhode Island, these coastal and tidal areas provide environmental balance, but they are increasingly threatened by human activity. We need to continue to support their restoration, less they regress and become permanently damaged.

Over the past several years, we have seen the success of EPA's southern New England program. With projects since fiscal year 2014, these funds have helped protect and restore watersheds in the Narragansett Bay, Mount Hope Bay, and Buzzards Bay. They have supported coastal areas in South County, Rhode Island, and along Cape Cod and the islands.

The EPA's geographic programs have worked in other parts of the country as well, from the Puget Sound to the Chesapeake Bay, and they are working in New England.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said in the past, our estuaries are the lungs of our coastal areas. These EPA funds continue to help our New England estuaries recover and to thrive.

While I plan to withdraw this amendment, I hope that Chairman CALVERT and I can work together to preserve this needed program.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I am happy to work with the gentleman as we go through this process. If we can find some additional funds as we move to conference, I will be more than happy to revisit this issue with the gentleman.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I am grateful for the chairman's comments, and I hope we can, as the gentleman said, work together on this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in House Report 115–830.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 69, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $12,000,000) (increased by $12,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and the chair and ranking member of the Interior Subcommittee.

Mr. Chair, today I rise to highlight the importance of the EPA's Superfund Enforcement program. Around the country, communities are being put at risk by those who do not responsibly handle the waste that they actually create, and it can result in years of ongoing damage, which leads to health complications and environmental degradation.

The Superfund Enforcement program at the EPA was granted authority under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, or CERCLA, to enforce environmental cleanup laws that bring habitats and communities back from the brink in places where pollutants have seeped into the ground.

One of the Superfund sites in my State is the Hanford site, which is a decommissioned nuclear production complex next to the Columbia River. It was established as part of the Manhattan Project in 1943, and it was the location of the first full-scale plutonium production reactor.

The site is massive, and its legacy not only includes its devastating role in World War II but also the environmental impacts in central Washington and beyond.

□ 2230

The EPA has referred to the Columbia River as the ''lifeblood of the Pacific Northwest,'' and they are right. And it is why it is so crucial that we at the Federal Government do everything we can to clean up Hanford.

Another Superfund site, this one in my district, is the Duwamish River, which was designated as a Superfund site in 2001. Over the course of many years, factory waste and household pollutants have run into the Duwamish, and the Duwamish air quality is the most toxic in our State.

Water pollutants have affected our local fish and they have threatened the food supply and the fishing culture, particularly of those non-English speakers, Asian and Pacific Islanders, and people of multiracial backgrounds who depend on the river as a way of life.

It has gotten so dangerous that the State and Federal Governments have actually issued a warning against the consumption of fish from the river. On average, community members in the Duwamish live an average of 8 years shorter than other King County residents.

The Superfund Enforcement program allows the Federal Government to assess locations like this from Washington State to Washington, D.C., and determine who is responsible for cleaning up these potentially devastating contaminants.

By the numbers, Mr. Chairman, the Superfund Enforcement program has not only been incredibly successful, it has actually saved taxpayers money and leveraged a lot of money for us.

According to the EPA, in fiscal year 2017, the agency reported that they reduced, treated, or eliminated 217 million in pollution. During that same time, 245 million pounds of hazardous waste was treated, minimized, or properly disposed of, and 416,000 people were protected by the enforcement of the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Thanks to the Superfund Enforcement program, many of the bad actors who create the problems are actually responsible for cleaning them up, and we leverage a lot of the Federal Government's money. In fiscal year 2017, the amount committed by liable parties to clean up Superfund sites was $1.227 billion, which goes a long way toward ensuring that communities can be safe, healthy, and protected.

While the funding levels in the 2019 bill are not as low as the President's budget requested, I urge my colleagues to support continued funding in 2018 at the 2018 enacted level of $166 million or higher.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee to ensure that this program is meaningfully supported, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to note that this bill provides $10 million above the President's request for Superfund Enforcement and $12 million above the fiscal 2018 enacted level for the entire Superfund program. We attempted to find middle ground on enforcement while also prioritizing on-the-ground cleanup efforts that returns land to productive uses.

I certainly appreciate the gentlewoman's support for the interest in the Superfund program, and while the amendment does not do as she intends, this amendment is something we are unable to support at this time.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in great support of this amendment. Just last year, I dealt with a frightening situation in my district where a company abandoned its facility, leaving dozens of vats of drums of cyanide and various assorted other toxic chemicals. This facility was in the middle of a residential neighborhood with some neighbors only living 15 feet from the facility.

There is a legacy of abandoned waste sites that must be dealt with, and the cost far exceeds what we can fund in our bill. This flat funding that we have with the 302(b) allocation is something that the chairman knows I feel very strongly about, and I want to be on record of supporting this, and maybe we also need to include the reinstating of a Superfund tax.

I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Washington has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I did mention that I appreciated that there was more allocated than the President's budget.

I think the magnitude of the problem that we are dealing with and the hundreds of thousands of lives that are at stake in terms of who depends on the waterways that go through these Superfund sites is why I am asking the chairman if he might consider restoring the original level, which is, of course, more than was allocated.

I do understand the challenges, but I think that these are historical harms that we are trying to correct and money that is leveraged substantially by the companies that create the waste, and it is because the Federal Government is putting money into these that we are able to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33, printed in House Report 115–830.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in House Report 115–830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 85, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 85, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment today simply aims to increase funding to help combat illegal marijuana grow operations in our Nation's national forests. Illegal marijuana grows pose a significant threat to public safety as well as the environment.

According to the DEA, the majority of illegal marijuana production that occurs in Federal land is carried out by Mexican drug cartels. These cartels smuggle deadly weapons, illegal pesticides, and other dangerous materials across the border to grow illegal substances on our public lands.

Siskiyou County, in my district in northern California, has actually declared a state of emergency over the damage illegal marijuana production has caused to neighboring communities, the surrounding environment—again, damage much beyond what anybody would ever accuse legal industries of, farming, timber, whatever—and they are using, again, banned chemicals in the process, damaging wildlife, the environment, water supply, across the board.

While the majority of illegal grow activity occurs within California's borders, States across the country are also affected. Drug trafficking organizations are operating on 72 national forests in 21 States throughout the country.

Our agencies need the funding and tools to take proactive steps to push back against this growing, large threat. According to the Forest Service, it would cost over $100 million over 5 years to reduce the spread of this problem in California alone.

My amendment would increase funding to the National Forest System account by $4.5 million. Indeed, that is barely scratching the surface of what is truly needed, but it is a good start, and then we can fashion a pilot to show the good we can do over time.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote ''yes,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase that reduction and transfer $5 million to the National Forest System account, and as the gentleman explained, the funding would be used for the purpose of eradicating illegal marijuana growing operations in the national forests, and that is something that I support.

I know we work on it in Minnesota, and we have worked on it in our State forests. So I agree that this work is very important. I worked to ensure this funding was included in the fiscal year 2018 omnibus bill, so the funding is already provided, and now it is part of the program's base.

So the amendment, to me, is unnecessary because the program is already funded, but the offset is also problematic. The Forest and Rangeland Research account fund does scientific research that informs policy and land management decisions regarding such issues as I know we all care about: wildfire, fuels research, invasive species, which also can, especially in our forests, lead to the forest being less healthy so they have less resilience to wildfire, and new, innovative ways to harvest forest products, which in my State and many States is very important.

This amendment, I don't think is intended to, but I do believe it could negatively impact bipartisan programs like the Forest Products Laboratory and the Forest Inventory Analysis program.

So, as I mentioned, I am opposing this not because I don't think we need to work on eradicating illegally grown marijuana in our public lands, but because this program is already in part of the base, and the offset is problematic for many of the shared goals I think many of us in this body have.

So with that, I oppose this amendment, and I currently don't plan on speaking on it again.

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate my colleague's position there, but we are talking about, again, what the Forest Service says themselves is a $100 million problem over 5 years, or $20 million per year. This would seek to boost that.

If you saw the emergency situation, again, in areas like my district and adjacent, you would probably agree this

$4.5 million boost would be very important in order to get a good start at that.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman because this is somewhat personal to me. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in this illegal marijuana cultivation in our national forests.

One of the largest national forests in the State of California, Cleveland National Forest, is literally in my congressional district and right close to my house. We are always having problems with people setting up illegal grow operations in the Cleveland National Forest. So this increase to remediate these sites is needed.

I agree with the gentlewoman that these offsets are difficult, but I am pleased to offer my support for the gentleman's amendment. Hopefully, we can get rid of some of this illegal marijuana that is grown in these national forests.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have left.

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, again, I appreciate the conversation here, but when you look at the depth and the danger of what is being brought into our States and my own part of northern California, my colleague in the Cleveland National Forest, this is an acute problem. The environmental damage is unspeakable with the amount of chemicals, the damage to the wildlife, and the threat this poses to people out there innocently hiking, camping, utilizing the forest or maybe for even logging operations.

So we need to kick-start this as strongly as possible, and that is why I offer this amendment tonight in order to counter and send a message that we are taking this seriously where Federal employees, Federal agents have feared to tread in recent years because of this tremendous threat that the Mexican nationals and gang activity has caused in our national forests that belong to the people.

So, again, I urge my colleagues to support this. It is an important start and weaves into so much with human trafficking, environmental destruction, and even, in some cases, murder associated with the problems of the growth of this product in our national forests.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in House Report 115–830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 85, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 85, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, across the country, an invasive beetle known as the emerald ash borer has been wreaking havoc on ash trees. It was first discovered in 2002 in Michigan, but since then, it has spread to 33 States, killing millions of trees, inflicting severe harm on the forest products industry, and costing municipalities and property owners millions of dollars.

□ 2245

Ash trees infested with the emerald ash borer suffer nearly 100 percent fatality rates over a 3- to 5-year period. At this point, there is no known effective treatment.

Earlier this year, the emerald ash borer was discovered in Vermont. While the discovery was not a surprise, the news is devastating.

Forests are a central part of our economy, our landscape, and our way of life. It is going to be difficult to eradicate the pest, but there are steps we can take to contain its spread.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Appropriations Committee, Mr. CARTER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM for acknowledging the threat this invasive species poses.

The report language accompanying the bill recommends a $19.5 million increase to forest health management under the State and private forestry account for addressing high-priority invasive species, pests, and diseases, including the emerald ash borer. I support that increase.

My amendment specifies that, of this amendment, at least $5 million should be used to help mitigate the spread of and eradicate the emerald ash borer.

Ultimately, a successful response will require a strong partnership between Federal, State, and private sector stakeholders. This amendment is a good first step to ensure the Federal Government is doing its part.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for bringing this issue to our attention.

Invasive species, pests, and diseases have wreaked havoc across the Nation and continue to do so. I know that the emerald ash borer has been a tremendous pest throughout a good part of our country, certainly in State and private forests also.

We need to improve management in our forests, and we need those conditions to improve. So I am happy to accept the gentleman's amendment, and I hope we can reduce the emerald ash borer.

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. CARTER, I thank Ms. MCCOLLUM, and I thank the Appropriations Committee for their support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 36 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of Congressman POLIS, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 85, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 90, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this bipartisan amendment with my colleagues Representatives POLIS, KING, and RENACCI to support the brave men and women who serve as volunteer firefighters.

This commonsense amendment would add an additional $2 million for volunteer fire assistance grants. These grants provide matching funds to local and rural volunteer fire departments to assist with training and the purchase of communications and safety equipment.

California experienced one of the worst wildfire seasons in history last year, and this year is shaping up to be no different. Volunteer firefighters will provide nearly 80 percent of the initial defense of homes, businesses, and communities in the face of these fires before reinforcement arrives.

In my district, where we are under the constant threat of wildfire, departments such as Idyllwild Fire Protection District and the Riverside County Fire Department have benefited from the VFA grant program. These departments provide fire protection services to dozens of rural communities in my district that are at a heightened risk of wildfire due to the sustained drought and heat California is experiencing.

The volunteer firefighters who serve Idyllwild routinely overcome significant communications and topographical challenges. Grant programs,

like volunteer fire assistance grants, help them respond quickly and effectively to fire emergencies.

Throughout the rest of my district, interim Riverside Fire Chief Daniel Talbot has done an excellent job leading the department and preparing for what is already an intense fire season. This week alone, several new fires have sprung up as triple-digit temperatures continue to create a tinderbox across the Western United States. Images of blackened cars and houses reduced to their foundations are already far too common, images we will, unfortunately, only continue to see more of.

Despite this constant and recurrent threat, we still fail to treat fires like the devastating natural disasters that they are. The damage caused by wildfires in California, Colorado, and other States has been heartbreaking, and yet we still continue to underfund mitigation, suppression, and prevention efforts for these disasters.

Any additional assistance we can provide to those on the front lines to keep our communities safe is our social responsibility to protect the common good, especially when volunteers risk their lives to save our lives without pay.

Many of these departments who benefit from the VFA program operate in rural towns on shoestring budgets, so an additional $2 million will go a long way to helping them purchase critical extra equipment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment to give our firefighters the equipment and training they need to keep the public safe.

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

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan amendment with Mr. POLIS, Mr. KING, and Mr. RUIZ.

As a former volunteer firefighter, maintaining adequate funding for the volunteer fire assistance program is of particular importance to me. First responders are pillars of our community, and it has been a privilege of mine to advocate for them in Congress.

This program provides financial and technical assistance through grants to rural communities of less than 10,000 people that are matched by the community or State on a 50–50 basis. Grant funding for this program can be used to obtain and repair equipment and improve fire protection capabilities.

Ever more striking is that many of these rural fire departments often rely on volunteers. In fact, 70 percent of all firefighters are volunteers, over half of whom are found in rural communities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to provide these brave men and women the funds they need to adequately combat wildfires and protect our communities and treasured American landscape.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support this amendment. Mr. RUIZ and I represent the same area. Volunteer firefighters are extremely important, especially in our rural areas, and this is something we all should support.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, this amendment would reallocate $2 million to the Interior's volunteer fire assistance program with six to eight volunteer firefighters.

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate and thank my colleague, who has given his time in fighting fires in his capacity.

I thank my colleagues, as well as the chairman and the ranking members for their work on this bipartisan bill.

Mr. Chairman, once again, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan and commonsense amendment to support the volunteer firefighters who protect our communities, 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. RUIZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee for Mr. POLIS of Colorado, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 86, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 86, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer amendment No. 37 on behalf of my colleague from Colorado, Representative POLIS.

Mr. Chairman, as we continue to see global temperatures rise and extreme weather events like wildfires become more prevalent, it is imperative that Congress take action to help reduce these threats.

This amendment would increase funds for hazardous fuels management activities by an additional $10 million in order to mitigate the threats of wildfires and help save lives.

This program reduces dangerously high fuel loads and helps restore and improve the health and resiliency of our forests.

Managing hazardous fuel loads is critical to protecting the American public from wildfires, providing for fire safety and preserving our Nation's natural resources. Fuel treatments provide safer conditions and more strategic options for firefighters.

In the 2016 fiscal year, the Forest Service funded and helped conduct fuels treatment on more than 3.2 million high-priority acres nationwide. This included 2.1 million acres on areas with populated communities, high fire areas where the Forest Service could alleviate the risk more effectively.

Assessments of fuels treatment effectiveness show that 91 percent of treatments were effective in changing fire behavior and/or helping to control wildfire.

Despite this progress, the Forest Service estimates that there are millions of acres at high risk of wildfires, including some that are adjacent to communities.

We must make investments in hazardous fuels programs that have demonstrated effectiveness in reducing wildfire risk and continue to prioritize treatments in the highest priority areas to protect lives, property, and watersheds.

As the Representative for the central coast in California, I can tell you that we are no strangers to wildfires. This year alone, my district witnessed the devastating impacts of the Thomas and Holiday fires.

The Thomas fire became the largest fire in California history, burning nearly 282,000 acres in Ventura County and Santa Barbara County, and later triggering mudslides that tragically claimed the lives of 23 individuals in my district.

If we can take action to prevent wildfires, we should. We know it pays to be prepared. And we know that for every dollar spent on mitigation activities, we save $6 in return.

Mr. POLIS' amendment is a commonsense measure that would help provide sufficient funds to ensure that we are protecting lives and property from the threats of wildfires.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, certainly, I agree with the gentleman that hazardous fuel reduction is something that is extremely important. That is why we provide for a $30 million increase from last year's levels for hazardous fuel reduction in this bill.

Second, the national forests are overgrown and prone to severe and catastrophic fires, there is no doubt about

it. Colorado, for instance, has already experienced a number of these fires this year, and, certainly, our home State of California is no different. We have had a number of fires, and we have fires going on at this very moment.

The timber program, which removes trees from these overgrown stands, significantly reduces the threat of catastrophic fire. We went down a path in the early 1990s that many people in the mainstream environmental movement now realize is a mistake. We have now got out of that enterprise, and a lot of these forests, unfortunately, have overgrown and have bark beetle disease, so that now becomes hazardous fuel.

Unfortunately, it wasn't harvested in a responsible way earlier. Responsible harvesting of timber from the national forest is a necessary component of good forest and land management.

□ 2300

So taking money from that account is the offset that I can't support. But certainly, I do support hazardous fuel reduction, because, unfortunately, we have created a lot of it in our home State of California and throughout the West. So, unfortunately, I have to urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, this amendment offsets the $10 million increase for fuels management by reducing from the forest products.

Unlike the forest products line item, which funds timber sales, the hazardous fuels program is focused exclusively on reducing wildfire risks and employs a wide range of tools, including prescribed fire, mechanical fuels reduction, and thinning activities.

Increasing funding for hazardous fuels management can save lives. And when we consider the priority of forest products versus the opportunity to thin these fuels, I think the priority is clear, for saving lives, for saving property, and saving our environment.

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. CARBAJAL).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 38 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in House Report 115–830.

Mr. GROTHMAN. 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 115, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $23,250,000)''.

Page 116, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $23,250,000)''.

Page 147, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $46,500,00)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment in the form I have placed at the desk. There was a minor change in the figure there.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized on her reservation.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, while I appreciate the request made is intended to correct an inadvertent drafting error, I am concerned that granting the gentleman's request would legitimize a double standard being applied to unanimous consent requests here on the House floor.

For example, during consideration of the defense appropriation bill 3 weeks ago, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE sought to obtain a unanimous consent to correct just this sort of innocent drafting error in her amendment. The majority informed us that, while they had no problem trying to fix the error in some other less direct manner later in the process, they would object to doing so by unanimous consent.

More importantly, just today, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee asked for and could not get unanimous consent to consider a resolution endorsing Speaker RYAN's own statement rebuking the President's statements in Helsinki in which the President said that he takes the Russians' word over that of the U.S. intelligence community, and refused to condemn the Russians' attacks on our democracy.

If Democrats can't even get unanimous consent for that, endorsing a statement by the Speaker of the House, it starts to look like a partisan double standard for giving unanimous consent.

Mr. Chair, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 39 offered by Mr. GROTHMAN:

Page 115, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $23,250,000)''.

Page 116, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $23,250,000)''.

Page 147, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $46,500,000)''.

Mr. GROTHMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I will address the amendment. The purpose of this amendment is to try to make a small dent in what I consider to be the overall excessive spending that is going on here.

In the year which we are currently in, we anticipate borrowing about 22 percent of the Federal budget. A few years ago, we had that number down to around 11 percent—and to a certain extent because of the hurricanes, but to a certain extent not—we now are borrowing up to 22 percent.

President Trump, at the time he originally submitted the budget for this time, which was before the budget agreement was reached, I think, anticipated spending over $50 billion less than the amount that was spent in the last year. I tried to look at something to just give a little bit, a tip of the cap, to President Trump's request. I think he is paying a lot more attention to the burden we are placing on our children and grandchildren than Congress collectively.

And I looked at the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. I am requesting a 15 percent reduction in both of those numbers. It seems when you reduce anything else, it seems to plan that it is a matter of life and death, and horrible things are going to happen.

I like the arts. I don't know if I like the humanities quite as much as the arts, but they are okay, too. But it is hard to believe, at a time when we are borrowing 22 percent of our overall budget, that a minor 15 percent cut in these two items would be inappropriate.

We are, right now, going up in the National Endowment of the Humanities, hitting an all-time high this year, at the time of this huge deficit, and we are also increasing in the proposed budget the amount we are spending on the humanities.

It seems to me that these things, you could argue, are not necessarily a Federal purpose at all. I am not like President Trump was 2 years ago and trying to zero out these two lines altogether, but I think it is a little bit of an insult to our President, an insult to our children, an insult to our grandchildren to go up to high numbers on both these items.

So the purpose of my amendment, a minor 15 percent reduction. There is still more in both these accounts than we had just a few years ago.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. I certainly agree with the gentleman that we have a budget problem. I served on the Budget Committee for a number of years and recognize the fact that we are spending too much money.

However, if we take a look at the entire budget picture, nondefense discretionary accounts represent 16 percent of total Federal outlays. And if you take a look at the nondefense discretionary accounts, over the last number of years, we are pretty flat. We are pretty flat spending right now. I mean, even with this increase, even with this increase.

However, this NEA-NEH program is something I can't support. While I understand, again, why the gentleman wants to save money, this amendment would have unintended consequence affecting the men and women who serve in the country in uniform, military veterans, their families, as well as Native Americans, Alaska natives.

We are putting a lot of this money in to help people get through their posttraumatic stress syndrome. This amendment would have devastating consequence on critical work for the National Endowment for the Arts at Walter Reed Medical Center, 11 other clinical sites across the country that are supporting therapy service.

We have reformed the National Endowment for the Humanities to make sure that we have low overhead, and that this money is getting out into the country. This money doesn't go to New York or L.A. This goes out to the rural areas around the country that don't have the benefit of large interest in arts.

So I certainly urge Members to support the innovative work the NEA and the NEH are providing our men and women in uniform, our veterans, and families.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I too rise to speak in opposition to this amendment.

The NEA and the NEH have strong, bipartisan support on this committee, and I had really hoped the days of attacking these agencies were behind us. Maybe they seem like a good political target for those who don't understand the ways the arts and humanities affect our daily lives, but the economic benefits are undeniable for big cities, small towns, and everywhere in between.

The arts and culture industry contributes $764 billion to our economy every year, and the endowments are uniquely positioned to help smaller, rural areas, as you heard the Chair say, access that energy in a way that private capital can't or won't. And efforts to reach underserved communities are just as important.

NEA's Creative Forces program helps servicemembers and veterans manage TBI and PTSD through arts therapy. A cut would majorly impact the program's reach.

Similarly, NEH has funded the popular veterans book clubs that use literature that help process experiences in our military. I have been lucky to talk to some participants, and this is a deeply meaningful program that, again, is in jeopardy if this proposed cut moves forward.

Frankly, all of this comes at a very small price tag. The NEA and NEH use minimal Federal investments.

I will just end by saying this is an important way to create jobs, support families, and sustain communities in every Congressional district.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. I thank the chairman for his strong support of these programs.

I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Cuts to these programs may be penny-wise, but I think they are pound-foolish.

I am the Republican chair of both the Arts Caucus and the Humanities Caucus in this House, and these programs do wonderful work throughout the entire Nation, in every hamlet in America and, of course, supporting our veterans.

For every dollar the United States spends on Federal arts initiatives, nine non-Federal dollars are leveraged, generating roughly $600 million in matching funds. Last year's Federal arts appropriation was under $150 million, but the industry returned $10 billion to the Federal Treasury in income taxes.

I understand the gentleman's argument about government spending and our national debt. I take these matters seriously and have opposed a recent measure in this body that will increase our national debt over the next decade.

But on these programs, I trust that my colleagues from the Arts and Humanities Caucuses will expand on the incredible cultural and educational importance of supporting these programs as well.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Just a comment from the humble Congressman from Wisconsin. It was said that this is a small amount. I still think $300 million is a lot of money, okay? And we are only taking about $45 million out of that. We are leaving a lot behind. We are leaving—I don't feel, at this time, with such a big debt, we should be setting the all-time high that we have ever put in the endowment for the humanities and higher than any other amount we have put in the arts for the last 8 years.

And when I run for this job, I don't find anybody running around saying that they have got a big crisis in this country. I have a lot of rural area. And we have got to spend a lot more money in Washington, we have got this big debt, on the arts and humanities.

My local and municipal government are pleased to fund this. Philanthropists are pleased to fund this, and even people without a lot of money like me are happy to fund it on our own.

I request that the amendment pass and we make a little dent in this huge level of spending, and take a small amount out of here; not as much as President Trump, who cares so much about our children and grandchildren, wanted to take out, but at least a small 15 percent out due to our huge debt.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, can I inquire how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, one thing I want to make a point of, and because obviously this deficit is a problem. Everybody recognizes that. Seventy percent of all our spending today is nondiscretionary spending, 70 percent.

When I came to Congress 26 years ago it was 30 percent. Today those numbers have totally flipped. Now it is 30 percent discretionary, 70 percent nondiscretionary.

Of the discretionary account, half of that goes to defense. The other half goes to nondefense discretionary. No way are we ever going to balance the budget on nondefense discretionary spending. At some point, we all need to come together, Republicans, Democrats, the President, and come to a budget agreement. It has been tried before and needs to be tried again. And the 70 percent of nondiscretionary spending has to be on the table and we have to bend those cost curves.

We are not going to—and I dispute the fact that we are at an all-time high on NEH and the National Endowment for the Arts. In past years, those numbers were quite higher.

□ 2315

Those numbers have been cut down over the years, and we are trying to do the best we can on these discretionary accounts; but being what it will, this is not, I think, a wise cut. Money is going to every congressional district in the United States.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in House Report 115–830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 138, beginning on line 1, strike section 430.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, neither of the amendments that I offer tonight have much to do with the appropriations we are addressing. They are not about specific budget provisions, although I very much enjoyed listening to the many amendments tonight and am impressed with how often the discussion has been cordial. Instead, this amendment seeks to preserve current Clean Water Act protections for our rivers, streams, and wetlands.

Our Nation's river systems and wetlands provide irreplaceable resources: natural water quality improvement, flood protection, shoreline erosion control, recreation, general aesthetic appreciation, and natural products for our use at no cost. Yet section 430 of this bill seeks to undermine the critical balance between protecting these waters and the day-to-day operations of our Nation's farmers, ranchers, and foresters.

Under current law, you do not need a Clean Water Act permit if discharges of dredged or fill material are associated with normal farming, ranching, or silviculture activities. This exemption pertains to normal farming and harvesting activities that are part of an established, ongoing farming or forestry operation. Only when the activities change or convert the use of a waterbody to a new purpose or impair the historic flow or reach of a stream or wetland does the exemption no longer apply.

What this means is that farmers can continue to plow their fields, plant their seeds, and harvest their crops without ever having to obtain approval under the Clean Water Act; but if a farmer wants to use the current exemption to convert his farmland into a residential development, he can't do that unless he gets a permit.

A rancher couldn't use this exemption to plow under a wetland to expand the reach of her grazing lands, and forestry operations can't use this exemption to change the course of a local stream to improve drainage on their growing lands.

Section 430 of this bill seeks to provide an absolute exemption for impacts to any streams or wetlands that happen to be on agricultural, ranching, or forestry lands. This is a fundamental change to the Clean Water Act and one where the impacts have never been explored.

This amendment would be a departure from almost 40 years of implementation of the Clean Water Act by eliminating the existing provision requiring that the exemptions are limited to established, ongoing farming practices. It could result in the loss or impairment of thousands of acres of valuable wetlands.

Mr. Chairman, we shouldn't be using an appropriations bill to change Federal policy related to the protection of our Nation's rivers and streams. To the best of my knowledge, no hearings or investigations on the impacts of this provision have ever been held.

If Congress intended to overturn almost 40 years of Clean Water Act precedent, regular order would require hearings before the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which has sole jurisdiction over the Clean Water Act, and approval by that committee before consideration on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, this rider is bad policy for the protection of our environment, for the protection of human health, and for the protection of public safety.

Mr. Chair, I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment.

My colleague today has labeled this language a loophole in the bill, which is false. A loophole is used to get around a law. The language he wants to strike requires EPA and Army Corps to follow the law.

I ask once again my colleague, a friend of mine and a nice guy, to come visit us in northern California and meet with the farmers and ranchers who have seen firsthand this misuse and abuse of the Clean Water Act and to gain an understanding why this language is necessary. It is not theoretical. This is regulatory overreach at its worst going on right now.

The recapture provision of the Clean Water Act was never meant to swallow the original intent of the agricultural exemptions clearly laid out in the act, but that is exactly what has been happening. If this amendment passes, it would only get worse.

It was never the intention of the Clean Water Act to punish farmers for conducting normal farming practices, normal operations, such as plowing or doing stock pond maintenance, indeed, continuing what it is they have always done.

There is a difference between filling a river and a difference between plowing the corner of a field. These exemptions were constructed to address that difference.

The ongoing expansion of enforcement, indeed, the reinterpretation of clear exemption, is not what has been going on for 40 years as asserted, but only in recent years under the previous administration have they reinterpreted these laws; otherwise, you wouldn't have these farmers and others in such a fuss over what they have done for many decades.

The ongoing expansion of enforcement of the Clean Water Act has chipped away at the rights of landowners and has made it a danger to farmers to effectively utilize their own property—key word, ''own.'' This isn't somebody else's wetlands. This isn't someone else's habitat. This is land that belongs to farmers who have been practicing farming in the way they see fit for many years before this reinterpretation.

It is really ridiculous that a farmer must worry about being slapped with a fine in the millions of dollars just for plowing on their own land or a decision to rest that land, let it lie fallow, or wait for improved market conditions.

In my district, there have been lawsuits against residents for farming without Federal permission. Cases like these across the country have cost farmers millions of dollars—yes, millions of dollars—in legal damages, and they risk running farmers out of business. I don't know of many farmers who can absorb million-dollar fines very many times and continue doing what they are doing.

If this amendment is not defeated, these damages to farm communities will only grow. America's farmers and ranchers deserve our support. They deserve to be able to make decisions about managing their land, managing their crops, have crop rotations that make sense to them for market conditions, or just allowing the land to rest without having to seek an onerous permit if they let their land rest for a couple years, this without more regulatory ambiguity and red tape.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I tried to listen very carefully to my friend from northern California.

Number one, I would love to come visit and talk to his farmers and his ranchers, with his permission and accompaniment.

Number two, I think if there is administrative misuse, if there is a reinterpretation of a law that has been in place for 40 years, let's address that. Let's do that through the Department of the Interior. We have, I believe, from the gentleman's perspective, a very friendly administration. Let's make sure that they are implementing the law appropriately.

By the way, I agree with the gentleman, it was never intended to punish farmers.

The gentleman's northern California experience is different from ours here. My mom and dad both grew up on farms in northern Virginia, which are completely residential developments right now.

We want to make sure that we don't, with this rider, make it possible for a farmer to change from farming to suburbia without ever obtaining a permit,

and that is essentially what we have done.

By the wholesale nature of this repeal, of the nonstop to the exemptions, we essentially really shortcut the Clean Water Act.

I urge us to look for a middle ground solution that answers the needs of farmers without opening wide this exemption for any farming, ranching, or grazing activity, forestry activity that might result in this full repeal.

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, indeed, I appreciate my colleague's comments and thoughts on this.

We are not talking about conversion to suburbia. We are talking about a reinstitution of a crop that may have been lying fallow for a few years or changing from a crop such as a hay crop to wheat.

Indeed, one of my growers up north got in big trouble because they wanted to put in a wheat crop on their own land, which isn't wetlands unless we want to start reinterpreting that way by EPA working with their henchmen in the Army Corps, basically out of the Sacramento office, to keep coming after him and finding more and more people. This puts more wind in their sails to come after people who are making an honest living, not trying to develop houses or suburbia.

Indeed, I would agree with the gentleman on that. And that is going to require a fairly difficult permit process, especially in my home State of California, if you want to start turning this ag land into suburbia. It is not what we are after.

There was a farm bill some years ago called the Freedom to Farm. What has happened to that? What has happened to that concept?

With clear exemptions in the Clean Water Act for normal farming practices, not new interpretations that have been put in place in the previous administration we are still trying to unwind and get their attention on, that is why this amendment would be damaging towards that effort.

It is not a fight over clean water; it is a fight over Federal control. They never intended for this.

It is unfortunate I have to even be here today to defend simply requiring the bureaucrats to follow the law and the clear exemptions that were put in place under the Clean Water Act.

Activities of the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers go above the law to impose these requirements, again, significantly expanding the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act, which clearly exceeds congressional intent when they passed the Clean Water Act 40-plus years ago.

Mr. Chair, again, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in House Report 115–830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 138, beginning on line 10, strike section 431.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike section 431, which repeals the current Clean Water Rule.

Without this Clean Water Rule, the streams that supply public drinking water systems to one in three Americans will remain at risk.

Mr. Chairman, everyone agreed that clarity was needed in light of the Supreme Court decisions in 2001 and 2006 that created uncertainty about the scope of waters protected under the Clean Water Act. Calls for EPA to issue a rule even came from such organizations as the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Western Business Roundtable, and the National Association of Manufacturers.

The EPA and the Corps solicited comments to clarify the scope of waters protected under the Clean Water Act, and that included a lengthy and inclusive public rulemaking process that included over 200 days for public comment. The comment period was even extended twice in response to extension requests.

The final rule reflected over 1 million public comments in the proposal, the overwhelming majority of which supported the Clean Water Rule. They had 400 meetings across the Nation with various stakeholders.

The final Clean Water Rule was robust and ensured that water sources were protected by taking into account the connected systems of water, from wetlands and seasonal bodies of water to large rivers and lakes.

The requirements of the rule were meticulously developed and addressed longstanding uncertainty, improving our national commitment to protect not only America's water, but the American people.

About 117 million Americans get drinking water from streams that were vulnerable to pollution before this new Clean Water Rule. Our health and our lives depend on clean water, our economy depends on clean water.

Mr. Chairman, what is unusual is the Trump administration is already working to replace, revise the 2015 rule, so I am baffled why this rider is necessary. Does the rider mean the Republican Party can't trust its own EPA to write the rule to their requirements?

So I stand here today to denounce this unnecessary rider and to defend clean water for the American people.

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

□ 2330

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, with the change of administrations, we were able to reduce the number of issues addressed in this bill, but some issues warrant continued congressional attention. WOTUS is one of them.

Deciding how water is used should be the responsibility of State and local officials who are familiar with the people and the local issues. Under the WOTUS rule, however, the reach of the Federal jurisdiction would be so broad that it would significantly restrict a landowner's ability to make decisions about their property and a local government's right to plan for its own development.

The language in the underlying bill simply repeals the misguided WOTUS rule and clarifies what rules will be in effect until a new rule is finalized, specifically, the same rules that were in effect immediately prior to the promulgation of the final WOTUS rule.

WOTUS is an issue that warrants continued congressional attention and the provision in the underlying bill is the appropriate action to take.

For these reasons, I must urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly respect the opinion of the chair, but I do take issue with the notion that it is a misguided WOTUS rule. There were 1 million comments, 400 meetings, and I served on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and National Resources Committee in the last 2 years of the Obama administration when EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy came to us and said that after the original publication of the intended new clean water rule, there was so much feedback that she went back to the drawing board for another year of hearings and comments to address the many concerns that were raised by farmers, cattlemen, and others, most of which were resolved at the time.

Mr. Chair, I respect the notion that a new administration has the right to go through the same process, the same hearings, and the same public comment to modify the rule to evolve it as we move forward. But to just throw out the old rule by a rider to an appropriations bill, seems the wrong way to make law, the wrong way to govern.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my few colleagues here at a little bit before midnight to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LANCE) having assumed the chair, Mr. BUDD, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SUPPORTING ICE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for an agency that works extremely hard to keep our country safe, and that is Immigration and Customs Enforcement, known as ICE.

While some on the other side of the aisle have called for ICE to be abolished—yes, that is not a joke, and indeed, have proposed a bill that they are now running away from, they failed to put their money where their mouth is on the issue when their bluff was called.

ICE is, in fact, one of the most important components of our country's interior law enforcement. Without them, even the most modest level of border security would be difficult. In 2017 alone, the numbers are staggering: 226,119 illegal aliens removed; 32,598 Homeland Security criminal arrests; 4,818 gang arrests, including 796 MS–13 members; and 2,370 pounds of the very dangerous fentanyl drugs seized, which only a small amount is very dangerous to thousands of people.

The statistics should speak for themselves. ICE is critical for our country and its law enforcement. We should be doing everything we can to support them instead of threatening and abolishing an agency that works around the clock to protect our borders and our interior from these great threats. We should appreciate this branch of law enforcement, not try and run it out of town.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 18, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5634. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing five (5) officers to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5635. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Herman A. Shelanski, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5636. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Edward C. Cardon, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5637. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a supplemental update of the Budget for Fiscal Year 2019, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(a); Public Law 97-258, Sec. 1106(a); (96 Stat. 911) (H. Doc. No. 115—140); to the Committee on the Budget and ordered to be printed.

5638. A letter from the Director, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, OSHA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revising the Beryllium Standard for General Industry [Docket No.: OSHA-2018-0003] (RIN: 1218-AB76) received July 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5639. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Miscellaneous Corrections [NRC-2018-0086] (RIN: 3150-AK13) received July 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5640. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-093, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5641. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-108, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5642. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 18-035, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5643. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. RSAT-18-6183, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5644. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification pursuant to the reporting requirements of Sec. 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 17-130; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5645. A letter from the Deputy White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination and a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5646. A letter from the Deputy White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination and a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5647. A letter from the Director, Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2017 annual report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5648. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the Statistical Programs of the Unites States Government: Fiscal Year 2018 report, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5649. A letter from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting two notifications of designation of acting officer and nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5650. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 150121066-5717-02] (RIN: 0648-XF699) received July 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5651. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 150121066-5717-02] (RIN: 0648-XF805) received July 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5652. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 151130999-6594-02] (RIN: 0648-XF821) received July 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5653. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Adjustment to the Atlantic Herring Management Area 1A Annual Catch Limit [Docket

No.: 151215999-6960-02] (RIN: 0648-XF774) received July 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5654. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the State of Rhode Island [Docket No.: 161017970-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-XF814) received July 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5655. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 161017970-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-XF879) received July 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5656. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Skate Complex; Adjustment to the Skate Wing Inseason Possession Limit [Docket No.: 160301164-6694-02] (RIN: 0648-XF883) received July 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5657. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the State of New Jersey [Docket No.: 161017970-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-XF856) received July 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5658. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 170828822-70999-02] (RIN: 0648-XG001) received July 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5659. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 170828822-70999-02] (RIN: 0648-XG063) received July 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5660. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket Nos.: 120328229-4949-02 and 150121066-5717-02] (RIN: 0648-XG140) received July 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5661. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 150121066-5717-02] (RIN: 0648-XF868) received July 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5662. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition filed on behalf of workers at the Feed Materials Production Center in Fernald, Ohio, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7384q(c)(2); Public Law 106-398, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 108-375, Sec. 3166(b)(1)); (118 Stat. 2188); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5663. A letter from the Controller, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, transmitting the Audited Financial Statements of NSDAR for the Fiscal Year ended December 31, 2017, pursuant to Public Law 88-504 (36 U.S.C. 1102); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5664. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting a letter presenting the views of the Intelligence Community and the Department of Defense on Sec. 1002 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6138. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for ambulatory surgical center representation during the review of hospital outpatient payment rates under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115–831, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4952. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study and submit a report on the effects of the inclusion of quality increases in the determination of blended benchmark amounts under part C of the Medicare program with an amendment(Rept. 115–832, .Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1482. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain or replace certain facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NEWHOUSE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1001. Resolution providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 119) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy (Rept. 115–834). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4952 referred to the Committee of the Whole House, on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 6138 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 6393. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for internet openness requirements for broadband internet access service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 6394. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require that supplemental nutrition assistance benefits be used to purchase only supplemental foods that are eligible for purchase under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (commonly known as the WIC program); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. KIND, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 6395. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to provide adjustment assistance to certain workers adversely affect by reduced exports resulting from tariffs imposed as retaliation for United States tariff increases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 6396. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to provide adjustment assistance to firms adversely affect by reduced exports resulting from tariffs imposed as retaliation for United States tariff increases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 6397. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a new status for certain tax-exempt organizations with administrative expenses not exceeding 25 percent of contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself, Mr. DUNN, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mrs. LESKO):

H.R. 6398. A bill to authorize the Department of Energy to conduct collaborative research with the Department of Veterans Affairs in order to improve healthcare services for veterans in the United States, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DUNN, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.R. 6399. A bill to direct that certain assessments with respect to toxicity of chemicals be carried out by the program offices of

the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BACON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. KATKO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 6400. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a threat and operational analysis of ports of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 6401. A bill to assist the Department of Homeland Security in preventing emerging threats from unmanned aircraft and vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE of California1 (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 6402. A bill to extend the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 6403. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to modify the beneficial ownership requirements by creating an exception for certain accounts; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 6404. A bill to amend the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 to provide for a set aside for small fruits in the specialty crop research initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BERA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. LEE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BASS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COOK, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ROYCE of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 6405. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2801 Mitchell Road in Ceres, California, as the ''Lance Corporal Juana Navarro Arellano Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 6406. A bill to deter, prevent, reduce, and respond to harassment in the workplace, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, and harassment based on protected categories; and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of amounts related to employment discrimination and harassment in the workplace, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, and harassment based on protected categories; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Financial Services, House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 6407. A bill to require the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain surplus computers and technology equipment to nonprofit computer refurbishers for repair and distribution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 6408. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize international cooperative activities to strengthen efforts relating to countering violent extremism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. POSEY, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 6409. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide inscriptions for spouses and children on certain headstones and markers furnished by the Secretary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KIND, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 6410. A bill to provide for the administration of certain national monuments, to establish a National Monument Enhancement Fund, and to establish certain wilderness areas in the States of New Mexico and Nevada; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 6411. A bill to amend the duties of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) to ensure FinCEN works with Tribal law enforcement agencies, protects against all forms of terrorism, and focuses on virtual currencies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 6412. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to permit employers to unilaterally cease to deduct from the employee's paycheck dues owed by the employee to a labor organization when the agreement establishing such a deduction expires and to allow employees to cancel such deductions at any time; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TROTT (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 6413. A bill to combat trafficking in human organs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. WALBERG):

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of the parsonage allowance to the Nation's religious and spiritual communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H. Res. 999. A resolution expressing agreement with the statements of the Speaker of the House of Representatives made on July 16, 2018, regarding Russian Federation interference in the 2016 United States elections and related matters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 1000. A resolution electing a Member to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. Res. 1002. A resolution expressing congratulations to the towns of Camden, Bethune, Elgin, and Kershaw County, South Carolina, for being named 1 of 10 All-American Cities winners; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 6393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:
H.R. 6394.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The authority enumerated in Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution
By Ms. DELBENE:
H.R. 6395.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. SCHNEIDER:
H.R. 6396.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. POSEY:
H.R. 6397.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution
To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a new status for certain tax-exempt organizations with administrative expenses not exceeding 25 percent of contributions.
By Mr. NORMAN:
H.R. 6398.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Mr. BIGGS:
H.R. 6399.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Mrs. LESKO:
H.R. 6400.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Alticle 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Mr. MCCAUL:
H.R. 6401.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.
By Mr. ROYCE of California:
H.R. 6402.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and, Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).
By Mr. BUDD:
H.R. 6403.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3, providing the power to regulate ''commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states.''
By Ms. DELBENE:
H.R. 6404.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. DENHAM:
H.R. 6405.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
Clause 1
Clause 7
Clause 18
By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:
H.R. 6406.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. GARRETT:
H.R. 6407.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. KEATING:
H.R. 6408.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. LAMALFA:
H.R. 6409.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States
By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:
H.R. 6410.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. PERLMUTTER:
H.R. 6411.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:
H.R. 6412.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. TROTT:
H.R. 6413.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 120: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 173: Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HOLDING, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 184: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 592: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 632: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 719: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 754: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. BASS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 790: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 850: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 972: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1038: Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 1171: Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1223: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 1318: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 1377: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 1378: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1511: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1542: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1552: Mr. HUIZENGA and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1651: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1661: Mr. CURTIS.
H.R. 1881: Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 1904: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2101: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2273: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2315: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2345: Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. DELBENE, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 2416: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2421: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2452: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2477: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2589: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2640: Mr. SOTO and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2841: Miss RICE of New York, Ms. MENG, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2911: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 2946: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2965: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2976: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 3032: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. HURD.
H.R. 3113: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 3148: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3325: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 3608: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 3635: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 3671: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3866: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3976: Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 4138: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 4143: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 4206: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4215: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4253: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 4256: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 4271: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 4483: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 4556: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4691: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 4693: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 4777: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 4881: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 4888: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 4897: Mr. EVANS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 4973: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 4985: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 5003: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 5107: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 5141: Ms. NORTON and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 5199: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 5281: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 5291: Mr. SIRES and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 5306: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5417: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 5517: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 5595: Mr. COMER.
H.R. 5621: Mr. BARTON and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 5634: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 5637: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 5640: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 5671: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 5701: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 5822: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 5864: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 5899: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KATKO, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 5903: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 5915: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 5922: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 5948: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 5949: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 5958: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 5988: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 6011: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 6013: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 6014: Mr. TROTT, Mr. BOST, Mr. FASO, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 6016: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 6034: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 6076: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 6080: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 6081: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 6097: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 6108: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 6113: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 6137: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 6159: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 6178: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 6219: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 6239: Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 6249: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 6263: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 6275: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H.R. 6280: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 6288: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 6304: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 6315: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 6318: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 6326: Mr. POCAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BASS, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 6330: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 6345: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 6356: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 6358: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H.R. 6360: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 6367: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 6368: Mr. NORMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 6369: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 6378: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 6382: Mr. CHABOT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 6392: Mr. DONOVAN.
H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. GOHMERT.
H. Res. 28: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H. Res. 136: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H. Res. 199: Ms. STEFANIK.
H. Res. 400: Mr. YODER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
H. Res. 455: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. SIRES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CORREA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H. Res. 621: Mr. EVANS.
H. Res. 628: Mr. CRIST and Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 673: Mr. STIVERS.
H. Res. 745: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. POE of Texas.
H. Res. 763: Mr. SUOZZI.
H. Res. 826: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H. Res. 864: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H. Res. 888: Ms. BASS.
H. Res. 976: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. HULTGREN.
H. Res. 981: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H. Res. 990: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H. Res. 991: Mr. CRIST.
H. Res. 994: Mr. HUNTER.
H. Res. 995: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. HUDSON.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 17, 2018 *No. 120*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, send Your peace into our hearts today, providing us with the contentment that comes from Your abiding presence. Bless our lawmakers. Use them to give hope to the hopeless, help to the helpless, and freedom to the captives. Remind our Senators that evil will triumph when good people do nothing. Give them the courage to stand for right though the heavens fall. May they totally depend on You, acknowledging You as the Author and Finisher of their faith.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

THE IRS AND THE FIRST AMENDMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, last night the Internal Revenue Service made an important announcement. It is particularly welcome news to those of us who are intently focused on defending the First Amendment, for those of us who, over the years, have raised concerns during the last administration about activist regulators punishing free speech and free association.

It is a straightforward, commonsense policy decision. The Internal Revenue Service is cutting back on the amount of nonpublic information it collects and stockpiles about Americans who donate to nonprofit causes. The IRS will no longer pointlessly demand private contributor lists from whole categories of tax-exempt organizations. I say ''pointlessly'' because the identity of nonprofit donors serves no compelling purpose under sections 501(c)4, and 501(c)6 of our Tax Code.

Contributions to these organizations are not tax deductible—not tax deductible—so the IRS does not need to see this data for accounting purposes. These organizations are not required to release that information under the public inspection and availability requirements.

Let me repeat. The identity of the donors to these organizations is not necessary for accounting and is not required for public inspection by the Internal Revenue Code.

It raises the question that if the IRS isn't permitted to do anything with this set of Americans' private information, why collect it in the first place?

Unfortunately, we know exactly what happens when the government stockpiles private data about the donations through which Americans participate in the public discourse. We know exactly why many on the left are keen for bureaucrats to have this confidential information. Where it leads is Americans being bullied for exercising their First Amendment rights. This bullying is established by bureaucrats and, in some cases, by elected officials.

Sometimes the government itself does the bullying. Case in point: the Obama administration's IRS scandal. The agency slow-walked the applications of groups that appeared conservative, including some of my own constituents. Donors and groups faced unusually aggressive questioning, unreasonable deadlines followed by unreasonable delays. These were Federal authorities using the weaponry of government to punish Americans for supporting speech they didn't like.

Other times, government simply enables the harassment. It fails to protect this private information from leaking to the army of angry leftwing activists who stand eager to harass and bully anyone who is contributing to national conversations with political views with which they disagree.

Back in 2014, the IRS had to settle a lawsuit on this very issue. An IRS worker broke the law and leaked an unredacted copy of a group's confidential tax forms which wound up in the hands of a liberal organization on the opposite side of the issue. Needless to say, private information about Americans' political speech was quickly weaponized for political purposes. In one case, the CEO of a technology organization was hounded from his job by liberal activists for daring to see this subject differently than they did.

Some State governments began demanding their own copies of the information the IRS was gathering. There were similarly troubling results. In 2012, California, which had promised nonprofits that donor lists would only be seen by the State's Registry of Charitable Trusts, accidentally—accidentally—published the donor lists of hundreds of nonprofits from across the political spectrum. More States, like New York, have sought to copy California, allowing more activist regulators to access this information.

So the pattern is unmistakable. This particular political movement wants to erase our age-old tradition that citizens should be able to keep their private views and the causes they privately support private.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Back in the 1950s, it was the NAACP who took on the State of Alabama over precisely this issue. The State government tried to get their hands on the NAACP's donor list. The issue went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, where the NAACP won a big victory for the First Amendment.

Here is what Justice Harlan wrote in that opinion: ''Inviolability of privacy and group association may in many circumstances be indispensable to preservation of freedom of association, particularly where a group espouses dissident beliefs.''

He said that forcing private organizations to disclose their donors was not so different from forcing people with certain views to wear armbands or other clothing, advertising their beliefs to the world.

In both cases, the government's action would be inviting harassment and intimidation upon Americans—those whose beliefs were either unusual or unpopular or, in today's culture of intimidation, those whose beliefs the left disagrees with. The result is, more speakers stay silent, fewer Americans choose to exercise their right of free association.

It is bad enough to wield government power to chill political speech and invite harassment of citizens based on what an angry mob might assume their opinions are, based on their private financial records. It is even more egregious to pursue that nakedly political goal while calling it—believe it or not—good government.

In this country, good government means protecting citizens' First Amendment rights to participate in the competition of ideas, not trying to shut down that competition. We persuade. We don't intimidate.

So I welcome this announcement and applaud the leadership of Secretary Mnuchin and Acting IRS Commissioner David Kautter. I am glad this step will make the right of Americans to freely advocate for their strongly held beliefs less vulnerable to the malice of some in government and to the proven failures of bureaucracies. I urge continued vigilance for all of us who cherish the First Amendment.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on a different matter, it is becoming a historic year for favorable economic news. There are plenty of ways to measure how American workers, job creators, and entrepreneurs are writing a new chapter.

After nearly a decade of stagnating pay and vanishing opportunities, recent months have brought remarkable milestones. Optimism among American small businesses has reached its highest level since President Reagan's first term. Sixty-seven percent of Americans believe that now is a good time to find a quality job in the United States—the highest percentage in 17 years of Gallup polling. Just last month, a manufacturing industry measure reported growth in 17 out of 18 sectors, from textiles to precision technologies.

It is no surprise, then, that the National Association of Manufacturers found last month that a record-high 95.1 percent of American manufacturers have a positive view of their company's outlook.

What do these numbers mean to real workers on the floor of American factories? At Mack Molding, an injection molder and contract manufacturer, with locations in Statesville, NC, and Arlington, VT, it means a $5.4 million investment in facilities with preparations to hire 100 new workers. At Sabel Steel, based in Montgomery, AL, it means large pay raises for most of the company's 230 employees and new, more efficient equipment at facilities across the South. Both companies credit last year's historic tax reform law with helping make their 2018 success possible.

Our Democratic colleagues can talk all they like about repealing middle-class families' and job creators' historic tax cuts and sending that money back to Washington instead, but this united Republican government is proud of the new prosperity they are building. We will not let the Democrats take away their tax cut.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRUMP-PUTIN SUMMIT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I am at a loss for words to describe what happened yesterday in Helsinki, Finland. I am disappointed, as well, by the stunning silence of some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in response to it.

When each of us is elected to serve in Congress—the House and the Senate—we are asked to take an oath, a very serious oath. In it, we swear to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. The President of the United States similarly swears to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Yesterday in Helsinki, Finland, the President of the United States was engaged in an appalling display. What we saw at that press conference—standing just several feet away from Vladimir Putin, the leader of Russia—was the President's decision to turn his back on the organizations and agencies of the U.S. Government, to question their credibility, and to affirm, incredibly, that Mr. Putin had given a powerful denial to what they have found when it comes to the Russian interference in our last election.

Just days after bullying our key NATO allies and failing to publicly accept that Russia attacked our country, attacked our democracy, this administration and its enablers here in Congress are failing that oath.

President Trump refuses to accept the findings of American intelligence professionals, the Department of Justice, the Department of Defense, and virtually every agency of our government that is tasked with keeping us safe and instead accepts Vladimir Putin's absurd, self-serving denials. Many of my colleagues here in Congress refuse to even speak up to denounce the President's actions.

Consider what happened months before the 2016 election when our Nation's top intelligence officials came and told key congressional leaders about the Russian cyber attack on the United States. The administration at that time, under President Obama, was deeply concerned. President Obama was looking for a bipartisan response condemning Putin's efforts in the closing days of the elections so as to avoid any hint of partisanship in the public announcement and to present a unified deterrent.

What was the response of Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL after hearing this alarming revelation that Vladimir Putin was actively interfering in our elections and trying to undermine our democracy? Senator MCCONNELL's response: No thanks. We are not going to help. And incredibly, neither the Senator nor his party did.

Is there anyone in the Senate—anyone who took the oath to protect our Nation against enemies, foreign and domestic—who thinks any of us, regardless of political party, should receive help from a foreign adversary to get elected? I hope we all agree that country must come before party. So then why do so many of my Republican colleagues remain silent in light of President Trump's open denial of the reality of Russia's involvement in our election?

Yesterday, we watched in disbelief as the President not only refused to even acknowledge the act of cyber war against the United States but, incredibly, blamed America first for our poor relationship with Russia. We watched our American President refuse to stand up to Vladimir Putin, a former KGB official, who executed one of the most breathtaking cyber attacks in history aimed at the United States and aimed at undermining the Western security alliance and our country's democracy. An American President stood on the world stage next to a tyrant—a tyrant who denies that he attacked us—and then the President of the United States repeatedly agreed with that adversary and dismissed criminal indictments of Russian Government officials responsible for the attack. The President closed with a rambling preening about his great election victory.

We have an American President who seems to be utterly incapable of saying

the obvious to Vladimir Putin. The President should say: Don't ever interfere in U.S. elections again. I don't want your help, and I don't believe your absurd denials. He refused to say that.

Compare his bizarre and dangerous comments in Helsinki with what President Ronald Reagan said before the 1988 NATO summit. Instead of bullying our closest allies, Ronald Reagan said:

Our first priority is to maintain a strong and healthy partnership between North America and Europe, for this is the foundation on which the cause of freedom so crucially depends.

Again, Ronald Reagan said:

Our first priority is to maintain a strong and healthy partnership between North America and Europe, for this is the foundation on which the cause of freedom so crucially depends.

There is at least one Republican Senator who is not silent. My friend and a great American patriot, JOHN MCCAIN, said this yesterday about the Helsinki press conference:

Today's press conference in Helsinki was one of the most disgraceful performances by an American President in memory. The damage inflicted by President Trump's naivete, egotism, false equivalence, and sympathy for autocrats is difficult to calculate. . . . President Trump proved not only unable, but unwilling to stand up to Putin. He and Putin seemed to be speaking from the same script as the President made a conscious choice to defend a tyrant against the fair questions of a free press, and to grant Putin an uncontested platform to spew propaganda and lies to the world.

I could not agree more. It is obvious. We, all of us, Democrats and Republicans, should agree with what JOHN MCCAIN said.

Despite President Trump's shameful denials of Russian interference at yesterday's farce of a press conference, the evidence is clear: Russia did interfere in the 2016 election. Our intelligence agencies and the bipartisan Senate Intelligence Committee have concluded that not only did Russia interfere in our elections through cyber attacks, but they did so to harm Hillary Clinton, help elect Donald Trump, and undermine our democratic process.

When Donald Trump hears those words, it sends him into a rage. He denies any Russian interference for fear that it might reflect on his victory in the election. There is no evidence that has been produced to date that shows that Russian interference changed the outcome of that election. I am not questioning whether Donald Trump won the Electoral College and became President, but I don't think he should question whether the Russians were trying to undermine that process.

During his ongoing investigation into Russian meddling, Special Counsel Mueller has so far indicted 32 individuals and 3 companies on a total of 191 criminal charges. This includes the February indictment of 13 Russian trolls who engaged in a multiyear effort to influence our election, to support the election of Donald Trump by sowing discord and inflaming social tensions online.

The Mueller investigation includes 12 members of the Russian military intelligence, specifically named, who were indicted last Friday for engaging in a sustained operation to hack into the emails, accounts, and computer networks of the Democratic National Committee, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, and Hillary Clinton's Presidential campaign.

These Russians also created online personas and worked with WikiLeaks to publish the stolen documents. To cover their tracks, they committed identity theft, engaged in money laundering, and at one point leased a computer in my home State of Illinois to store and move the stolen documents through encrypted channels.

Additionally, the Russians hacked into the computer networks of election officials and vendors in order to steal voter data and other information. The indictment, produced by Special Counsel Mueller, mentions that the Russians ''hacked the website of a state board of elections . . . and stole information related to approximately 500,000 voters, including names, addresses, partial social security numbers, dates of birth, and driver's license numbers.'' This was, presumably, in reference to the Illinois State Board of Elections, which we already knew was one of the first victims of a successful Russian cyber attack—a Russian cyber attack that President Donald Trump refuses to believe ever happened.

We know that Russia meddled in the 2016 election, and we know that we should be gearing up for Russia to interfere with the 2018 midterm election as well. Just this past weekend, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, my former Republican Senate colleague from the State of Indiana and a man for whom I voted for this position and whom I respect very much, reiterated the ongoing threat that Russia presents, saying: ''In regard to state actions, Russia has been the most aggressive foreign actor—no question—and they continue their efforts to undermine our democracy.''

What a departure from what President Trump said in Helsinki yesterday. His own Director of National Intelligence has refuted the statement he made to the world yesterday, agreeing with the ''powerful statement'' of Vladimir Putin's that he had nothing to do with an attack on our election. Our President is cozying up to Vladimir Putin at the expense of the credibility of his own Director of National Intelligence. Why is this happening?

Instead of condemning President Trump and supporting the Special Counsel's efforts of getting to the bottom of this, sadly, the vast majority of congressional Republicans are actively working to undermine the investigation.

Just last week, Senate Republicans confirmed the nomination of Brian Benczkowski to serve as Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. They voted for Mr. Benczkowski to be in charge of 600 Federal prosecutors despite the fact that Mr. Benczkowski, as a lawyer, has never been in a trial—never. He has never been in a courtroom and has never been in a trial. He was named by President Trump to head up the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. That may not be the worst part.

Mr. Benczkowski, in his private law practice in Washington, also chose to represent a Russian bank, the Alfa-Bank, which has deep ties to Vladimir Putin. This is despite the fact that when he was called on it, he said he would not commit to recusing himself from this Russia investigation.

Furthermore, this vote occurred as President Trump and House Republicans had been looking for an excuse to fire Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein, who is overseeing the Mueller investigation. Should Rosenstein be fired, Mr. Benczkowski could be easily tasked by the President to oversee the Russia investigation. That would be an unmitigated legal disaster.

Enough is enough. Today is the day that, I hope, my colleagues—Democrat and Republican alike—will step forward and speak up.

The world is still reeling from the comments that were made yesterday in Helsinki by the President of the United States of America. There are serious questions from our longtime NATO allies—those who count on the United States for the safety and security of their republics. There are serious questions in their minds about who we are, what we stand for, the relationship between this President and Vladimir Putin—a relationship which is absolutely inexplicable in that President Trump would refuse to concede the obvious—that Vladimir Putin is setting out to undermine our values in the world.

President Trump should stand with the brave men and women of law enforcement, intelligence, and the Department of Defense who have warned him about Vladimir Putin, and he should not be so easily swept away with these meetings he has.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRUMP-PUTIN SUMMIT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President:

[Yesterday's summit] was one of the most disgraceful performances by an American President in memory. The damage inflicted by President Trump's naivety, egotism, false equivalence, and sympathy for autocrats is difficult to calculate. . . . President Trump proved not only unable but unwilling to stand up to Putin. He and Putin seemed to be speaking from the same script as the president made a conscious choice to defend a tyrant against the fair questions of a free press, and to grant Putin an uncontested platform to spew propaganda and lies to the world.

Coming close on the heels of President Trump's bombastic and erratic conduct towards our closest friends and allies in Brussels and Britain, today's press conference—

Yesterday's press conference, actually—

marks a recent low point in the history of the American Presidency.

No prior president has ever abased himself more abjectly before a tyrant. Not only did President Trump fail to speak the truth about an adversary; but speaking for America to the world, our president failed to defend all that makes us who we are—a republic of free people dedicated to the cause of liberty at home and abroad. American presidents must be champions of that cause if it is to succeed. Americans are waiting and hoping for President Trump to embrace that sacred responsibility. One can only hope they are not waiting . . . in vain.

Those are very strong words. People would say: Well, CHUCK SCHUMER is the Democratic leader. Of course, he is going to criticize President Trump. But those strong, biting, and effective words are not mine. Those three paragraphs I quoted come from JOHN MCCAIN, who is probably the leading Republican expert on military security, national security, and foreign policy.

When Senator MCCAIN said that, it should be a clarion call to every Republican to not just speak up but to take action because the national security of America is in danger.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCAIN's statement, in its entirety, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN STATEMENT ON PRESIDENT TRUMP'S MEETING WITH PRESIDENT PUTIN

''Today's press conference in Helsinki was one of the most disgraceful performances by an American president in memory. The damage inflicted by President Trump's naiveté, egotism, false equivalence, and sympathy for autocrats is difficult to calculate. But it is clear that the summit in Helsinki was a tragic mistake.

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

''It is tempting to describe the press conference as a pathetic rout—as an illustration of the perils of under-preparation and inexperience. But these were not the errant tweets of a novice politician. These were the deliberate choices of a president who seems determined to realize his delusions of a warm relationship with Putin's regime without any regard for the true nature of his rule, his violent disregard for the sovereignty of his neighbors, his complicity in the slaughter of the Syrian people, his violation of international treaties, and his assault on democratic institutions throughout the world.

''Coming close on the heels of President Trump's bombastic and erratic conduct towards our closest friends and allies in Brussels and Britain, today's press conference marks a recent low point in the history of the American Presidency. That the president was attended in Helsinki by a team of competent and patriotic advisors makes his blunders and capitulations all the more painful and inexplicable. ''No prior president has ever abased himself more abjectly before a tyrant. Not only did President Trump fail to speak the truth about an adversary; but speaking for America to the world, our president failed to defend all that makes us who we are—a republic of free people dedicated to the cause of liberty at home and abroad. American presidents must be the champions of that cause if it is to succeed. Americans are waiting and hoping for President Trump to embrace that sacred responsibility. One can only hope they are not waiting totally in vain.''

Mr. SCHUMER. It is still difficult to comprehend what transpired yesterday in Helsinki. Because of his actions, it was one of the worst days for any President of the United States in recent memory. On foreign soil, President Trump said the United States was to blame for the state of the relationship between Russia and America.

He trashed American intelligence and took the word of the KGB over the word of the men and women of the CIA. Can you believe it? Can you believe it? He said Russia's intelligence agency, which murders, steals, lies, and cheats, is better than ours. There is no rational explanation for an American President to do such a thing. It was the act of a man who seems incapable of distinguishing between his own narrow personal interests and the interests of America's national security.

Can you imagine if President Kennedy believed Khrushchev when he said there were no missiles in Cuba? Can you imagine if President Reagan believed Gorbachev without verifying that the Soviet Union would reduce its missile stockpile? We would be living in a much different world than we are today. Thank God President Kennedy and President Reagan showed strength in the face of tyrants—but President Trump shows abject weakness and sycophancy.

Let me explain to the President why he is being so strongly criticized when he embraced Putin's strong and powerful denial. The reason, President Trump, that you are being so criticized when you accept Putin's word is, Putin is a trained liar. He lies brazenly, shamelessly, and repeatedly about big things and small.

Putin lied about the presence of Russian troops in Crimea. He lied about the Malaysian airplane being shot down by a Russian rocket. He lied about Russian athletes doping at the Olympics. He lied about Russian behavior in eastern Ukraine. He lied about Assad's use of chemical weapons. He lied about interference in the Brexit vote. Just last week, he lied about the Kremlin's involvement in a recent nerve agent attack in the United Kingdom.

Yet when President Putin gives President Trump a ''strong and powerful denial'' that he didn't meddle in our elections, President Trump immediately accepts Putin's word over the considered judgment of America's dedicated intelligence professionals. It is almost as if Donald Trump is embracing Putin's needs. I am ashamed of it, and every American should be. No previous President would be that naive or that weak. No serious leader would allow themselves to be taken in so easily.

The only person with cause to celebrate is Vladimir Putin. Putin got to stand on the stage with an American President who refused to hold him accountable for anything. He watched President Trump careen through Europe, carrying out Putin's dream agenda—torching old alliances, interfering in the domestic affairs of the United Kingdom, weakening NATO and American power in the region. Putin skated through a bilateral summit and press conference without facing any consequences for deliberately meddling in our elections. Putin could not have scripted a better result.

I am from Brooklyn. If we learned anything, we learned one thing there: When there is a bully around, as Putin is, you show strength. President Trump showed abject weakness. Do you know what that means? The bully will continue to take advantage of it. If Donald Trump was such an easy mark in Helsinki, President Putin will realize he is an easy mark elsewhere.

The behavior of the President is just inexplicable. Everyone in the United States is scratching their heads. There seems to be no rational explanation for President Trump's behavior, and so millions of Americans are left wondering if Putin indeed has something over the President. That is the most logical explanation of the President's bizarre and weak behavior so deleterious to American interests.

If there is another credible explanation for why President Trump behaved the way he did, it would behoove the President to let the American people in on it; otherwise, so many Americans are going to continue to wonder, does President Putin have something over President Trump that makes the President behave in such a way that hurts our country so?

We know the President doesn't like to prepare much, but even the most basic preparation would lead a President away from the erratic behavior we saw yesterday. The truth is, the summit yesterday was like an x-ray machine, revealing that ''America First'' is really just ''Trump First,'' no matter what it means for the country he is sworn to defend from enemies foreign and domestic.

So the question looms: What will the Senate do in response? What will my Republican colleagues do in response? A few of them have echoed Senator MCCAIN's sentiments, and they deserve recognition for that, but those Senators who are not JOHN MCCAIN, who are here in the Senate wielding an immense power to shape events, I say to them, words are not enough. Our response to the debasement of American interests before a foreign adversary demands a response, not just in word but in deed. Our Republican colleagues cannot just talk the talk—some of them have done that, most haven't—but, as a body, they need to walk the walk. The American people are demanding it.

Our country needs to see Republicans in the Senate and the Republican Party stand up and show through action that unlike our President, they will not tolerate Russian aggression or accept Putin's lies. They need to act in the spirit of Ronald Reagan, not in the spirit of Donald Trump. Too often, when the President goes off the reservation, the Republican Party has lightly rebuked his behavior and waited for everyone to move on. Given the crisis, given Trump's horrible actions, that is not good enough. Our Republican colleagues cannot just go tsk-tsk. They must act if they want to help America.

Yesterday, I outlined four things we could do immediately in response to the President's disastrous summit. Let me repeat them and add a fifth.

First, ratchet up sanctions on Russia, not water them down. The sanctions we passed 98 to 2 have not even been fully implemented. Some in the House now want to reduce those sanctions. We need to strengthen them.

Second, and very importantly—probably most importantly—our Republican colleagues need to join us in demanding testimony from the President's national security team that was in Helsinki, and we need to do that immediately. We need hearings as soon as possible to assess what President Trump might have committed to President Putin in secret. President Trump's public statements were alarming enough. The Senate needs to know what happened behind closed doors. Does anyone believe he was tougher on Putin in secret? You can't assume anything but that as weak as he was in public before President Putin, he was even worse in private. Why else did he not want anyone in the room?

President Trump and President Putin met one-on-one behind closed doors for nearly 2 hours. Where are the notes from the meeting? What did the President agree to? Was Secretary Pompeo briefed afterward on what happened? Were any other members of the President's team briefed? The American people need to know what is happening. The American people deserve to know what is happening. It is our security at risk.

I am calling on Leader MCCONNELL and his leadership team to immediately request a hearing with Secretary of State Pompeo and the rest of the President's national security team from Helsinki so we can find out what the heck happened there—the explanation for what happened openly, and even more importantly, what happened in that meeting behind closed doors.

Third, our Republican friends must end the attacks on the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the special counsel. Those have mainly emanated from a small group in the House.

Given the indictments, given the indictment yesterday, not from Mueller but from mainline Justice, we have to let this investigation go forward. President Trump's actions yesterday lead many more Americans to suspect that something was amiss; that there may have been collusion. What else would explain President Trump's actions and protestations in a foreign country?

We need to end these attacks and let the investigation proceed unimpeded and encourage the President to sit down for an interview with Mueller.

Fourth, the President must insist on the extradition of the 12 Russians recently indicted for election interference. In one of the more bizarre of many bizarre incidents yesterday, Putin suggested that Americans come and interview the Russians in Russia or actually watch as Russian agents interview the Russians in Russia. Is Russia known for a free and open judicial system? Is Russia known for the rule of law? Of course not. It was an absurd suggestion. Any other President would have rejected it out of hand.

We need to bring them here, and the President, to represent the honor and the strength of the United States—something he has failed to do thus far—needs to demand it.

Finally, election security. Our elections are at risk. We have now had indictments of Russians interfering in the 2016 elections. Everyone in America, except Donald Trump, admits that happened—Democrats and Republicans, Speaker RYAN, Leader MCCONNELL—that Russia tried to interfere and interfere, most everyone believes, on President Trump's behalf. Why? Well, we heard Putin's explanation.

We can't have that happen again. We must move election security legislation immediately.

To its credit, in a bipartisan way, this Chamber and the other put $380 million in the last omnibus for election security, but there is very fine legislation. One is sponsored by Senator KLOBUCHAR, and she has worked with some of the Republicans on that. Another is sponsored by Senator CHRIS VAN HOLLEN. I believe Senator RUBIO is a cosponsor of that. We need to move that legislation—hopefully, with bipartisan support—quickly.

These are five simple things we can do together, Democrats and Republicans.

Now, yesterday, I saw my good friend—I see him sitting here—Senator CORNYN say that we have done most of these things already. I wish it were so. It isn't. We haven't done any of it. Leader MCCONNELL has not called for hearings to bring Secretary Pompeo and others here. We have not increased sanctions, which we should do. In fact, there is a move in the House to decrease them. We have not asked the President to demand extradition of the Russians. We have not urged some Republicans, particularly in the House, to stop interfering with the Mueller investigation. We haven't done any of the four items I mentioned yesterday or the fifth I mentioned today. I hope Senator CORNYN and others will lead the charge and help us get those done, in a bipartisan way, for the sake of this wonderful and great country.

The bottom line is that we need to act. A few statements will not change President Trump's behavior and will not stop President Putin from continuing to make a mess of our alliances around the world and our elections here in America. Action is required. The eyes of America are on the Republicans in the Senate to join us in the actions I have outlined or other actions they might feel appropriate.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, turning to SCOTUS, I will conclude this morning by adding that at this very delicate time, Senators from both parties should carefully scrutinize President Trump's Supreme Court nominee, Brett Kavanaugh. Not only has President Trump promised to select judges who would overturn Roe v. Wade and undo the healthcare law, Judge Kavanaugh has some troubling views on Executive power and accountability.

We have all just witnessed the behavior of a reckless President who has shown he is willing to test the bounds of Executive authority at home, just as he is willing to depart from all wisdom and sense on foreign soil.

Judge Kavanaugh has demonstrated in several writings that he believes the President should be above civil and criminal indictment while in office and that the President should be granted broad deference to enforce or not enforce laws he ''deems'' unconstitutional.

Consider for a moment what it would mean for the Supreme Court to rule that this President is immune from indictment or that he should be allowed to exercise his authority so wantonly as to decide which laws to enforce or not. That is all the more reason, given what Judge Kavanaugh has written, that he get careful and rigorous scrutiny before we move on any vote.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Blew, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, Department of Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:45 a.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Texas.

RUSSIAN ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I came to the floor to talk about the ''Abolish ICE'' movement and the reasons that is a misconceived idea by some on the left, but first I feel compelled to respond just briefly to some of the comments made by our friend from New York, the Democratic leader.

First of all, the Democratic leader says we need to have hearings on the matter of Russian interference in our elections. I would remind the Democratic leader that we have been doing that for a long time—ever since the intelligence community assessment was released at the end of the Obama administration documenting Russia's meddling in the election. That assessment was released on an unclassified basis. It is on the website of the Director of National Intelligence if anybody wants to read it.

Also, I would submit to him the 29-page indictment that Robert Mueller had issued by a grand jury against 12 Russian intelligence officers. It lays out in minute detail what the Russians were doing to try to cause confusion and undermine public confidence in our elections. As a matter of fact, this afternoon the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is hearing from some Obama administration officials on why they didn't do more to stop it back when President Obama was in office when they knew very clearly what was going on but did not do—well, did virtually nothing to stop it.

So I would say to my friend from New York, the Democratic leader, there have been a lot of hearings, and the hearings are ongoing. Obviously, Special Counsel Mueller has issued this indictment. I only wish that it was more than a name-and-shame exercise because there is no chance the Russians will extradite these intelligence officers over here for a trial. But I think it does serve a useful educational purpose by pointing out in minute detail what the Russians have been up to. They have upped their game in a way that is surprising to many people, having used everything from propaganda, to social media, to cyber theft of information like the Clinton emails and the DNC emails during the course of the last election. It has gotten very sophisticated. We better be about fixing it and getting ready for the next election rather than coming to the floor and engaging in the favorite Washington pastime, which is the blame game.

Senator SCHUMER said we need to issue sanctions against Russia. Well, I have in front of me about two single-spaced pages of actions that we have taken since the beginning of the Trump administration to support our allies against Russian aggression and to punish Russian misconduct, whether it is in the elections or otherwise. I would entertain—I understand the Senator from Colorado has some additional sanctions he thinks would be appropriate, and I think that would be something that would sting.

Rather than just sending a press release or trying to message this or use it for partisan political purposes, let's consider additional sanctions that will actually discourage and hold accountable the Russians for their election meddling and deter them, hopefully, from doing it again.

I understand the fourth thing my friend from New York said is that we need to stop criticizing the Comey FBI and the Department of Justice under the Obama administration. Well, it is pretty clear from the investigations that have occurred that something rotten was happening at the leadership of the FBI. Just to listen to Mr. Strzok—and his protestations that there was no bias associated with those investigations are patently unbelievable. It is unbelievable, not credible.

So I understand that the Democratic leader wants to focus his attention on the President. That is his prerogative, and, indeed, he has been the leader of the anti-Trump resistance since President Trump was elected.

Many of us do disagree with the President's assessment of the intelligence, as I have suggested. I firmly believe there is solid evidence of Russian meddling in the election. I think President Putin misrepresented the facts. I am not surprised by that given who he is and how he operates. As the Democratic leader said, as a former KGB colonel, he is accustomed to dissembling and distorting, manipulating information in a way that serves his purpose.

I think we should be absolutely clear. We all support the men and women who are the professionals who make up the intelligence community in this country, many of whom expose themselves to great danger, and, indeed, many have lost their lives trying to protect this country against adversaries around the world. I think the findings of the intelligence community assessment during the end of the Obama administration provides a roadmap to what the Russians did, as did the indictment of the 12 Russian GRU intelligence officials.

We better wake up. Rather than the blame game and pointing fingers, we better get ready for the next election, the midterm election in 2018.

I think there is a lot we can do together, but as long as this becomes a political, partisan, stop-Trump-at-all-costs effort, I don't think we are going to make much progress.

I will conclude this part of my remarks by saying that I trust our intelligence community. I trust their assessment that there was Russian meddling in the election. But I also trust the investigation so far, which has shown absolutely no collusion with the Trump campaign and Russian intelligence activity leading up to the election. That is what I think has the President so spun up, because he feels as though this is an attack on him personally. I wish we could separate those two. But, indeed, our Democratic colleagues don't want to separate them because they realize this is the best way to keep this story going for as long as they can through the next election and, who knows, through the next Presidential election as well.

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about this misguided effort to abolish ICE, Immigration and Customs Enforcement. This is the operational component of the Department of Homeland Security. We have seen this movement in hashtags on Instagram, on T-shirts. We have watched protestors who showed up in California when ICE agents were trying to investigate the trafficking of children. Can you imagine these protestors interfering with an investigation into the crime of human trafficking of children? But that is not all. Some of the House Democrats have introduced legislation to eliminate ICE.

Of course, any sensible person would tell you that eliminating ICE is reckless, which is why I recently introduced a resolution with 14 of our colleagues denouncing these radical calls in the strongest of terms. This is just reckless and naive, this ''Abolish ICE'' movement. It is a move that would be fundamentally irresponsible.

Based on one recent poll, close to 70 percent of the American people, when asked about it, opposed the idea—and for good reason. ICE was created, after all, in 2003 in response to the discovery that many of the 9/11 hijackers had exploited holes in our immigration enforcement and overstayed their tourist visas and attended flight schools without a proper visa. We know what happened on that terrible day, 9/11/2001. We know that hundreds of thousands of foreign nationals overstay their visas every year illegally. Without ICE, those unlawfully residing in our country, in violation of their visas, would be allowed to stay indefinitely. Is that what the ''Abolish ICE'' movement is about—eliminating enforcement of our immigration laws and allowing people who flout those laws to succeed in staying here in the United States in violation of those immigration laws?

Of course, abolishing ICE would mean ending all of the agency's programs and functions. It would mean allowing

dangerous criminals, including potential terrorists who are in our country, to remain here. It would mean scrapping the ICE Cyber Crime Center's investigation of child exploitation online. It would mean ending the ICE Blue Campaign to rescue human trafficking victims and provide them with a safe place to stay and other services. The Blue Campaign was just unanimously authorized by Congress, by the way, this year, and abolishing ICE would eliminate it. Abolishing ICE would mean doing away with the unit that focuses on human rights violators and war crimes. That unit is currently pursuing close to 2,000 leads. It would eliminate initiatives like Operation Community Shield, which combats the proliferation of transnational criminal gangs.

I hope our colleagues understand what they are encouraging when they say we should abolish ICE. I think it is incumbent on them to explain their rationale to the hard-working officials who are on the frontlines, fighting against human trafficking, child exploitation, and illegal immigration. What do they have to say to those people who risk their safety—perhaps even their lives—to enforce those important laws, much less to those whose jobs would be on the line?

There are some important statistics relating to Homeland Security Investigations, which is a critical part of ICE, that our Democratic friends who are encouraging the abolition of ICE should know about: 8,887, which is the number of visa applications that Homeland Security refused based on terrorist connections or other derogatory information; 904, which is the number of sexually exploited children identified and/or rescued by Homeland Security in 2017; 3,945, which is the number of cases initiated based on human smuggling last year; 4,735, which is the number of transnational gang members arrested in the United States in 2017; and 980,000, which is the number of pounds of narcotics Homeland Security Investigations seized in 2017, which included thousands of pounds of deadly drugs—like fentanyl—that help fuel the opioid crisis.

ICE plays a leading role in all of these areas. If the critics were to get their wish and if ICE were abolished, the numbers for all of these items would be zero because Homeland Security Investigations could not exist without ICE.

There is more. Think about the close to 33,000 criminal arrests made by Homeland Security Investigations last year—90 criminal arrests each day. Without ICE, these criminals would still be on the streets, endangering our communities. The $524 million in illicit currency that was seized would be back in circulation, being used in illegal transactions. There were 7,000 pounds of heroin, 57,000 pounds of methamphetamines, and 260,000 pounds of cocaine impounded last year. That poison would all be back on the market and being sold in our communities.

I hope our colleagues who are calling for the abolition of ICE are prepared to explain their reasoning for abolishing an agency that combats illegal drug sales and online exploitation and helps protect our Nation's borders. My respectful suggestion would be that they need to spend a little more time thanking these public servants for the critical role ICE plays in keeping all of us safe. Maybe they should spend a little time getting to know the ICE officers who go to work every day and do their duty, protecting our country.

Earlier this month, Vice President PENCE talked about this. He reiterated President Trump's words of support—that the men and women of ICE are incredible people. These include the more than 20,000 investigators, field officers, special agents, and analysts, who, as the Vice President said, ''stand up for the rule of law in this nation.''

Every day, ICE confronts criminal illegal immigrants who endanger our communities. They fight vicious gangs like MS–13 and stop human smugglers and child traffickers, sometimes endangering their own safety.

In 2017, the Vice President pointed out that attacks on Customs and Border Protection agents had increased by nearly 75 percent. Deliberately fostering resentment, anger, and contempt for ICE and our other law enforcement officials obviously puts our officers in additional danger. This is reckless, not to mention, again, dangerous.

ICE critics try to justify their calls by pointing out the situation at the border in which certain families were separated but are now in the process of being reunited. We all agree these families should be reunited, and I know the Presiding Officer has authored important legislation to change the law to make sure that families are kept together when they come across the border and claim asylum. But then there are cases processed in an expedited fashion in front of an immigration judge, so if they have some legitimate claim to asylum or immigration benefits, they can get that heard.

Also, one of the objectives, of course, is to eliminate the failed catch-and-release policies of the past, which have done nothing but encourage additional illegal immigration and reward criminal organizations for whom this is a business model, exploiting gaps in our immigration laws. Unfortunately, when we have Members of Congress who resist fixing those gaps, filling those gaps, and solving the problem, it does nothing but enrich these criminal organizations for whom this is gold.

It is clear that the situation at our border is a crisis. In 2014, President Obama called it a humanitarian crisis when tens of thousands of unaccompanied children came across the border, and that continues today because we haven't fixed the problem on a bipartisan basis, even though those solutions are readily available.

Those who criticize the enforcement of our immigration laws, the so-called zero tolerance policy, have focused on separating families. So what we have tried to do, since we all agree families should not be separated, is to provide a means for those once separated to be reunited and detained in appropriate facilities and have their cases heard on an expedited basis before an immigration judge. Not fixing the problem will simply encourage more of the same.

Unfortunately, as I said, our colleagues who refuse to be part of the solution actually are part of the problem. We know who wins in this game; it is the criminal organizations who are, as one expert said, ''commodity agnostic.'' They will traffic in children; they will traffic in guns; they will traffic in drugs—anything that makes them a buck. This is a very, very lucrative business model for them. Unfortunately, when we don't fix the problem by plugging the holes, we are unwittingly helping to support that business model.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

TARIFFS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I particularly enjoyed the remarks of my distinguished friend from Texas, a good man, who makes a real difference around here.

I rise today to speak on the administration's recent actions regarding global tariff policy. I am one of the President's strongest supporters in most matters. I have been steadfast in working with President Trump on our shared economic agenda, especially passage of the most important piece of tax reform legislation in a generation.

Tax reform is already providing significant relief to families and businesses, large and small. Businesses across the country are now more globally competitive and are investing in their workforce through wage hikes, bonuses, and increased 401(k) contributions that are benefiting American workers, families, and their communities. But this roaring economy, which we worked together to build for American workers and businesses, is at risk because of the President's trade policies.

Tariffs against our allies and partners in Europe, Canada, Mexico, and around the world are already harming American farmers and manufacturers and raising costs for American families. If this continues, our economy will suffer.

I have long advocated for implementing enforceable international rules to level the playing field for American businesses, innovators, and entrepreneurs, and I have consistently fought to protect U.S. intellectual property rights around the globe. I have also been committed to advancing a trade agenda that serves the American people. But the administration's recent actions are misguided and will harm, rather than protect, the American people.

The administration has implemented or threatened global tariffs on approximately $500 billion of goods. Pure and simple, tariffs are attacks on American businesses and consumers. These actions put American families and businesses at risk and threaten to undermine the success of tax reform. Furthermore, they are closing off international markets that our farmers, ranchers, and other exporters depend on.

I have heard from businesses from my home State of Utah that have already been hurt by the imposition of steel and aluminum tariffs. Utah manufacturers are struggling with higher steel and aluminum costs and, as a result, are struggling to compete with foreign manufacturers.

I have also been hearing from U.S. auto manufacturers and share their deep concerns about the consequences of raising tariffs on cars, trucks, and automotive parts. A decision to raise auto tariffs would lead to a net job loss and lower capital investment in the U.S. auto sector by increasing costs and reducing choice. The result will be lower demand for cars in the United States and lower auto sales and production.

While I share the administration's goal of strengthening American manufacturing, tariffs on cars and auto parts would directly injure one of our country's most important manufacturing sectors.

Some of my colleagues have been pressing the need for legislation to restrict the trade authorities that Congress has delegated to the President, and I have been sympathetic to their efforts. If the administration continues forward with its misguided and reckless reliance on tariffs, I will work to advance trade legislation to curtail Presidential trade authority. I am discussing legislative options with colleagues both on and off the Finance Committee, and I will continue to do so. However, I would much rather work with the administration to advance a trade agenda that serves the interests of the American people and job creators.

I want the President to hold our trading partners accountable. I want him to negotiate strong deals that help our U.S. companies and workers compete around the globe.

In particular, I agree with the President that China utilizes mercantilist trade policies to benefit state-owned and Communist Party-controlled firms, harming American companies and workers. We have to help U.S. businesses, innovators, farmers, and ranchers compete globally, and that means we have to confront the challenges posed by China. That is why I have recommended to the President that it is time to engage in negotiations with China, using a target of strategy to address their unfair trade practices. While those efforts are under way, the administration should not impose further tariffs on our allies and partners, particularly on autos and auto parts. In that way, the President can safeguard the economic growth we have worked so hard to achieve and give himself a strong negotiating position with China.

The administration's actions on trade have hurt American manufacturers, farmers, ranchers, workers, and families. The President has asked all of those groups to endure losses so that he can negotiate winning trade agreements. All are watching to see what the President will achieve at the negotiating table in return for their sacrifice. However, now is the time for the President to undertake that effort. I believe that I will support him if he does undertake that effort, and I hope he will.

I care a great deal for the President. I want him to be a success. These approaches are not successful. They are not the way to go. I want to help the President to get around those and do the things that he ought to be doing to strengthen our economy and to strengthen our workers and our businesses.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to oppose the nomination of James Blew for Assistant Secretary for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development at the Department of Education. I am opposing this nomination on behalf of the millions of parents, students, and teachers who made it clear during Secretary DeVos's confirmation process that they believe the Department of Education's top priorities should be helping to educate our students and supporting our public schools. They made it clear when they posted on social media, voicing concerns about Secretary DeVos's lack of experience and knowledge during her hearing in front of our HELP Committee, when they overwhelmed the Senate switchboard urging their Senators to vote against her nomination, and when they took to the streets to protest her nomination and her ideological agenda.

They made it clear that they believe every student has the right to a high quality public education—no matter where they live, how they learn, or how much money their parents make. Despite an unprecedented tie-breaking vote by Vice President PENCE, Secretary DeVos has ignored the public's overwhelming rejection to her extreme ideology. Instead, she continues to promote her privatization agenda, trying to shift taxpayer funds away from our public schools.

She is ignoring key parts of our Nation's K–12 law by refusing to hold States accountable for the success of our most vulnerable students. She is making it easier for predatory for-profit colleges and corporations to take advantage of students, rolling back protections for students and dismantling the unit that investigates claims of fraud and abuse. Time and again, she is failing our students and her duty to protect their civil rights.

She has tried to shrink the Office for Civil Rights, has rescinded guidance for schools on how to investigate claims of campus sexual assault, and has rolled back rules that protect transgender students, students of color, and students with disabilities.

All of those students, parents, and teachers who voiced their concerns about Secretary DeVos during her nomination have not gone away. They are still making their voices heard, demanding that the Department of Education start standing up for students.

Unfortunately, Mr. Blew, whose nomination is before us, has made it clear that he is cut from the same cloth. During his career, Mr. Blew has advocated for vouchers. He has failed to adequately support teachers with the tools they need to help their students succeed. He has even worked closely with and helped to fund Secretary DeVos's privatization efforts.

The Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development advises the Secretary in developing and implementing policy, which impacts every student in our country. It is a critical position. Given the actions and decisions by Secretary DeVos, it is very clear that we need an independent voice in this position. Unfortunately, Mr. Blew has proven that he is not up for that challenge. For that reason, I will vote against his nomination. I ask my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today the Senate is finally voting to confirm James Blew, who has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development at the U.S. Department of Education. He is well-qualified to lead that office. For 20 years, in various roles, he has advocated for improving educational opportunities by overseeing grants to low-income, high-risk schools. He has a M.B.A. from Yale University. He will be in charge of helping to manage the Department's budget and ensure that programs are working as intended.

Mr. Blew's sin with some of my friends on the other side is that he is in favor of giving low-income children a choice of a better school and in favor of

public charter schools, which gives teachers more freedom to teach and parents more freedom to choose the school for their child.

No one should be surprised that a Republican president would nominate such an Assistant Secretary of Education. Every Republican president has nominated assistant secretaries of education and secretaries of education—I was one of them—who support giving low-income children more choices of good schools—the same choices that wealthier children have—such as public charter schools.

As far as public charter schools go, every Democratic president since 1990, when the first charter schools were formed, has supported public charter schools.

Mr. Blew did not deserve to be subjected to the unreasonable delay and obstruction that the Democrats have given to his nomination. He was nominated on September 28, 2017, 292 days ago. We held a hearing on November 15, 2017, 244 days ago.

Going back to the Clinton administration, there had been no hearings for this position, but I held one anyway, as chairman of the committee, as a courtesy to Democrats. Then, Democrats forced Mr. Blew's nomination to be returned to the President at the end of the congressional session last year.

Let's see how that compares to how President Obama's first Assistant Secretary for the same job was treated. Carmel Martin was nominated on March 18, 2009, and was confirmed by voice vote without a hearing on May 1, 2009, 44 days later.

It is one thing to vote against a presidential nominee. That is appropriate. Any of us can do that. I think it is wrong to always vote against a presidential nominee just because you disagree with that nominee's point of view. Why would you not expect a Republican president to nominate an assistant secretary who favors giving poor children choices of good schools and supports public charter schools that were invented by the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota and were supported by every Democratic president since 1990? So this unreasonable delay of a well-qualified Assistant Secretary is not good for the Senate, not good for the country, and not good for children who need that sort of leadership.

I support and urge my colleagues to vote for Mr. Blew.

I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Blew nomination?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 156 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Corker	Inhofe	Scott
Cornyn	Isakson	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Sullivan
Crapo	Kennedy	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—49

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Udall
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Duckworth	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Harris	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2018.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, Johnny Isakson, John Kennedy, John Thune, John Boozman, Roy Blunt, John Cornyn, Tim Scott, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Cory Gardner, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2018, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 66, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 157 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Alexander	Flake	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Peters
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heitkamp	Risch
Capito	Heller	Roberts
Cardin	Hoeven	Rounds
Carper	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Collins	Isakson	Scott
Coons	Johnson	Shaheen
Corker	Jones	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	King	Tester
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Enzi	McConnell	Warner
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—33

Baldwin	Harris	Murray
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	Klobuchar	Smith
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Stabenow
Duckworth	Markey	Udall
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 66, the nays are 33.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all postcloture time on Executive Calendar No. 595 be considered expired at 2:25 p.m. and the Senate immediately vote on the nomination; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that following disposition of the nomination, the Senate vote on cloture on the Oldham nomination.

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:04 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the Federal Reserve's job is to ensure the economy works for average Americans; that Wall Street doesn't again crash the economy and decimate worker pensions; that banks can't cheat families out of their hard-earned savings; that monetary policy helps workers to find and keep a job that pays a living wage.

During his time in the Bush administration and his role at the Fed so far, Randy Quarles, nominated as Vice Chair of Supervision, has done the opposite. Time and again, Mr. Quarles has sided with Wall Street and not with workers.

Look what happened with the stress tests. The Fed allowed the seven largest banks to redirect $96 billion that should be used to pay workers, to reduce fees for consumers, and protect taxpayers from bailouts. Instead, they plowed that money into share buybacks and dividends that reward—you guessed it—wealthy executives and investors. Two banks had capital below the required amounts. Those banks failed the tests, but they got passing grades anyway.

Now the Fed is about to propose new rules to make stress tests even easier next year—making them less frequent and giving banks more leeway to design the exams they will then much more likely pass.

The Fed, under Mr. Quarles' leadership, wants to loosen limits on Big Bank borrowing, a move opposed by former Republican FDIC Chair Sheila Bair and former Vice Chair Tom Hoenig.

The Fed is proposing to weaken the Volcker rule—the rule that stops big banks from taking big risks with Americans' money—and the Fed is undercutting the role of FSOC and oversight of foreign megabanks that may soon join a proposal to undermine the Community Reinvestment Act. Again, this is a boon to Wall Street and a punch in the gut to American workers.

Wall Street simply doesn't respect the dignity of work. Data from last week tells a story Ohioans know too well—big banks and corporations are doing better than ever, while workers still haven't gotten a meaningful raise.

So now we install another nominee—this time for 14 years—who doesn't seem to understand that workers are the backbone of our economy? Mr. Quarles missed the 2008 crisis the last time he was in charge a decade ago. He spent his time at the Fed recently doing favors for Wall Street at the expense of working families. Americans cannot afford a nominee who fails American workers and homeowners and taxpayers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I rise to speak out against the nomination of Randal Quarles to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. Quarles served in the Bush administration's Treasury Department in the years that led up to the financial crisis of 2008. His failure to take action to prevent this crisis led to hundreds of thousands of foreclosures and evictions in my home State of Nevada. Nevada was ground zero for the financial crisis. We were the hardest hit of any State in the country. We had the highest foreclosure rate for 62 months straight, and we had the highest number of underwater mortgages. Banks took the homes of more than 219,000 Nevada families. Anyone driving through parts of Las Vegas and Reno in 2009 could see boarded-up houses, ''for sale'' signs, and empty lots everywhere. On many streets, you would see more houses in foreclosure than not.

I was attorney general in Nevada at this time. My team and I did everything we could to fight for homeowners and help them save their homes. We sued the big banks and secured $1.9 billion to create the Home Again: Nevada Homeowner Relief Program to help Nevadans stay in their homes.

As all of this was going on, I knew there was only so much we could do at the State level. We needed real change at the Federal level to prevent the financial crisis from ever happening again. The Federal regulators should have protected Nevada homeowners, but instead they protected the big banks. I ran for a seat in the Senate because I wanted to change the system. I wanted to put rules in place that protected Nevadans, not Wall Street bankers. That is why I cannot, in good conscience, support Randal Quarles' nomination to a 14-year term as a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve.

Randal Quarles was one of those policymakers in the Bush administration who let the big banks write their own rules. Maybe things would be different if he had learned the lessons of the financial crisis, if he had demonstrated any understanding that radical financial deregulation only helps the big banks, but Randal Quarles has been sitting on the Fed's Board of Governors since October of last year. Since then, he has advocated for policies that weaken oversight of the financial system, let big banks gamble with depositors' money, and undermine protections for consumers and homeowners.

Over a decade has passed since the rules he helped write caused hundreds of thousands of Nevadans to lose their homes, and he still hasn't learned his lesson. He is pushing the same agenda that led to the financial crisis in 2008. The mistakes he made as a member of the Bush administration devastated families and communities in my home State.

Now the Senate is about to reward him with a position—the Vice Chair of Supervision—that he will hold for the next 14 years. He will be the lead on writing the rules that govern Wall Street and the banks. I don't trust him to put families first. I don't believe he will make our financial systems safer and more fair. Randal Quarles shouldn't be allowed to oversee our financial system for 14 minutes. I refuse to rubberstamp his nomination for a position that lasts 14 years.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the nomination of the Honorable Randal Quarles to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The Senate has already confirmed Mr. Quarles—this Congress—to serve as a member of the Federal Reserve with a bipartisan vote of 65 to 32, but that term expired on February 1, 2018, and he has been serving as a member of the Board in a holdover capacity since. Confirming Mr. Quarles to a new 14-year term will provide needed stability at the Board and allow for the prompt consideration of other Board nominees.

Mr. Quarles has a wealth of government and private-sector experience dealing with both domestic and international financial markets. In addition to his current service on the Board, his government experience includes serving in multiple top posts in the Treasury Department.

Currently, only three of the seven available Board seats are filled, and several other nominees to the Board await confirmation. I have appreciated the important work carried out by Mr. Quarles at the Board thus far, including his role in developing regulatory and supervisory policy for the Federal Reserve System.

Some are arguing today he is responsible for the housing crisis. He wasn't on the Federal Reserve Board when the housing crisis occurred. Some have argued that he is trying to weaken stress tests. Yet today, in the face of that very argument, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve testified to the Banking Committee that the stress tests they applied this year, for which they are being criticized, are the strongest stress tests they have applied yet, and they have not given anybody a pass. In fact, those who did not completely pass the test are still required to maintain their capital requirements as they were last year.

If confirmed, I am confident Mr. Quarles' experience and skill will continue to be effective in terms of helping the Board promote the effective operation of the U.S. economy and serving the public interest.

He has previously received, as I said, bipartisan support, being confirmed last year as Vice Chairman by voice vote, and as a Board member by a vote of 65 to 32. Earlier today, the Senate's cloture vote on Mr. Quarles' nomination was 66 to 33—yet again another indication of strong bipartisan support for this nomination.

I urge all my colleagues to support Mr. Quarles' nomination today and vote for his confirmation.

I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Quarles nomination?

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 158 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Alexander	Flake	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Peters
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heitkamp	Risch
Capito	Heller	Roberts
Cardin	Hoeven	Rounds
Carper	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Collins	Isakson	Scott
Coons	Johnson	Shaheen
Corker	Jones	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	King	Tester
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Enzi	McConnell	Warner
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—33

Baldwin	Harris	Murray
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	Klobuchar	Smith
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Stabenow
Duckworth	Markey	Udall
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, Bob Corker, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Orrin G. Hatch, John Cornyn, David Perdue, John Barrasso, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 159 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Corker	Inhofe	Scott
Cornyn	Isakson	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Sullivan
Crapo	Kennedy	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—49

Baldwin	Feinstein	McCaskill
Bennet	Gillibrand	Menendez
Blumenthal	Harris	Merkley
Booker	Hassan	Murphy
Brown	Heinrich	Murray
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Nelson
Cardin	Hirono	Peters
Carper	Jones	Reed
Casey	Kaine	Sanders
Coons	King	Schatz
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Schumer
Donnelly	Leahy	Shaheen
Duckworth	Manchin	Smith
Durbin	Markey	Stabenow
Tester	Warner	Wyden
Udall	Warren	
Van Hollen	Whitehouse	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 49.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as I have done two or three times before in the last week, I would take some of my colleagues' time to discuss the nomination of Judge Kavanaugh to serve as an Associate Justice on the Supreme Court.

I think the debate surrounding his confirmation has highlighted the deep divide between how conservatives view the role of the judiciary versus how liberals view it. The reason liberal outside groups oppose Judge Kavanaugh's nomination is quite simple: They don't think he will promote their preferred policies and the outcomes of those policies while on the Bench.

I can't think of a better example that demonstrates how differently liberals and conservatives view the role of the judiciary, so let me tell you how I and most Americans view the role of the judiciary. There are pretty simple things we learned from high school government courses about the checks and balances of government—pretty simple, pretty common sense, because it is all about the purpose of the Constitution of the United States.

Under the Constitution, we have three branches of government. Congress makes the law, the President enforces the law, and the judiciary interprets and applies the law and the Constitution.

The judiciary's role as a coequal and independent branch of government is significant. It is confined. In the words from the Constitution, they can only deal with cases and controversies. As Alexander Hamilton explained in Federalist Paper No. 78, the judiciary ''may truly be said to have neither FORCE nor WILL, but merely judgment.'' In other words, the judiciary must stay in its lane—a very slow lane—calling balls and strikes as the courts see them, without trying to encroach on Congress's authority to make policy through the legislative process. When the Supreme Court goes beyond its mandate and enters the policymaking arena, it threatens the structure of our Constitution.

To preserve the judiciary's independence, Justices of the Supreme Court are appointed for life. They are not directly accountable to the voters for

their decisions. The American people can toss out those of us in Congress if we make bad policy decisions, but if a judge ends up legislating, we are stuck with a judge who made those bad decisions for life.

The benefit of this arrangement is that judges can make decisions according to the laws, not based on the whims of political opinion because they are immune from that political opinion. But the downside is that some judges can see their independence as a green light to override the policy choices of Congress or the States and substitute their own policy preferences. The threat this poses to self-government should be very self-evident: Instead of the people's representatives making policy choices, unelected judges who aren't answerable to the American people make them.

Conservatives believe that judges must rule according to the law as written. In any case, the law might lead to a liberal political result or, it might require a conservative political result, but the judge can't take that into consideration. The law must be interpreted regardless of whether the judge agrees with the political results of the decision. A good judge will oftentimes personally disagree with the result he or she reaches.

Many liberals view the role of the judiciary very differently. Liberals believe that an independent judiciary, unaccountable to the American people, is a very convenient way to achieve policy outcomes that can't be achieved through the democratic and representative process. That is why, in nearly every case before the Supreme Court, it is very predictable how the four Democrat-appointed Justices will rule. In most cases, they will reach the result that achieves liberal political goals. How else can you explain the fact that the Democrat-appointed Justices have voted to strike down every restriction on abortion—a right that appears nowhere in the Constitution—but would uphold restrictions on political speech or gun rights? After all, these rights are expressly covered by the First and Second Amendments.

The unfortunate reality is that liberal jurisprudence is thinly veiled liberal policymaking, and I am very generous when I say ''thinly veiled.'' This explains many of the leftwing attacks on Judge Kavanaugh that are now going on. Judge Kavanaugh has a track record of putting aside any policy preferences that he has and ruling according to the law as it is written. I think this is a virtue. Indeed, it is necessary for judges to do that—to show their impartiality, to show their judicial temperaments. But liberal outside groups and their Senate allies see this as a threat. They want judges who will impose their policy preferences—only have those policy preferences disguised as law, of course. They want politicians hiding under their judicial robes. That is why many of the attacks on Judge Kavanaugh are based on policy outcomes.

Leftwing groups are spending millions of dollars to convince the American people that Judge Kavanaugh is hostile to their preferred policies. I believe this effort will be unsuccessful. What the American people see in Judge Kavanaugh is a judge who will rule according to the law, not for or against various policies.

Nine Ivy League Justices and their cadre of mostly Ivy League law clerks aren't equipped to replace Congress's exclusive lawmaking function.

One attack I have seen on Judge Kavanaugh is that he represents a threat to the Affordable Care Act's protection of people with preexisting conditions. I want to tell you why numerically that just doesn't work out—because the same five Justices who twice upheld the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act are still on the Court. Justice Kennedy, whom Judge Kavanaugh would replace, voted to strike down the Affordable Care Act. In other words, even assuming you could predict Judge Kavanaugh's vote 1 year or 10 years from now on the Affordable Care Act, his vote would not change the outcome. Moreover, Judge Kavanaugh had two opportunities to strike down the Affordable Care Act on the DC Circuit, where he now serves. He did not do it. So where do they get the idea that he is a predictable vote to undo the ACA?

For those of us for repeal, maybe we ought to vote against him because he hasn't voted that way on the DC Circuit—those of us who thought the Affordable Care Act should be repealed—and because he may not be a sure vote to do that. And even if he were, there are still five votes to preserve it.

The leftwing groups might want to put away their crystal ball. Even the New York Times fact checker threw cold water on the argument that Kavanaugh was a sure vote against the Affordable Care Act. The New York Times labeled the leftwing attacks ''exaggerated.''

Another attack on Judge Kavanaugh is that he is hostile to abortion rights. This attack misrepresents his record on the DC Circuit. There, Judge Kavanaugh acknowledged that the court must decide the case based on Roe v. Wade and subsequent abortion decisions. He applied the precedent, as precedent requires judges to so do.

We hear the same fearmongering over abortion every time there is a Supreme Court vacancy. I remember that 38 years ago when Sandra Day O'Connor was going to be the first woman appointed to the Supreme Court, there was real worry then that Roe v. Wade was in jeopardy. She is one of those who preserved it in the Casey v. Planned Parenthood case 12 years later, as she got on the Court. Yet Roe v. Wade is still the law of the land. Justices have a way of surprising us. I think Justice Kennedy, now leaving the Court, was one of those because even though we didn't pursue this in depth with him at his hearing, those of us who are pro-life—and I am one of them—were pretty assured that Kennedy might be one of those votes to override Roe v. Wade. Yet, in 1992, in the Casey v. Planned Parenthood case, Kennedy was one of the majority who voted not to do any harm whatsoever to Roe v. Wade.

There is no way to predict how a Justice will rule in a particular case. Many times, this Senator has been disappointed by what he thought a Justice might do if approved. Who could have predicted that Judge Scalia, for example, would strike down a ban on flag-burning? Just this term, we saw how Justices appointed by Republican Presidents can reach decisions with liberal political results because that is what the law requires. In Sessions v. Dimaya, Justice Gorsuch sided with an immigrant who challenged a statute under which he could have been deported as unconstitutionally vague. In Carpenter v. the United States, our Chief Justice Roberts, who most of the time is considered a conservative or strict constructionist, held that police were required to obtain a warrant before searching cell phone location data. If you are a law enforcement person, you consider that a bad decision. If you are a privacy rights person, you consider Chief Justice Roberts to be right.

It is sad—very sad—but not surprising that leftwing groups and their Senate allies oppose Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation based on policy concerns rather than on legal concerns. Luckily, a majority of Americans and a majority of Senators believe that the mark of a really good judge is someone who does what the Constitution assigns them to do—interpret the law as written, regardless of whether the result is liberal or conservative or even anything in between. As Justice Gorsuch said, judges wear robes, not capes.

In his 12 years on the DC Circuit, Judge Kavanaugh has a clear track record of setting aside any policy preferences and ruling according to law as Congress wrote it. Criticizing the results of certain decisions says more about his critics than about the judge himself.

We are already seeing an attempt at Borking Judge Kavanaugh. I was in the Senate when liberal groups and some of my colleagues smeared the highly respected Judge Bork after he was nominated for the Supreme Court. Judge Bork was very candid with the Senate Judiciary Committee. He was unfairly attacked for being so candid. We are seeing liberal groups and their Senate allies try to replicate this shameful episode.

But since the nomination of Justice Ginsburg to the Supreme Court, the tradition has been for nominees to, in her words, give ''no hints, no forecasts, no previews'' of how they would vote, and that applies to how they would address certain cases. In a press conference last year, the minority leader affirmed that ''there is a grand tradition that I support that you can't ask''

a judicial nominee ''about a specific case that might come before them.'' That is exactly the Ginsburg rule.

I expect, if Judge Kavanaugh wants to be on the Supreme Court not only for the sake of being on the Supreme Court, getting there, but also to serve the role he ought to serve as an impartial Justice, that he is going to follow the Ginsburg rule when he comes before my Judiciary Committee. I implore my colleagues not to try to extract assurances about how he will rule in specific cases in exchange for a confirmation vote, because they ought to get the answer from Kavanaugh that Ginsburg would give and, as far as I know, every one of the nominees since then.

The only question that matters is this: Does Judge Kavanaugh strive to apply the law as written by Congress, regardless of his personal views? From what I know about Judge Kavanaugh—and I haven't gone through all of his 300 opinions yet that he has written as a circuit judge, but the answer appears to be yes.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if there is one thing we have been able to rely on over the past half century or so, it is Democratic hysteria over Republican Supreme Court nominations. No sooner does a Republican President announce a nomination than the Democrats are off and running. It doesn't matter who the nominee is—the playbook is the same. The Democrats warn that equal rights are in jeopardy; that our system of government may not survive; in fact, that Americans may not survive. That is right. In the lead-up to Justice Gorsuch's confirmation, the head of one liberal organization stated that there was ''substantial evidence'' that if Gorsuch's ''egregious views were to become law, Americans' lives . . . would be put at risk in untold ways.'' I am happy to report that a year into Justice Gorsuch's tenure on the Supreme Court, Americans seem to be doing OK.

Fast-forward to Judge Kavanaugh's Supreme Court nomination, and once again, Democrats are predicting that the sky will fall if a Republican President's Supreme Court nominee is confirmed.

Faced with an eminently well-qualified, mainstream nominee, they have been forced to resort to distortions or outright conspiracy theories to make their case. Their statements have been so extreme that they have already been called out more than once by the mainstream media.

The New York Times—not exactly known as an apologist for the Republican Party—published a fact check with the headline ''Democrats Overstate Kavanaugh's Writings on the Affordable Care Act.''

The Washington Post published a fact check that described a Democratic characterization of Kavanaugh as ''extreme distortion.'' Two tweets offering a truly absurd conspiracy theory about Justice Kennedy's resignation received four Pinocchios from the Washington Post—a rating that qualifies the tweets as ''whoppers.''

At the root of Democrats' frenzy is their belief that the only good Supreme Court Justice is a Supreme Court Justice who shares their political beliefs and who will rule in support of them. That is a very disturbing point of view. Our system of government is based on the rule of law, but the rule of law depends on having judges who will rule based on the law and the facts, not on their personal opinions.

Once judges start ruling based on their political opinions or their feelings about what they would like the law to be, then we will have replaced the rule of law with the rule of individual judges. That is exactly what Democrats are pushing for. They are looking for Supreme Court Justices who will rule based not on the law but their personal beliefs. More specifically, they are looking for judges who will rule based on Democrats' beliefs. Just look at the Democrats' statements since Judge Kavanaugh's nomination. Democrats aren't interested in whether Judge Kavanaugh is qualified or will rule in accordance with the law; instead, they are concerned about his views on specific issues and whether those views line up with Democrats' opinions.

Democrats want a Supreme Court that will ratify the opinions of the Democratic Party, whether or not those opinions are in line with the law or the Constitution. Of course judges have political opinions. Of course judges have personal feelings. When you are a judge, your job is to leave those things at the courtroom door. Your job is to judge based on the law and the facts, even when you don't like—especially when you don't like the outcome. As Justice Gorsuch has said, ''A judge who likes every outcome he reaches is very likely a bad judge—stretching for results he prefers rather than those the law demands.''

I don't know how Judge Kavanaugh would rule on the cases he would face as a member of the Supreme Court, but I do know that in each and every case, he would look not for the results he prefers but for those the law demands.

In a 2017 speech at Notre Dame Law School, Judge Kavanaugh said:

> I believe very deeply in those visions of the rule of law as a law of rules, and of the judge as umpire. By that, I mean a neutral, impartial judiciary that decides cases based on settled principles without regard to policy preferences or political allegiances or which party is on which side in a particular case.

That is it. That is the job of a judge—to serve as the umpire, to call the balls and strikes, not rewrite the rules of the game.

When you are considering a candidate for Congress, political opinions, like those the Democrats are demanding, matter. When it comes to judges, there are really only two important questions: First, is this judge well qualified? Second, does this person understand the proper role of a judge? When it comes to Judge Kavanaugh, the answer to both questions is yes. His qualifications are outstanding. He is a graduate of Yale Law School. He clerked for a Supreme Court Justice. He is a lecturer at Harvard Law School. Most importantly, as a judge on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, he has handed down thoughtful, well-respected decisions that reveal his deep respect for the law and the Constitution and his understanding that it is a judge's job to interpret the law, not to legislate from the bench.

It is unfortunate that Democrats' belief that the only good judges are liberal judges is preventing them from giving an outstandingly qualified nominee like Judge Kavanaugh a fair hearing. There is still time for them to abandon their partisan political opposition and take a real look at Judge Kavanaugh's qualifications for the Supreme Court. I hope they will.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRUMP-PUTIN SUMMIT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues this afternoon to talk about the President's deeply embarrassing and disgraceful meeting with President Putin yesterday.

But first, allow me to comment on what we just heard from the President. A few minutes ago, President Trump seemed to say that he accepts the findings of the intelligence community that Russia meddled in our election. Well, welcome to the club, President Trump.

We have known since the middle of the 2016 election that they meddled. For the President to admit it now is cold comfort to a disturbed public that has watched him bend over backward to avoid criticizing Putin directly. President Trump may be trying to squirm away from what he said yesterday, but it is 24 hours too late—and in the wrong place—for the President to take a real stance on Putin's election meddling.

Amazingly, President Trump, after reading his statement that he accepted the intelligence community's conclusion that Putin meddled in our election, added, in his own words, ''could be other people also. A lot of people out there.'' This is just like Charlottesville. He made a horrible statement,

tried to back off, but couldn't even bring himself to back off. It shows the weakness of this President. It shows the weakness of President Trump—that he is afraid to confront Mr. Putin directly. Like a coward, he tries to squeal away from it when he is several thousand miles away.

What is President Putin going to take out of the President's actions today? That the man is weak, that he is afraid, that he is cowardly, and that Putin will feel he can take even further advantage of Donald Trump.

The President is now asking the American people not to believe their own eyes and ears about what he told the world in Helsinki yesterday. Even in his completely implausible effort to ''correct'' his own words, he departed from his text to again claim that the hacking could have been done by someone other than Russia. If the President can't say directly to President Putin ''Mr. Putin, you are wrong and we are right; our intelligence agencies are right,'' it is ineffective, and worse, it shows such weakness. It tells President Putin to continue to take advantage of the United States because President Trump doesn't have the courage, the strength, maybe not even the conviction to say to President Putin's face what he tried to say a few minutes ago.

The President's comments a moment ago changed very little. The question still remains: What will the Senate do in response? I have seen a few of my Republican colleagues shrug their shoulders, claiming they have done all they can. That is bunk. As Senators, we have a responsibility and an ability—an incredible power given to us by the Founding Fathers to check and balance this President.

As I said this morning, here are a few things the Senate can do immediately in response to the President's disastrous summit. We can ratchet up sanctions on Russia, not water them down. Sanctions we passed 98 to 2 have not even been fully implemented by the Trump administration. And now someone has inserted a loophole to water them down in the House defense legislation.

Second, our Republican colleagues need to immediately join us in demanding public testimony from the President's national security team that was in Helsinki. Secretary Pompeo, DNI Director Coats, Ambassador Huntsman, and anybody else who was part of that team ought to be testifying openly, publicly, and directly to Congress. We need to know this because, as frightening and damaging as the President's comments were to the public in Helsinki, what he said behind closed doors is, in all likelihood, even worse. Why did the President want to close the doors? There are lots of explanations. None of them are good. Does anyone believe that President Trump was tougher on Putin in secret? Why else did he not want anyone in the room?

Next, where are the notes from that meeting? What did the President agree to? Can we have the translator come in and testify? Was Secretary of State Pompeo briefed afterward on what happened? Did he take notes? Were any other members of the President's team briefed? The notes need to be turned over to Congress immediately.

I am calling on Leader MCCONNELL and his Republican leadership team to immediately request a hearing with Pompeo, Coats, Huntsman, the rest of the President's national security team in Helsinki, and with the translator, so we can learn the full extent of what happened behind closed doors. Our national security is at risk. It is an unusual request for unusual times.

Next, our Republican friends must end attacks on the Justice Department, the FBI, particularly the special counsel, and let the investigation proceed unimpeded. The best way to do this is to pass the legislation, authored by a bipartisan group led by Senators COONS and BOOKER on our side and Senator TILLIS and GRAHAM on the Republican side, which passed out of the Judiciary Committee.

Leader MCCONNELL, if you are serious about checks and balances, if you are serious about making sure President Trump obeys the law and protects our security, put that bill on the floor now. It will pass.

Fourth, the President must release his tax returns and insist that the 12 Russians indicted for election interference are handed over. The President has refused to release his tax returns, but these bizarre actions he has taken seem to indicate that President Putin has something over President Trump, something personal, and it might be financial. We need to see the tax returns.

Finally, we must move the election security legislation immediately. Senator KLOBUCHAR has bipartisan legislation. Senator VAN HOLLEN has bipartisan legislation. Senator HARRIS has legislation. We need to move it. Leader MCCONNELL has talked about it a little bit. Let's move it quickly, but remember, the President still has control because the Director of National Intelligence has the ability to put out this report, and he is, after all, a Presidential appointee. I have some faith in the integrity of Mr. Coats, but he may not even be there after November, particularly given the way President Trump treats his appointees. So that legislation is good and necessary, but hardly sufficient.

I hope our Senate will move; I hope our Republican colleagues will not just talk the talk, but walk the walk. ''Tsk, tsk'' is not enough when national security is at stake. Action—bipartisan action—is required.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to follow my leader and talk about this issue of great importance.

Let me begin with something I cherish. I have a photo, taken on December 1, 2016, of one of my children in snowy fields in Lithuania in a U.S. military operation with NATO troops called Operation Iron Sword. The photo is of my son taking the oath of office to become a captain in the United States Marine Corps. He was deployed with 1,200 members of his battalion on the border of Russia between the Black Sea and the Baltic Sea, to protect America against a nation that General Joe Dunford, the head of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, describes as our principal adversary. These 1,200 young men and women were deployed far from home, working together with a nation on the Russian border to protect them and to protect our country.

My son was not alone with the Marines; there were also troops from many NATO nations and Lithuania and troops from other service branches of the United States. I hope you will forgive me for being a little bit Marine-centric.

The Marine motto ''Semper Fidelis'' means ''always faithful,'' but I think that motto applies not just to marines but to all who wear the uniform in the United States, certainly those helping the European allies counter Russian aggression and those 1.3 million people on Active Duty today—''always faithful.''

After the last week, a very profound question has been raised. While our troops can carry that and meet that ''always faithful'' standard, I think we have some significant questions about this President. Would he meet the same standard—''Semper Fidelis,'' ''always faithful''? Would he meet it for this country? Will the Senate meet the ''always faithful'' standard?

In the President's first year and a half in office, exercising the responsibility to be a Commander in Chief, I would say he has been a bit more of a ''disruptor in chief.'' We have had Presidents of both parties since the beginning of the 20th century—Presidents Wilson, FDR, President Truman, President Reagan, other Presidents of both parties—who always tried to be Commanders in Chief, who tried to be builders of security, builders of alliances. That is not the path the current President has taken. He has tried to be more of a disruptor.

He has pulled America out of a diplomatic deal with Iran that allied nations in the International Atomic Energy Agency said Iran was complying with. I am not aware of the United States ever unilaterally backing out of a deal when there was a consensus that the other nations were complying with it.

He has pulled us out of a climate accord that we reached with other nations in Paris.

He has unilaterally decided that the United States would be the only holdout nation not participating in a U.N. global compact on migration to try to deal with the problem of migrants around the world.

He has loved to name-call our allies. It was shameful last week on his trip

to Europe that, essentially sitting in Prime Minister Theresa May's front office, he trashed her—one of our great allies. He trashed Angela Merkel, and he has done this before to the Prime Minister of Canada, the Prime Minister of Australia. Important allies of the United States have found themselves being name-called by this petty man. He has undercut valuable U.S. alliances. He described last week the European Union and Europe as our principal foe. He has repeatedly described NATO as obsolete. He has now launched trade wars against allies of the United States, asserting that national security demands that he do so.

The Presiding Officer and I were together in a meeting with the Canadian Foreign Minister in the last couple of weeks. She looked us in the eye and asked: Do you know how insulting it is that you would describe Canada—with the longest, undefended border in the world with another country, your ally in every war since the War of 1812, whose troops are serving side by side with Americans in Afghanistan, and who are fighting ISIS in Iraq today—as a national security threat?

We heard the same thing from Germany's Foreign Minister in the aftermath of this parade of insults against our allies last week. In the aftermath of using a national security waiver against our allies, the German Foreign Minister said just yesterday—and these should be painful words for anybody who cares about this country—that the United States is no longer a reliable ally.

To top all of this off, if there is a new low—and it may be debased even further tomorrow—it is the President's performance of standing next to Vladimir Putin, whose aggression against other nations, including the United States, has put troops, like my son, on the Russian border to work with allies halfway around the world—far from their families, far from their homes—and taking Putin's side over that of patriotic Americans who are working in our national security establishment and who have unanimously concluded that Russia attacked our 2016 election.

For him to say ''Well, my people say they did, but he says they didn't; I can't see why Russia would,'' what an abomination to all of the hard-working Americans who are with agencies like the CIA and the FBI and with other national security agencies who have reached a consensus opinion that Russia cyber attacked the integrity of our elections. To have watched this President stand on the stage publicly and say that he believed Vladimir Putin over patriotic Americans who were doing this work was a new low. They attacked us.

A President who would say there are good people on both sides of a White supremacy rally when there were three people killed in Charlottesville, VA, including two State Troopers I knew, is the same President who would stand next to a dictator who attacked us and take his side over the side of American security professionals.

So I return to the question. The Americans who wear the uniform, whether they be marines or not, are always faithful. The President's performance, especially in the last week, raises deep questions about whether he meets that standard. Yet I think, for purposes of today, as I conclude, the question has to be: Will the Senate meet the standard?

I don't expect anyone in the administration to check this bad behavior. Some may encourage the President to do differently. Some may try to check the bad behavior, but I don't think they will be able to. I think we would be naive, frankly, to think that the House of Representatives would check the bad behavior. The fact that the Select Committee on Intelligence's investigation on the House side has gone off the rails suggests that it will not.

The question is posed pretty starkly, and it sits directly on our shoulders: Will the U.S. Senate take the steps to protect this country from the destruction we are seeing right now?

There needs to be a briefing of the Senate as to what was going on last week and what was discussed with Vladimir Putin and what could be the justification for the horrible capitulation we saw.

We need to do all we can to protect the Mueller investigation and let it reach its end point so we know who was culpable and how to protect our elections. The Russians who have invaded our election system need to be extradited to the United States. The administration needs to implement the sanctions legislation that this body passed by 98 to 2.

We also need to grapple with election security questions. I was a mayor and a Governor with boards of elections that ran elections, and no one has confidence that this President and this administration will protect American elections.

As I close, I will just say—and I have not said it in the time I have been in the Senate, and I hope I never say it again—that I think this issue and this time may well be one of the most important moments in the history of the entire U.S. Senate. We will either rise to the occasion and will show that we are always faithful or we will not. I hope we will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, back in the day when I was a trial lawyer and we had had a witness come to the stand who had made a big mistake—who had said something that would hurt your case or, maybe, even decide it the wrong way or who had misrepresented someone—you went through a period of rehabilitating the witness, which meant, basically, asking friendly questions and trying to get that witness back into a credible position. Sometimes it works and sometimes it doesn't.

This afternoon, President Trump attempted to rehabilitate himself for his performance in Helsinki, Finland.

The President said:

> While I had a great meeting with NATO, raising vast amounts of money, I had an even better meeting with Vladimir Putin of Russia. Sadly, it is not being reported that way—the Fake News is going Crazy!

I don't think that comment is going to rehabilitate President Trump from his performance in Helsinki. It was sad, heartbreaking, and, in many ways, infuriating to think that he stood within a few feet of this Russian tyrant and said he believed that man, Vladimir Putin, more than he believed the intelligence agencies—the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice—of the United States of America. That was what he said, and it was a moment that will not easily be forgotten. It is not something he can talk his way out of.

He made similarly incoherent and jarring comments moments ago in an apparent damage control event. He went so far as to say that our NATO allies ''were thrilled'' with his recent visit during which he bullied and belittled them.

In some moments, the President loses touch with reality. He believes that we are suffering from national amnesia and that we can't remember what happened yesterday or last week. We remember. The reason we remember is that it is such a dramatic departure from the conduct of previous Presidents and that it is such a dramatic departure from the history of the United States. I think our President's sense of history reaches back to the day before yesterday and not far beyond.

He does not realize, as President Reagan said so often, that our NATO alliance is critical to the security of the United States and to our European friends and to the world. He just doesn't get it. He doesn't understand why that alliance is so critical. He belittles it. He bullies the members. He picks some of our strongest allies and decides to make them spectacles of his performance. That doesn't make it any easier for them to continue to stand by our side, and it, certainly, doesn't put them in a position of trusting us in the future if they desperately need us.

My mother was born in Lithuania, in the Baltics. I have been there many, many times. They are great little countries—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—and next-door, Poland. They have seen a lot over the years. They have been overrun by Nazis and Communists, and they have seen their freedoms be eliminated under autocratic rule. They believed, when they finally restored democracy about 25 or 30 years ago, that their only chance—their only guarantee of any future—was going to be with the NATO alliance, with becoming part of Europe—with becoming part of this great alliance with the United States.

Last night, I was with Gordon Smith, a former Senator from Oregon. We both

remembered a visit to Lithuania in 1999 where there was this rally, this small rally, in one of the public streets in Lithuania. It was a NATO rally or, as they called it, ''GNAT-OH.'' They were chanting in Lithuanian how much they wanted to be part of NATO. They understood then and they understand today that the NATO alliance is Lithuania's ticket to freedom, that the NATO alliance is its insurance policy. The NATO alliance gives it hope that there will not be another generation of Lithuanians who will live in suppression and chains.

When the President belittles this and suggests that, perhaps, the Baltics are on the table when he talks of Vladimir Putin, it strikes fear in the hearts of God-fearing people who basically can still remember what it means to be under the heel of the Communist leadership of Moscow. The President just doesn't get it. He does not understand the importance of it. He, certainly, doesn't understand Vladimir Putin. To think that he would allow Putin to use what he called ''powerful words'' and deny what we already know to be true says that the President is very gullible.

What is it about this relationship between Donald Trump and Vladimir Putin? How can you explain this? Why would a President of the United States be bowing and scraping to this Russian tyrant—to a man who has a dismal record when it comes to human rights, to a man who led his troops in the invasion of the nation of Georgia and who invaded Ukraine and who took over Crimea, to a man who set up a situation in Syria in which innocent people would die and in which their own tyrant would succeed, to a man who invaded our election process as he did?

I guess what we are looking for now, as our minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, said earlier, is an accounting of what actually happened in Helsinki. This disastrous meeting between President Trump and Vladimir Putin needs to be fully explained to the American people. I join with Senator SCHUMER in calling for hearings with the President's Helsinki team—with Mike Pompeo, the Secretary of State, and with Dan Coats, the Director of National Intelligence and a man I greatly respect, who showed a steel spine this last week as he witnessed the President's turning on him and the intelligence community, and with Mr. Huntsman, our Ambassador to Moscow. They should all be coming to Washington quickly to explain what happened and how to repair the damage created by President Trump.

We need to see a transcript of the one-on-one meeting with President Trump and Vladimir Putin. If he were so deferential in his public press conference with Vladimir Putin, what did our President say to Putin behind closed doors? It is not too much for the American people to ask for an accounting.

We need to make sure that the Republicans will join us in protecting the Office of Special Counsel. So far, Robert Mueller's investigation has led to the indictments of 32 individuals, and 5 have already pled guilty. The latest included 12 Russian intelligence agents who were specified by name as being involved in the efforts to undo our election.

We also need something that is very basic and, I think, that all of us have now come to realize is essential. President Donald Trump can no longer refuse to disclose his income tax returns. He did it throughout the campaign. He has refused to make a disclosure since. We need to know his financial relationship with Russia and Vladimir Putin's oligarchs. There has to be more to the story than we know today, and it is time for this President to come clean.

Finally, we need to press for election security legislation. We live in a dangerous moment. I also agree with former Senator Dan Coats. It is a moment at which the Russians will try to take advantage of us.

My last plea will be to my colleagues who have not spoken out clearly on this subject—not to the Presiding Officer, because he has spoken out, and I respect him so much. We need them to come forward and make it clear on a bipartisan basis that we stand together when it comes to foreign policy, the values of this Nation, and the security of the United States. We understand that Vladimir Putin has been a tyrant who has really made life miserable and who has killed many innocent people in his rage against the West and against the United States.

Most of all, we need more Republican Senators who will join with those in the past who have stepped forward and put country first over party. I remember reading the history of the Nixon years and the breaking point. The breaking point finally occurred when people like Republican Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, stood up and said: ''There are only so many lies you can take, and now there has been one too many.'' He joined with several other Republican Senators and went down to the White House and sat face-to-face with President Richard Nixon. They sat directly in front of him and explained that enough was enough.

It will take that. It will take that again for Republican Senators to have the courage to meet with this President and tell him he has to stop giving away the heritage, the values, and the legacy of the United States of America.

Those courageous Americans back in that day were, of course, talking about lies, corruption, obstruction of justice, and dangers to our democratic system. They took the oath of office. It is the same one we have taken to protect the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and to, certainly, put party second to our obligations to our Nation.

For their courage, we and history owe them a debt of gratitude. Since yesterday's fiasco with Putin, only one Republican has spoken specifically on the Senate floor about this crisis. He was joined by the most eloquent statement by JOHN MCCAIN, who, because of illness, could not be physically present. That is it. It is not enough.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to urge this body to uphold our solemn responsibility to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States and to protect the Nation from all enemies, foreign and domestic.

I have long believed the President's words and actions have undermined our national interests and our values, but yesterday felt different.

As someone who has sat for 26 years on the House and Senate Foreign Relations Committee, it was a day of infamy in the history of our foreign policy.

Yesterday, the American people witnessed a supplicant President of the United States capitulate to a brutal foreign leader on the world stage. Far from standing up to Putin, President Trump was unable to even acknowledge Russia's attack in 2016 and the continued threat it poses today. Instead, the President reverted to his own insecurities about his electoral victory and disturbingly subverted the work of the men and women who lead our intelligence community.

I shouldn't have to repeat this, but I will, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are as unequivocal as well. Seventeen—seventeen—U.S. intelligence agencies together assessed that Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered a sophisticated influence campaign aimed at the 2016 Presidential election. Yet the President said he had ''no reason to believe'' Russia interfered, and I have no reason to believe what he tried to clean up today.

Those statements directly contradicted statements from then-CIA Director Mike Pompeo—who is now the Secretary of State—the U.S. Vice President, Michael Pence, and the Director of U.S. National Intelligence.

The President said:

> I have great confidence in my intelligence people, but I will tell you that President Putin was extremely strong and powerful in his denial today. And what he did is an incredible offer; he offered to have the people working on the case come and work with their investigators—

With respect to the 12 military intelligence officers that the special counsel indicted—

> I think that is an incredible offer.

The only incredible thing about that offer is that the President of the United States would invite the perpetrator of the crime to help with the investigation. That is incredible.

Every time President Trump failed to stand up to Vladimir Putin felt like a collective punch in the gut of the American people. It was disturbing and saddening to see the leader of the free world shrink in the face of a dictator.

Just as disturbing is, we have no idea what transpired between President Trump and Putin during their secretive, lengthy meeting. What could the President need to discuss with President Putin for 2 hours with no other advisers present? If President Trump said such appalling things in public, Lord knows what he would have said to Putin in private. We deserve to know what was said and what was agreed to. We can't afford to be blindsided or outmaneuvered.

Just today, the Russian Ministry of Defense publicly stated it is preparing to start implementing an agreement that the President apparently struck in Helsinki with President Putin—an agreement that neither Congress nor the American people have been informed about.

President Trump, to adequately protect America's interests, we need to know what commitments you made to Putin. What specific topics did you discuss? What were the suggestions President Putin made to you? Did you discuss any changes to international security agreements, and, if so, what were they? Did you advocate for the extradition of the 12 Russian intelligence officers indicted last Friday? Did you make any commitments to the U.S. role regarding Syria? Did you press Russia to return to compliance with the INF Treaty and halt its nuclear threats against Europe? Did you discuss U.S. sanctions on Russia, including CAATSA sanctions that this body passed 98 to 2? If so, did you commit to any action?

Did you call upon President Putin to withdraw from Crimea and eastern Ukraine so both areas can be returned to the sovereign Government of Ukraine or did you ultimately give up on Crimea?

Did you discuss NATO military exercises scheduled for this fall? Did you agree to roll back or change the nature of those exercises? Did you discuss U.S. security assistance to Ukraine and make any concessions regarding their continuation?

Did you raise the issue of political prisoners with President Putin, including that of Oleg Sentsov, the Ukrainian filmmaker who has been detained for 4 years on a hunger strike?

What, if anything, did you commit to? We need to know.

The President keeps saying having a good relationship with Russia would be a good thing. Of course, having good relationships with countries, in general, is a good thing, but those relationships must be grounded in trust, in cooperation, in the values we share—values like human rights, democracies, self-governance, and individual freedom.

We do not share values with a country that attacks our elections and, by doing so, seeks to undermine our democracy. We do not share values with a country that invades its sovereign neighbors and engages in a brutal war with Ukraine. We do not share values with a country that bolsters the Butcher of Damascus and is complicit in war crimes in Syria. We do not share values with a country that assassinates political opponents and jails journalists. We do not share values with a country that continuously violates the international order. We do not share values with Russia under Putin.

We take oaths when we are sworn into office. President Trump did as well. Yesterday's behavior, from my view, was an abdication of that oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

We have reached a terrible and historic low point in the United States. An American President, it seems, has teamed up with Russian intelligence against our democracy, our FBI, our Justice Department, and our intelligence community.

Our President is more closely aligned with Vladimir Putin than he is with his own government. It is unfortunate we have come to expect this behavior. President Trump has made his fixation on Putin and his affinity for authoritarians crystal clear, and America is weaker because of it. The question is, Are Senate Republicans OK with this? Except for the Presiding Officer and one or two other colleagues, from the silence of many or the feeble comments of others, I would say so.

Are they willing to concede Russian policy to President Trump? Is the price of letting this President surrender to a brutal dictator in Moscow some corporate tax cuts and a Supreme Court seat?

Tweeting about being ''troubled''—troubled—is shamefully inappropriate. Signing on to symbolic measures that carry no force of law is a joke, and remaining silent in the face of betrayal is nothing less than complicity.

It is time the Republican-led Congress live up to its constitutional responsibilities. If this Senate is to respond appropriately, here is what we must immediately do, starting this week:

First, the Foreign Relations Committee; the Armed Services Committee, of which my distinguished colleague is the ranking Democrat; and the Intelligence Committee, of which my distinguished colleague is a member, must hold hearings on what happened in Helsinki. We have a right and a responsibility to know what transpired between Trump and Putin and how it affects American citizens. We have the power to compel the administration to provide that information; we just need to use it.

Second, the Senate must protect the Mueller investigation and prevent interference by President Trump. The President is laying the groundwork to fire the special counsel. We can't let that happen. It is our responsibility to protect the integrity of our institutions.

Third, the Senate must conduct real oversight of the Russia sanctions that were signed into law last August. As I have said repeatedly on this floor, the Trump administration is ignoring several mandatory provisions of the law—mandatory. In all of the sanctions that I have helped write, this is one of the first times the Congress came together and didn't give the President waivers because they were concerned about what he would do vis-a-vis Russia, and look at this—maybe that foresight was very clairvoyant.

I and other Democrats have spoken out. We have sent several letters. We continuously urged administration officials to implement the sanctions. Where are the Senate Republicans, including all of those who voted for this bill, except for one? Silent.

If you want to stand up to Putin, if you want to stand up against Trump's capitulation in Helsinki, then we need to press the administration to finally implement what is already in the law—what is already in the law. We should do so today.

Fourth, we need to protect ourselves here at home, since it is clear we have a President who will not. The Senate needs to take up and pass the Protecting the Right to Independent and Democratic Elections Act I introduced last month. There are also measures by Senators WARNER, KLOBUCHAR, and others that would bolster our electoral defenses.

President Trump's intelligence community has repeatedly warned that the Kremlin's dangerous interference in U.S. democracy is continuing. Just days ago, the Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, said the warning signs are ''blinking red'' of further Russian cyber attacks. He noted that we are under literal attack. Yet instead of marshaling a whole-of-government response, President Trump remains fixated on protecting his fragile ego.

Today is the fourth anniversary of the shooting down of Malaysia Airlines flight 17 over eastern Ukraine by Russian-supported separatists, which killed all 298 people on board—a devastating reminder of the real dangers of the Kremlin's brutal targeting of civilians and why our relations with Russia have been strained.

Yesterday, Putin said the ball is in America's court. Well, it is time we take our shot. It is time we show the American people and the world what it means to put country over party. It is time to show the American people that we can be patriots and not just partisans; that we will stand by our allies and stand up to our adversaries; that we will defend our democracy, our institutions, and the values that truly make America great.

Our President has proven too weak, too egotistical, too feckless, or maybe too compromised to do it. It is up to us.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as I and many of my colleagues feared, the Trump-Putin summit was disastrous,

and their press conference amounted to a disinformation operation in which President Trump played the willing participant. The propaganda, dissembling, and denials are part of Russia's hybrid operations against our country, our allies, and our partners that are an ongoing and persistent threat to our national security.

By failing to challenge Putin's fabrications on Russia's interference with U.S. democracy, its annexation of Crimea, its role in Syria, its use of chemical agents against civilians, or its violations of its armed control obligations, President Trump acquiesced in Russia's lies and alternative facts and undermined our security in the process.

A low point was President Trump siding with Putin, over our own intelligence community's assessment, on Russian election interference. It was the unanimous judgment of the intelligence community that Putin directed an attack on our 2016 elections with the intent of undermining public faith in our democratic process. That assessment was just reaffirmed unanimously by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

Furthermore, last Friday, the Justice Department indicted 12 Russian military intelligence officers on charges of ''large-scale cyber operations to interfere with the 2016 presidential election.'' Despite being briefed on these developments, President Trump chose to side with Putin on election interference.

It is unconscionable that an American President, standing on foreign soil, chose to play Putin's press secretary rather than take the word of his own intelligence officials—career professionals who put their lives on the line for the safety and security of all Americans.

President Trump's words hurt our national security. Nations or potential sources may no longer trust the United States. They may hold back in fear that their highly classified secrets could be revealed to Russia, a foreign adversary, as Trump has done in the past.

Yesterday, President Trump also made a moral equivalency between the United States and Russia. This is an unfathomable and dangerous break from the actions of past Presidents of both parties.

President Trump's actions this week and throughout his Presidency have undermined the once bedrock belief around the globe that the United States is a beacon of hope and reliability.

Further, moral equivalency is a longtime Russian narrative used by Putin to justify his continued oppression of his people and suppression of democratic impulses within Russia.

On a more basic level, President Trump is undermining that which makes us strong. The world order that the United States created after World War II is something we have benefited from for decades. We draw strength from our allies and from participation in international institutions. The United States is not weakened by them; we are strengthened by them.

The mere act of the two Presidents sitting down together was a victory for Putin. Instead of taking this opportunity to talk tough and call Putin out for his misdeeds, President Trump delivered rewards without gaining any changes in Russia's behavior. This adds up to weakness, acquiescence, and more. Nothing about Russia's behavior has changed. Putin is still in Crimea. He is still propping up Assad's murderous actions in Syria. He is still interfering in the domestic politics of the West and undermining people's faith in the democratic process.

This is not theoretical. Director of National Intelligence Coats warned that Russian cyber attacks are threatening our government and our financial institutions. He used very explicit language to say that, akin to before 9/11, the warning signs of Russian aggression are ''blinking red again.'' Yet, instead of recognizing that threat, denouncing attacks from Russia, and developing a whole-of-government solution to counter the threat, Trump is cozying up to Putin.

In light of President Trump's dereliction of his responsibilities, I urge my Republican colleagues to stand up for the security and integrity of our democracy. Some of my colleagues have condemned President Trump's performance yesterday, but clearer and more concrete steps must be taken. Republicans must reject President Trump's weak and damaging views on foreign policy. What we saw this week and throughout this Presidency is an aberration that is unsustainable, and this course must be corrected soon. Words of regret or sadness for a missed opportunity are not sufficient in the wake of yesterday's display of weakness and narcissism.

Republicans should join with Democrats to pass legislation to protect the Mueller investigation and to ensure that the investigation is permitted to follow the evidence wherever it leads and bring this matter to a conclusion.

Republicans should join with Democrats to hold hearings and get testimony about the President's trip and particularly what he promised Putin during their private meeting.

Republicans should join with Democrats in calling on the President to fully implement the sanctions act against Russia for its numerous nefarious activities.

Republicans should join with Democrats and demand that President Trump be interviewed by Special Counsel Mueller under oath.

Finally, I urge the Trump administration to at long last issue a comprehensive strategy coordinating our military, diplomatic, law enforcement, financial, and all other instruments of U.S. national power to counter Russian malign influence, as called for in last year's NDAA. We are waiting a year for a legislative mandate of this Congress to provide such a report. Time is running out.

This is not a partisan issue. It is long past time for the President to denounce the Kremlin's behavior and take steps to mount a whole-of-government response to deter it in the future.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Arizona if he wishes to be heard first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you. I will just be a moment.

Mr. President, I appreciate the comments from my Democratic colleagues and hope that more of my Republican colleagues will speak about the spectacle yesterday in Helsinki.

I said yesterday that I never thought I would see the President of the United States stand with the President of Russia and blame the United States for Russian aggression. I said yesterday that that was shameful. I feel the same today.

Today, the President said that the press conference had been misinterpreted by the fake news media. I would say to the President that we all watched the press conference, and it wasn't the fake news media that sided with the Russian President over our own intelligence agencies; it was you.

This body must stand and reaffirm that we stand with the men and women in the Department of Justice who have brought these 12 indictments against individuals from the Russian Federation who interfered with our elections. We must say that we stand with our NATO allies and we stand with those in the EU; that they are not foes, they are friends. We must stand up to the real adversaries we have. Right now, Russia is an adversary. I hope the President will realize that. I hope he will take the word of the men and women of the Department of Justice and the entire intelligence agencies rather than the empty words of a dictator.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am honored and grateful to follow the very powerful comments of my friend and colleague from Arizona. They remind me of our mutual friend, his colleague and partner from the State of Arizona, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, whom we miss at this moment more than ever. Senator MCCAIN is with us in spirit, and those words remind us that the threat we face at this perilous time in our national history must be met with a truly bipartisan response.

The threat we face is every bit as serious as any in the history of this country because it involves an attack on the pillars of our democracy. We know that 9/11 and Pearl Harbor involved a

physical assault with immediate loss of life. Russia's attack on this country in 2016 is every bit as serious and urgent.

In the words of the Director of National Intelligence, our former colleague Dan Coats, this incident should put us truly on alert. Those blinking lights based on objective and unvarnished evidence, as he put it, of a pervasive, continuing attack should bring us together as a legislative body and as a country.

This issue really is not about Donald Trump as much as it is about our Nation. The summit in a sense realized our worst fears; indeed, our deepest nightmare. At best, it was going to be a gift to President Putin because it legitimized him and elevated him on the world stage, even if no words followed that private meeting.

The truth is that it happened, and the President of the United States was a puppet, a patsy, a pushover—in fact, an appeaser, in the worst tradition of that term—on the public stage. The President put Russia over this country. He failed to fulfill his oath of office to defend this Nation against all enemies, foreign and domestic. He failed to put America's interests first. In fact, he blamed America first. He blamed everyone except for Putin and himself.

Now he has attempted, shamefully, to rewrite history—unartfully, incredibly. He has said, in effect, that some editing, some minor change in grammar, would allow him to escape the universal condemnation from all sides of the political spectrum of his shameful surrender to Vladimir Putin.

The question is, What does Vladimir Putin have on Donald Trump? We will not know until the special counsel finishes his investigation. We must do everything in this body—and this point is central to what we are saying today—to protect the special counsel against the continuing onslaught and assault from Donald Trump's cronies and surrogates on the far right—the fringe of the Republican Party—who are seeking to discredit the special counsel investigation; indeed, talking about impeaching Ron Rosenstein and demanding documents involved in that investigation. We must now pass the Special Counsel Independence and Integrity Act.

If Donald Trump is serious and he believes that the Russians, in fact, interfered with our democracy, what he will do now is implement the sanctions that were made mandatory on Russia. He has violated his duty by continuing to avoid imposing them. He will authorize the Cyber Command to take aggressive measures—not simply defensive—and penetrate and disrupt the systems of cyber within Russia that are used against us. He will authorize the exposure and revelation of Russian oligarchs' and Vladimir Putin's wealth around the world, hidden and concealed—the result of their corruption in Russia. He himself can undertake these measures.

If the Senate is serious about protecting the United States, it will order that the transcripts and notes and any documents and the security team who attended that summit come to the Congress in a closed briefing and eventually an open one, under oath, so the American people can know. They should be required to provide whatever they know about what happened in that private meeting so that we know what happened and the implications of what happened are truly known.

Just yesterday, the Department of Justice issued a criminal complaint against Maria Butina. It followed indictments against 12 Russian individuals. Maria Butina is a Russian agent who worked through the NRA to influence and corrupt our political system—again, part of the Russian attack on this country. We need to hold hearings now to know whether Russia has been using organizations like the NRA and other shell companies to illegally funnel money into our election.

I will close where I began. These issues transcend partisanship. They ought to be put above the everyday issues that concern us. We cannot say that we weren't warned. The failure to act and act now to hold Russia accountable, to make them pay a price, to show them that we will not tolerate—nor will our allies—this kind of interference in our elections will mean they will do it again. History will judge us harshly.

Our allies were never more important than now. They are victims of the same kind of attack. Rather than trashing and beating them, as President Trump has done, we should bring them to our side and express to them, as this Senate did by a 97-to-2 vote, that we are committed to NATO and that if one of us is attacked, all of us are attacked. In fact, almost all of us are under attack right now.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I wish to start by thanking my colleague from Connecticut for his words today and for his leadership in protecting the integrity of our democracy and the rule of law.

When it comes to issues of national security and foreign policy, we have had many vigorous debates in this country over the decades and many important debates here on the floor of this Senate. There have been deep disagreements over specific foreign policy choices that we make as a country. But there has consistently been broad bipartisan support for the view that the United States and strong U.S. leadership benefit not only our interests but the interests of folks around the world. That has been American leadership grounded in key values and principles, including the promotion of democracy, universal human rights, the rule of law, a free press, and the idea that America is an exceptional nation based not on tribalism but a beacon of hope for all people, as symbolized by the Statue of Liberty. This isn't to say that over the decades we have always been virtuous or always consistent in the application of these principles. We all know we have made many mistakes and detours along the way, but until now, until this moment in our history, the principles and values I outlined have been the guideposts and cornerstones for American Presidents—Republicans and Democrats alike—since the end of World War II.

With those guideposts, we have built some very important international architecture: our alliances, international institutions, and international agreements. But today, sadly, we have a President who has gone absolutely rogue on the time-tested bipartisan tenets of American foreign policy, whether it is the way he attacks or berates our allies or when he consistently goes out of his way to praise dictators like Vladimir Putin or Kim Jong Un or other autocrats around the world.

I am not going to take the time today to chronicle the mountain of evidence leading up to the events of last week that show already President Trump's radical retreat from the kind of global leadership that America has exercised since the end of World War II. We all know that those views are shared by many of our Republican Senate colleagues. Senator MCCAIN has been very strong on that, as have other Republican Senators. Others have said quietly what Senator MCCAIN has said publicly. This is a moment where everybody has to come together as patriots, not partisans.

Including Senator MCCAIN, we have a lot of Republican foreign policy experts and independent groups, like Freedom House, that have raised the alarm bells about this administration's far-reaching attacks on fundamental institutions of democratic society, like freedom of the press.

One thing we all know is this: We know the words and actions of an American President have real-world consequences. Those of President Trump leave our friends unsure if they can depend on us and create openings and opportunities for our adversaries. They weaken our credibility and squander our moral authority on the world stage.

Of course, the events of last week and yesterday are the ultimate expression of this President's retreat from that bipartisan tradition of American foreign policy—first, going to a NATO meeting and berating some of our closest allies. All of us understand that each of our NATO allies needs to fully contribute to NATO. In fact, these countries have already made that commitment, but President Trump threw them under the bus and diminished the importance of the NATO alliance.

Then, of course, he went directly from there to his meeting with President Putin, but before that meeting, the President let us know what his state of mind was. The President tweeted out: ''Our relationship with

Russia has NEVER been worse thanks to many years of U.S. foolishness . . .''—not Russia's invasion or occupation of Crimea, not Russian aggression in the Ukraine, not Russian activities around the world that undermine peace and stability, and not Russia's attack on our democracy in the 2016 elections.

In fact, shortly before he went to meet with Putin, he again invoked a Stalinist expression, where he said: ''Much of our news media is indeed the enemy of the people.'' That is something I am sure warmed the heart of Vladimir Putin, who doesn't like any criticism, like our President doesn't like any criticism.

Then he went in to this meeting and came out in that joint press conference. What did he do? Standing side by side with Vladimir Putin, he told the world that he sided with Putin over the leaders of the American intelligence community on the question of whether or not Russia interfered in the American elections in 2016. He said: President Putin assures me that they did not interfere. He says it very strongly.

Then, he sided with President Putin over his own director of the CIA, who has testified before Congress about Russian interference in 2016, over Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, over Secretary of State Pompeo, and over the very people President Trump said all of us should trust in these important positions of responsibility. Yet, on a world stage, he bowed to President Putin and said he trusted President Putin's word over that of U.S. intelligence. I understand that today he is trying to walk this back. He actually tweeted:

> While I had a great meeting with NATO . . . I had an even better meeting with Vladimir Putin of Russia. Sadly, it is not being reported that way—the Fake News is going Crazy!

The challenge President Trump has this time is that we all watched that press conference. The world saw it. So really, the question now for us here in the Senate—Republicans and Democrats alike—is this: What are we going to do? What are we going to do now that the President of the United States has taken this position, undermining the credibility of his own country?

We were worried before the President went to the NATO meeting, and we passed a resolution here—that was a good thing—affirming our support for NATO. Last year, over the objections of the Trump administration, we passed legislation imposing sanctions on Russia.

Now we have to come together, as Senates have before—Republicans and Democrats—to send a very strong signal that the United States stands together in support of the bipartisan principles we have stood for before.

We now know the President will not defend the integrity of our democratic process. We need to do it, and my colleagues have outlined many steps we should take. One step we should take is directly related to future elections, because what we know from the testimony of the head of the CIA, the head of the DNI, and the Secretary of State is that they all expect Russia—unless something changes—to interfere in our 2018 and future elections.

The 2018 elections are 16 weeks away. We now know the President of the United States is not going to defend the integrity of the democratic process. So we have to do it. One of the many things we should do is to support legislation I have introduced together with Senator RUBIO, bipartisan legislation. It is very clear. It says to Vladimir Putin: If you interfere in another U.S. election and we catch you, Russia will automatically face very stiff sanctions to your energy sector and your banking sector, and there will be a huge price to pay. It is called the DETER Act. The whole idea is to make sure that Vladimir Putin knows that the cost of interfering in our elections far outweigh any benefit he may think he gets.

So I hope we will stand together as Republicans and Democrats to do what the President of the United States will not do, and that is to protect the integrity of our elections. Let's learn from the past. Let's work together for the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, just yesterday the world watched as President Trump, standing in front of the American flag, side by side with Vladimir Putin, not only betrayed the dedication of the men and women of the U.S. intelligence and law enforcement communities but then showered praise upon the Russian President—the man who directed the interference of our elections.

This prompted outcry from Members on both sides of the aisle, as it should. I read statements from my colleagues that were very strong in condemning President Trump for putting Russia ahead of the United States, using terms like ''shameful'' and ''disgraceful,'' and not just from Republicans who bravely stood up to this President before. I heard from Members of Congress and even from some FOX News contributors, unable to twist themselves into defending this President at this moment, as he so clearly undercut our own country. I am glad they spoke up because words matter.

But do you know what also matters? Action. So now, I ask: What will congressional Republicans do about it? Many Republican Members of Congress are acting as if they just have a Twitter feed, as if they aren't the party in control of the Senate and the House, as if they don't have the ability to actually make a difference and demand change. That is absurd.

The time for handwringing and hoping the problem goes away is over. With the power to call up legislation and hold hearings, Republican leaders do have options, and they certainly have a whole lot of Democrats who stand ready and willing to help.

It is truly horrifying and deeply alarming that President Trump failed to use that moment to push President Putin to end his attacks on our country and our elections, and he failed to condemn the Kremlin's interference in the elections of our allies; or Putin's support of the brutal Assad regime and connections to chemical weapons attacks by the Syrian Government; or the illegal annexation of Ukraine's Crimean peninsula; or the 2014 downing of MH17 over Ukraine, where 295 people were killed; or the murder of journalists and opposition politicians; or the use of chemical weapons; or the undemocratic authoritarian and oppressive rule of the Putin regime and how it actively works against our American principles.

Instead of standing up for our values and our national security, our President defended Putin on all fronts. Instead of putting America first, he performed Putin's bidding by attacking our closest allies and trying to dismantle NATO.

Today, I know President Trump tried desperately to backtrack, but we know where he stands, and we all heard what he said on the world stage just yesterday. It is appalling, inexcusable, and unworthy of the President.

So my message to every Member of the Senate and to every Member of the other body is clear. It is time to strengthen the sanctions against Russia for its aggression around the world and to demand answers from Secretary Pompeo and the other members of the Trump national security team, especially about what the President may have promised Putin during their closed-door meeting, and for them to provide Congress—all of us—with any notes from the meeting that may exist.

We need them to stand up for and protect the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the special counsel; to insist that the President demand the extradition of the 12 Russians indicted for their attacks on our elections; and to pass election security legislation.

This is not a partisan issue. This is about defending the integrity and foundational values of our Nation. This is about Congress doing its constitutional job and holding the President accountable for his shocking and repeated failures. This is about telling our allies around the world that they can still depend on the United States. This is about putting the country before the party.

Stand not just with Democrats. Stand with people across the country by taking action to hold Russia accountable and to protect this country from future attacks. Ask President Trump why he is choosing to defend Russia and blame America, and ask what or who is motivating him, because it certainly is not the American people, our security, our values, or our future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to see President Trump's clarification today. The Russians did meddle in our election. That is the consensus not just of the intelligence community, but it is the consensus here among our own Intelligence Committees of the House and Senate, led by Republicans.

I will say that Congress has pushed pretty hard against some of the Russian activity, not just the meddling but the illegal annexation of Crimea and Russia's continued support of the Assad regime in Syria, which has caused so much pain and agony. We have passed historic sanctions around here on Russia. Should we have additional sanctions? I am certainly open to that, but it is not as if Congress has not acted.

We have also provided, for the first time ever, lethal weapons to the Ukrainians to be able to push back on the eastern border of Ukraine. I pleaded with the Obama administration to provide such weapons, and they never did, and this administration has done so despite protestations from Russia.

We just funded $350 million or so to protect our electoral security here in this country and to help our State boards of election to be able to push back against what I am concerned about, which would be interference in yet another election cycle in this country. I am glad that was a bipartisan effort to do so. We have also built up our military, including putting more resources into Central and Eastern Europe and more exercises there to push back, including up-armoring our armored vehicles there because of the threat we now believe is coming from Russia, not just on the eastern border of Ukraine but throughout eastern Central Europe.

This administration has actually expelled more Russian diplomats, I think, than any administration at once, at least. In reaction to the poisoning in the UK, we expelled more diplomats than any other country. We also shut down a Russian consulate, I believe, in the State of the colleague who just spoke, and these are all things that have happened.

The irony is, the actions speak pretty loudly, don't they? It is unfortunate that our words have not spoken as loudly recently.

Again, I appreciate the President's clarification today. I think we need to be honest. We need to be straightforward, and that would result in a better relationship with Russia.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Today, Mr. President, I am coming to the floor to speak about something very positive; that is, the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh to be the next Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. A lot of people have talked about Judge Kavanaugh's impeccable qualifications.

I spoke to a Democratic colleague today who may or may not support him, but said: I agree this guy is very qualified. And he is. He now sits on the DC Circuit, the second most powerful court in the land. He has lots of decisions, and they are decisions that have gotten positive reviews from judges across the political spectrum. He is clearly qualified.

Important to me are not just someone's qualifications and their legal background, but also their character. Character is incredibly important for a Supreme Court that will have to deal with so many issues—issues that are important to us and our families going forward.

This guy is someone of deep and strong character. He is compassionate. He has the humility to be able to listen. He has a big heart. I have known this guy for over 15 years. Brett Kavanaugh served in the second Bush administration. I also served there. I got to know him and his wife there and before that, as well, during the campaigns.

This is someone who is, to me, not just a legal scholar and a judge but a friend. I have seen him as a father and as a husband. I cannot think of anyone I would rather see on the Court in terms of these character strengths he has. He is someone who is humble and compassionate and a good listener.

As he goes through the confirmation here in the Senate, I think my colleagues who are still undecided are going to be impressed. I think the American people will be impressed because they will recognize him as the kind of person they would like to see on the Supreme Court.

Judge Kavanaugh, or Professor Kavanaugh as he is known at the Harvard Law School where he teaches, is respected for all of the right reasons, across the board. He volunteers as a tutor for underprivileged kids. He helps the homeless through his church. He fed meals to the homeless just last week, which was previously planned.

Some friends on both sides of the aisle have come forward to speak out about him and his character, and that is good. His former students at Harvard Law School have said that he is a guy who never pushed partisan politics on them in class. Instead, he focused on the Constitution and the importance of hearing all sides of an argument to find out what the law is and what the law says. That is what you want in a Supreme Court Justice.

Today, I want to mention some people who know Brett Kavanaugh by another name; that is, Coach K. Coach K is not the famous Coach K of Duke fame, but he is Coach Kavanaugh. He teaches and coaches both his younger daughter's team and his older daughter's team.

Julie O'Brien, whose daughter goes to school with Brett Kavanaugh's older daughter, recently wrote an article in the Washington Post that I thought encapsulated what I am trying to say about Brett Kavanaugh. She discussed how Coach K coaches her daughter's basketball team. Last season, the Blessed Sacrament School's sixth grade girls team had an undefeated season and won a citywide championship, so he must be a pretty good coach too.

Not surprisingly to the parents or players who know him, Julie wrote, the team photograph and trophy are displayed prominently in Coach K's judicial chambers. Along with coaching, Brett is known as the carpool dad, shuttling his daughters and their friends to and from practices, games, and events.

Mrs. O'Brien went on to mention another story, which I think displays Brett's character well. She said that a few years ago her husband passed away. With no one to accompany her daughter to the annual father-daughter dance, Brett Kavanaugh stepped up. That year, and every year since then, Brett has taken her daughter alongside his own daughter to the father-daughter dance.

That is the kind of man Brett Kavanaugh is. He is thoughtful. He is caring. He does things because they are the right things to do, as someone who cares about others and cares about his community.

He has chosen to spend 25 of his last 28 years serving the American people in various jobs, most recently, of course, on the DC Circuit. He is the kind of person, again, you would want on the Supreme Court. He has a judicial philosophy that is pretty simple. He has proved time and again that he is a judge who will apply the law fairly and impartially.

He interprets the law in the Constitution based on the words, historical context, and meaning rather than trying to legislate from the bench. That is what most people are looking for.

Speaking to the Notre Dame Law School in 2017, Judge Kavanaugh spoke of the legacy of Justice Antonin Scalia and what people should take away from his time as a Supreme Court Justice. He stated:

> The judge's job is to interpret the law, not to make the law or make policy. So read the words of the statute as written. Read the text of the Constitution as written, mindful of history and tradition. Don't make up new constitutional rights that are not in the text of the Constitution. Don't shy away from enforcing constitutional rights that are in the text of the Constitution.

I think Judge Kavanaugh is the kind of judge the American people want—someone who will fairly and impartially apply the law, not legislate from the bench. He has an outstanding judicial record from 12 years on the bench. He is a thought leader among his peers, on the appellate courts, and has the respect of the Justices on the Supreme Court, as well, because they picked up his decisions and used them in later cases.

Just as importantly to me, again, he is a good person. I am proud to support Brett Kavanaugh's nomination to the Supreme Court of the United States. As his confirmation process continues, I hope my colleagues on both sides will

keep an open mind and get to know the Brett Kavanaugh whom I know, his family and friends know, and the American people are coming to know. I hope we can confirm him with a strong bipartisan vote so that he can serve our American community from a new role—that of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

TRUMP-PUTIN SUMMIT

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, as my colleagues and the Presiding Officer may know, I spent many years of my life in the Navy. I spent some 23 years, starting at the age of 21, on Active and Reserve Duty in the U.S. Navy as a naval flight officer, and I spent most of those 23 years as a P–3 aircraft mission commander. I was even, for a limited period of time, the air intelligence officer for my P–3 squadron when we were deployed in Southeast Asia.

I flew hundreds of missions during both the Vietnam war and the Cold War, conducting surveillance operations, gathering intelligence on the Soviets and on others who undermine and destroy the American way of life.

As a Cold War warrior, watching an American President yesterday blatantly ignore attacks on a democracy and our intelligence agencies was beyond galling. It was reprehensible—reprehensible.

Four days ago, Special Counsel Mueller indicted 12 Russian intelligence officers for interfering in our democratic elections in 2016. That same day, last Friday—Friday the 13th—the Director of National Intelligence, our old colleague, Dan Coats from Indiana, said that our country's digital infrastructure is literally under attack. Here is what he said:

> The warning signs are there. The system is blinking. It is why I believe we are at a critical point.

That was on Friday the 13th.

Yesterday, our President, with the entire world watching, chose to attack not the Soviets, not the Russians, but Bob Mueller. He is one of the finest people I have ever known and worked with. He attacked Bob Mueller and rebuked the U.S. intelligence community—with whom I have worked as a member of the Homeland Security committee for any number of years, as has our Presiding Officer—instead of siding with the 17 U.S. intelligence agencies, all of whom agreed unanimously, without dissent, that the Soviets, the Russians, intervened in our election in 2016 in an effort to throw the election to Donald Trump and to take it away from Hillary Clinton, the Democratic nominee. There is no question that is what they did.

Our President chose to ignore that, and instead of admiring and speaking to the work of the intelligence agencies and concurring with them yesterday, he decided to side with an authoritarian thug, Vladimir Putin. That was a defining moment in our Nation's history.

I think it is a sad moment in our Nation's history. We ought to move immediately to pass bipartisan legislation, introduced in the Senate earlier this year, to allow Bob Mueller's critical work and that of the people working with him to be completed without the constant threat of political interference.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. President, having said that as a predicate, I want to turn to the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh to serve on the Supreme Court. Brett Kavanaugh used to clerk for a Federal judge named Walter Stapleton. Most people who are outside of the Delaware Valley—and maybe Maryland, Pennsylvania, New Jersey—haven't heard of Walter Stapleton. But if you have been involved in legal issues or judicial issues there, you may recall that he was nominated to serve as a district court judge, a Federal district judge, in Delaware and served there for a number of years with distinction.

He went on to serve on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals in our region—again, serving with distinction. I think he assumed senior status in that court in 1999, after many years of service on the Federal bench.

In the second half of the last century, he was seen as a giant in the judicial system—the Federal judicial system—certainly in our part of the world, but I think beyond our borders.

When George W. Bush, my former colleague as Governor, as President, nominated Brett Kavanaugh to serve on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, among the people I consulted with was former Judge Walter Stapleton and others who had clerked for him and worked with him. They knew Brett Kavanaugh and were very complimentary, as our colleague ROB PORTMAN has been today, talking about the human side of him and the qualities I think we would admire in almost anybody.

When I was a kid growing up, there used to be a guy on the radio—ABC radio—many years ago. His name was Paul Harvey. I don't know if our Presiding Officer is old enough to remember Paul Harvey. He would give the news, and he would do things like give the top of the news, and he would say ''Page 2''—and sort of like turn the page and report the rest of the news.

I am going to go to page 2 here today with respect to Brett Kavanaugh. I voted for him. There are about a dozen Democrats in 2006 who voted for cloture; four of us—Robert Byrd, Mary Landrieu, I think, Ben Nelson, and I—voted for confirmation. We voted our hopes rather than our views. We voted, in part, because of what we had learned from others who knew him, who had worked with him, and who admired him. I have said flatout that if I had known then what I know now about the kinds of decisions he would write and support over the following 12 years, I would not have voted for him in 2006. I think it is highly unlikely I would vote for him today.

I think it is time to hit the pause button on such consequential nominees, like Mr. Kavanaugh, whose writings have repeatedly made clear that he believes the President is above the law. This is a man, Mr. Kavanaugh, who worked with Kenneth Starr to go after Bill Clinton as President, hammer and tong, for alleged misdeeds and misconduct that he apparently had done.

Now, some 20 years later, that same Brett Kavanaugh seems to have—rather than feeling that Presidents definitely are not above the law, that Presidents have to be held accountable like anybody else, he seems to have done a 180. Instead, he basically seems to feel that Presidents are almost above the law and cannot be held accountable.

I don't get it; I don't know how someone can change on something—it wasn't just during the Starr years. To have gone from that position of being such a fervent attack dog in going after Bill Clinton to basically saying that the Presidents can pretty much do, without oversight, what they see fit—that is one of the issues I want to discuss with Judge Kavanaugh, when I meet with him, hopefully later this month.

For that reason alone—Judge Kavanaugh's views of the President, with the President being above the law, especially at this point in time in our Nation's history—I think that one issue, that one reason, should be enough to say let's hit the pause button. Let's hit the pause button on this nomination. There are a number of other reasons why Judge Kavanaugh is, in my view, the wrong pick for the Nation's highest Court. I want to stress just a few of those today.

In May 2006, as a nominee to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, Brett Kavanaugh made a pledge under oath. Brett Kavanaugh pledged to Members of this body that if confirmed, he would ''interpret the law as written and not impose personal policy preferences.'' Those are his words, not my words. Mr. Kavanaugh went on to pledge that he would ''exercise judicial power prudently and with restraint.'' Brett Kavanaugh pledged that he would ''follow precedent in all cases fully and fairly.'' Those are not my words; they are his words. Brett Kavanaugh pledged that he would, above all, ''maintain the absolute independence of the judiciary,'' which is, in his words, ''the crown jewel of our constitutional democracy.''

I took Brett Kavanaugh at his word in 2006. I trusted him when he made those pledgees. I afforded Mr. Kavanaugh, as a young lawyer, the opportunity to fulfill his promise to faithfully uphold and interpret our laws as written. I expected him not to inject his personal policy preferences or the ideology of special interests and groups like the Heritage Foundation into his decision making on the bench.

I know now, a little more than 12 years after he made those pledges, that

my trust in Brett Kavanaugh was misplaced. As a judge on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, Brett Kavanaugh has broken his pledges repeatedly.

There is an old saying in my State: Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. Judge Kavanaugh, shame on you, but you won't fool me twice.

Brett Kavanaugh's broken pledges impact the lives of just about every American. They may well affect millions of Americans with preexisting conditions in years to come, who risk losing access to affordable healthcare, as well as a woman's freedom to make her own healthcare decisions. They affect hard-won workers' rights, consumer protections, and civil rights enacted into law over decades for the protection of future generations. They affect the independence of our judiciary and the system of three separate, coequal branches of government established by our Founding Fathers, a system designed to ensure that no citizen, not even the President of the United States, is above the law.

Judge Kavanaugh's broken pledges affect the water we drink, the air we breathe, and the world we will leave to our children and our children's children. Today, we seek to shine light on Brett Kavanaugh's environmental record—one which, sadly, all too often puts the interests of polluters ahead of those of the public.

One such example is when Mr. Kavanaugh rejected EPA's good neighbor rule, which regulates air pollution that travels across State lines to downwind States, such as Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, and others. In the case of EME Homer City v. EPA, he sided with polluters and ignored petitions from Delaware and eight other States, as well as the District of Columbia, when he said EPA lacked the authority to require upwind States to be better neighbors. Judge Kavanaugh's views were deemed too extreme even for some of the Supreme Court's conservative Justices, who reversed his decision, saying that he had followed his own policy views rather than the law written by Congress.

Just yesterday, I was with First State officials and concerned citizens in the State of Delaware, all speaking out against the current EPA's misguided decision to reject Delaware's ability and that of our neighboring States to address dangerous pollutants blowing into our State from dirty powerplants to the west of us. Delaware families—especially children and those with asthma—still suffer from harmful pollution that lands in our communities through no fault of our own. That is just not right.

When I was Governor of Delaware for 8 years, from 1993 to 2001, I could have shut down my State's economy, taken every vehicle off the road, and shut down every business. We would have still been out of compliance for clean air with respect to ozone because of the air coming into our State from States to the west, our upwind States. Think about that.

There is a reason why we have a golden rule. There is a reason why we talk about the Good Samaritan. There is a reason why we have the saying: We ought to treat other people the way we want to be treated. We want to be treated like a good neighbor. If the shoe were on the other foot, we wouldn't send our pollution to those States. EPA should stand up for our States and say enough is enough, but apparently Judge Kavanaugh disagrees.

Brett Kavanaugh also dissented from an opinion on toxic air pollution written by Chief Judge Merrick Garland. In White Stallion Energy v. EPA, Mr. Kavanaugh said that EPA had to consider the costs to industry when determining whether powerplants should have to reduce toxic air pollution that causes cancer and lowers the IQ of children. Justice Scalia quoted Brett Kavanaugh directly when the Supreme Court later adopted Mr. Kavanaugh's position in another 5-to-4 decision, even though the Clean Air Act doesn't say a thing about having to consider costs.

In Coalition for Responsible Regulation v. EPA, Mr. Kavanaugh rejected the longstanding interpretation that Congress gave EPA the authority to control any air pollutant, including greenhouse gases that contribute to climate change. Mr. Kavanaugh argued that taking the Clean Air Act at its word and interpreting ''any air pollutant'' to include greenhouse gases would lead to what he considered—again, as his own personal position and not as a matter of law—absurd results.

Mr. Kavanaugh not only has proven to be untrustworthy in this regard, but he has already called into question EPA's authority to regulate greenhouse gases and combat climate change.

These cases and the ideas advanced by Judge Kavanaugh in his opinions have striking similarities to those advanced by recently departed Trump administration official Scott Pruitt, and that should worry every Member of this body. Scott Pruitt may be out as Administrator at the EPA, but if Brett Kavanaugh is confirmed to serve on the Supreme Court, Mr. Pruitt's dangerous anti-environment agenda will continue to wreak havoc, this time with the weight of our Nation's highest Court behind it for a long time. Put simply, Brett Kavanaugh will attempt to finish, in many respects, what Scott Pruitt started.

I take seriously the Senate's constitutional role of providing advice and consent on a President's nominee to the Supreme Court. As Governor of Delaware, I nominated scores of men and women to serve on our courts—supreme court, court of chancery, superior court—major courts not just for Delaware, actually, but for the country. I always felt that the Delaware Legislature should carefully consider my nominees, give them a hearing, meet with them, and in the end, vote them up or down.

I felt we should have done that with Merrick Garland. We should have done that with Merrick Garland almost 2 years ago. We treated him shamefully—we didn't, but some in this body did. As such, I will afford Brett Kavanaugh the opportunity my Republican colleagues—at least most of them—refused Merrick Garland, chief judge of the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, highly regarded by Democrats and Republicans alike, when they abdicated their constitutional responsibilities in 2016. Now they want to rush through, literally in only a couple of months, the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh.

As I said earlier, I look forward to interviewing Brett Kavanaugh in the coming weeks and providing him the opportunity to explain why he broke his pledges time and again. How could a person who seems that nice and that decent make so many wrongheaded and I think wronghearted decisions and support those decisions from the bench time and again?

We are in a battle on many fronts in this country. One of those battlefronts is with respect to our environment—the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the health of our people, young and old. We are fighting dangerous environmental rollbacks put forth by this administration—maybe not every day but just about every week. What we don't need in this country, where we have lived by and been sustained by an incredible system of checks and balances for years, for decades, for centuries, we don't need a Supreme Court that will similarly side with polluters over public health.

I yield back my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, to follow up on the remarks of our distinguished Democratic ranking member on the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator CARPER, who spoke about the environmental prospects of Trump's nominee, Brett Kavanaugh, should he reach the Supreme Court, I come at this from a very particular angle. Let me start by kind of laying the predicate, if you will, for my comments.

A long, long time ago, when the Founding Fathers were setting up our country, they brought over from England the tradition of an independent judiciary and of the common jury. It was extremely important to the founding generation. The Declaration of Independence made reference to efforts to interfere with the right to trial by jury.

The efforts by British agents of influence to interfere with American juries was a constant thorn. The feeling was that the independence of courts and, particularly, the independence of jurors was a very significant check and balance in the constitutional system that the Founders were setting up.

These were experienced politicians. These were thoughtful people who had read and debated a lot about governance. They understood that there were times when very powerful interests were able to dominate a legislative body, there were times when very powerful interests were able to dominate a Governor or other chief executive and, indeed, there were times when that same very powerful interest could not only dominate the legislative branch but also the executive branch at the same time. Therefore, you needed to have a third branch of government—an independent branch of government—to which you could go to be sure that you were being treated with justice. They designed it all fairly carefully.

The jury has a lot of advantages to it. You don't get repeat jurors. Every jury veneer, every jury pool, is a new group. The reason for that is to make it hard for big interests to be able to go to people who might be jurors and try to fix the jurors in their favor in the same way they go to legislatures and try to fix legislators in their favor. You do not know who your jury is going to be until it is called up. So you can't apply influence to a jury. If you try, it is actually a crime. It is called tampering with a jury.

We very carefully set up independent judges and pools of regular citizens who were to come in, virtually at random, to do one jury service and then to go back to their lives, and we did it for a reason. Blackstone described that reason as to provide a safeguard for regular citizens against other more wealthy and powerful citizens, more wealthy and powerful interests.

It is an interesting piece of our constitutional analysis because, in most places, what has been set up is a structure that has been designed to protect the common citizen against the excesses of government. The checks and balances have been generally set up to protect the ordinary man and woman against excessive use of government power against them.

With the juries, Blackstone said, it is a little bit different. It is not just abuse of power by government; it is abuse of power by the more wealthy and powerful interests, because the Founders knew that it would be the more powerful and wealthy interests who would come in and try to fix the legislature, who would try to fix the Governor or, at the Federal level, the President, and that, therefore, the jury would stand as the guardian and the bulwark of regular Americans against influence from the more powerful and wealthy interests.

Look around at who the more powerful and wealthy interests are in our country right now. Collectively, the biggest is probably the fossil fuel industry. If you add up the whole Koch brothers' Koch Industries' apparatus, if you add up ExxonMobil, Chevron, Shell, and the whole American Petroleum Institute population, if you look at the extent to which they have seized control of the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and if you put that whole array together, it is very likely not only the most powerful political influence effort now, but it may very well be the most powerful political effort in American history. Those wealthy and powerful interests are hard at work at making sure that their interests come first and that the interests of ordinary Americans come at a very distant second.

The way in which Mr. Kavanaugh comes to this nomination smells of all of that influence already. For starters, he was selected through a very private process—from all of the information we have about it—that is moderated by a group called the Federalist Society but which checks in with all of the big Republican funding special interests to make sure that they are all OK with the nominee. There is a preclearance by special interests that takes place for these judicial nominees. Obviously, the most powerful and wealthy special interest—the biggest political force, perhaps ever—is going to be a part of that checklist.

There can be no doubt that if the fossil fuel industry were not checked off on Brett Kavanaugh, he would not be the nominee. There is no doubt in my mind that they and other special interests—the gun lobby, the anti-choice crowd, the Wall Street folks—all had the chance to say: No, not that guy. Find me somebody who will be good to us.

So Kavanaugh has already cleared that process. Now you see the confirmation process underway, and you see big special interests' dark money already out, campaigning for him.

The last time we had one of these contests, it was this: Is it going to be Merrick Garland? No, we are going to stop him dead and not even give him a hearing. We are going to bring on this character, Gorsuch, and he is going to come in.

Somebody spent nearly $18 million in political ads to support that switch. Somebody felt it was worth $18 million to have Gorsuch and not Garland on the Supreme Court. We don't know who that person was because of the dark money protections that are such a scourge in our democracy right now. That individual donor's hand is hidden behind all of this dark money machinery, but we do know that there is a person—an entity—who spent $18 million to have it be Gorsuch, not Garland.

So that is the track record for this.

Here comes Kavanaugh, and the same machinery is now up for him. He was precleared by the special interests, and big dark money interests are already spending money for him. Who in his right mind would believe that this guy is not predisposed in the direction of those big special interests? It is almost impossible to imagine under these political circumstances.

When you look at his record on the DC Circuit, this is a guy who has been on the warpath against environmental protection. This is a guy who is Scott Pruitt in robes. This guy is really something.

Now, he was not on the original Trump list, as I understand it. So maybe he has been spending his time auditioning on the DC Circuit for this incredibly dominant special interest—the fossil fuel industry—and exhibiting his ability and his willingness to make anti-environment decisions, to make pro-corporate decisions, and to make pro-polluter decisions so that he can inch his way, maybe, onto the Trump list for the Supreme Court.

Sure enough, not only is he on the list, but he is now the nominee. His record is absolutely abysmal. You would have to call him an environmental extremist. It is truly, truly exceptional to think of all of the different cases in which he has been involved. My colleague from Hawaii is here. So I am not going to go through them all, but as this goes forward, I will have plenty of time to explore these issues with him.

It is going to be very, very important to the big polluters to have Kavanaugh instead of Kennedy because, when you look at the record in the Supreme Court, there has been a considerable array of decisions on environmental matters in which Justice Kennedy has been the swing vote. So extract Justice Kennedy with his retirement and put in Kavanaugh with his record from the DC Circuit, his preclearance by the polluting interests, and the fact that big-money folks are already out there pushing for him. They are going to want something.

I suspect what they are going to want is a reversal of Justice Kennedy's position in favor of the environment and all of the issues on which he was the 5-to-4 tiebreaker in favor of the environment. Now all of those cases will go back the other way, and polluters will rule.

Polluters already rule here. We are incapable of doing anything serious about climate change. Polluters completely dominate over in the House. They have written this ridiculous letter and have told the House that it shouldn't even do a carbon price. They have put all of their polluter front-group names on this letterhead. Of course, Trump still thinks that climate change is a hoax.

You have a situation that the Founding Fathers were concerned about. You have an enormous special interest with extraordinary power that dominates the Senate and the House and that has completely gotten this administration by the choke chain. Now what it wants to do is to extend its power to the one

part of the government the Founding Fathers set up to be able to tell the special interest no, to require it to follow the truth, to require it to look at real evidence, to subject witnesses to cross-examination, to provide discovery so that you know what is really going on, and for there to be penalties if you try to tamper and for there to be penalties if you lie.

This is not the environment that the big polluters like. So they want to control it. I see the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh as an effort, basically, at agency capture at the Supreme Court level. We have to be very careful about this.

I yield to my distinguished colleague from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island.

In Hawaii, we understand the importance of caring for our planet. The Native Hawaiian community embraced the idea of ''malama 'aina,'' a respect for and responsibility to care for the land in a way that protects our environment for future generations. That is why Hawaii has led the way in enacting measures to fight climate change and safeguard our natural resources. In the last few years alone, Hawaii has set ambitious goals to move to 100-percent renewable energy and become carbon neutral.

We were the first State in the country to commit to meeting the objectives of the Paris climate agreement. In contrast, the Trump administration has spent the last year and a half disparaging the idea of protecting our land and natural resources. Donald Trump has taken action after action to prioritize the interests of his supporters in the fossil fuel industry at the expense of our environment.

The President filled his administration with appointees who refuse to accept the realities of climate change. He named two Environmental Protection Agency Administrators—Scott Pruitt and Andrew Wheeler—who don't even believe in the EPA's mission of protecting the air we breathe and the water we drink.

Administration officials have weakened rules that regulate pollution and protections for our natural resources. These actions have led to lawsuits by groups who embrace ''malama 'aina'' and seek to protect our environment. These lawsuits will be decided by our courts. The outcomes will depend on an independent, fair, and unbiased judiciary.

A number of these cases will come before the Supreme Court. In the October term, the Court will be hearing a case called Weyerhaeuser Company v. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to decide whether the Federal Government can protect endangered species on private land. Cases making their way through the lower courts include California v. EPA, which challenges the Federal Government's regulations on vehicle emissions, and West Virginia v. EPA, which challenges President Obama's Clean Power Plan. These cases raise crucial questions that will determine whether the government has the power to protect our environment. The answers to those questions may very well come from the Supreme Court.

The President's nominee to the Supreme Court, Brett Kavanaugh, raises serious concerns about whether he would be that fair arbiter on environmental issues, the kinds of cases that will surely come before the Supreme Court. Throughout his time on the circuit court of appeals, Judge Kavanaugh has argued for weakening environmental regulations. Basically, his decisions benefit industry over the environment.

In Coalition for Responsible Regulation, Inc. v. EPA, Judge Kavanaugh argued that the EPA should not regulate greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act because the cost to business was more important than protecting the environment and public health from climate change. He said that the EPA should not include greenhouse gases in the interpretation of the statute that says EPA can regulate any air pollutant because, as far as Judge Kavanaugh was concerned, such a requirement or enabling the EPA to do that would result in higher costs for businesses. Judge Kavanaugh did not consider the cost to the environment.

In Hawaii, we are already paying the price of climate change caused by greenhouse gases. Our coastlines are disappearing, corals in our oceans are dying, and catastrophic floods are becoming more frequent and more severe. The science behind the need to regulate greenhouse gases is clear. This message is lost on the President and apparently on Brett Kavanaugh, as he argued for a very limited interpretation of the EPA's authority to regulate.

In another environmental case, Judge Kavanaugh sided with the fossil fuel industry in his dissent in White Stallion Energy Center v. EPA in 2014. He argued that under the Clean Air Act, the EPA should not—should not—regulate toxic air pollutants from powerplants without factoring in what those regulations would cost polluters. The majority disagreed with Judge Kavanaugh, saying that the EPA's approach ''is clearly permissible,'' consistent with prior Supreme Court instruction, and consistent with the purpose of the legislation, which was, of course, to protect the environment and the health and safety of people. When the case went to the Supreme Court, then-Justice Scalia quoted Judge Kavanaugh in his reversal.

Judge Kavanaugh's opinions even went so far as to attempt to restrict the manufacture and sale of renewable fuel. In a 2012 case, Grocery Manufacturers Association v. EPA, Judge Kavanaugh opposed the EPA's grant of E15 waivers. These waivers would permit the manufacture and sale of a type of renewable fuel that would help our Nation decrease its dependence on foreign oil. In his dissent, Judge Kavanaugh argued that the EPA's rule permitting this renewable fuel would in effect force the production of renewable fuel. There is nothing in the statute that talked about forcing anybody to do anything. Actually, the word in the statute is ''permit.'' Permitting is not the same as forcing. Of course, Judge Kavanaugh certainly knew the difference before taking a position that supported the fossil fuel industry.

Judge Kavanaugh's record on these environmental issues makes it highly likely that as a Supreme Court Justice, he would favor fossil fuel interests over human health, renewable energy, and protecting our planet.

Senators have a constitutional responsibility to provide advice and consent on all judicial nominations, particularly those to the highest Court in the land, the Supreme Court. This responsibility requires us to take note of the fact that the Trump administration continues to fill the courts with deeply conservative, ideologically driven judges who will hold lifetime positions. The administration and their conservative allies expect that some of these judges will continue on to appellate courts and to the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, this week, we will be voting on two nominees for Federal appellate courts: Andrew Oldham from Texas for the Fifth Circuit and Ryan Bounds from Oregon for the Ninth Circuit. I will be voting no on both of these nominations.

Andrew Oldham has been an ideological warrior behind some of Texas Governor Greg Abbott's most extreme positions against a woman's right to choose, against LGBTQ people, and against solutions for the 800,000-plus Dreamers put at risk for deportation by Donald Trump's rescinding of DACA.

In 2013, as deputy solicitor general of Texas, Mr. Oldham defended a severe anti-choice Texas law, HB2, that put restrictions on doctors delivering reproductive healthcare. The restrictive provisions were upheld by the Fifth Circuit but struck down in a subsequent U.S. Supreme Court case called Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt.

In 2014, Mr. Oldham served as counsel of record for Texas in its successful challenge to the Deferred Action for Parental Accountability, or the DAPA Program. DAPA would have provided protections for the parents of Dreamers so families would not be cruelly separated, as we are seeing with such terrible and sad results today under Donald Trump's zero tolerance policy at the border.

While Mr. Oldham was advising Governor Abbott on legislation, his boss supported or signed bills to restrict the rights of the LGBTQ community by regulating bathroom usage in public schools and allowing faith-based groups to deny adoptive and foster parents who conflict with their beliefs.

In his response to the Senate Judiciary Committee's questions about these extreme positions, Mr. Oldham sought to discount them as merely advocacy positions on behalf of a client, that being the Governor of the State of Texas, while Mr. Oldham's career shows otherwise.

NOMINATION OF RYAN BOUNDS

Mr. President, I turn now to Ryan Bounds, who was nominated to a circuit court judgeship even though the President knew that Mr. Bounds did not have the approval of either of his home State Senators. The nominee himself admitted that Oregon's two Democratic Senators, his home State Senators, RON WYDEN and JEFF MERKLEY, played no role in his selection.

The Judiciary Committee ignored the traditional blue-slip process, which has been basically adhered to for over 100 years, by holding a hearing on Mr. Bounds' nomination even though neither of his home State Senators returned his blue slip. The Congressional Research Service could not find a single instance where a judicial nominee, without at least one blue slip returned by a home State Senator, had a hearing or was confirmed by the Senate, but nonetheless Mr. Bounds' nomination proceeds apace.

In writings that were not disclosed to the Oregon selection committee that reviewed his application, Mr. Bounds published a number of very offensive articles on race and gender while he was an undergraduate. While these writings were brought to light by a third-party organization, Mr. Bounds himself should have disclosed them to the committee. His articles took disparaging positions on topics, including race relations, opposition to ''multiculturalism,'' LGBTQ rights, and labor rights.

In closing, I seriously question whether, based on their full records, these two nominees can be the impartial and non-ideological judges we expect of life-tenured judges to our Federal courts, let alone, as in the case of these nominees, to the circuit courts. We all know that the circuit courts are only one step removed from the Supreme Court.

These questions of fairness and impartiality will continue to apply to judicial nominees as long as the President continues to choose judges vetted by two far-right, ideologically slanted organizations backed by millions of dollars—the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation. This is certainly the case with Mr. Oldham's and Mr. Bounds' nominations to the circuit courts and Judge Kavanaugh's nomination to the Supreme Court.

My colleague from Rhode Island, Senator WHITEHOUSE, went into length about these very well-funded entities that have spent millions to support Neil Gorsuch on the Supreme Court, and that they are going to do the same thing with Judge Kavanaugh's appointment to the Supreme Court. Those who appear before Federal circuit judges and, of course, the Supreme Court should be able to rely on a fair, impartial, and objective judge, free of ideological propensities. Neither Andrew Oldham nor Ryan Bounds fits that bill.

I will be voting no later this week on both of these nominees and urge my colleagues to vote against these confirmations as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong concern about Judge Brett Kavanaugh's nomination to the Supreme Court. In particular, I want to discuss today his troubling record on the environment and what that means for people's health.

Judge Kavanaugh has demonstrated that he simply doesn't believe that existing law allows new environmental threats to be addressed via any sort of regulation. I am talking about existing law designed to protect human health and our environment.

When you take a look at Judge Kavanaugh's record, one thing becomes abundantly clear: Judge Kavanaugh has tried to weaken Clean Air Act protections even though the act controls pollutants such as smog and carbon monoxide, which contribute to asthma, heart attacks, and even premature deaths. They put our health at risk.

In a 2012 case, Judge Kavanaugh authored an opinion that found the EPA had exceeded its authority when the Agency directed upwind States to literally stop blowing smoke onto their downwind neighbors. The good news is that the Supreme Court was more sensible than Judge Kavanaugh. Justices Kennedy and Roberts joined four others in a 6-to-2 decision to overturn Judge Kavanaugh's lower court ruling. Writing for the majority, Justice Ginsburg found that the EPA does have the power to act to protect people's health. I agree with the Supreme Court's 2012 decision, and so do most Americans. An April 2018 poll found that 75 percent of Americans support even stricter limits on smog.

What Judge Kavanaugh particularly doesn't like is that the Clean Air Act specifically gives the Environmental Protection Agency the right—the duty, even—to regulate new pollutants that threaten people's health. He has objected to using the law to establish new programs to reduce mercury—a potent toxin that harms developing brains. In 2014, Judge Kavanaugh lashed out at tough standards for mercury—a toxin that has been found to harm children's development.

Judge Kavanaugh's narrow view of the Clean Air Act could be extremely damaging to our efforts to address climate change by regulating greenhouse gases. Although the act does not mention greenhouse gases by name, the Supreme Court has held that the EPA does have the power to regulate them. In fact, the Court held that the act requires the EPA to address any air pollutants that are found to endanger human health. But Judge Kavanaugh still seems to have a problem with adding new pollutants to that list. This is even though Judge Kavanaugh claims to believe what virtually every scientist tells us: that manmade climate change is real and is an enormous threat to our planet and to our health. But merely accepting climate science is too low a bar because even if Judge Kavanaugh believes in the urgent challenge of climate change, he doesn't seem to believe there is an urgent need to address it, as his record demonstrates.

Over the next few decades, the Supreme Court will have many opportunities to weigh in on how our government can work to protect our environment, particularly regarding climate change.

And the stakes are high: Scientists tell us that in order to avoid dangerous global warming, we must reduce our carbon dioxide emissions to zero sometime between 2050 and 2065. But in 2018, global carbon emissions are still increasing, not decreasing.

At the same time, President Trump is attempting to backpedal on every commitment our country has made toward fighting global warming. He is pulling us out of the Paris climate agreement. He is pulling back the Clean Power Plan. He is looking for ways to force utilities to keep expensive coal plants online—a move that would cost Americans billions of dollars in increased electricity bills.

All of these moves will hurt the environment and harm the health of Americans, and in each case, Judge Kavanaugh's record shows that he is likely to act as nothing but an enabler.

My State of Minnesota is already experiencing the cost of climate change. The rains in Minnesota are growing more intense, leading to increased damage from flooding. As our winters grow milder and our summers warmer, plant and human diseases are spreading. Many scientists predict that the forests in my State will retreat rapidly, leaving Minnesota looking like Kansas by the end of this century.

But it does not need to be all bad news. A rapid transition to emissions-free energy sources is necessary to avoid the worst effects of climate change, but this change will bring economic opportunity to our country. We just need to rise to the challenge. In Minnesota, wind and solar and biofuels are already potent drivers of job growth.

If Judge Kavanaugh succeeds in overturning the Federal obligation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the clean energy transition in our country will certainly slow. We will lose the competitive advantage to China and other economic rivals in the race to develop the technology and innovations of an affordable, clean energy future.

Right now, we have a President who pushes coal and fossil fuels which, unless their carbon dioxide emissions are captured, must become the energy sources of the past. President Trump's energy policy is backward-looking and puts our economic competitiveness at risk. But presidents serve only for a term or two, which brings us back again to Judge Kavanaugh.

Hopefully, we will be able to recover from the backward environmental policies of the Trump administration. But Supreme Court Justices serve for life, so we cannot afford a Justice who is hostile to our environment and to human health. We cannot afford a Justice who rejects actions to fight climate change. We just don't have the time.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

CYBER SECURITY

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments about the topic in the news today and yesterday and, hopefully, will result in some action by Congress; that is, the threats we face as a Nation regarding our electoral system.

First I would like to recognize the Presiding Officer of the Senate, Senator RUBIO, for working with Senator VAN HOLLEN to come up with a piece of legislation called the DETER Act, which I think will serve us well. If the Director of National Intelligence certifies that a foreign power—Russia or anyone else—is trying to attack our electoral infrastructure, they will pay a heavy price.

Today is July 17, 2018. On Friday, last week, I think it was July—I don't know the dates; I just got back from traveling. So on Friday of last week, a few days ago, the Director of National Intelligence said the following: ''The warning lights are blinking red again. Today, the digital infrastructure that serves this country is literally under attack.''

How much more do we need as a body and as a nation to rally ourselves to act while there is still time?

He indicated that our cyber space strategies emphasize only defense, not offense as well, evoking President Reagan's Cold War approach to the Soviet Union. Mr. Coats suggested that if Russia continues to try to take on the United States in the cyber arena, then the administration should throw everything we have into that exercise.

Every Member of Congress, every Member of the Senate, as well as the President, has an obligation to defend the Nation against all enemies, foreign and domestic. I am 1,000 percent convinced that the Russians meddled in our election in 2016. They did not change the outcome, but they did disrupt our election. The bottom line is they are still up to it.

If you don't believe me, just ask Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, who is a former Member of this body.

In August of 2001, the 9/11 Commission found statements from the CIA that indicated there was something afoot, that ''the lights are blinking red,'' but they couldn't point to bin Laden specifically. As we look back, how much accountability should the Bush administration have had and how much accountability should Congress have had back then? Did we miss the warning signs regarding the September 11 attack? I would suggest that the chatter was strong and the threat was real, but nobody could really pinpoint it.

Here is what I am suggesting: The chatter is strong, the threat is real, and we know exactly where it is coming from. The question is, Will the House and Senate, working with the President, do anything about it? Senator RUBIO and Senator VAN HOLLEN have chosen to try to do something about it.

We are all eventually going to be in the history books. President Trump said today that he believed our electoral infrastructure needs to be made more secure—not just electoral infrastructure; energy and financial services are under threat, and not just from Russia.

So I want to look forward. I heard Senator MCCONNELL say today that he would like to find some bipartisan legislation that could come forward sooner rather than later to try to harden the infrastructure before the 2018 election. The bottom line here is that we all owe it to every voter in the country and all of those who are serving in the intelligence community and in the military to secure our election the best we can.

I am hoping that we will become ''Team America'' just for a few minutes. I am not asking my Democrat friends to give President Trump a pass, and I am not asking my Republican colleagues to stop fighting for our agenda. I am asking both parties to calm down and focus on the common enemy. The common enemy is Russia, and countries like Russia, that want to undermine our democracy, pit us one against the other, and they did it in 2016. If you believe Dan Coats, they are going to do it again. This meeting recently with President Trump and Putin—in my view, we missed an opportunity to really put the Russians on notice. But rather than look back, let's look forward.

Today, President Trump expressed confidence in our intelligence community. I am glad to hear that. I trust them far more than I trust Putin. It is not just America that Putin has been trying to interfere with; it is in France and Germany and everywhere else there is a democracy. President Putin is trying to destroy alliances like the European Union, which, I think, has value to the United States. He is trying to break NATO. He is attacking us here at home: fake news—truly fake news—made-up news article to try to pit one American against the other and trying to steal emails from party officials and dump them into the public domain at critical times in the election.

What do I say to my Republican colleagues? It was the Democrats last time; it could be us next time. It was Russia last time, and they are still up to it this time, but Iran, North Korea, China—fill in the blank—we are all exposed.

Article 5 of the NATO Charter says that an attack against one is an attack against all. So I would ask my colleagues tonight to think about that in terms of our democracy. An attack on one party should be an attack on all parties.

The Republican Party should take no comfort or glee in the fact that our Democratic friends were compromised in a very embarrassing way that hurt them. Nobody changed vote totals. But can you imagine how we would feel if the inner circle of the President was hacked and, at a crucial time in the election, the information was exposed?

To my friends in the media, you have to make a hard decision: How much do you empower this? How much do you aid a foreign government by publishing this information?

I believe we are at war in many ways. We are not at war in a direct way with Russia, but these cyber attacks are, to me, a hostile act against our country just as much as if they had launched a conventional attack. They are going to continue to do this until they pay a price.

I would like for us to come together to not only harden our infrastructure to make sure that 2018 cannot be compromised by a foreign power but also to make countries like Russia pay a price.

Senator VAN HOLLEN and Senator RUBIO have a very good piece of legislation which basically says that if the Director of National Intelligence certifies that a foreign power like Russia is continuing to interfere in our election, then we will up sanctions. We will make it harder, not easier, on that foreign power. It is Russia today; it could be somebody else tomorrow, and it probably already is.

So rather than taking the moment and dividing us about what President Trump said or didn't say, why don't we use this as an opportunity to listen to the professionals, not the politicians.

Senator RUBIO is on the Intelligence Committee. I am very proud of the work they have accomplished. They made a bipartisan finding that Russia did meddle in the 2016 election with the view of trying to help Trump over Clinton, but there is no evidence it changed the outcome.

The bottom line for me is that if we don't come together now—this is the end of July, July 17—we have precious days left to take action that could protect the 2018 election cycle.

The worst thing that could happen in a democracy is if somebody's vote could be stolen or the information provided to the public could be tainted in a fashion by some foreign entity to pit

one American against another. We do enough of that ourselves; we don't need anybody else's help. And the record is clear, in terms of 2016, that Russia was all over the place spreading disinformation, trying to create conflict within the Democratic primary, within the Republican primary, and during the general election.

November will be here before we know it. Here is what we have to ask ourselves as a body—and eventually be held accountable by the public and history. What did we do in July to answer the alarm raised by Director Dan Coats about the warning lights blinking red? I see attacks on critical infrastructure going on today, and I will expect them to continue. We need to up our game as a nation.

I don't know how any of us can go to our constituents in November and say that we answered Dan Coats' call if we do nothing. So I hope that Senator MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER can find a way to come up with a common agenda—maybe starting with the Rubio-Van Hollen bill—to see if there is common ground to deal with a common problem.

I would ask President Trump not to look backward, but to look forward. I have no doubt that you won the election, Mr. President, in 2016. The Russians didn't beat Ms. Clinton; you did. But what they are up to now can jeopardize our democracy.

We are just a stone's throw away from their changing vote totals. Senator RUBIO knows this better than I because he is on the Intelligence Committee. They are already infiltrating voter registration files. It would not be much of a leap to have some votes flipped through cyber attacks. So we have a chance in the coming days—working together, not against each other—to find solutions to this problem. I am sure whatever we come up with will not be perfect, but at least we tried. The one thing I cannot live with is not trying.

I have known Dan Coats for well over a decade, Secretary Pompeo, the entire national security team, Senator BURR, Senator WARNER, Senator RUBIO—they all tell us the same thing: Our critical infrastructure is under attack by foreign powers, Russia being the leader. The question for us is, What do we do about it?

I am hoping that next week the President will call the Congress together, in a bipartisan fashion, to come up with some preventive measures to protect our infrastructure, when it comes to the November election, and that we, as a nation, try to figure out what the rules of engagement are going to be, not to just defend ourselves from aggression but punish the aggressor.

I don't have all the answers. I am not suggesting this is my area of expertise, because it is not, but I am smart enough to know Russia is going to continue what they did in 2016, until somebody makes them pay a heavy price, and it is just not Russia; be it Iran, China, North Korea, or other bad actors.

I don't know how, as a body, we can live with ourselves if we don't try to heed Dan Coats' warnings. They are not just given by him but by those who work for him, who are nonpolitical, who have made it their life's work to find ways to protect this Nation.

So, Mr. President, we have a chance to bring the Congress together. Challenge us to work with you to find solutions to this looming threat, better ways to defend America's critical infrastructure when it comes to our 2018 election, and challenge us to work with you. I hope we will be smart enough to meet that challenge, and I hope you will issue that challenge. You are the most special person in our constitutional democracy when it comes to national security. You are the Commander in Chief. You rightly criticized President Obama for being slow when it came to reacting to Russian interference in 2016. I am sure that was a hard call for President Obama, but there is no doubt in my mind that you, the Senate, and the House are now on notice—by your own intelligence services—that Russia is interfering now and will continue to do so up to 2018 and beyond unless somebody stops them. At a minimum, we should come up with defensive measures available to us. As a nation, we need to deal with this threat.

I am not worried about a foreign power taking over our country in a conventional military fashion. I am worried about foreign powers and terrorist organizations using cyber attacks to cripple our country, our economy, our finances, and our energy, but, most importantly, the heart and soul of democracy, which is free and fair elections. Putin wants no part of free and fair elections. All of us should very much want to have a free and fair election in 2018. We are not going to have one unless we push back together and push back now.

I yield the floor.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein.

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

NIGER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I want to draw the Senate's attention to the plight of civil society leaders in Niger, where political and civil rights have been deteriorating over the last several years. This disturbing trend threatens the U.S.–Niger partnership and should concern each of us.

Mahamadou Issoufou was elected President of Niger in 2011 and, in the following years, worked cooperatively with Niger's international partners, including the United States, to make progress toward the restoration of democratic governance in that country. Our countries have partnered together on health, development, and humanitarian assistance programs, and as we all know, we have suffered tragic losses together in the fight against terrorism.

Progress toward democratic governance has been significantly eroded. Since the run up to President Issoufou's reelection in 2016, the government has increasingly persecuted opposition politicians, journalists, peaceful protesters, and civil society leaders in a manner that has undermined progress and stability in the country.

This trend has not gone unnoticed. The State Department noted in its most recent Human Rights Report that Niger's significant human rights issues include harsh and life-threatening prison and detention center conditions, detention of opposition politicians, and restrictions on freedom of assembly. In November 2017, Niger withdrew from the global Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative after being suspended for failing to meet good governance standards, including for its repression of civil society.

An example of this disturbing trend involves the arrest of several dozen civil society leaders between March and April of this year, in connection with demonstrations against the country's new finance law. Many of these individuals, like Ali Idrissa, the coordinator for the Network of Organizations for Budgetary Transparency and Analysis, are affiliated with Publish What You Pay and are advocates for transparency and accountability of Niger's revenues in order to combat corruption. That effort should be a shared goal in Niger. Peaceful public assembly and calls for accountability should not result in imprisonment.

I urge the Trump administration, other donor governments, including the EU, and the international financial institutions to hold the government of Niger accountable for respecting its citizens' right to freedom of expression and assembly and to join me in calling on President Issoufou to release the detainees and to dismiss the charges against these individuals. This is now a matter of urgency, as four civil society leaders reportedly face jail sentences at a judgment hearing on July 24.

Doing so would be a positive step by the government of Niger toward proving that it is serious about upholding the values that underscore our partnership, including to maintain its eligibility under the recently initiated Millennium Challenge Corporation Compact. That Compact is now subject to heightened scrutiny by the Appropriations Committee, which provides the funding for it.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I was unable to attend yesterday's vote on the nomination of Scott Stump, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education. Had I been able to attend, I would have supported the nomination.

CONFIRMATION OF SCOTT STUMP

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate voted to confirm Scott Stump, who was nominated to serve as Assistant Secretary for Career, Technical, and Adult Education at the Department of Education. Mr. Stump will be in charge of matters related to career, technical, and adult education at the high school and postsecondary levels.

Stump is well-qualified for this role. He spent nearly 14 years at the Colorado Community College System as assistant provost for career and technical education, where he was in charge of directing the system's career and technical education programs and guiding implementation of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act. He is also a past president of the National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education Consortium, now called Advance CTE. He is supported by the Association for Career and Technical Education and Advance CTE. He was approved by the HELP Committee on June 26, 2018, by voice vote.

Mr. Stump will be key in carrying out the Perkins Act reauthorization, which I expect Congress to complete its work on this year. The reauthorization, which aligns Federal dollars more closely with the needs of employers and employees and gives States more flexibility in spending Federal dollars, was passed out of the HELP Committee unanimously on June 26, 2018. The House of Representatives passed its reauthorization on June 22, 2017.

I look forward to working with Mr. Stump as he takes on this role at the Department of Education, and I urge my colleagues to support him as well.

TRIBUTE TO ROCCO SICILIANO

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate the life of Rocco Siciliano, of Beverly Hills, CA. This combat-decorated veteran of World War II served his Nation as an infantry platoon leader in the 10th Mountain Infantry Division in Italy, earned the Bronze Star for Valor, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, and the Army Special Commendation Medal. He and thousands of his fellow countrymen served as soldiers in the liberation of Europe under Supreme Allied Commander General Dwight D. Eisenhower, a fellow Kansan and personal hero of mine. Rocco later served in President Eisenhower's administration, first as an assistant secretary in the U.S. Department of Labor from 1953 to 1957, then as Special Assistant to the President for Personnel Management policies from 1957 to 1959. This leads me to the reason I rise today.

Rocco Siciliano, after decades of service to our Nation in many significant roles and having secured many accomplishments over his illustrious career in both the public and private sectors, was elected chairman of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission in 2001. Joined on the commission by fellow decorated World War II combat veterans, Senators Daniel Inouye and Ted Stevens, Rocco led the commission whose congressionally mandated mission is to create a national memorial to our 34th president, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Rocco successfully led the Commission for 14 years before stepping down as chair in 2015. As Rocco's successor as chair of the Commission, I feel I must recognize him for his significant accomplishments. During his tenure, Rocco guided the commission through the processes of memorial site selection and the design competition. His remarkable and steadfast work has helped the commission get us to this memorable juncture. The memorial to Ike is under construction in our Nation's Capital, between 4th and 6th Streets on Independence Avenue, Southwest. Rocco continues to serve as chair emeritus on the commission as one of the four Presidentially appointed commissioners. The commission seeks to dedicate the completed memorial to Ike on May 8, 2020, the 75th anniversary of V–E Day.

Speaking on behalf of the Eisenhower Memorial Commission, I wish to recognize Rocco's patriotism, leadership, perseverance, and tenacity that have been of great benefit to our Nation. He has been a valued colleague in this monumental endeavor, and I stand to honor him today.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING MARCUS J. YATES

● Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today I wish to join the Philadelphia community in renaming the 6000 block of Springfield Avenue to Marcus J. Yates Way.

Thirty years ago, on July 18, 1988, a gun fight on this block took the life of 5-year-old Marcus Yates. Marcus's death was a tragedy that prompted Philadelphia residents to seek change in their community, and while today's street dedication leaves us with a daily reminder of Marcus's life, it also serves as a testament to the dedication of the Yates family and those who stood alongside them, to ensure that his death would not be in vain.

Marcus's killing served as the inspiration for efforts to better protect the children of west Philadelphia. Neighbors looked to create new, safer spaces for children, with residents setting up sports teams and drama clubs. Following the incident, citizens also organized a number of antidrug groups and held antidrug marches throughout the city, citing the increase in drug trafficking as a cause for the increase in gun violence in the community.

In 1990, the Yates family opened the Marcus J. Yates Home for Children, housing over 30 foster children from the area. Since their son's death, the Yates family has become advocates against gun violence, seeking to prevent similar devastation from occurring throughout the Nation. They have taken this effort from the municipal level all the way to the Federal Government.

When people described Marcus, they often commented on his vibrant, welcoming spirit. It is a tragedy that the community lost a bright soul at such a young age. Through the efforts of Marcus's family and his community, his legacy is one of advocacy and action. They have worked tirelessly to ensure that his short life was not lost in vain.

The efforts of the West Philadelphia community, as well as the resilience of the Yates family are examples for us all. Their actions show us that with compassion and collaboration, tragedy can be a driving force for positive change. We honor their efforts and their persistence today on the anniversary of a life taken too soon.●

TRIBUTE TO JACKSON WILLIAM ''J.W.'' STINE

● Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, today I would like to acknowledge and honor Jackson William ''J.W.'' Stine on his 100th birthday. Mr. Stine is a longtime businessman and World War II veteran combat pilot who has served the State of Louisiana for many years.

Mr. Stine was born to Sulphur residents Andrew and Elma Stine on July 22, 1918. He attended Normal College—today Northwestern State University—and went on to marry his high school sweetheart, Doris ''Dee Dee'' Drost on January 14, 1944. They remained married for 67 years until Dee Dee passed away in 2011. Together they raised seven children, and today, they have 31 grandchildren and 71 great-grandchildren.

J.W. joined the U.S. Army Air Corps in 1944. Captain Stine flew over 40 combat missions as a pilot of a B–26 aircraft over Germany, Italy, and France. He flew the B–26 Marauder in the 17th Bombardment Group. J.W., with the 17th Bombardment Group, and conducted bombing missions against critical targets throughout the Mediterranean, Italy, France, and Germany. It received the Distinguished Unit Citation, DUC, for its support of the Anzio invasion and another for its outstanding performance over Schweinfurt. For operations in support the invasion of France, it received the French Croix de Guerre with Palm.

J.W. and his best friend, J.C. Carlin, opened a construction company in Sulphur after World War II and then a

lumber company to supply the construction company which was called Starlin Lumber. He eventually bought out J.C.'s share and changed the name in 1973 to Stine Lumber.

J.W. instilled the core values of faith. family, and community in his seven children. He is a proud father of a nationally known artist, a colonel in the Air Force, a captain in the National Guard, two former Louisiana State legislators, a former Sulphur City councilman, a former Louisiana commissioner of administration, past president of Greater Beauregard Chamber of Commerce, past McNeese State University Foundation president, past chairman of the Boy Scouts of America Calcasieu Area Council, past chairman of the Council for A Better Louisiana, a current member of the Christus Health System Board, and current chairman of Louisiana Association of Business and Industry.

On July 22, 2018, J.W. Stine will celebrate his 100th birthday. I and my fellow Louisianans are proud of his accomplishments and the positive impact that he has had on our state. He fought for our Nation, raised an incredible family, and started a successful business. He has truly lived out the American Dream.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:16 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 490. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam.

S. 931. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, as the ''George Sakato Post Office''.

S. 2692. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4558 Broadway in New York, New York, as the ''Stanley Michels Post Office Building''.

S. 2734. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the ''George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 66. An act to establish the Route 66 Centennial Commission, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prepare a plan on the preservation needs of Route 66, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1376. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to require preservation of certain electronic records by Federal agencies, to require a certification and reports relating to Presidential records, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2979. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 390 West 5th Street in San Bernardino, California, as the ''Jack H. Brown Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3076. An act to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance on electronic consent forms, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3230. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 915 Center Avenue in Payette, Idaho, as the ''Harmon Killebrew Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3460. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 323 East Chapel Hill Street in Durham, North Carolina, as the ''John Hervey Wheeler United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 3906. An act to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a stormwater infrastructure funding task force, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4407. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3s101 Rockwell Street in Warrenville, Illinois, as the ''Corporal Jeffery Allen Williams Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4446. An act to amend the Virgin Islands of the United States Centennial Commission Act to extend the expiration date of the Commission, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4890. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9801 Apollo Drive in Upper Marlboro, Maryland, as the ''Wayne K. Curry Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4946. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1075 North Tustin Street in Orange, California, as the ''Specialist Trevor A. Win'E Post Office''.

H.R. 4960. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 511 East Walnut Street in Columbia, Missouri, as the ''Spc. Sterling William Wyatt Post Office Building''.

H.R. 5238. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1234 Saint Johns Place in Brooklyn, New York, as the ''Major Robert Odell Owens Post Office''.

H.R. 5333. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the regulatory framework with respect to certain nonprescription drugs that are marketed without an approved new drug application, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5415. An act to require agencies to submit reports on outstanding recommendations in the annual budget justification submitted to Congress.

H.R. 5504. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4801 West Van Giesen Street in West Richland, Washington, as the ''Sergeant Dietrich Schmieman Post Office Building''.

H.R. 5554. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs.

H.R. 5772. An act to designate the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Courthouse in Amarillo, Texas, as the ''J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 5846. An act to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study regarding the buyout practices of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, with amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 899. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the requirements that new Federal employees who are veterans with service-connected disabilities are provided leave for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disabilities apply to certain employees of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 66. An act to establish the Route 66 Centennial Commission, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prepare a plan on the preservation needs of Route 66, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 1376. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to require preservation of certain electronic records by Federal agencies, to require a certification and reports relating to Presidential records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2979. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 390 West 5th Street in San Bernardino, California, as the ''Jack H. Brown Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3076. An act to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance on electronic consent forms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3230. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 915 Center Avenue in Payette, Idaho, as the ''Harmon Killebrew Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3460. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 323 East Chapel Hill Street in Durham, North Carolina, as the ''John Hervey Wheeler United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3906. An act to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a stormwater infrastructure funding task force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 4407. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3s101 Rockwell Street in Warrenville, Illinois, as the ''Corporal Jeffery Allen Williams Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4446. An act to amend the Virgin Islands of the United States Centennial Commission Act to extend the expiration date of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4890. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9801 Apollo Drive in Upper Marlboro,

Maryland, as the ''Wayne K. Curry Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4946. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1075 North Tustin Street in Orange, California, as the ''Specialist Trevor A. Win'E Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4960. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 511 East Walnut Street in Columbia, Missouri, as the ''Spc. Sterling William Wyatt Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5238. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1234 Saint Johns Place in Brooklyn, New York, as the ''Major Robert Odell Owens Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5415. An act to require agencies to submit reports on outstanding recommendations in the annual budget justification submitted to Congress; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5504. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4801 West Van Giesen Street in West Richland, Washington, as the ''Sergeant Dietrich Schmieman Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5772. An act to designate the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Courthouse in Amarillo, Texas, as the ''J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 5846. An act to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study regarding the buyout practices of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 5333. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the regulatory framework with respect to certain nonprescription drugs that are marketed without an approved new drug application, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–5963. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to the Congress on the Profitability of Credit Card Operations of Depository Institutions''; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5964. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve for calendar year 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–5965. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Saudi Arabia for replacement of old machine guns, grenade launchers, lasers, night vision goggles, accessories, and spare parts and components that are in poor condition in their inventory in the amount of $50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17–132); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–266. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing its support of the right of American citizens to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 87

Whereas, the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 11 of the Constitution of Louisiana guarantees the right of Louisiana citizens to keep and bear arms; and

Whereas, in recent years, Congress as well as certain states have passed laws which have eroded or attempted to erode the right of the citizens of this country to keep and bear arms; and

Whereas, Americans have the right to protect themselves at home with a firearm; and

Whereas, the United States Constitution recognizes that the right to keep and bear arms is necessary to the security of a free nation and for its citizens to protect themselves and their families; and

Whereas, there are some who would repeal or impair the right to keep and bear arms. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby express support of the right of American citizens to keep and bear arms and does not support any actions that would impair or erode that right, including but not limited to the right of citizens to protect themselves and their families in their home. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM–267. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to an amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Report to accompany H.R. 1900, a bill to designate the Veterans Memorial and Museum in Columbus, Ohio, as the National Veterans Memorial and Museum, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–304).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 557. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the strategic importance of NATO to the collective security of the transatlantic region and urging its member states to work together at the upcoming summit to strengthen the alliance.

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2497. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 3218. A bill to allow employers to offer short-term savings accounts with automatic contribution arrangements for financial emergencies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3219. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to modify the requirements for multiple employer plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 3220. A bill to establish the Refund to Rainy Day Savings Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. COTTON, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 3221. A bill to provide for an additional nondiscrimination safe harbor for automatic contribution arrangements; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 3222. A bill to designate the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and United States Courthouse in Amarillo, Texas, as the ''J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 3223. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to make supplemental funds available for the management of fish and wildlife species of greatest conservation need, as determined by State fish and wildlife agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 3224. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain public lands in Ouachita National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 3225. A bill to ensure the humane treatment of pregnant women by reinstating the presumption of release and prohibiting shackling, restraining, and other inhumane

treatment of pregnant detainees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 3226. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that the treatment of natural gas vehicles is equal to the treatment of electric vehicles; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 3227. A bill to reunite families separated at or near ports of entry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 3228. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for distributions from 529 programs to pay apprenticeship and qualified early education expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 21

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 116

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 116, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit veterans who have a service-connected, permanent disability rated as total to travel on military aircraft in the same manner and to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces entitled to such travel.

S. 205

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 205, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 422

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 422, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 427

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 427, a bill to enhance Social Security benefits and ensure the long-term solvency of the Social Security program.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to use only human-based methods for training members of the Armed Forces in the treatment of severe combat injuries, and for other purposes.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to veterans.

S. 515

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 515, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S. 783

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to distribute maternity care health professionals to health professional shortage areas identified as in need of maternity care health services.

S. 817

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 817, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 948

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 948, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 1121

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to establish a post-secondary student data system.

S. 1212

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to provide family members of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others, and law enforcement, with new tools to prevent gun violence.

S. 1278

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1278, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union.

S. 1522

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1522, a bill to establish an Every Kid Outdoors program, and for other purposes.

S. 1642

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1642, a bill to amend the Revised Statutes, the Home Owners' Loan Act, the Federal Credit Union Act, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require the rate of interest on certain loans remain unchanged after transfer of the loan, and for other purposes.

S. 1712

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1712, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the automatic recertification of income for income-driven repayment plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1730

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 1730, a bill to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally.

S. 1989

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1989, a bill to enhance transparency and accountability for online political advertisements by requiring those who purchase and publish such ads to disclose information about the advertisements to the public, and for other purposes.

S. 2101

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2101, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the crew of the

USS Indianapolis, in recognition of their perseverance, bravery, and service to the United States.

S. 2105

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2105, a bill to modify the presumption of service connection for veterans who were exposed to herbicide agents while serving in the Armed Forces in Thailand during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

S. 2131

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2131, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish medically necessary transportation for newborn children of certain women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2144

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2144, a bill to provide a process for granting lawful permanent resident status to aliens from certain countries who meet specified eligibility requirements.

S. 2463

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2463, a bill to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes.

S. 2567

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2567, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance the national strategy for combating and eliminating tuberculosis, and for other purposes.

S. 2577

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2577, a bill to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004.

S. 2578

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2578, a bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Commerce to provide advanced notice to Congress before changing any questions on the decennial census, and for other purposes.

S. 2593

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2593, a bill to protect the administration of Federal elections against cybersecurity threats.

S. 2823

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2823, a bill to modernize copyright law, and for other purposes.

S. 3051

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3051, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a working group to study regulatory and legislative improvements for the livestock, insect, and agricultural commodities transport industries, and for other purposes.

S. 3128

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3128, a bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program.

S. 3131

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3131, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide increased labor law protections for agricultural workers, and for other purposes.

S. 3172

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3172, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 61

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 61, a resolution calling on the Department of Defense, other elements of the Federal Government, and foreign governments to intensify efforts to investigate, recover, and identify all missing and unaccounted-for personnel of the United States.

S. RES. 572

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 572, a resolution supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 3222. A bill to designate the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and United States Courthouse in Amarillo, Texas, as the ''J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3222

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. J. MARVIN JONES FEDERAL BUILDING AND MARY LOU ROBINSON UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and United States Courthouse located at 205 SE 5th Ave., Amarillo, Texas, shall be known and designated as the ''J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse''.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3396. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 4, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3396. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 4, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFINITION OF LIVESTOCK.

Section 602(2) of the Emergency Livestock Feed Assistance Act of 1988 (7 U.S.C. 1471(2)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''fish'' and all that follows through ''that—'' and inserting ''llamas, alpacas, live fish, crawfish, and other animals that—''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the majority and minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the

Senate on Tuesday, July 17, 2018, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Sharks''.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 17, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''the semi-annual monetary policy report to the Congress''.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 17, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 17, 2018, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 17, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Reducing Healthcare Costs: Eliminating excess healthcare spending and improving quality of value for patients.''

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 17, 2018, at 12 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 17, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Karina Ramirez Velazquez, be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the day.

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following individual fellows in my office be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 115th Congress: Casey Dreher, Cathleen Carlson, Nick St. Laurent, Gabe Kaptchuk, Shaanan Cohney, Roberta Kienast Daghir, and Derek Southern.

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

AMENDING TITLE XIX OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 6042 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6042) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to delay the reduction in Federal medical assistance percentage for Medicaid personal care services furnished without an electronic visit verification system, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 6042) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 18, 2018

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, July 18; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Oldham nomination and that time until 2 p.m. be equally divided; that at 2 p.m., notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate vote on confirmation of the Oldham nomination with no intervening action or debate; and that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues.

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

The Senator from Vermont.

TRUMP-PUTIN SUMMIT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, at the Helsinki summit yesterday, President Trump embarrassed our country, undermined American values, and openly sided with Russia's authoritarian leader Vladimir Putin against the U.S. intelligence community's unanimous assessment that Russia interfered in our 2016 Presidential election. JOHN MCCAIN is right when he says it was ''one of the most disgraceful performances by an American president in memory. The damage inflicted by President Trump's naivete, egotism, false equivalence, and sympathy for autocrats is difficult to calculate. But it is clear that the summit in Helsinki was a tragic mistake.''

That is not BERNIE SANDERS. That is former Republican Presidential candidate Senator JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona.

Today, after a strong international backlash, Trump, in a bizarre statement, claimed he misspoke and of course blamed the media for reporting what he said. Even now he could not help but suggest that the electoral interference ''could be other people also,'' not just Russia.

Today, we face an unprecedented situation of a President who, for whatever reason, refuses to acknowledge an attack on American democracy. Either he really doesn't understand what has happened or he is under Russian influence because of compromising information they may have on him or because he is ultimately more sympathetic to Russia's authoritarian-oligarchic form of society than he is to American democracy. Whatever the reason, Congress must act, and must act now, to demand that the President of the United States represent the interests of the American people and not Russia.

Let us be clear. Russia has been meddling not only in U.S. elections but in the elections of other democracies—the United Kingdom, France, Germany, to name just a few. Russia's goal is to advance its own interests by weakening the transatlantic alliance of democracies that arose after World War II, while also inflaming internal divisions in each of these countries.

We should also be clear that this interference is directed from the very highest levels of the Russian Government. Last week, Special Counsel Robert Mueller announced a set of indictments of 12 members of Russia's military intelligence service, the GRU. There can be no doubt that given the nature of the Russian Government, Vladimir Putin was directly involved in this effort, but our concern is not only what has already happened, it is what could happen in the future.

Last week, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, a former Republican Senator, raised the alarm on growing cyber attack threats against the United States in a range of areas, including Federal, State, and local government agencies, the military, business, and academia, saying the situation is at a ''critical point.'' He said:

[Russia is the] most aggressive foreign actor, no question. And they continue their efforts to undermine our democracy.

Coats compared the warning signs to those the United States faced ahead of the September 11th terrorist attacks. This is a clear and present threat to our democratic system and those of our allies. Ultimately, of course, we want a

peaceful relationship with Russia. We do not want a return to the Cold War, and we surely do not seek conflict, but at the same time, we must be very clear that we oppose what Putin is doing, both in terms of his foreign policy and his domestic policy.

On foreign policy, we will not accept Russian meddling in the elections of democratic countries, stoking political tensions by promoting hatred and suspicion of immigrants and minorities and trying to undermine longstanding alliances between democratic allies.

In 2014, in violation of international law, Russia invaded neighboring Ukraine and annexed the Crimea region. Russia has assassinated political opponents abroad, most recently through the use of poison in Salisbury, England, on a former spy and his daughter, a chemical attack that endangered the lives of many civilians. The British Government concluded that this atrocious attack was likely carried out by Russia's military intelligence service.

Domestically, Putin has undermined democracy in Russia, crushing free speech, jailing political opponents, harassing and assassinating journalists who criticize him, and increasing persecution of ethnic and religious minorities and the LGBT community. President Trump had an opportunity to speak out on all of these issues, to confront Putin about these destabilizing and inhumane policies, but he chose not to. If the President of the United States is not going to do it, Congress must.

The Congress must make it clear that we accept the assessment of our intelligence community with regard to Russia's election meddling in our country and in other democracies. The Congress must move aggressively to protect our election systems from interference by Russia or any foreign power and work closely with our democratic partners around the world to do the same. The Congress must demand that the sanctions against Russia that were passed last year be fully implemented. The Congress must make it clear that we will not accept any interference with the ongoing investigation of Special Counsel Mueller, such as the offer of preemptive pardons or the firing of Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein, and that the President must cooperate with this investigation.

Finally, the Congress must make it clear to President Trump that his job is to protect the values that millions of Americans struggled for and died to defend—the values of democracy, justice, and equality.

Tweets, comments, and press conferences are fine, but we need more from Republican Senators now. It is time for the Senate to rein in the President's dangerous behavior. If their leadership will not allow votes on dealing with this extraordinarily important matter, then my Republican colleagues must join with Democrats to make it happen, or all of their words are worthless.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, the events of the last 36 hours, particularly the issue that now dominates the media coverage in America, and our political debates on the floor cause me to come today to the floor of the Senate to speak for a few minutes to my constituents in the State of Florida but also to anyone else who clearly should care about this issue across our country, for it is one that impacts our Nation in ways that I don't think have been fully vetted or are clearly understood by enough people.

The idea that the Russian Federation, at the command of Vladimir Putin, interfered in our election is something that most Americans are now familiar with. It has been a topic of ongoing conversation, discussion, debate, argument, and dispute, pretty much since the fall of 2016 and to the present day. It has morphed into something that has become domestically more of a partisan issue. It is hard to believe. If you were able to get in a time machine and go back just 5 years and tell someone that Russian interference in our election would become a partisan issue, along the lines in which we see it play out now, few would believe you.

I will spend very little time today talking about the past and saying ''you guys did this on the other side of the aisle before we did'' and vice versa because it isn't constructive and means nothing to the future.

It wasn't long ago, in a major Presidential debate where the Republican nominee, Mitt Romney, pointed to Russia as the greatest geopolitical challenge of the United States, that he was roundly mocked not just by President Obama, who was running for election and subsequently won, but by many in the press. I don't say that for purposes of drawing a ''you guys were wrong back then'' kind of argument. I say it solely for purposes of understanding how far we have come and where we are today.

By the way, I wouldn't necessarily agree with that statement. I believe, by and large, that the greatest geopolitical challenge for the United States and the world in the 21st century will be whether China's rise is peaceful and productive or not.

When the story of the 21st century is written, there will be some chapters in that book about Vladimir Putin and Russia, and it is a topic that increasingly dominates our domestic debate today in ways that I think require more careful examination and understanding if we are to make from it good public policy and good decisions for the country.

I think it begins with something that I talked about last week; that is, understanding the nature of this conflict. It begins with a man, Vladimir Putin. I don't know the man, but I know enough about him and have certainly learned enough about him to make some pretty clear assessments that I believe in deeply. The first is that this is a man who was raised in the Cold War Soviet Union, where people were trained to be suspicious about each other, and who then went on to a career in the intelligence agency of that country, the KGB. The result is that he is, by nature and by all accounts, both a suspicious and a paranoid individual, as someone probably would be if they spent their whole life lying to other people. You begin to assume that everyone is a liar. This is a man who made his living by deceiving westerners and manipulating them.

He also grew up in a society where neighbors spied on each other and kids turned their parents in, and you never really knew who the other person you were talking to was. But if you were reported as someone who was against the government, your career, your ability to go to school and the quality of life for your family would be deeply impacted. There is no way that you grow up in a society like that and in an environment like that and, then, later on, go and work as a spy and it does not somehow frame the way you operate or think for years to come.

The other thing that is pretty clear—for reasons I don't fully understand because I don't know him, I don't know his family, and I don't know his upbringing—is that he takes everything deeply personal. Any sort of effort against Russia is not a geopolitical decision or something that he can depersonalize. He seems to absorb all these things as a personal attack on him. As a result, he, I think, has come to view himself as Russia—as the embodiment of the Russian Federation.

You add to all of that his views as a leader, and it is interesting because, if you go back to Vladimir Putin 15 years ago, he wasn't nearly as confident or as bold as he is at this moment. There are a lot of reasons for it, but this is a person who accidentally became the leader of Russia. He is kind of almost the guy who stumbled into the role because of a series of circumstances. He was hardly known before he started his career as Prime Minister but went on to the Presidency, nonetheless. He is someone who wound up in this position almost by accident, but since then, he has solidified his hold.

There is the Vladimir Putin from the first time around and the Vladimir Putin from the second time around, but one thing is abundantly clear from his public statements, and that is that he viewed the end of the Cold War as a disaster for Russia, and not for the reasons some people think. It is not an ideological rationale, but because Russia, which already has a deep and long history in its geopolitics of feeling ignored by Europe and Asia and disrespected by the world—at the end of the Cold War, Russia was a nation that faced incredible challenges.

Imagine for a moment that you are in the government or living in the Soviet Union and you oversee this incredible empire that covers all of this territory and have all these nations within your sphere of influence, and overnight, it all evaporates. Overnight, all of the countries in your periphery begin to join NATO. They start having elections. They start becoming allies of the United States. Your territory shrinks. One day, Ukraine is part of the Soviet Union; the next day, it is its own country.

Then add to that, over the next 12 to 15 years, the sort of emergence of the United States for much of that period of time as the world's sole superpower, while Russia was struggling to have an economy or even be relevant in the global discourse.

Then you come to see that Vladimir Putin viewed that period of time in world history, up to the present day, as an example of the strong America and strong West abusing a weak Russia, because this is ultimately how he views life and how he views the world. It is a battle between the weak and the strong, where the strong prey on the weak. You know who he wants to be. So because of all of that and because he is paranoid and because he is suspicious, he believes the United States, for example, was behind the protests in 2011 that broke out on the streets against his rule. He believes the United States is behind everything that is happening in Ukraine. All of this leads him to the two goals he has, and there are two goals that have become crystal clear, especially beginning his second time around as President.

A lot of people forget that he was President, he left, and his handpicked successor served for a period of time. Then he came back for the second time. It is the second Putin we are now dealing with.

Since that time, two things have become pretty clear about his goals. The first is that he wants to reestablish Russia once again as a world power, like the time when the Soviet Union was on par with the United States of America. He can't do that economically. A lot of people don't realize this, but Russia is the 9th or 10th largest economy in the world. To put it in perspective, the Italian economy—Italy is a great country—the Italian economy, with less territory, less oil, fewer people, is bigger than the Russian economy. It is about equal to the Spanish economy. I would dare say—for example, my home State of Florida has an economy now at about $1 trillion. Russia is at $2 trillion. There are States in this country that have a bigger economy than Russia's. So he is not a global economic superpower. The only thing that makes him a global superpower is the fact that they possess thousands of nuclear weapons and conventional military capabilities that are significant and have improved as he has invested in them. He quickly realized: The way I am going to become relevant in the world again is not through my economic or diplomatic prowess; the way I am going to become relevant in the world again is I am going to use my conventional weapons, my conventional capabilities, along with some asymmetrical ones, to inject myself in the discussion in different parts of the world and show people that Russia and Vladimir Putin are strong again.

That is what he has done. It actually began back in 2008 with the invasion of Georgia—we now commemorate the 10th anniversary of that—but it also plays out in his intervention in Syria or the annexation of Crimea. I believe he would have moved forward into Kiev and broader Ukraine had there not been the EU and U.S. sanctions against him as a result.

The first objective is to make Russia a world power again. The second objective, which he thinks is tied to the first, is that he has to make America weak. Vladimir Putin is a strong believer in zero-sum propositions—not in the idea that somehow we can both be better off or that there can be a win-win but a true believer in the idea that in order for me to be stronger or us to be stronger, you have to be weaker.

It plays out that in order for Russia to be stronger, America, which he views as his greatest geopolitical competitor, has to be weaker. That is why they chose to interfere in the 2016 election.

Let me say this: I don't think Vladimir Putin interfered in our elections; I don't believe he interfered in our elections; I know it for a fact. By the way, so does everyone who has looked at this issue and knows anything about it. There is zero doubt about it. What I think we are missing in our debate is the why and the how.

The why is not what people think. He may have had a personal preference in an election, but his interference and his efforts to interfere in our elections began well before the President of the United States descended down those escalators in New York in the summer of 2015. They intended to do this long before that period of time.

His No. 1 objective was to ensure that no matter who was elected President of the United States, that person would assume office under a cloud of nagging and persistent controversy. He wanted to weaken them internally because, as an intelligence officer, he understood the power of being weakened from within. He understands it so much that he jealously protects his image in Russia, he guards it, disclosing very little about himself or about his personal life. He never puts himself in a position to appear vulnerable. He only shows pictures of things he wants people to see and actually allows no dissent—to the point where a substantial number of the people who opposed Vladimir Putin are not out of politics or even in jail; they are dead. Sadly, the world is littered with story after story of a Russian opposition figure found dead in his hotel room, strangled, fell out of a window, poisoned. It happens over and over again. These things are not a coincidence.

He wanted to weaken whoever was the next President of the United States. No matter how this election turned out in November, whether the President was named Trump or Clinton, we would be dealing with a President right now under a cloud of controversy because he had it lined up either way.

The second thing he wanted to do as part of the first part is undermine confidence in our institutions—I mean all of our institutions: our elections, the media, our political figures, everything. It has extended to important institutions like the FBI and our intelligence agencies. He undermined confidence so that no one could be believed. And the President is under controversy. Divide us against each other so that there are no authorities in which we trust. Some of this, by the way, was already happening in our country, but they had the nuanced understanding of it to be able to exploit it.

The third, as part of the first and second, is to really drive divisions—not just to weaken the President and undermine confidence in our institutions but look for ways to do so by exacerbating preexisting tensions in our society.

These were the aims of the Russian interference campaign beyond everything else. It was not about electing one candidate or another; it was about these things. It would be hard to see what happened yesterday and the reaction to it and not conclude that this effort succeeded his wildest expectations. Today, the President of the United States has operated for the better part of a year and a half under a persistent cloud of controversy.

On the one side, his political opponents are intimating that his Presidency is illegitimate, that his election was not real. I heard words like ''treason'' thrown around yesterday.

On the other side is complete denial that there was any interference and the undermining publicly of important institutions in this our country, such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which, by the way, is made up of thousands of employees, the vast and enormous majority of whom are patriotic Americans who keep us safe every single day. Undermining confidence in our institutions is tied to the point I just made, not to mention the fact that, increasingly, Americans get their news and information from someone who tells you what you already believe and confirms your bias even further, which drives our divisions.

There is no way you could see what was happening in this country over the last year and a half—which was already happening, by the way, and for which all of us in American politics are somewhat responsible—and not conclude that Vladimir Putin's plan to undermine the Presidency, no matter who it

was, to undermine confidence in our institutions, and to drive divisions in our country has been wildly successful, at a very low price.

Interestingly, yesterday one of the interviews that he did—I think it was Mr. Wallace at FOX News who asked him about this, and his response was that none of the things that were leaked are untrue, as if to almost say with a wink, even if we colluded—or not colluded—even if we hacked and even if we did all these things and interfered, so what? We didn't lie. These are all true things.

So what have I heard in response to some of this? I will not spend a lot of time addressing some of the arguments made by the President's opponents. There is an ongoing investigation being conducted by Mr. Mueller, which I believe should reach its conclusion naturally as he continues to do his work. I have said this, and I will repeat it: It is in the best interest of the President of the United States and of our country for Mr. Mueller to do his work without interference and be able to conclude it. No matter where you line up or whom you voted for, we should all want to know the truth. That truth will ultimately have to be proven in a court of law.

From his history, I have no reason to believe that Mr. Mueller will not conduct a full, thorough, and fair investigation. Ultimately, it is truth and the light of the truth that will help us overcome a lot of these controversies we find today. Until that has happened, any accusations are unfair, unwise, and counterproductive.

But one of the arguments I have heard from people on my side of the aisle is that this is not a big deal because everybody does it. And if by ''everybody does it'' you mean everybody spies, yes, virtually every nation on Earth has an intelligence agency, and some do a better job than others. But do not be misled—everyone does not do what we saw in 2016. Our problem in 2016 was not that the Russians spied on Americans or that the Americans spied on the Russians or that the Chinese spied on us; our problem in 2016 is that the Russian Federation, under the command of Vladimir Putin, weaponized information. One thing is to gather information; another thing is to strategically leak it in an effort to influence the domestic politics of another country. And that is what Vladimir Putin ordered done for purposes of undermining the next President, whoever it was, and undermining confidence in our elections and our institutions.

They hacked into emails. They released these emails through a third party. It was picked up in the media, it was reported, and then we fought about it. That is what they have done. They have done it in other countries for years. They did it somewhat in the Cold War. They did it in 2016. And they will do it again. Let there be no doubt—they will do it again. Then after they released all this stuff, they used their army of bots and trolls to drive this information online, on platforms, particularly trying to drive it to certain groups and people to divide us even further against each other.

One of the most dangerous things they did, which is now open record in the indictment issued last week by the Mueller investigation, is they probed the electoral systems of our States and counties. A lot of people are saying: They didn't get in the ballot box. Absolutely. I tell you with full confidence that the reason President Trump won had nothing to do with Vladimir Putin—nothing. But I think we are wrong if we think all we should be worried about is the ability to change votes at the ballot box because if they can somehow change people's registration and enough people on election day go to vote and are told ''You aren't allowed to vote,'' their trolls will be ready to drive that news out there on election day. Then come election day, no matter who won, the other side will say that there were these weird things that happened down there in some county or some State, so the election is not valid.

Imagine that for a moment. Imagine an election in 2000 in my home State that was decided by less than 600 votes. Imagine that in a Republican county, a bunch of Democrats went to vote on election day and were told: You can't vote today because you are not registered. If that happened to enough people, the Russian trolls would jump all over it. They would start driving it on the news. It would be featured on cable news that day.

That night, if they lost, they would be arguing ''The election was rigged. The electoral officials in the Republican county rigged the elections''—all driven by the Russians, and vice versa, by the way.

That is the danger, that we can one day potentially elect a President of the United States who swears into office with a substantial number of people believing that the election was stolen, undermining not just the President at that point but our very system of democracy. That is what they did. Anyone who tells you that everyone does that is lying. Everyone does not do that. The United States does not do these things. I am a big critic of the Chinese, but the Chinese don't do these things. I have other problems with them. The Belgians don't do this, and the Japanese don't do this. Only one country in the world has weaponized information in this way in order to interfere in an adversary's election, and that is the Russian Federation under Vladimir Putin.

The other argument I have heard is: What is wrong with better relations with Russia? Nothing is wrong with better relations with Russia. I will tell you right now that the world would be a better place, a more peaceful place, and our lives would be a little easier. We would be stronger if, somehow, we had a partner in the Russian Federation with whom we could work to deal with things like terrorism and the proliferation of nuclear weapons and Iran and all sorts of issues—North Korea. We all wish we had that.

The reason that isn't happening, frankly, is not because of us. It is because of Vladimir Putin. For Vladimir Putin, better relations are not what he is interested in. He is not seeking a partnership with the United States. What he is seeking is geopolitical, perceptional equality. He wants to be viewed as being on par with America, both as a leader and his country as a whole, and he believes the only way he can do that is to pull himself up and tear us down. I, frankly, have to tell you that it is very difficult to have better relations with someone who believes that the only way for him to be better off is for you to be worse off. As long as the Russian Federation is led by someone who has total control of his government and has these views, it is going to be very difficult to have better relations.

That does not mean we don't meet with Vladimir Putin. Anyone who says that the meeting, alone, is wrong is not being wise and is being disingenuous. As 90 percent of the nuclear weapons on this planet are possessed by the United States and the Russian Federation, that alone is reason for us to engage with Vladimir Putin. We have to. We have no choice. Yet we should engage with him with clear eyes and a clear understanding of what he is up to and what he is trying to do. We should engage with a very clear understanding that this is a man who, throughout his life as leader of the Russian Federation, has never passed up an opportunity to exploit the weakness of an adversary or a competitor. Every time he sees weakness and the opportunity to gain an advantage, he will take it, and any engagement with him in which that is not understood is a dangerous one.

So I have no problem with having better relations with Russia. Frankly, I am not one of these people who is over the top on Russia to the extent of the threat it poses. It does have nuclear weapons, but we have bigger threats than Russia. Yet it is a very significant one that needs to be addressed.

Our moving forward is what, I hope, we will focus on. Mueller will continue his work, and the Intelligence Committee, which I sit on, will continue its work. Yet we are going to have an election in a few months. We are going to continue to have elections every 2 years, hopefully, forever, and there is no reason to believe that they will not try to do this again.

That is why, earlier this year, along with Senator VAN HOLLEN, I proposed the DETER Act, which is the only thing that Vladimir Putin understands—deterrence. The DETER Act says here is a list of sanctions, and these sanctions will go into effect immediately if the Director of National

Intelligence, after an intelligence assessment, determines that Russia is, once again, interfering in our elections so that before he even does it, he has a very clear understanding of what the price is going to be.

Men like Vladimir Putin operate as cost-benefit analyzers. They weigh the costs against the benefits, and then they decide what action to take. There is no doubt, in 2016, he saw that the costs of what he did were very low. He thought he could hide it. He thought, by the time we would have figured it out, it would have been too late. He thought that America would be in such disarray that it wouldn't be able to get its act together and actually impose any additional sanctions. He saw the benefits as extraordinary, so he took action, and he will do it again if he doesn't think the costs are high enough.

My hope is, over the next few days and in a short period of time, we will figure out a way, in working together as Americans on this issue, to set aside all of the stuff about yesterday—that probe will continue, and our work on the Intelligence Committee will continue—and focus on the future.

No matter how you feel about 2016, who among us would say that if Russia interferes in 2018—or in any year for that matter—it shouldn't be punished? Who among us would say, if we had the opportunity to put into law strong consequences for interference that could deter such an attack, we wouldn't want to do it? That is why I hope that no matter how you may feel about the other things that are going on that the Senate can come together and work together to pass this law, because, otherwise, we are leaving our Nation vulnerable.

I will close with something I said back in October of 2016, which is that Vladimir Putin is not a Republican, and he is not a Democrat, and he is not a conservative, and he is not a liberal. Do not ascribe to him any of the attributes of American politics. He interfered in 2016 in order to create chaos and controversy, not to elect any particular party or individual. By far, that was his strongest motivator, and he will do it again.

I believe, if left unchecked, he will target Members of the Senate who he thinks are his opponents. He will target Members of Congress. Eventually, he will even target our debates outside of elections. I believe, if left unchecked, he is going to take the next step and not just leak information but will make it up. He is going to come up with 9 emails that will be real and will embed a 10th that will be fake. It will be reported, and it might cost one an election or might cost someone enough heartache that one has to resign.

Information is a very powerful weapon. If you go online, you will already see the ability to produce these deepfake videos that look real, videos that only an expert could tell are fake. They are of people saying or doing things they never said or never did. Imagine those being in the hands of a nation-state and being leaked 2 days before an election. A nation-state is going to do these things. It is going to happen if we do not deter it from happening and if we do not prepare our Nation and the American people. If you think this is chaotic, then allow that to happen without informing us and preparing us and strengthening us and putting in place a deterrent against that. Then you will know chaos—a chaos that will shake us to our core.

I hope that we can take this small but important step of coming together as Americans and protecting our elections for years to come against an adversary who is determined to tear us down in order to build himself up. This is reality. This is the world and the threat we face. The sooner we address it the safer our Nation and our people will be.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

BLUE-SLIP TRADITION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds is just the latest in more than a year of attacks that have been based on a strategy of converting the United States from a nation that is based and organized on and that fights for the principle of ''we the people'' into one that bows to the powerful and the privileged.

His nomination has already strained and degraded the Senate's blue-slip tradition as our colleagues rush to pack our courts with extremist judges to advance that vision—not of judges who call balls and strikes but of judicial activists who want to rewrite the Constitution to put down workers, to put down healthcare rights, to lay out and tear down consumer rights and women's rights—so many opportunities and empowerments diminished in the favor of the privileged and the powerful. That is what is going on with the packing of the Court.

This deed of putting forward this nomination on the floor tonight changes a 100-year tradition of comity in the U.S. Senate and the recognition that the home State Senators have something important to say about the integrity of the individual who is being put forward. At stake in this confirmation is the Senate's advice-and-consent responsibility as applied through the blue-slip tradition—a tradition that incentivizes consultation and bipartisan cooperation. When you take away the blue-slip tradition, you diminish the incentive for consultation and cooperation. This tradition has existed since 1917. It was 101 years ago when Senator Thomas Hardwick objected to President Wilson's district court nominee, and he wrote his objection on a blue slip of paper—thus, the name.

No judge until now—101 years later—has ever been confirmed by this body having not received a single blue slip from a home State Senator. Until this administration, just five had been confirmed without both blue slips having been returned. This tradition has been honored by both parties. It has been a bipartisan tradition. When the Democrats have been in power, the Republicans have wanted it to be honored. When Republicans have been in power, the Republicans have honored it. In fact, in 2009, at the start of President Obama's term when the Democrats controlled both the Executive Office and this Chamber, my Republican colleagues wrote a letter. They wrote that they expected the blue-slip tradition to be observed evenhandedly and regardless of party affiliation. It was not just that letter from which we have heard over time. We have heard from Chairman GRASSLEY.

Chairman GRASSLEY wrote clearly about this:

> For nearly a century, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee has brought nominees up for committee consideration only after both home State Senators have signed and returned what is known as a ''blue slip.'' This tradition is designed to encourage outstanding nominees and consensus. . . . I appreciate the value of the blue-slip process and also intend to honor it.

He intended to honor it, he wrote, in 2015. Yet putting this nomination through the committee dishonored the tradition. Bringing it to the floor dishonors this tradition. It doesn't honor it because it violates it.

During the time that President Obama was in office, the Republicans used the blue slips to block 18 nominees. The nominees never progressed without the return of two of those slips.

We can turn back to the former chair of the Judiciary Committee, ORRIN HATCH, who wrote in The Hill:

> Weakening or eliminating the blue slip process would sweep aside the last remaining check on the president's judicial appointment power. Anyone serious about the Senate's constitutional ''advice and consent'' role knows how disastrous such a move would be.

The current chair and the former chair were pretty clear, and now they intend to tear it down—a moment of opportunity to sacrifice a century of comity and consultation.

The clear factor is one principle when in the minority and tearing down that principle when in the majority. It is one principle for Obama's nominees and a different principle for Trump's nominees. Where has all of the honor and principle gone in this Chamber? There were no hearings for Obama's nominees without blue slips. There have been hearings for four of Trump's nominees without blue slips.

Now, the majority leader helped to drive this change. He said: Republicans now will treat a blue slip ''as simply notification of how you're going to vote.'' That is what he said. It is simply notification. So it is up to the chair of the committee, the former chair of the Judiciary Committee, and all of

the members who signed that 2009 letter saying how important this was to this Chamber to stand up and actually exhibit some trace of consistency with the position put forward just a short time ago.

So now he is coming to the floor for a vote. This is a nominee on whom there was no consultation. We had a committee out in Oregon, set up by my senior colleague, Senator WYDEN. We told the White House: Wait to make your choice until after the committee submits its list. This is the Oregon bipartisan—bipartisan—judicial selection committee. But the President was in such a hurry to pack the court that he didn't wait for consultation.

I happen to have heard a Member across the aisle saying: Well, the White House said they consulted. Well, let me tell you that they didn't consult. They didn't ask me. They didn't ask Senator WYDEN.

What does that mean for the White House? Is it the case that everything we have heard in the last year and a half is accurate out of the White House, because I have heard virtually every Member across the aisle say otherwise.

So here you have the two of us having asked the White House to wait so they can get some consultation and get some advice from Oregon, but they didn't wait. That was certainly the wrong thing to do.

At the end of 2017, the nominations go back, and the White House has to resubmit them. We said: Here is another chance for you to honor the concept of consultation. And what happened? The White House did it again. They didn't care about consultation.

If we hear from our colleagues tonight, this week, and in the days to come that they are going to push this nomination forward, don't expect consultation from any future President when you happen to be in the minority because that is what you are striking down—a tradition that encouraged, expected, supported, and promoted consultation.

Have no doubt that this isn't an ordinary nominee. When asked about anything else in his record that they should know might be inflammatory, this nominee didn't breathe a word about key writings in his past. When this nominee was asked about his views on diversity and how they might have differed from before, he didn't breathe a word about his former views—and maybe they are his present views.

What did this nominee say on diversity? He said students who work ''to promote diversity . . . contribute more to restricting consciousness, aggravating intolerance, and pigeonholing cultural identities than many a Nazi bookburning.'' That is his attack on diversity, but that isn't all he said. He said diversity training is a ''pestilence'' that ''stalks us.''

That isn't the only topic that he weighed in on in such a way that is way out of the mainstream and exhibiting massive intolerance for diversity here in the United States, where we come from every corner of the world. When it came to the process of a campus holding accountable young men involved in sexual harassment, young men involved in rape, he also said: ''There is nothing really inherently wrong with the university failing to punish an alleged rapist.''

I see that my colleague is here to speak, and I appreciate his coming down. He is coming down to speak on the principle of the blue slips and how it enshrines cooperation, and so I am delighted he is here.

I will have more to say later, but at this moment, I defer to my colleague, Senator BLUMENTHAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, first of all, I want to say how honored and grateful I am to follow my friend and distinguished colleague, who has outlined some of the reasons that I would vote against this nominee. I especially respect his raising this issue of the blue-slip approval process, which is probably unknown to the vast majority of Americans.

Let me begin by saying, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, as a litigator who has spent about 40 years in the courtroom before Federal and State judges of all kinds all over the country, why the blue slip from a U.S. Senator matters to justice.

We debated this issue on the Judiciary Committee. It is a time-honored tradition that Senators be consulted, that they return a blue slip; that is, approval of a nominee from their State. That is because Senators, such as Senator MERKLEY and Senator WYDEN, are rooted in their States. They know the lawyers. Many of us are lawyers. They know the colleagues of people who may be nominated to the U.S. district court or the court of appeals in the jurisdictions that cover the areas that they serve. They know the lawyers who have appeared before these judges—their qualifications and sometimes their faults. Also, they know the opinions of these lawyers, their records in court, and how they have performed. They know their character, their integrity, and they know their records outside of the courtroom as well.

You have just heard tonight from Senator MERKLEY some statements that are extraordinarily revealing. The American people deserve to know them, and my colleagues deserve and need to consider them.

For generations, the blue-slip process has ensured that judges are well-suited for the States where they will preside. The majority's decision to ignore this process and, for the first time—very, very significantly—to ignore it with respect to both Senators from a State is a precedent that is profoundly damaging to this institution and to American justice.

It isn't about us. It isn't about our prerogatives or our pride. It isn't about our hurt feelings or our sense of insult. The sun will rise tomorrow on all of us in this Chamber, and we will go on to do the business of this Nation, but for many people who will go into a courtroom where Ryan Bounds may preside, they will experience a lesser standard of justice than they deserve, a lesser standard of justice than most judges provide. They deserve better. They are ultimately the losers, not we. It is not about us. The American people are the losers if we destroy this principle and norm that Senators must approve nominees who are from their own State.

Only rarely, very rarely, is a fraction of the nominees found unacceptable by the Senators from their States. In my experience, in my 8 years here, I think there have been maybe a few, and with good reason. But this President shows that no principle is safe and no norm is inviolate in the rightwing fringe's campaign to remake the Federal judiciary and to remake it in the image of the far right in this country.

They have an ideological agenda and no respect for quality in deciding who will serve on the judiciary. Those groups that are trying to remake the court of appeals and the Federal district courts—that is, to remake judges at the lower level—whether it is the Federalist Society or the Heritage Foundation, are also responsible for the President's decision to make himself a puppet of their recommendations, letting them pick judges who meet their anti-choice and anti-healthcare litmus tests.

Those tests really are President Trump's test. He said: I am going to appoint judges who are pro-life. He berated the Chief Justice because he was responsible for upholding the Affordable Care Act and clearly showed that he would appoint judges who would strike it down.

His decision to pick a Supreme Court Justice nominee who believes that the President should be above the law perhaps should surprise no one, but his outsourcing of that decision to those same rightwing groups that are trying to remake the lower courts is truly unprecedented. He has become a puppet of those groups in all of his judicial nominees and most particularly in his Supreme Court nominee.

I know my colleagues will want to speak tonight about Ryan Bounds and other related issues, but let me just say about Judge Brett Kavanaugh of the Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit that he has shown that he meets the Trump litmus test because he has been vetted and screened by those rightwing groups. He has shown that he would automatically overturn Roe v. Wade and that he would, in fact, strike down significant protections—indeed, protections for millions of Americans under the Affordable Care Act—from preexisting conditions.

He also believes that a President can refuse to comply with a law if he believes it is unconstitutional—if he

alone believes it is unconstitutional—even if the law was duly passed by Congress and upheld by the courts. He has written: ''Under the Constitution, the President may decline to enforce a statute that regulates private individuals when the President deems the statute unconstitutional, even if a court has held or would hold the statute constitutional.''

Judge Kavanaugh has also written that the President should be immune from even investigation for criminal or civil wrongdoing. Under his view, a President could not be investigated or indicted, could not be held accountable under the law, and would not have to respond to a civil suit or a subpoena or a request to be investigated by law enforcement. That is the rule he believes should be adopted.

It is clear from Judge Kavanaugh's position on Executive power that he is a staunch supporter of, in effect, an imperial Presidency. He believes a President is above the law and immune from checks and balances. This view is antithetical to our democratic principles and tradition. It is in keeping with Donald Trump's view of the Presidency. It is out of sync with what our democracy needs now, especially with this President.

President Trump has repeatedly expressed his admiration of dictators like Kim Jong Un or Vladimir Putin. His apologists will tell us to ignore Judge Kavanaugh's view of Executive power—pretend like they don't exist—but we have a responsibility to consider them, to take into account these extreme views on Executive power. They must be a central issue in this confirmation battle.

He would, in effect, welcome legislation enabling the President to fire a special counsel for any reason or no reason at all, and if we have learned anything over the last 24 hours, it is that the special counsel's investigation must be protected. It must be protected against the concerted and coordinated, concentrated effort of the Trump surrogates and cronies to discredit or derail it. It must be protected against efforts to impeach Rod Rosenstein. It must be protected against the President's own threats, continuing to call it a witch hunt, when we see more and more in indictments and convictions that it is real and significant. Donald Trump cannot be permitted to derail it.

We will talk again about Judge Kavanaugh.

As to Ryan Bounds, the decision is for now, and because he has been rightly denied approval through the blue-slip process, because the abandonment of that process does such grave potential damage to American justice, and because Ryan Bounds is unfit by virtue of many of his views and past statements to serve on the Federal bench, I will oppose and vote against him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I wish to join my distinguished colleague from Connecticut in commenting on the qualifications and prospects of these two nominees whom we are facing now on the Senate floor. I thank him for his comments.

I would like to take my time to bring to the attention of this body some of the concerns that—what I think are in the nature of concerns that if we do this now, we will learn to rue the day we made these mistakes.

Let me begin, as I did in my comments about Judge Kavanaugh, with just a quick overview of how our Founding Fathers felt about the judicial branch of government and about the jury and what it was there for. The Founders were experienced politicians. They were adept at history. They read widely. They prided themselves on the expertise they had developed in how you design a government, and they were very conscious about doing something that was unprecedented and that they wanted very desperately to have work right. So they put their hearts and souls into trying to get it right, this American experiment of ours.

From sad experience in the Colonies, they knew big special interests could come in and could completely dominate a legislative body; that the legislative body would be at the beck and call of big, private special interests. They had also seen Governors in the Colonies become corrupted by influence. So they were very concerned that it was not enough that you separated the legislative and executive branches and created some degree of rivalry between the two because that left the prospect still that the big special interests that commanded the legislature could also command the executive branch. Then, where would the ordinary citizen go? Where would you go for relief when some big and powerful interest controlled those two branches of government? You would go to the courts. That is why they made the judiciary independent. That is why they insisted and fought so hard to make sure the institution of the jury made it over from England, made it to the Colonies. It was part of our battle with England that the King had tried to interfere with our juries. We took the power of the jury and the independence of the court seriously, not just as a matter of providing justice to an individual person but as part of the architecture of our Constitution, as part of the architecture of freedom that our Constitution represents.

There is something that is interesting about the jury and the courts, but the jury, in particular, that makes it a little bit different than a lot of the rest of what went on in that Constitution because, clearly, the Founding Fathers were concerned that the power of government would be co-opted by powerful interests and then evil work would be done with that power against ordinary people. So a lot of our constitutional structure is designed to protect all of us regular Americans against the power of government, but in the courts, and specifically in the jury, there is a different power that was at issue.

Blackstone was the predominant legal figure in the Colonies at the time. The reference that lawyers of the Revolutionary era used was ''Blackstone's Commentaries.'' Blackstone described how, within the larger context of the judicial branch, the jury was a defense for regular people not against the government, interestingly—possibly against the government—but also, and perhaps more importantly, against the more wealthy and powerful citizens. It was set up so the courts would provide equality between an ordinary American citizen who was being run over by a big, powerful, wealthy American citizen, and they would be treated fairly. It would be the chance where you could stand up against wealth, where you could stand up against power, and even if they controlled the legislature, even if they controlled the Governor, you still had your shot before that jury of your peers and in those courts.

So that is the context for looking at these judges who are being put forward by a special interest apparatus of perhaps unprecedented power in our country's history—certainly unprecedented power in our country's history since Teddy Roosevelt broke the back of the big trusts and the Big Business interests that had dominated in his era.

Here, we have these two characters coming through, and one is Mr. Bounds. Mr. Bounds has a considerable problem with himself, which is that he is filling a seat on the Ninth Circuit that is designated to the State of Oregon. It has, until this moment, always been the tradition of the Senate that the home State Senators associated with that seat have the ability to say no. It is part of our checks and balances. The people from that State who are likely to know him the best—the Senators who are here—have the chance to say no. Both of the Oregon Senators have said no. Has that mattered one whit to the Trump administration? No, they have broken this tradition.

Regrettably, our Republican colleagues are complicit in letting this happen. They are complicit in letting this happen. It is a sad day for the Senate because the blue-slip process—the process by which home State Senators are allowed to say no—is also the only process that defends that this is an Oregon seat in the first instance. There is no other check on the President's power to appoint. So there are a lot of reasons why Bounds is disqualified, but the most compelling one to me is because the two home State Senators have both said no to this person.

Things do turn about. I have been in the majority here, and I have been in the minority. I have been here with Republican Presidents, and I have been here with Democratic Presidents. Things do turn about. When the day

comes that we have a Democratic President making these appointees and when we have Democratic control so we can confirm these appointees, Republican Senators are going to regret that they threw their own blue-slip rights away today on this nomination, and throwing their blue slips away doesn't just mean they lose their vote as to the Oregon Senator for this seat, it means they lose their vote that defends that this needs to be an Oregon judge in this seat.

There is nothing, after the blue slip is gone, that would allow our colleagues from Texas to prevent a Democratic President from appointing a New York City judge to Texas seats on the circuit court of appeals.

So if that starts to happen, don't come crying back to us now about this. Today is your chance to stop that—to stop all of that—and to put the Senate back to respect for our colleagues' judgment, a mutual and bipartisan respect for our colleagues' judgment that has been the standard of the Senate for a century now. It is going today, and it is going today under what pressure? Why would we want to turn to other colleagues and say: For the first time ever, your views don't count about the judge from your home State, Senator. The only reason for that is the power of the political pressure behind these appointees, and that is the big special interests that are putting these nominees forward, that have precleared them through this mysterious, dark process that the Federalist Society runs, that have pushed forward these political campaigns to support them through this mysterious, dark process that is funded through the Judicial Crisis Network, and they are going to be telling them what to do through a mysterious, dark process of funded so-called friends of the court—amici—who are going to be there in the court all day long telling them what to do. That is the process that is breaking the blue slip, and it oughtn't to. It is not right on its own, and it certainly isn't right to break the blue slip.

The last thing I will say is about this character Oldham, who is coming in. Among the leading Republican special interests are the great polluters. They got Scott Pruitt in. What more proof do you need that the polluters are in control than to put Scott Pruitt in charge of the EPA? The man was a joke, and yet in he went, confirmed by the Senate.

Now comes Oldham, who has said that the entire administrative state is enraging to him—enraging to him. It is the illegitimacy of it, he says. ''It is the entire existence of this edifice of administrative law that's constitutionally suspect.''

No, it is not. We have an entire body of law, the delegation doctrine, that controls what is appropriate for Congress to delegate to an administrative agency. It has been that way for decades. This is fanciful stuff, but it is a wonderful red flag waved for the big polluters, saying: Whenever you disagree with a regulatory agency that tries to keep you cleaning up your act, I am going to be with you. That is what the Oldham nomination is all about. It is all about telling the big polluters that we have a friend for you on the courts now.

If there is one thing that ought not to happen in this country, it is that somebody walks up the steps of the courthouse, and before the argument is even made, they know they are going to lose the case, not from the arguments in the brief but from the identity of the party on the front page of the brief.

That is why Oldham is going on the court, so that the big polluters can know they will win their cases in front of him without him even having to read the brief. All he will need to do is look at the cover, see that the big polluters are on the cover, and know he is there to attack the administrative state making them keep the water clean, making them keep the air clean, or making them keep their carbon emissions under control.

That is what this is about. This is not right. It is not right that the blue slip is being torn apart today on the Senate floor. It is not right that somebody who doesn't think that the EPA ought to even exist is being put forward as a judge.

But the connections come back to that same initial point, which is that the big special interests who like to control legislatures and who like to control executive branches would also love to control the courts, because that is the place where they can still be held to account.

So it is with real regret that I face this day in the Senate.

I yield my remaining time.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Of course.

Mr. MERKLEY. I very much appreciate his laying out this basic framework under which this conversation is taking place. But just for clarity, the Senator made the point that there is no law that requires a member of a circuit court to be in a particular State and that it is only under this tradition and agreement among the Members of this body that a judge reside in a particular State as part of a circuit court.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. That is absolutely correct. There is not a law that assigns within the Ninth Circuit which judges will be treated as Oregon judges and which judges will be treated as California judges. Within Rhode Island, we are part of the First Circuit Court of Appeals. There is one seat on that court that, by tradition, is designated to Rhode Island.

Mr. MERKLEY. So if we lose this blue-slip tradition for circuit courts, it would be the case that when the seat comes open that is now held in Rhode Island, an administration could nominate and conceivably a majority could confirm someone who lives, say, in Arizona.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. It would mean that the Senators from that State would have no defense against that change. It would mean that the next Democratic President could appoint Rhode Islanders to Texas. It would mean that the next Republican President could appoint Texans to Rhode Island, and neither the Senator from Texas nor the Senators from Rhode Island would have any defense left against that without the honoring of the blue slip.

Mr. MERKLEY. So, in essence, if our colleagues across the aisle vote for this confirmation, they are basically saying that they are voting to give up the understanding among this body that has ensured that they would have a voice in making sure that a member of their circuit court was residing in their State and someone they felt had the qualities of integrity and understanding necessary to administer justice.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. They would either be giving up the one defense they have to make sure that the seats on the court that are allocated to their State are in fact filled with judges from their State, or they would be suggesting that there should be two different sets of rules that apply—that there be one blue-slip rule for a Democratic President and that there would be a different blue-slip rule for a Republican President.

I don't think that is credible. I think that once the blue slip is torn down, reestablishing it is virtually impossible. I think the day will come when Senators come to regret that they are trying to get a home-State person appointed from Idaho or Colorado or New Mexico or Texas, and they have given up their ability to see to it that happens, and that a lawyer from San Francisco or from New York City or from Florida or from anyplace else can be dropped into their circuit court seat, and they have nothing left to do about it, because the one tool they have to stop that and to enforce that prerogative is the blue slip, and it dies today.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate so much my colleague from Rhode Island laying out what is at stake here.

Why has this 101-year tradition maintained itself over a period of time in which so many things have changed in our culture? The country has been transformed, but for over a century, there has been this mutual understanding that, when it comes to the circuit court, it is appropriate to have members serving on that circuit who have roots in and approval and understanding related to different States within that circuit. That is what has held it together.

If I tear it down for one of my colleagues, I tear it down for myself. If I tear it down for their circuit, I tear it down for my circuit. That is what has held it together—that we each want the circuits to be able to reflect individuals who have an understanding of

the issues that might come up in that circuit.

There is embodied in the law a residency requirement for some positions on a circuit court. But that residency requirement isn't the same as a blue-slip requirement. You can establish residency very easily in another State. Previous decisions of the court have made sure it is possible to easily establish residency in another State. Therefore, it is the blue slip that has maintained this balance.

We were taking a look at some of the writings of the individual who is up for this particular position that so bothered and concerned me and concerned the senior Senator from Oregon, my colleague Senator WYDEN. I shared a little bit about his stated written views on diversity, that students working to ''promote diversity . . . contribute more to restricting consciousness, aggravating intolerance and pigeonholing cultural identities than many a Nazi bookburning.'' That was a direct quote. He referred to diversity training as a ''pestilence'' that ''stalks us.''

I have an article he wrote entitled ''Labor Unions and the Politics of Aztlan.'' This is about students who are part of a minority group on campus, and whether they should be able to take up an issue, and, at his campus, they did. They took up an issue about the ability of workers to organize into labor unions.

He said: ''I would hardly suggest that no student group should be able to take up a political matter, if it is of direct relevance to its reported mission.'' He said: I wouldn't say that any group shouldn't be able to, but the sundry ethnic centers or the clubs that derive many a material benefit from those ethnic centers should not be able to take up an issue related to their mission. I am paraphrasing here, but I will come back to it and make sure I give the exact words.

Here, we have it. He said, essentially, that for the Chicano or Latino Stanford students who protested against a hotel chain for firing workers who tried to form a union, if they stood up for those workers, he felt it was the wrong thing for them to be able to do so. He said: ''I would contend, however, that no student group that is affiliated with an ethnic center or any other department of this university has any business holding political issues central to its mission.''

Can you imagine? He says he wouldn't weigh in that any group couldn't pursue issues on campus, but when it comes to the ethnic groups, it is just plain wrong, in his opinion, for them to be able to take a position on an issue. That is a pretty significant situation, for somebody who is going to be a judge on a body to be able to say that, in his opinion, if it is an ordinary student group, they have every right to get involved, but if it is a Latino or Chicano group or an ethnic group, they shouldn't be allowed to get involved in an issue. How can people come before that judge and expect anything that resembles a fair hearing, here in the United States of America, where we have a vision of opportunity for every single American, where we have a 1964 Civil Rights Act that was passed long before this nominee attended college and that threw out the notion that discrimination was acceptable?

I am delighted that my colleague from Massachusetts has arrived to weigh in on this issue of the appropriateness of a nominee coming to the floor of the Senate who, in the judgment of the two home-State Senators, isn't appropriate either because of views they have carried that bring into question their ability to fairly administer the law and, therefore, bring into question the entire integrity of the court at that moment, or because the individual also demonstrated a completed lack of integrity by failing to provide this information about their writings when they were asked to do so.

I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I thank Senator MERKLEY for bringing us here this evening to give us this chance to talk about a Supreme Court nominee and to have us all here to talk about a whole range of issues, because this Supreme Court nominee will affect the lives of every single human being. So I thank Senator MERKLEY for doing this.

Since day one, the Trump administration has been plagued with chaos, corruption, and broken promises. Candidate Trump promised to drain the swamp in Washington, but this administration is teeming with shady, corrupt political appointees using their government service to line their own pockets and to do the bidding of their benefactors.

Candidate Trump promised to take care of everyone—to make sure that every American was, in his words, ''beautifully covered.'' Instead, he is trying to rip up the Affordable Care Act, permit insurance companies to discriminate against tens of millions of people with preexisting conditions, and knock millions more off healthcare coverage.

Candidate Trump promised to raise taxes on the rich. Remember that one? Yes. Instead, he handed out an eye-popping $1.5 trillion tax giveaway to giant corporations and the superrich.

For hard-working American families, the Trump Presidency has turned into a nightmare. Trump hasn't broken his promises to everyone—no, not by any stretch. For millionaires, billionaires, and giant corporations, Trump has kept his promises all the way. Nowhere has that been more obvious than with our courts.

''Equal Justice Under Law''—those are the words inscribed over the top of the Supreme Court. That is what the American judicial system is supposed to be all about—a fair, neutral forum governed by the rule of law; a place where everyone can be heard; a place where individual rights are respected; a place where nobody is above the law. Those are high aspirations, but these ideas never sat well with the wealthy and well-connected. They are used to getting special deals, and a judicial system that protects everyone, no matter their wealth or status in this country, is a challenge to their unchecked power.

For years, they have engaged in a concerted campaign to turn our courts into one more rigged game, a place that carefully protects the rich and powerful and kicks dirt in everyone else's face. Billionaires and giant corporations have been working on this plan for decades.

Today, the rich and powerful do their best to drown our elections in money and tilt our government in their favor. Every day, they use their money to buy favors in DC. Every day, they deploy armies of lawyers and lobbyists to bend the laws passed by Congress to their will. Every day, they push this government to do just a little more for the rich and powerful and a little less for everyone else.

They are doing the same in our courts too. Since Donald Trump was elected, we have seen judge after judge come through the Senate, some barely qualified, some with deeply offensive records. But nearly all these judges have one key quality: a demonstrated willingness to put a thumb on the scales for those at the top at everyone else's expense.

This week, we will vote on two more Trump-nominated appeals court judges. If they are confirmed, they will continue to tilt the courts away from equal justice under law.

Nowhere is this effort more obvious or more damaging than with the President's Supreme Court selections. During the Presidential campaign, Donald Trump asked one group to draw up a list of acceptable candidates to serve on the Supreme Court—one group, one very influential group, one extremist group—the Federalist Society, a radical, rightwing group deeply committed to overturning Roe v. Wade. Trump promised publicly that if he was elected President, he would select Supreme Court nominees exclusively from the Federalist Society's list.

The idea of a Republican President outsourcing the selection of judges has never been so nakedly public. For decades, the Federalist Society has been one of the leading rightwing, billionaire-funded groups working to capture our courts. Their agenda? To impose their extremist agenda on the entire country, undermining critical rights like women's rights, workers' rights, voting rights, and environmental protections.

The courts are at the heart of the Federalist Society's plan, so the group has been laser-focused on filling the Federal bench with people who are precommitted to serving the interests

of the rich and powerful instead of dispensing equal justice under law.

By allowing them to handpick the Justices who sit on the Supreme Court, Trump gave the Federalist Society an unprecedented opportunity to impose their extremist agenda on the entire country. What is at the top of their list? Overturn Roe v. Wade. A top conservative explained that Leonard Leo, the Federalist Society's longtime executive vice president, was the man to get the job done. ''No one has been more dedicated to the enterprise of building a Supreme Court that will overturn Roe than the Federalist Society's Leonard Leo.'' Criminalize abortion, punish women—that is the Federalist Society's plan.

Donald Trump has been happy to dance to their tune. During the 2016 campaign, he said: Yes, women should be punished if they try to get an abortion. And if he could appoint two or three Justices, Roe would be automatically overturned.

Since taking office, President Trump has made it abundantly clear that he plans to fulfill his promise to select candidates exclusively from the Federalist Society's list. Just days after his inauguration, Trump nominated Neil Gorsuch—one of the candidates on the Federalist Society's list—to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court. Judge Gorsuch had a long record of twisting the law in ways that favored the interests of large corporations over women, over workers, over consumers, and over just about everyone who wasn't wealthy and well-connected. Republicans were so dedicated to getting Gorsuch on the Court that they actually changed the Senate rules to get him through the Senate nomination.

From his powerful perch on the Supreme Court, Judge Gorsuch has continued to make it harder for Americans to find justice. In just 1 year on the Court, he has voted to gut the ability of public sector unions to negotiate for higher wages, better benefits, and improved working conditions for teachers, nurses, firefighters, police officers, and other public servants; he has voted to undermine workers' ability to hold their employers accountable for breaking the law; and he has voted to uphold President Trump's immoral Muslim ban.

The same powerful people who handpicked Justice Gorsuch know they will have another ally in Brett Kavanaugh. Frankly, it is not hard to see why. Like Justice Gorsuch, Judge Kavanaugh's record shows that he will continue to tilt the scales of justice in favor of the rich and powerful and against everyone else. Don't take my word for it; take a look at his record.

Judge Kavanaugh voted to limit the ability of women to make their own healthcare decisions. He opposed a ruling protecting women's access to birth control under the Affordable Care Act. He voted to make it harder for agencies to protect public health, safety, and economic security. He ruled that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—the agency that has returned $12 billion directly to people who were cheated by corporate lawbreakers—is unconstitutional. He suggested that Federal judges might substitute their own personal policy judgments for those of expert Federal agencies that have been directed by Congress to enforce the law.

Judge Kavanaugh had a lot of competition to get selected to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court. After all, the Federalist Society had pulled together a whole list of people prescreened to overturn Roe v. Wade and help out the powerful corporate interests that are really calling the tune in Washington. Why pick Judge Kavanaugh? Why him instead of someone else on the list?

There is something special that makes Judge Kavanaugh a lot more attractive to President Trump. Judge Kavanaugh believes that, while in office, a sitting President should be above the law. He has argued that sitting Presidents should not face personal civil suits or criminal investigations or prosecutions while in office.

After the spectacle broadcast live on television around the world of President Trump attacking American intelligence agencies and American law enforcement officers while sucking up to Vladimir Putin, we should all question Judge Kavanaugh's willingness to protect the President no matter what. After Trump's deeply embarrassing performance, Republicans who actually want to stand up for the United States of America and stand up to Trump instead of hiding behind carefully worded tweets could refuse to rubberstamp Trump's Supreme Court nominee. Republicans who believe that no one is above the law could vote no on Judge Kavanaugh.

There is a lot more that makes this nominee particularly attractive to President Trump. Judge Kavanaugh has demonstrated incredible hostility toward efforts to rein in public corruption and to break the stranglehold of money on our political system.

Substituting your personal views for the will of Congress is not the job of a judge, and it is certainly not conservative. Stripping rights away from women, voters, workers, and immigrants, while expanding the rights of corporations and rich people isn't fair, neutral, or equal.

Judge Kavanaugh didn't make this stuff up on his own, no. Judge Kavanaugh is part of a movement to twist the Constitution in ways that are deeply hostile to the rights of everyone but those at the top. He has been a part of that movement for the majority of his professional life, both before and after he became a judge, and now he has a record of 12 years of judicial decisions that demonstrate his loyalty to that radical ideology.

All of this makes Brett Kavanaugh a dream candidate for the rightwing, extremist Federalist Society; a dream candidate for rightwing, extremist Republicans; a dream candidate for the rightwing groups and billionaires who want to buy off our political system; a dream candidate for a sitting President whose campaign is under an active, ongoing FBI investigation that eventually could land in the U.S. Supreme Court; a dream candidate for all of them and a nightmare for everyone else.

President Trump has made his choice. Here is the thing: President Trump is not a King. The Constitution demands that the Senate have a say in who gets to serve on the Supreme Court, and that means every single Senator has a vote. Think about what is at stake. One Justice, one vote could determine whether women can make their own healthcare decisions. One Justice, one vote could determine whether workers can join unions to negotiate for better pay, better working conditions, and better benefits. One Justice, one vote could determine whether millions of people with preexisting conditions can still get health insurance. One Justice, one vote could make decisions on voting rights, civil rights, immigration, criminal justice, consumer protection, and environmental protection. One Justice, one vote could decide whether everyone or just those at the top can find justice in America.

The Justices who sit on the highest Court in the country should not be prescreened by extremist groups whose agenda is to tilt the scales of justice against Americans who are most vulnerable. They should not work to hand our courts over to corporate giants and wealthy individuals. The Justices who sit on our highest Court should be unequivocally committed to one principle: equal justice under law.

Judge Kavanaugh's record shows that he is not the right candidate to spend a lifetime making decisions that will touch the lives of every American. Every American who believes that our courts should not be another puppet of the rich and powerful should speak out, and every Senator who believes in equal justice under law should say no to Judge Kavanaugh.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to my colleague from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for eloquent remarks. I particularly want to thank my colleague from Oregon for putting together this time to speak on issues so important to our State, as Senator WARREN has noted, and issues important to our country. In the context of talking about Ryan Bounds, I am going to talk about how, unfortunately, the handling of the Bounds nomination moves the Senate even further away from what I think the Senate has always been about, which I would describe as principled bipartisanship.

As I indicated, Ryan Bounds, an important judicial nominee, is being considered as a candidate from my home State of Oregon, and we will vote on him before the end of the week.

As I have indicated, I believe the debate about Ryan Bounds is not a typical debate on a typical nomination for reasons I am going to outline tonight.

In my view, it is vital that the Senate look at this nomination in a broader context, particularly as it relates to what I call the decline of principled bipartisanship in the Senate. I want to be clear about what I mean when I mention the words ''principled bipartisanship'' and the reason I describe it that way—bipartisanship born of principle.

Bipartisanship is not about taking each other's bad ideas. I see my friend from South Dakota in the chair of the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I wouldn't come up to him in the name of bipartisanship and ask him to take a flawed idea, and I am quite sure he wouldn't ask that of me because I know the Presiding Officer well enough to know he has had an interest over the years in bipartisanship built around principle.

So bipartisanship is not about taking each other's lousy ideas; it is about taking each other's good ideas.

The fact is, the Senate has certainly been very polarized, very divided this session, and yet we have been able to do it when we kept that lodestar of principled bipartisanship in mind.

If you had said in January of 2017 that the U.S. Senate would enact a 10-year Children's Health Insurance Program, an improved, expanded Children's Health Insurance Program, I think people would have said: You are hallucinating. It can't happen. Because my colleague, who sits right over there, Chairman HATCH, and I talked about this was a chance to help children and save money, we are able to do something nobody thought was possible because both of us shared an interest in the well-being of children and cost-effective approaches in healthcare.

I know my colleague knows about this. Senator CRAPO, who sits a few seats from Chairman HATCH, and I lined up more than 270 forestry groups because the whole system of fighting fire was broken, and we said we have to do something very different. We have to end the incentive, basically, for raiding the fire prevention fund to put the fire out, and then the problem got worse. It didn't make any sense in South Dakota; it didn't make any sense in Oregon; it didn't make any sense anywhere, but because Chairman CRAPO and I found common ground around principles that this wasn't a cost-effective approach to discriminate against fire prevention, and we saw how important it was to take a balanced approach on natural resources so we could have forest health and get fiber in the mills and protect our land, air, and water, it was an agreement based on principled bipartisanship.

So two big issues, not immigration or trade that are in the headlines, but an awful lot of people in America and in our part of the world are going to benefit from the principled bipartisanship that led to an unexpected breakthrough in terms of meeting the healthcare needs of our children and a transformative approach—not my words, the words of the Forest Service—in terms of fighting fire.

The fact is, the handling of these judicial nominations, and Ryan Bounds in particular, is a break, a dramatic, sharp break from this tradition of principled bipartisanship.

I would like to say, by the way, that in Oregon, we have followed the idea of principled bipartisanship as it related to judicial nominations as well. I have had the pleasure of working with two Republicans very closely on these judicial nominations: the late Mark Hatfield, a revered figure in Oregon, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and my former colleague Gordon Smith, two Republicans. Nobody ever thought Gordon Smith and I would work together.

We had a race in 1996. I won by a little bit. He won the next one. Nobody ever thought we would work together, but we worked together on those judicial nominations, literally, hand in glove, a Democrat and a Republican.

Senator MERKLEY, who defeated Senator Smith, brought exactly the same approach to this, and he said: Well, how did it work in the past? I said: Well, we had a judicial selection process that was bipartisan, and we would have all our offices represented.

I remember, when I was the junior Senator and Mark Hatfield was the senior Senator and Bill Clinton had been elected, I said: Senator, I can't imagine that you and I aren't going to find common ground through our selection process and the effort to come together around judges that make sense for our State and our country—and we did.

Year after year, that has been the case for almost 20 years. I have been the senior Democrat in our congressional delegation. It has been an extraordinary privilege that the people of Oregon have afforded me. Year after year after year, we would come together not because we always agreed on someone's philosophy or their view on a particular issue but because we felt, in the name of fairness and principled bipartisanship, we ought to strive to find common ground and make it possible to generally send three nominations to the White House that a President would pick from.

The nomination of Ryan Bounds is a total rejection of the idea of principled bipartisanship. I am going to talk a little bit more about how the selection process works, but I want to begin by making clear that I am troubled by the incendiary, intolerant writings by Mr. Bounds that came to light only after he was nominated.

I am, in fact, more troubled by the fact that he concealed those writings from the independent and bipartisan Oregon committee that reviews potential candidates for nomination. In my view, moving forward with this nomination, in the face of those revelations, is going to have regrettable and irreversible consequences. It not only tramples on Oregon's bipartisan judicial selection process, as I am going to outline—and my colleague from Oregon already has touched on this—it tramples on a century-old tradition of what is just collegiality, good relations among Senators, courtesy, allowing home State Senators to review judicial nominations.

My view is, this approach cheapens the constitutional responsibility of the Senate to provide or withhold advice and consent on nominees. It has the potential to forever lower the basic standards of honesty and decency to which the Senate holds the nominee. It will be a signal that a nominee can conceal information the public has a right to know—histories of prejudice and scorn that the potential nominees could find embarrassing and disqualifying should that information come to light.

It signals that the Republican majority believes the end justifies the means in the course of seating judges, a prospect that certainly speaks to the larger debate the Senate is going to have on the Supreme Court in the months ahead.

I am going to begin by walking through a number of the issues, beginning with excerpts from the writings Mr. Bounds failed to disclose to our bipartisan judicial selection committee.

I want to make it clear again that I find much of what was written to be disgusting and baffling, and I am again especially concerned that it was concealed from the committee.

First is a passage in which Mr. Bounds targeted ethnic minorities and expressed a dripping disdain for multicultural values.

Mr. Bounds wrote:

> During my years in our Multicultural Garden of Eden, I have often marveled at the odd strategies that some of the more strident racial factions of the student body employ in their attempt to ''heighten consciousness,'' ''build tolerance,'' ''promote diversity,'' and otherwise convince us to partake of that fruit which promises to open our eyes to a PC version of the knowledge of good and evil.

Mr. Bounds said:

> I am mystified because these tactics seem always to contribute more to restricting consciousness, aggravating intolerance, and pigeonholing cultural identities than many a Nazi [talking about book burning.]

Now, my colleagues who are following this, I am the child of Jewish refugees who fled Nazi terror in Germany. Not all of our family got out. We lost family at Theresienstadt. One of our very dear family members was gassed at Auschwitz.

To compare, as Mr. Bounds did, the work of organizations that promote multiculturalism and tolerance here in the United States to Nazi bookburning rallies is beyond extreme. Our diversity

is a core strength of America. The Constitution protects the right of minority Americans to celebrate their diversity. Mr. Bounds clearly doesn't see it that way.

In an even more sarcastic passage, he wrote:

> The opponent is the white male and his coterie of meanspirited lackeys: ''oreos,'' ''twinkies,'' ''coconuts'' and the like. He enjoys making money and buying material things just to make sure that people with darker skin don't have access to them. He enjoys killing children and revels in the deaths of minorities. If you are white male and pro-choice, for instance, it is often ascribed to your desire for poor black and Hispanic women to abort their children as frequently as possible.

These are his words—words that invent an absurd sense of victimhood based on a fictional reading of how ethnic minorities view others.

I would just ask my colleagues, how can somebody who wrote and published statements like those—statements that were printed in Stanford's newspaper for anybody to read—be capable of hearing a case involving matters of race in an impartial fashion?

After intoxicated athletes vandalized a gay pride monument at Stanford, Mr. Bounds wrote:

> We hear of sensations of personal violation and outrage and of suspicion that male athletes and fraternity members are bigots whose socialization patterns induce this sort of terrorism. Perhaps all of this is true, but the castigation of athletes and frat boys for flagrantly anti-homosexual prejudices is predicated on a motivation for this vandalism that has not been articulated.

He continued:

> The vandals might face hate-crime charges, fraternity members—regardless of their individually demonstrated prejudices (or, for that matter, sexual orientation)—face mandatory sensitivity training . . . and sensitivity insinuates itself a little further into the fissures of our community.

So in that passage, Mr. Bounds somehow managed to make victims out of homophobic vandals and attack the concept of sensitivity. It is a sort of division in American society. It is as if he believed being sensitive to minorities who are the targets of hate and prejudice on a daily basis was an unreasonable prospect.

Next I will turn to Mr. Bounds' views on sexual assault on campus. He wrote:

> There is nothing really inherently wrong with the University failing to punish an alleged rapist—regardless his guilt—in the absence of adequate certainty; there is nothing that the University can do to objectively ensure that the rapist does not strike again.

He continued:

> Expelling students is probably not going to contribute a great deal toward a rape victim's recovery; there is no moral imperative to risk egregious error in doing so.

Now, I would be the first to say that a disciplinary proceeding in a university is not a courtroom. They don't operate under the same legal standards. However, universities that receive Federal dollars do have a legal obligation to protect the young women on their campuses. Once again, this is something that the nominee, Ryan Bounds, seems not to comprehend.

So when you take these writings together—the merit of diversity, the advancement of ethnic minorities, the protection of survivors from sexual assault—these are issues at the heart of some of the most significant cases that come before Federal judges. Mr. Bounds' writings reflect that he held shocking views on these matters as a young adult—views that he hid by concealing the writings I have touched on.

There are plenty of inflammatory examples beyond those I quoted here today that touch on additional topics.

I hope Senators and those following this would find my judgment not something you can debate. This is indisputably appalling stuff. I believe, having talked to some colleagues, they might want to dismiss the writings because they came when Mr. Bounds was a young man, and one would certainly hope that people mature as they age. I would agree with that if Mr. Bounds had done two things: first, if he had disclosed the writings to our independent and bipartisan Oregon committee—in other words, been candid with the bipartisan and independent committee like the Oregonians who came before him for close to two decades. I don't think that is asking too much—to be candid, to be straightforward, as those other Oregonians who went on to distinguished service on the Federal bench did for almost two decades. In addition to disclosing these writings to the independent and bipartisan committee, if he had recanted and apologized for these horrendous remarks. In my view, he failed to take either action.

When you think about this, nobody would ask Mr. Bounds to recant every utterance, every writing, every belief he held as a young adult. I think we would all widely think that is unreasonable. I understand that when there is a Republican in the White House and a Republican in charge of the Judiciary Committee, I am not going to see eye-to-eye with every judicial nominee who comes up for a vote. That is why I have gone to some lengths tonight to mention that I have been the senior Democrat for essentially two decades. Whether it be Mark Hatfield or Gordon Smith, two very thoughtful Republicans, and now our colleague JEFF MERKLEY, we have always, always tried to be deferential, tried to find common ground in recognizing what party was in the White House and what party controlled the Senate.

I am not asking Mr. Bounds to transform himself into Thurgood Marshall. It is completely reasonable to expect an admission that comparing the promotion of diversity to Nazi rallies was wrong.

I can only imagine what my late parents, both of whom fled the Nazis at a very young age—and all they wanted to do was to serve in our military, wear the uniform of the United States. My dad wrote propaganda pamphlets that we dropped on the Nazis. I can only imagine what my parents would say to Mr. Bounds' idea of comparing diversity to Nazi rallies.

Dismissing the value of diversity is wrong, and insisting that it is not worth protecting the victims of sexual assault because it is impossible to guarantee safety from rape is wrong. Instead, Mr. Bounds hid these writings rather than recant, take back their content.

The comments he has made since they came to light, in my view, suggest that Mr. Bounds sees this as a matter of clumsy word choice and youthful indiscretion. He only acknowledged it after it became a threat to his nomination. I don't think it was a true apology. It is as if he believed he could wave the writings off as a messy, isolated little episode from the past.

In my view—and something I am going to talk about going forward—nominees for the Federal bench must be held to a higher standard. If you are up for a lifetime appointment on a powerful Federal court, you have to be truthful and forthcoming in your nomination process. Ryan Bounds has not, and that ought to be a reasonable judgment from what I have outlined thus far.

Now I want to touch on the second important issue, and that is the way this nomination has literally trampled on our bipartisan selection process for judicial nominees.

As I have said, I am proud that for the better part of two decades, prospective judicial nominees have been identified and vetted by our bipartisan committee made up of Oregonians from across the State and from all over the legal community.

As I indicated, it was especially important to me to partner with my Republican colleagues to ensure that all sides had a voice in this issue—in fact, even before I came to the Senate because I was the senior Democrat in our delegation then as a Member of the House. I always wanted to hear Senator Hatfield's views and what he thought was in Oregon's interest.

When there is a vacancy on the bench, our selection committee performs a thorough statewide search for candidates. It conducts very rigorous interviews. It provides a list of recommended potential nominees to Oregon Senators.

Senator MERKLEY and I review these recommendations closely, and we respect that not everyone on the list is going to be somebody we would have chosen ourselves. They are not all people we would agree with 100 percent. After our review, the two of us submit a short list to the President for his consideration. For us, this is the beginning of how we put advice and consent into practice.

When the Trump administration came to office, Senator MERKLEY and I wrote to the White House Counsel to guarantee that he was aware of our longstanding bipartisan selection process.

As part of the independent committee work, candidates are asked to disclose anything from their past that could have a negative impact on their potential nomination. It ought to be obvious to any lawyer—even to anybody with a casual interest in American law and history—that the incendiary writings, particularly about minorities, would qualify as potentially threatening to a nomination. This was the exact point at which Mr. Bounds withheld any and all information about his writings.

It is not as if Mr. Bounds simply declined to look back far enough into his past when he was interviewed. In fact, Mr. Bounds cited certain activities from his precollege days going back to high school in an effort to paint a picture of diversity and tolerance. So the reality is, he misled the committee by omitting the writings that I have described tonight.

When his writings came to light in February, five of the selection committee's seven members, including the chair, said they would have changed their decision to include Mr. Bounds among their recommended candidates. I think that is a very important statement.

It is not widely known that it will always say in the newspaper that the distinguished President of the Senate recommended so-and-so and the President chose his recommendation. We all know that is generally not the case. We forward a list of individuals—usually three—that our bipartisan committee feels would be qualified to serve on the bench.

In the case of Mr. Bounds, when his writings—the ones he neglected to tell the committee about—came to light, five of the selection committee's seven members, including the chairman, said that they would have changed their decision to include Mr. Bounds among the recommended candidates.

Our local bar association wrote that Mr. Bounds' writings ''express insensitive, intolerant, and disdaining views toward racial and ethnic minorities, campus sexual assault victims, and the LGBTQ community.''

The association's statement went on to say that it ''strongly disavows the views expressed in those articles''—the ones I have read tonight—''as racist, misogynistic, homophobic, and disparaging of survivors of sexual assault and abuse.'' I will repeat that last part: ''racist, misogynistic, homophobic, and disparaging of survivors of sexual assault and abuse.''

Those are not my words. Those are the words of Mr. Bounds' local bar association based in Portland. The association, in addition, requested that Mr. Bounds resign from the chairmanship of its equity, diversity, and inclusion committee, which he complied with.

Other member groups of the Oregon legal community added their voices and urged the leaders of the Judiciary Committee to turn to other potential nominees. The leaders of the Oregon Women Lawyers and the Oregon Asian Pacific American Bar Association wrote the following:

> These were not comments from the Twittersphere or errant social media posts. These were well thought-out, carefully constructed, published articles in which [Bounds] repeatedly diminished, mocked, and advocated wholeheartedly against the principles of inclusion for which our organizations have fought.

That is really an important point. Mr. Bounds wasn't sitting down at his laptop, his iPad, pounding out a couple hundred characters. He was thinking carefully; these were published articles that he clearly had spent a lot of time trying to get the words to reflect what was on his mind. And people have recognized it—no 280 characters for those articles.

The Oregon Hispanic Bar Association and the LGBT Bar Association of Oregon wrote the following:

> We believe Mr. Bounds' failure to disclose these writings—and his conduct related to their disclosure—demonstrates Mr. Bounds does not show the appropriate judgment and discernment to faithfully uphold and apply the laws of the United States of America.

These are the voices of Oregon's legal community. The nominations process is supposed to be responsive to those voices. Apparently, none of what I have gotten into tonight has been of any interest whatsoever to the chairman of Senate Judiciary Committee, the majority leader, or the White House, because they simply moved forward with the Bounds nomination anyway. Really, there were no substantive discussions with them at all. It appears now that the White House simply had no interest in respecting the bipartisan, 20-year history of tackling these nominations in a way that reflects principled bipartisanship. Mr. Bounds was their choice from the beginning, and no revelation, no red flag—no matter how big—was going to change him.

Our independent group of experts—people with bipartisan roots that go back decades—had no interest in delay. But if blowing up a decades-old bipartisan tradition is bad, then blowing up a tradition that dates back more than a century is even worse.

For 101 years, going back to Chairman Charles A. Culberson of Texas, the Judiciary Committee has sought input from Senators on judicial nominees from their home States. It is done by returning what are known as blue slips. It is the definition of senatorial collegiality—courtesy, if you will, in an effort to make sure that all felt they were going to be heard.

The committee sends blue slips to home State Senators when a nomination comes up. At that point, the home State Senators have a few options. Once they review the nomination, they can return the blue slip with a positive or negative recommendation, and the committee moves forward. Or the home State Senators can withhold the blue slip.

Senator MERKLEY and I withheld our blue slips. We have not consented to a hearing, a markup, or a debate on the floor. We have done that because Mr. Bounds purposefully misled the independent Oregon committee that reviewed his candidacy by concealing the disturbing writings from his young adulthood. In my view, that is exactly the way the blue-slip process is supposed to work.

History shows that this tradition has benefited both sides. It is a check on the power of the President and a moderating, democratic force on the Judiciary. It helps to ensure that administrations are not seating flawed nominees or extremist judges whose views are simply far from the mainstream of the lives that they have considerable power to change, if confirmed.

In fact, let me quote a letter from the entire Senate Republican conference sent to the last President at the very beginning of his term in 2009. What that means is every member of the Senate Republican caucus sent to President Obama, at the beginning of his term in 2009, a letter with one of the very first lines saying:

> Unfortunately, the judicial appointments process has become needlessly acrimonious. We would very much like to improve this process, and we know you would as well.

So at a time when that side of the Chamber—everybody over there—was out of power and they had no choice but to appeal to the other party's good will, they went ahead and struck a bipartisan chord. Their letter described the ''shared constitutional responsibility'' in the nominations process. They wrote that dating back to the Nation's founding, the Senate has had ''a unique constitutional responsibility to provide or withhold its Advice and Consent on nominations.''

They continued:

> The principle of senatorial consultation (or senatorial courtesy) is rooted in this special responsibility, and its application dates back to the Administration of George Washington. Democrats and Republicans have acknowledged the importance of maintaining this principle, which allows individual Senators to provide valuable insights into their constituents' qualifications for federal service.

Here is the heart of the letter that came from that side of this body:

> We hope your administration will consult with us as it considers possible nominations to the federal courts from our states. Regretfully, if we are not consulted on, and approve of, a nominee from our states, the Republican Conference will be unable to support moving forward on that nominee.

So there you have the heart of the fury that we represent tonight. When a new Democratic administration came into office, my Republican colleagues sprang into action to defend the blue-slip process. That letter was sent on March 2, 2009, to President Obama, and our colleague Senator LEAHY was then the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. The letter clearly indicates that Leader MCCONNELL and his Republican colleagues believed that nominations should not go forward without blue slips having been returned.

That was when there was a Democrat in the Oval Office. A Democrat held the

gavel in the Judiciary Committee. They had the power to tell the Republicans in the minority to get lost; take a hike. Democrats did no such thing.

We upheld the blue-slip tradition on this side of the Chamber, where my good friend Senator MERKLEY and I sit. We went along with the unanimous request from that side of the Chamber in honoring blue slips.

There were no hearings of judicial nominations when a Democrat held the gavel in the Judiciary Committee, when neither home State Senator had consented. In fact, the Judiciary chairman, Senator LEAHY, has emphasized that he went above and beyond what several committee leaders before him had done to respect the rights of the Republican minority.

Someone watching in the Gallery or on TV, someone who is hoping to see the Congress pick up again on what I have described as principled bipartisanship, probably hoping to hear Republicans are operating with the same bipartisan comity now that they are in power—those people are in for some serious disappointment. If the Senate approves the Bounds nomination, it will be the first time in more than a century that a judge has been confirmed without a blue slip from either home State Senator.

The fact that Mr. Bounds wrote the appalling things I have described ought to have at least slowed this nomination down. For him to have hidden the writings is disqualifying. I don't think the matter can be ignored or wished away.

The fact that these writings are embarrassing and reflect poorly on him in retrospect does not in any way give him a license to conceal them. In my view, my colleagues in the majority ought to look at this issue the same way.

The Republican majority, working hand in hand with the Trump administration, is now on the verge of breaking a century of bipartisan tradition to seat a nominee with very serious red flags. In fact, Chairman GRASSLEY has now held hearings on four circuit court nominees who didn't have blue slips from one or both of their home State Senators.

Recently, Leader MCCONNELL changed his tune on what the blue slip was about. He was quoted as saying that the blue slip ''ought to simply be a notification of how you're going to vote, not the opportunity to blackball.''

I have two reactions to that. Senator MERKLEY and I have been called a variety of things over the years, but I don't believe anybody has ever said that we are interested in blackballing people. We are interested in doing our jobs. We are interested in carrying out our constitutional responsibilities, our constitutional responsibilities to our constituents.

Second, blue slips have never been simply an indication of how Senators will vote. Leader MCCONNELL knows it. The letter he and his colleagues sent in 2009 is proof. To invent this new interpretation of how the process should work demonstrates, as I have indicated, that the Republican majority has changed the rules of the game.

My colleagues on the other side ought to be aware of this new responsibility because of how the administration, the majority leader, and the Judiciary Committee have handled the Bounds nomination. This, colleagues, is going to be the end of the blue-slip process. This is lights-out for a process that ensured fairness for each Senator. I would wager that when the next Democratic administration comes in and the Democrats hold the gavel in the Senate, a Republican letter that demands a say in judicial nominations will find it hard not to be treated like a takeout menu that is shoved unsolicited under the doorway—straight to the dustbin.

I have outlined the letter my Republican colleagues sent to President Obama in 2009. It talked about a shared constitutional responsibility, but the administration seems to define ''advise and consent'' as Senators rubberstamping whatever nominations are sent their way. This is a historic moment and, I think, a sad one. As I indicated, it is part of a larger context—part of a pattern of the majority violating norms, misleading the public, and bending rules to their absolute limits in order to reshape the judiciary and seat judges who are far from the mainstream.

Justice Scalia passed away unexpectedly with 237 days left in President Obama's second term. During the process of deciding on a nominee to fill the open seat, President Obama did something he didn't have to do—something that upset many progressive Democrats. He specifically chose a moderate nominee as a show of good faith. After all, in 2010, when another seat opened up, my friend who chairs the Finance Committee called Justice Garland a fine man, a consensus nominee.

What a difference a few years makes. Judge Garland didn't even get a hearing in 2016. The Republican majority in the Senate ran out the clock on his nomination. Now that Republicans control the White House and the Senate, they changed the rules in the Senate so they could confirm Supreme Court Justices without needing a single Democratic vote—a clear double standard.

The Trump administration has outsourced the selection of judicial nominees to a right-wing group called the Federalist Society, which is funded by powerful corporate interests and individuals with deep pockets. They are answerable to no one but their well-monied backers, certainly not the public at large.

Ryan Bounds is a Federalist Society hand-picked nominee. So was Neil Gorsuch, who now sits in the Supreme Court seat that Leader MCCONNELL and Chairman GRASSLEY held open for months and months. So is Brett Kavanaugh, whose nomination the Senate will debate at great length in the months to come.

These are nominees who adhere to a backward-looking, corporatist, rightwing judicial philosophy that is packaged in the branding of so-called ''originalism.''

The guiding principle of originalism is ostensibly that our rights as a people are contained within our founding document, but in practice, originalism provides cover for rightwing jurists to empower corporations over downtrodden workers and the wealthy over the vulnerable. It is a political agenda masquerading as a judicial philosophy.

For example, you would find it impossible to locate in the Constitution where it says that unscrupulous healthcare providers can lie to pregnant women about the services they do and do not provide, but a right-leaning Supreme Court just said they are allowed to deceive women in that way.

Originalist judges regularly trample on the Fourth Amendment, giving the government the power to peer deep into the lives of citizens.

And in an example that is particularly relevant to my home State, which has had a ''death with dignity'' law on the books for decades, originalist jurists, including Justice Gorsuch and Judge Kavanaugh, deny that Americans suffering with terrible illness have a right to make their own decisions about their own lives and bodies without interference from the State.

Twice, Oregonians have passed ballot measures approving death with dignity. Oregon's Death with Dignity Act has been in place for two decades, and it was upheld by the Supreme Court in Gonzalez v. Oregon.

And as I have said on this floor in previous debates, there is nothing in the Constitution that gives the State the power to deny suffering Oregonians the right to make basic choices about the end of their lives.

Justice Gorsuch and Judge Kavanaugh disagree. They would put the State between patients and their doctors, and their view that our rights are only those enumerated in the Constitution conveniently ignores key precedent and the text of the Ninth Amendment, which says:

> The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

. . . shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

So there is a clear implication written into our founding documents that there are rights held by the people that are not overtly laid out in the text of the Constitution.

Furthermore, the originalist viewpoint ignores what Justice Douglas referred to in Griswold v. Connecticut as the ''zone of privacy created by several fundamental constitutional guarantees.''

It was that zone of privacy that formed the basis of his opinion that

guaranteed the right of married couples to use contraceptives. That right was later extended to unmarried individuals.

A similar legal theory guaranteed the right of all American women to make their own choices about their reproductive health.

And it is that case, Roe v. Wade, that is now in the crosshairs of the right wing as the Kavanaugh nomination moves forward.

Colleagues, Roe is settled law—it has been that way for 45 years—but it is the right-wing agenda, wrapped in the cloak of originalism, that seeks to overturn it.

Overturning Roe would turn the clock back to the dark days when women's healthcare choices were made by the State—nevermind the flimsy legal argument for it. That prospect is overwhelmingly opposed by the American people. The imagery of back alley abortions and risky procedures performed in secret is well understood, in part because those horrors are not all that far back in our history as a Nation.

And the fact is, the women who have the most to lose if Roe is overturned are the vulnerable and the poor. It is the women who will lose access to the doctors of their choosing in small town clinics. It is the women who cannot afford to a fly to another State where the reproductive healthcare services they need are legal, safe, and available. It is another step that cleaves our laws and our healthcare system in two, going back to another era when healthcare in America worked only for the healthy and the wealthy.

These questions are all part of the broader context I felt the need to address here today as the Senate debates the Bounds nomination.

As somebody who has done my best to operate in a bipartisan manner throughout my career, it saddens me to see the majority party change the rules of the road in this way pushing through nominees that are far outside the mainstream, destroying bipartisan traditions that have stood for decades, even more than a century, reshaping the judiciary at the behest of extremist, right-wing outside groups that put the interests of the wealthy and powerful over the vulnerable.

These actions by the majority collectively pull bricks from the democratic foundations of our government. They will bring to the judiciary same vitriolic discourse that Americans find so disgusting in the Congress. They undermine the public trust.

In the long run, it will be an open question whether the current structure of the courts will survive.

As for today, I want my colleagues to understand what is at stake as the Senate prepares to vote on the Bounds nomination. This nominee concealed disturbing, intolerant writings from his past, misleading the bipartisan committee that reviewed his candidacy.

The White House and Republican leaders here in the Senate have apparently decided that does not matter, and now, a century-old bipartisan tradition that protects our power as Senators and acts as a moderating force on the courts is on the ropes. In my view, this will forever change how judicial nominations are handled. It will further divide the Congress, and it will further divide the courts along partisan lines.

And this will only be a preview of the tense debate on the judiciary that is sure to come in the months ahead.

I will close with one last point.

There are values on the line now that are important to the people of my State and to Americans, particularly the right of all American women to make their own choices about their reproductive health and their healthcare. The Roe case is settled law, and it has been that way for 45 years, but now there is really a prospect of its being turned back. The poor and the vulnerable have the most to lose. These are all issues that are part of the broader context I wanted to address here tonight. I am not sure if Senator MERKLEY was here at the particular moment.

I see my colleagues who have been very patient because my time has expired.

We had a bipartisan selection committee for judges in our State, with the late Mark Hatfield and Gordon Smith, who was Senator MERKLEY's predecessor—Democrats, Republicans—all of whom said we don't want to bring the same vitriolic discourse to judicial selection that constitutes so much of the public debate today.

What we sought to do in the Oregon congressional delegation—Senator MERKLEY, Senator Hatfield, Gordon Smith—was to buttress the public trust. What we are seeing now in Oregon and with the judges who are being given, in my view, such short shrift—such unfair treatment—raises the question of whether the current structure of America's courts can survive. That is what is at stake in these votes.

I think what we are discussing tonight is going to only be a preview of the tense debate on the judiciary that is sure to come. I think we are capable of better. Oregon has shown it for two full decades as it relates to judicial selection.

I urge the Senate to return to that kind of collegial process, exemplified by the blue slip, exemplified by the Oregon bipartisan selection committee. Until that happens, I will have to urge a ''no'' vote on the Bounds nomination.

I thank my colleagues for their patience.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise not even, I guess, 24 hours since the news broke across the airwaves about what the President was saying and what he was not saying in Helsinki with Vladimir Putin being just a few feet away from him. That was a terrible moment for our country.

Yet, in the aftermath of that, folks came together from across the country and from across all kinds of usual lines of division. Democrats and Republicans came together to express both outrage at the insult but also, I think, to express a sense of solidarity about the path forward—that this moment of crisis in our national security has to be met with bipartisan consensus. Thank goodness that has prevailed so far. We have a long way to go, but that was a good moment for the country after a very bad moment.

I am not here tonight to talk about that, but I want to point to it as an example of the sides coming together on a big issue. I think there have been other moments this year. At one point, when we passed appropriations legislation, there was a strong investment in national security and national defense but also investments in priorities like education and healthcare and the opioid crisis and childcare and the National Institutes of Health—on and on. Great investments for our country will help us grow and make us stronger. The farm bill recently passed the Senate. That was overwhelmingly bipartisan. So there have been good moments.

I am afraid, on the Judiciary, we have had, unfortunately, the opposite. Since I have been in the Senate—and as Senator WYDEN referred to earlier—I have had the privilege of working with colleagues on nominations for the U.S. district court in Pennsylvania—for the Eastern District, the Middle District, and the Western District. It has been a collaborative process. Since 2011, in working with Senator TOOMEY, even though we are on opposite sides of the aisle, we have confirmed—I think it is—14 judges because we have collaborated. There has been give-and-take, and there has been review and scrutiny and then, ultimately, consensus in allowing a candidate to go forward.

No Federal judge in those years would have gone forward without the signing of the blue slip that has been referred to tonight by both Senators. It happened in the past when there were two Republican Senators, but now, with a split delegation, that tradition continues in our State. It is a good tradition. It is the right way to do it.

That tradition prevailed until recently, when it came to appellate court judges—in my case, in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, which includes Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and the Virgin Islands. Even at the very end of the Obama administration, my colleague from Pennsylvania objected and would not return a blue slip. That nomination for the Third Circuit, at that time, did not go forward. I respected the blue slip that my colleague decided not to sign. The Obama administration respected it, and that nomination didn't go forward. I didn't like it, but that is what the agreement was.

Now we are into this new world where, just recently, as our two colleagues from Oregon are talking about

what has happened in the Ninth Circuit, which is in the northwestern corner of our country, and in the Third Circuit, which is where I live and where I work, we had a nomination go forward without a blue slip that had been signed by me. My point of view was disregarded by both the White House and the Senate Judiciary Committee in contravention of years of tradition—and not tradition for the sake of tradition but of practice because it allows you to arrive at a consensus pick that both parties have to agree on.

That is not good for the Senate. It is not good for the judiciary. It is, ultimately, not good for the American people because, if one party has total control, as the Republican Party has now with both Houses of Congress and the administration, you are going to get judges with only one point of view. That leads me to my last point for the night, which will take a few minutes, but I want to make sure this gets on the record.

Another piece of bad news, in terms of the judiciary, unlike the other good news about consensus in other areas of our work, is what has happened under this administration with regard to the selection process for the Supreme Court. This has never happened before when, during a campaign, organizations—in this case, only two—come together and present a list of names. That list of names is, in essence, a bargain between a candidate and those groups. Then that is carried forward to the administration. Now we have a list of just 25 names—25. The last time we checked, there were about 700 Federal judges in the United States of America. The President could pick any one of those Federal judges. Many of them—I don't know how many—had been chosen by Republican Presidents. Many of them are very conservative or conservative, and some are moderates.

Apparently, the only way you get on that list is to be hard right. You have to pass whatever tests are applied by the Heritage Foundation and the Federalist Society. This list has been designed to do the bidding of corporate special interests that are determined to handle healthcare in a fashion that none of us would want it handled—by giving the power back to insurance companies to make decisions on healthcare. It is a corporate agenda that crushes unions or seeks to crush unions. It represents working men and women and promotes policies that, in my judgment, will leave the middle class further behind. So any judge on this list, which I would argue is a corrupt bargain between the advocate and those groups and now the President and those groups, is fruit of a corrupt process.

Just by way of example, the Heritage Foundation is an extreme rightwing organization. That organization just released a new proposal to end protections for people with preexisting conditions, to gut Medicaid for seniors, people with disabilities, and children. They recently hosted a press conference for Republican attorneys general who are trying to eliminate those protections through the courts. Just in one State, Pennsylvania, more than 5.3 million people have preexisting conditions. That is almost half the population of Pennsylvania. Those 5.3 million people include over 643,000 children who have preexisting conditions.

The Heritage Foundation wants to take us back to those dark days in which you could be denied treatment or coverage because of your having a preexisting condition. I don't know many Pennsylvanians who want to go back to those days, to turn back the clock in that fashion.

The Heritage Foundation also called labor unions cartels. Labor unions, of course, helped to build the greatest middle class ever known to man. In my State, from the formation of the first permanent Pennsylvania local labor union in Philadelphia in 1792 to the Lattimer massacre in Northeastern Pennsylvania, which is one county away from me, to the Homestead strike in Western Pennsylvania—in all of those struggles, Pennsylvania's workers have led the way to ensuring that working people have basic rights, good wages, and of course benefits like healthcare. Yet you have organizations in the United States of America that want to rip away protections that people recently gained when it comes to healthcare.

The last thing—the very last thing—working men and women in Pennsylvania need is another corporate judge on an increasingly corporate court.

Here is some evidence for that assertion. A review by the Constitutional Accountability Center shows the consequences of the Court's corporate tilt, finding that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has had a success rate of 70 percent in cases before the Roberts Court since 2006, a significant increase over previous Courts that were thought to be conservative, I guess.

In the most recent term, the Court sided with corporate interests in 9 out of 10 cases in which the U.S. Chamber of Commerce advocated for a position.

I was elected by the people of Pennsylvania to represent all Pennsylvanians and to advance policies, especially when it comes to making decisions about judges and Justices in a fashion that would give meaning and integrity to what is inscribed on the Supreme Court: ''Equal Justice Under Law.''

I was not sent here to genuflect to the hard right or to any organization. In this case, I certainly was not sent here to genuflect to the hard right with regard to groups funded by corporate America.

President Lincoln said it best about what he hoped our Nation would be. He called on our Nation to work to ensure ''that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.''

It seems that some in Washington today—and I have to say, the administration with them, with this nomination to the Supreme Court, most recently announced—are determined to pack the Court with a government of, by, and for extreme right, corporate special interests. So I oppose the President's nomination because it is a corrupt bargain, as I said before, with the far right, big corporations, and what can only be called Washington special interests.

On a night like tonight, when we are talking about major matters of justice—how our courts will function, whether they will be balanced, whether there will be mainstream judges and Justices—I hope we will go back to that model that still prevails in some States—I would say in most States—when it comes to district court judges: collaboration between and among Democrats and Republicans. It is now being jettisoned at the appellate court level, certainly in the Third Circuit and now apparently in the Ninth Circuit and several others. Of course, on the Supreme Court, there is no consultation. There is consultation with two groups; that is it—and maybe some others who get to be in the room. But if you are a conservative judge in America today, appointed by a Republican, you need not apply to become a Supreme Court Justice. You have to be hard right enough to be on that list of 25. You could be one of those hundreds of conservative judges, but you are not going to get on the list of 25 because you haven't demonstrated that you are hard right enough.

I think it pains all of us that we are at this point. There were days, not too long ago, when Presidents consulted with both parties before—before—a Supreme Court nomination. We know that. That is on the record, as clear as day. But now we have this list, and only the list for the Supreme Court. Now we have blue slips that are being thrown out the window or not honored when it comes to the appellate courts. I hope that this kind of cancer doesn't go all the way to the Federal district courts.

I think all of us wish we were in a different place, and I hope we can return to those traditions that lead to consensus and, I think, lead to bipartisan collaboration and, ultimately, better fulfillment of that goal and that value of equal justice under law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to join many of my colleagues who have come to the floor to speak about our country's third branch of government; that is, our courts.

Senators have a solemn obligation to advise and consent on the President's nominees to our Federal courts. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I take that obligation very seriously.

As Senator MERKLEY—who is heading up this evening's speeches and has brought a number of people together—knows, it is not just an obligation of

members of the Judiciary Committee; it is also an obligation of Senators, when they look at the judges who are coming out of their particular States, to make sure that this is a person—whoever the nominee is—who represents our country as an independent voice and someone who respects precedent as a member of the Federal bench, whether it is on the Supreme Court level or whether it is on the circuit or Federal district court levels.

In the U.S. Senate, we are here to do the people's business and not the President's business. This is an important job, particularly when it comes to nominees to our Nation's highest Court. The next member of the Supreme Court will make decisions that will affect the lives of people across the country for generations.

In the last decades, the Supreme Court has decided whom you can marry, where you can go to school, and—for people like my grandpa, who was a miner and who worked 1,500 feet underground his whole life—how safe your workplace is. Those are decisions that affect people and their lives.

The next Justice of the Supreme Court will make decisions that will affect the lives of people across the country, determining whether health insurers can deny coverage to people who are sick or have a preexisting condition or whether women's rights are protected. These are all cases that will be coming to the highest Court of the land. It is for this reason that it is critical that here in the Senate, we do our jobs and thoroughly examine Judge Kavanaugh's record.

This is part of our jobs in evaluating Supreme Court nominees, regardless of which party controls the White House. In fact, when Justice Elena Kagan's nomination was considered, because she had worked for an administration, approximately 171,000 pages of documents were made available.

Given Judge Kavanaugh's years of service on the DC Circuit, as well as his previous work in the Bush administration, we will need to do due diligence in reviewing the record. That is part of our job.

For a lifetime appointment to our Nation's highest Court, the American people deserve no less. This is especially important because, for me, many of Judge Kavanaugh's past rulings are very troubling.

One area that I am concerned about is, of course, related to Judge Kavanaugh's record on consumer issues. I have done a lot of work in this area, and, of course, I am concerned about the Executive power issue. I would say that is a paramount concern, as well as some of his other decisions regarding healthcare and women's healthcare, but I want to discuss the consumer issues because I don't think they get a lot of attention, and they should. They matter to people in their everyday lives.

In his current job, Judge Kavanaugh ruled that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which protects consumers when it comes to everything from credit cards, loans, and mortgages, was unconstitutional. He also went out of his way to dissent against net neutrality.

Judge Kavanaugh also wrote a dissent that would have limited a woman's access to contraception, and he ruled against allowing a woman the right to control her own reproductive health in a decision that was later reversed by the full DC Circuit.

We also know that Judge Kavanaugh has criticized the case called Chevron, which ensures that health and safety rules stay on the books. It is about how you consider agency decisions and the experts in the agencies. As I noted in Justice Gorsuch's hearing, overturning Chevron would have titanic, real-world implications, jeopardizing rules that protect health and public safety, requirements against lead-based paint, and clean water protections for our Great Lakes.

Finally, as I noted at the beginning—I will sort of end with my discussion of his rulings as I began—there are concerning implications to Judge Kavanaugh's writings, which support an expansive view of Executive power. It is an important moment, this moment in our country's history. We just saw the President of the United States stand next to Vladimir Putin and not publicly raise any of the issues that I thought should be raised, and we have Members of both parties gravely criticizing those decisions.

What I can say to the people of our State is, no matter what happens in the White House, our Founding Fathers set up a system of checks and balances. There is a check because of the courts, which can make decisions when they interpret our Constitution. There is also a check because of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

What does Judge Kavanaugh say about this? When they are in school, kids are told—and I know I was told this—that no one is above the law. But decisions he has made and his writings would not lead you to that same conclusion, that simple lesson that we were taught.

When you look at the article he wrote for the University of Minnesota Law Review, as well as one in the Georgetown Law Journal, he has an incredibly expansive view of Executive power. He has said that we shouldn't even have a special counsel process, when in fact Members of the Senate, including those on the Judiciary Committee, Democrats and Republicans, have gone the other way and said: Yes, we want the check of a special counsel investigation when it is necessary—as it has been found to be in this case by the Trump Justice Department—but we want to make sure that the special counsel is protected. That is what the Judiciary Committee said.

We passed a bill out of the committee that strengthened that law and made it harder for someone to fire the special counsel. Yet in his writings, Judge Kavanaugh said that the President should be able to fire the special counsel. He also said that the President should be able to deem whether or not a law is constitutional. These are certainly questions I will be asking about in the Judiciary Committee, and I think we have a right to do that.

Yes, we can ask about a case that is before the Court, but before I came to the Senate, I had seen numerous nominees, including Supreme Court nominees, answer questions about cases such as Brown v. Board of Education and Griswold v. Connecticut. Justice Alito answered a question about that case.

A number of the nominees on the Supreme Court today have answered questions about settled precedent, and I believe we should be able to ask Judge Kavanaugh those questions and receive answers, especially for cases that are 45 years old.

People can have certain views on issues. Everyone does; judges do. But they have an obligation to follow the Constitution, to follow the law, and to respect precedent, and that is going to be our job so that the American people can understand where this nominee is coming from.

First, we will review all of those documents I talked about that are sure to come our way, and then, secondly, we will ask the questions the American people expect us to ask and get the answers they deserve to have.

I would also like to briefly address one of the two circuit court nominees before the Senate this week, because even as we review the President's Supreme Court nominee, we cannot lose sight of the importance of our lower Federal courts. The overwhelming majority of cases are decided by these lower courts. That is why it is imperative to have judges who are fair and committed to equal justice under the law for all Americans.

One Senate tradition that has been key to the appointment of good judges has been the blue slip. The blue slip is a check and balance that has promoted cooperation and better decision making about judges across party lines. It is for that reason that I am deeply concerned that the Ninth Circuit nominee now on the Senate floor will be receiving a vote, despite not having a blue slip from either home State Senator.

Prior to his nomination, no judge has ever been voted out of the Judiciary Committee—since I have been there—without a blue slip from either home State Senator. Since the tradition has been in existence, we have said that there should be a blue slip. There is no blue slip in this case. If Mr. Bounds is confirmed, he will be the first judge in history to be appointed to the Federal bench without a blue slip from either Senator from his home State.

This is all the more concerning, as noted by Senator MERKLEY and Senator WYDEN, because they have tried to

work with the White House in a bipartisan manner to find a qualified nominee to fill this vacancy. They convened a bipartisan committee of Oregon lawyers to review applications and make recommendations. This committee included attorneys chosen by those two Senators, as well as by Republican Congressman GREG WALDEN.

This is how judicial vacancies in Oregon have been filled for the past two decades, including the time when former Republican Senator Gordon Smith was in office.

So it is extremely unfortunate that my colleagues have disregarded this process. I respect them very much. I think they should have had a say. I think they should have been consulted, and I think we should follow the blue-slip process.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise alongside my colleagues tonight to speak on two incredibly controversial circuit judge nominees that the Senate considers this week.

The first, Ryan Bounds, of the Ninth Circuit, has not received the approval of either home State Senator. The majority is unfortunately moving forward with his nomination anyway, breaking a tradition that goes back 100 years—a bipartisan tradition, a moderating tradition, a tradition we need.

This is merely the latest example of the majority's sustained effort to toss aside the rules and the customs that have guided the judicial nomination process for 100 years. In May, Michael Brennan became the first circuit court nominee to be confirmed over the blue-slip objection of a home-State Senator.

If Judge Brennan's confirmation wasn't proof enough, the majority, by moving to vote on Bounds over the objections of both Oregon Senators, is signaling loud and clear that future Presidents need not work with Senators to ensure the selection of consensus nominees to fill these lifetime appointments.

For the past 20 years, including during the Bush administration, the Oregon Senators have convened a bipartisan judicial panel to interview candidates. Although Bounds was one of the candidates approved by the committee, it was later discovered that Bounds misled the committee about a number of highly controversial articles he wrote while in college. The majority unfortunately is moving forward on his nomination anyway.

Five of the seven members of the committee—a bipartisan committee—including the chair, said they would not have recommended Bounds if they knew of his writings at the time they interviewed him. The majority is unfortunately moving forward with his nomination anyway.

In light of these inflammatory writings—and they were truly inflammatory and nasty, unbecoming of someone being a town circuit judge, let alone a court of appeals judge—and the bipartisan committee's assertion that they should be disqualifying, Senator MERKLEY and Senator WYDEN, correctly and wisely, refused to support his nomination, but the majority is moving forward on his nomination anyway.

I might say about Bounds that he is not a judge. He doesn't have much of a history. He practiced in a private law firm. It seems he is a member of the Federalist Society—hard right. That is his only real qualification. Is he a thoughtful jurist? Obviously not. Is he a moderate jurist, neither far right nor far left? Obviously not. This is what we are doing on the bench these days. The hard right, the Federalist Society, which is probably in the 10 percent furthest to the right in America, chooses the judges, and nobody objects on the Republican side.

Now, another nominee, Mr. Andrew Oldham, for the Fifth Circuit, is even more disturbing for a lifetime appointment on the Federal bench. Mr. Oldham's career leaves no doubt that, if confirmed, he would be the living embodiment of a judicial ideologue. This is a hard-right warrior. He helped to defend a Texas law that would make it virtually impossible for women in rural areas to exercise their constitutionally guaranteed freedom to make decisions about their reproductive health. It was a law designed to tell rural women that they couldn't have freedom of choice. It was an absurd law, struck down by the Supreme Court in 2016. This is the kind of man we are putting on the bench.

As the Texas solicitor general, he defended the State's extremely restrictive photo ID laws, which a Federal court of appeals ruled created an unconstitutional burden on the right to vote, had an impermissible discriminatory effect against Hispanics and African Americans, and was imposed with an unconstitutional discriminatory purpose. The purpose that this nominee had in this law was to prevent people of color and poor people from voting. There was very little evidence of any fraud. This is the kind of person we are adding to the bench?

Mr. Oldham helped to lead the charge on litigation challenging the constitutionality of our healthcare law—a law that most Americans support. He lost at the Supreme Court, once again. Now the Republicans want to give him a promotion, putting him in a position to rule on future cases concerning the law.

Here is what Mr. Oldham said about the EPA: It is ''illegitimate.'' He repeatedly helped Texas to join Oklahoma—and then-Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt—to sue the EPA. Let me repeat that. Oldham considers the EPA illegitimate. The rightwing media has gone crazy about ''Abolish ICE.'' Meanwhile, the Senate Republican majority is about to vote to give a lifetime appointment to a man who wants to abolish the EPA.

''Abolish the EPA'' is a position I think none—none—of my Republican friends would dare support in public, would dare vote for—get rid completely of the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act? But they are happy to vote for a judge who believes in it and might help do it for them.

Mr. Oldham is so far out of the political mainstream that he doesn't represent the average Republican, let alone the average American. I hope his nomination will be objected to.

The truth is that Bounds and Oldham are part of a decades-long campaign by the hard right to install conservative ideologues on the Federal bench. They started it. Bork did not start this. It started when George W. Bush became President and his deal with the hard right was this: I will put these new nominees on the bench who are ideologues. They don't want to interpret law; they want to make law. That is what the Republicans have been doing.

When Clinton was President and when Obama was President, most of the judges they chose were moderate to liberal. They were not extreme. But the hard right has such a grip on the Republican Party these days—the Federalist Society, the Heritage Foundation, way out of the mainstream.

Most Americans don't believe in repealing Roe v. Wade. It is the mission of the Federalist Society. Most Americans don't believe the government should get out of healthcare altogether—Medicare, Medicaid, ACA. It is the goal of the Heritage Foundation. But they put these judges forward. President Trump has gone along with their lists and their nominees. Unfortunately, we don't hear a peep out of our Republican colleagues as the hard right hijacks the judicial bench in America.

The goal of this campaign is to achieve by judicial fiat what Republicans have been unable to accomplish through legislation. This hard-right agenda—extremely pro-corporate, extremely anti-consumer, anti-environment, anti-gun safety—must be pursued through the courts because the hard right—the Koch brothers and all of these hard-right groups—realize that they never get things through even a body like the Senate, where they have a majority of the Republicans, or the House. They want the one nonelected branch to turn the clock back decades, if not centuries. It will hurt America. It will fractionalize America. The middle class will be worse off. But the hard-right knows that these types of nominations don't get much focus.

An apotheosis of this is the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court as well. Kavanaugh was groomed as a partisan lawyer in the Clinton and Bush eras. He was added to a list of 25 judges vetted and approved by these two groups—the Heritage Foundation, dedicated to getting rid of Medicaid, getting rid of Medicare, getting the government out of healthcare altogether and letting people struggle,

letting those parents who have kids with illnesses never get insurance; and the Federalist Society, dedicated by its leader, by its own admission, to repealing Roe v. Wade. An analysis of the judicial philosophy of Kavanaugh by Professor Lee Epstein found that Judge Kavanaugh would be the second most conservative Justice on the bench, even to the right of Justice Gorsuch and second only to Justice Thomas, one of the most extremely conservative judges who has ever been on the bench.

That political and judicial history is key to understanding how Kavanaugh would rule as a member of the Supreme Court. On issues like healthcare and reproductive rights, on which the President has been crystal-clear about picking judges who are anti-Roe and hostile to healthcare, Judge Kavanaugh will have an enormous and unfortunate impact, if confirmed. After what the President has said, after knowing what the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation stand for, does anyone think Judge Kavanaugh would have been nominated by those parties if they weren't sure he would repeal or dramatically limit the ACA or Roe v. Wade?

Judge Kavanaugh, like Mr. Oldham and like Mr. Bounds, is outside of the political mainstream—dramatically outside—even outside of the Republican mainstream. It is part and parcel of the hard-right campaign that Republicans bow down and go along with to install conservative ideologues on the bench.

So I would say to my fellow Americans: No matter what your political persuasion—Democrat, Republican, Independent—everyone should want a more representative process for choosing judges and Supreme Court Justices in the Senate. Instead, humming in the background of the Senate's more newsworthy business, the Republican majority has confirmed a conveyor belt of nakedly partisan, ideological judges to the bench. Senators from both parties, in an America that wants moderation, should lock arms and put a stop to it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I so appreciate my colleagues from Minnesota and New York coming to the floor to share their insights on this challenge that we are in, where a 101-year-old convention is about to be smashed to smithereens by the majority in a determination to pack the courts and corrupt the constitutional application of law and in a determination to have judges who are not at all interested in the way the people envision our Nation. They are not at all interested in the rights of workers. Rather, they twist each provision to enable the powerful in our country to repress the workers of our country, to enable the interests of our country that simply want to roll on, on a commercial plane, to take away the ability of consumers to get a fair shake. They want to take away the ability of individuals to have fair access to healthcare. They want to take away one right after another after another on behalf of the wealthy and the well-connected. This corruption—this legislating from the bench that is occurring from the far right—absolutely flies in the face of the fundamental nature of our Constitution.

But here it is. Not only is it their quest to put the powerful in the catbird seat to rule over everyone else in this country, to undermine the fundamental strategy of the distribution and equal voice principle that Jefferson so forcefully articulated, but they are even willing to run roughshod over their own rights in the future, because each and every person who votes for a judge who has no blue slip—not one, not a single blue slip—is saying that in the future they are giving up the ability to be consulted when it is an individual who has been assigned to their State for the circuit court. That is how intense they are at this moment of dancing to the tune played by the Koch brothers and the Federalist Society. It is really one of the saddest things we have seen in a series of abuses of the process here in the U.S. Senate.

This nomination ends a tradition that has served our country well for over a century. It is a tradition that—just a brief span of time ago, my colleagues across the aisle were pleading with the Democratic majority to respect their rights. But not now. Not now. This is one of those cases where, in the transition from minority to majority, views have been flipped 180 degrees—a tradition since 1917, when Senator Thomas Hardwick objected to President Wilson's district court nominee, writing his objection on a blue slip of paper. That is where the phrase comes from. Not since then has any judge for the circuit court or district court ever been confirmed without a blue slip.

In 2009, my Republican colleagues wrote a letter. All signed on to it. They wrote: We expect the blue-slip tradition to be observed evenhandedly and regardless of party affiliation.

I ask you, which Member across the aisle has the consistency to stand up and honor the very principle they asked to be honored when then in the minority? Who? We are waiting. We are waiting for just one to come to the floor and be consistent in honoring the principle they begged the Democrats to honor when we were in charge.

To be sure, when the tide turns and they again say suddenly that they love this tradition, and won't the Democrats once again honor the tradition they begged us to honor in 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014? They begged us to honor it. They are going to be back asking again. But you cannot expect that after smashing this tradition, you can ask to have it back. So when it comes your turn, if you don't have any integrity today to honor the principle you begged for yesterday, don't let us hear you begging for it in the future.

What did people have to say in the past? The former chair of the Judiciary Committee at the time, in 2014, said: ''Weakening or eliminating the blue slip process would sweep aside the last remaining check on the President's judicial appointment power.'' That is what the Republican chair said when President Obama was in office. He said: ''Anyone serious about the Senate's constitutional 'advice and consent' role knows how disastrous such a move would be.'' Why isn't one of my colleagues today coming down to say how disastrous it would be?

Our majority leader said just recently that Republicans will now treat a blue slip as simply notification of how you are going to vote. Is that the way each and every one of you wants it to be from this floor, that while you have had the privilege in the past of weighing in on an individual assigned to your State, no more will you be treated differently from any other Senator because you are just being given a chance to indicate how you are going to vote? That is what the majority leader says we are going to reduce your Senate prerogative to, which means it is gone, it is no different from any other Member here.

There was a whole logic behind this blue-slip process, a logic that each circuit should have input from Senators whose States were represented on those circuit courts and that when the individual came from those respective States, it made sense to get the insight of the Senators from that State, not have decisions about your particular circuit court made by somebody from across the Nation. But that is where we are headed to now.

This nomination was tainted from the start because the President didn't consult with our senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN, or with the junior Senator; didn't call us up; didn't sit down; didn't invite us to a meeting; didn't hold a conversation; didn't have a dialogue; didn't consult. So don't expect any consultation in the future if you vote for this nominee.

Then at the end of the year, when the nomination was returned, we told the White House: You have another chance to wait until you get some consultation done, until you talk to us. No. They just forwarded it back again—no consultation. So there it is.

When this individual, Ryan Bounds, was interviewed by our committee in Oregon, he was asked to provide anything that was potentially controversial from his past, and he didn't. He was asked about his views on diversity and what information he had put out in the past, and he didn't supply any. So not only are there the controversial viewpoints of the past, there is a lack of integrity in the present. It isn't as if Senator WYDEN and I took it lightly. But how can you expect people to get a fair hearing or believe they have any chance of getting a fair hearing with these types of opinions being expressed?

What did he say on diversity? He said that students working to ''promote diversity . . . contribute more to restricting consciousness, aggravating intolerance . . . than many a Nazi bookburning.'' So if you advocate for diversity, you are compared to being an individual who burns books—not just any individual; a Nazi burning books.

That wasn't his only comment on diversity. He wrote quite extensively. Another phrase he used is that diversity training is a ''pestilence'' that ''stalks us,'' as if it is some kind of grim reaper to encourage people to reach out and embrace people who come from a different point of view or a different color or come from a different State. That is what he thought, that any training you might have in how to understand your own internal prejudices is a pestilence that stalks us.

He didn't like the fact that the university was trying to address the issue of men abusing women. He said that there is ''nothing really inherently wrong with the University failing to punish an alleged rapist.'' That is what you want to vote for?

He said more. He really disliked minority groups on campus taking a position on anything. In his essay ''Labor Unions and the Politics of Aztlan,'' he said: ''I would hardly suggest that no student group should be able to take up a political matter, if it is of direct relevance to its purported mission.'' So he is not objecting to most groups weighing in on something related to their vision, but, he said, ''I would contend, however, that no student group that is affiliated with an ethnic center or any other department of this university has any business holding political issues central to its mission.''

So if you are a member of a student group that isn't an ethnic group, it is wide open—demonstrate, argue, involve yourself, engage. But if you happen to be a member of an ethnic club or group on campus, then no way. You have no business taking a position.

How can anyone expect to get a fair hearing with someone with this extensive hostility toward ethnic diversity or ethnic groups? That is a pretty serious question to ask yourself in your responsibility of advice and consent, in your responsibility to ensure that there is not just integrity on the court but a perception of integrity, not just fairness on a court but a perception of fairness. How does anyone get a perception of fairness with these writings?

Mr. Bounds had the opportunity to inform the committee of these writings, but he chose not to. He kept them hidden away. The head of the Oregon selection advisory committee wrote the following: ''Mr. Bounds failed to disclose these writings when specifically asked by the committee about his views on equity and diversity.''

He did get asked about them later when they were discovered. There was a hearing in the Judiciary, and he had a chance to respond in questions for the record. He wrote in response that he regretted the rhetoric in the articles, but he didn't repudiate the viewpoint. He regretted, apparently, the particular words he used to express it, but he didn't say that he repudiated the viewpoint on his commentaries attacking diversity, attacking diverse clubs, saying that every other club has a right to participate and engage itself in issues relevant to its mission except the ethnic clubs. He didn't repudiate that. How do you expect to get a fair hearing before this judge?

At his hearing before the Judiciary Committee, in questions for the record, Senator BLUMENTHAL asked if he regretted not turning over the writings to the Oregon screening committee. He replied that it seemed reasonable to him that there wouldn't be a lot of interest in writings that have no bearing on someone's professional practice. These writings have everything to do with his professional practice, his consideration as a judge—a circuit court judge, not a district judge. He is not being nominated for the bottom rung; he is being nominated to the rung next to the Supreme Court. You don't think it has a bearing that you have written these things? You don't think it has a bearing that you hid them from the committee? That in itself tells you a great deal.

It is why this nomination is opposed by so many groups: the AFL–CIO, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the National Women's Law Center, the Oregon Women Lawyers Association, the Asian Pacific American Bar Association of Oregon, the Oregon Hispanic Bar Association, the LGBT Bar Association of Oregon.

Why wouldn't they oppose when you have an individual who failed the integrity test by hiding the writings, doesn't repudiate the writings, and has it in for diversity and minority groups?

Records are being broken. Two nominees up this week would mean 23 appeals judges confirmed. A lot are being confirmed. There are a lot in waiting. Why not bring someone to the floor who doesn't have these deep flaws? Why not vote down this individual and put up the next one?

We have already broken the record for confirmations in the President's first year, last year. Obama's 14 circuit court nominees waited an average of 251 days; Trump is half that at 125 days—less than half. We are marching through this.

Why not bring someone else to floor? Why not set this one aside? Because it fails the test of being fairminded and fails the test of integrity. Putting this judge forward does something else. It is not just a judge who fails the test on integrity and fairness; it is also the destruction of your rights, each and every Senator here, to have a say on circuit court nominees in your circuit. Is that really the place you want to go?

We have seen judges come before us who have had hearings held without ABA evaluations. We have had two considered who were unanimously rated ''not qualified.'' We certainly, therefore, have a lot that has changed dramatically. Last year was the first time that a seat had been stolen from one administration and set a year into the future. That is a precedent everyone here should regret—to have failed advice-and-consent responsibilities, which is a failure that no other set of Senators ever failed before. Fifteen times before, there have been open seats during an election year. Fifteen times before, the Senate debated the nominee. Fifteen times before, they voted on the nominee. But not last year.

The leadership of this body failed the test of leadership by failing to consider a nominee from the President for the Supreme Court. Is that the precedent you want to live with for the future?

Of course, now we have a new nominee for the Supreme Court. Not only does this nominee come from a list secretly compiled by the Federalist Society to make sure that they met the test the President had put forward—opposing Roe v. Wade, opposing the Affordable Care Act that has provided healthcare to another 30 million people across this land, 400,000 in my own State, but also the President chose off that list the one person best suited to write him a get-out-of-jail free card because of the massive, expansive view of Presidential power—a view of Presidential power you can find nowhere in the Constitution; a view that is completely at odds with the checks and balances our Forefathers so carefully crafted into that document; a view that says that a President should never be indicted and, even more extraordinary, never be investigated. That is a President above the law. That is a President beyond the law. That is something that is not a President. That is a King. That is a tyrant. That is a dictator who answers to no one because he or she is above the law. That is not a President in a constitutional democratic republic where there are checks and balances.

Indeed, this nominee has said that if a President deems a law to be unconstitutional because it is his or her opinion, the President doesn't need to follow the law. Can anyone remind this nominee for the Supreme Court that our system was designed to let the Supreme Court weigh in on what is and isn't constitutional, not to have a President dictate that? It is a scary proposition, an unworthy proposition to have that individual considered on the floor of this Senate.

In Federalist Paper 76, James Madison said that it is the duty of the Senate to prevent the appointment of unfit characters. Each and every Member of this Senate on both sides of the aisle has that responsibility.

These are questions you have to ask yourself: Is the person fit when they say the things that Ryan Bounds said? Is a person fit to serve on the bench

when they say that no student group affiliated with an ethnic center has any business holding political issues central to its mission right after he writes that other groups should have that power?

Is the individual fit who says that promoting diversity contributes more to restricting consciousness and aggravating intolerance than a Nazi book burning?

Is the person fit who says that training in diversity—training that each and every one of us has to take and our staff members have to take in this body—is a pestilence that stalks us, as if embracing the notion of understanding one's own biasses is an evil thing?

Is the person fit who said there is nothing wrong with the university failing to punish an alleged rapist?

Is the person fit who hid these writings from the selection committee?

Is the person fit when the selection committee said that based on these writings, they would vote overwhelmingly not to recommend this individual?

Is the person fit when they fail the test of integrity and are asked to produce their views on diversity and hide them?

I contend that standard that James Madison laid out for the responsibility of advice and consent—that standard of voting down individuals who are unfit—has rarely had a clear opportunity to be executed and should be executed 100 to 0 in turning down this nomination and in preserving the blue-slip tradition.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:09 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 18, 2018 at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

JAMES MORHARD, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, VICE DAVA J. NEWMAN.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

MARTIN J. OBERMAN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2018, VICE DANIEL R. ELLIOTT III, RESIGNED.

MARTIN J. OBERMAN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2023. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KEVIN K. SULLIVAN, OF OHIO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NICARAGUA.

THE JUDICIARY

DAMON RAY LEICHTY, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA, VICE ROBERT L. MILLER, JR., RETIRED.

JOHN MILTON YOUNGE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE MARY A. MCLAUGHLIN , RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

NICHOLAS A. TRUTANICH, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DANIEL G. BOGDEN, TERM EXPIRED.

G. ZACHARY TERWILLIGER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DANA J. BOENTE, RESIGNED.

WILLIAM TRAVIS BROWN, JR., OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE KEVIN CHARLES HARRISON, TERM EXPIRED.

NICK EDWARD PROFFITT, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ROBERT WILLIAM MATHIESON, TERM EXPIRED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 17, 2018:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

RANDAL QUARLES, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

JAMES BLEW, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PLANNING, EVALUATION, AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE INDIAN BUSINESS ASSOCIATION

HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the Indian Business Association (IBA) for its outstanding achievements representing Indian-American businesses, and its service as the voice for thousands of Indian-Americans across the country. The IBA began as a group of concerned citizens in Edison, New Jersey, who found the courage to confront hate crimes and hate speech occurring in their communities. The values of fairness, solidarity and social activism drive its mission and objectives, as the members of the IBA continue their work to build a better America for all its citizens.

The IBA has promoted entrepreneurship within the Indian-American community, contributing to the creation of many small businesses and jobs. It has strengthened our democracy by working with elected officials and organizing non-partisan voter registration drives. It has supported our communities by aiding—both financially and through the donated expertise of its members—countless civic and charitable endeavors.

The IBA also continues to preserve and introduce Indian culture to Americans of all walks of life. Now in its 38th year, the IBA hosts the annual New Jersey India Day Parade, our country's largest parade honoring India's independence. Attended by more than 35,000 people and joined by more than 100 organizations, the New Jersey India Day Parade celebrates the rich cultural heritage of its members and their many contributions to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the great achievements of the IBA, and acknowledge its tireless efforts to support Indian-American entrepreneurs and the jobs they create, its contributions to our common good, and its work to protect the civil rights of all Americans, regardless of color or national origin.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for Roll Call votes 329 and 330 on Monday, July 16, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on both votes.

IN RECOGNITION OF 50 YEARS FOR CONCERN HOTLINE

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate and thank Concern Hotline for 50 years of selfless service to the people of the Northern Shenandoah Valley. In 1968, prompted by the stark reality of the highest rate of suicide among Vietnam Veterans on the East Coast, a group of caring community leaders in Winchester and the northern Shenandoah Valley, decided to intervene. They formed the first valley suicide and crisis center, where those feeling confused and desperate could call a number at the George Washington Hotel and be patched to a volunteer ready to be of support.

Fifty years later, the organization is still doing extraordinary work, sometimes as a bridge-builder for Northwestern Community Services, before patients can make an appointment with a clinician. A trained staff of 35 volunteer "listeners" and two paid employees, are on duty 7 days a week, 24 hours a day, receiving calls on their cell phones and providing objective, confidential and anonymous contact with a fellow resident of the northern valley, anytime a person needs them and for as long as he or she needs them. The positive culture of Concern Hotline does not label any caller a "chronic caller" but welcomes all callers, including "frequent callers."

The personal touch is what distinguishes Concern Hotline from many other telephonic support organizations. Their mission is "to comfort and calm community members experiencing stress and crisis" and they do what no other program in the community does: they simply listen compassionately. For its long history, the Concern Hotline team has kept the following commitment: "We listen to your troubles and stresses, we hear your stories of hardship and pain, and we bear witness to your struggle to lead a happy, healthy life."

Mr. Speaker, I have always considered it a great honor to recognize and thank our community heroes such as our law enforcement officers, firefighters and emergency medical technicians for their willingness to help us during some of the most desperate times of our lives. Similarly, I ask you and our colleagues to join me in recognizing and thanking another group of community heroes, the volunteers and staff of our suicide prevention programs, and most especially the heroes of Concern Hotline, who, as listeners, have been saving lives and giving hope to the residents of the Northern Shenandoah Valley, for the past half century.

HONORING JOHN AND BENJEAN RAPP OF SUMMERSVILLE, WEST VIRGINIA

HON. EVAN H. JENKINS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize John and Benjean Rapp of Summersville, West Virginia. Mr. and Mrs. Rapp are cornerstones in their community, who have dedicated their lives to bettering our nation and improving West Virginia.

John Rapp served our country in the United States Air Force and returned home to the Mountain State to serve as a West Virginia State Trooper for over 20 years. Outside his time in uniform, John also served as a county commissioner for Mercer County from 1990 to 1996. As a county commissioner, he prioritized growing the economy and investing in infrastructure development.

Benjean Rapp has been an active member of her church and serves as a leader in multiple civic groups. Benjean played an integral part in working to restore the historic Old Main High School in Summersville.

Together, they have made a tremendous team and have had a positive impact on their community and the Mountain State.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 16, I missed the following votes due to significant delays with my flight back to Washington.

For Roll Call Vote 329, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4946, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1075 North Tustin Street in Orange, California, as the Specialist Trevor A. Win'E Post Office, I would have voted "yes."

For Roll Call Vote 330, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4960, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 511 East Walnut Street in Columbia, Missouri, as the Spc. Sterling William Wyatt Post Office Building, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING THE WACO EAGLES MOTORCYCLE CLUB

HON. BILL FLORES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Waco Eagles Motorcycle Club

and to congratulate them on obtaining a grant through the Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission Federal Grant Commission.

The Waco Eagles Motorcycle Club was formed 1934 and chartered with the American Motorcyclist Association in 1951. They are the second oldest chartered club with the American Motorcyclist Association in the United States.

In 1948, the Waco Eagles built the Waco Eagles Motocross Dirt Bike Park. The park has since provided countless hours of recreational off-road activities to families in Central Texas. The track provides open access to its club members and also hosts monthly organized races.

The park has been more than a place to ride bikes, it has become a place where families have gathered for generations, bringing their campers and barbeques to enjoy the comradery of fellow dirt bike enthusiasts. The club also gives back to the community, holding fund raisers to help Central Texas families in need.

In 2016 the Waco Eagles Motorcycle Club caught the attention of Librado Cobian, a current resident of Hawaii who is soon to be a Wacoan. He has been involved in dirt-biking and he wanted to find a cause to support in his new hometown. Mr. Cobian met with the president of the club and explained that he found a government grant for trail upgrades and that he could help the club apply to get funding for their park. According to the Waco Eagles, Mr. Cobian was diligent in gathering information for the grant and supporting the application process.

On May 24, 2018 the Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission awarded the park $390,560 through the National Recreational Trails Fund to upgrade park through trail renovation, maintenance equipment and handicap accessible facilities. These enhancements will benefit the families of Central Texas and will create a venue that can be enjoyed by future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. Librado Cobian for the work that he did to obtain the grant and the rest of the Waco Eagles Motorcycle Club for the work they have done for the Waco community.

I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us in our communities.

CELEBRATING THE 99TH BIRTHDAY OF WEBSTER WASHINGTON, SR.

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a good and decent man from the northern Shenandoah Valley, Mr. Webster Washington, on the occasion of his 99th birthday. Born on April 20, 1919, on a cattle farm in Stone Bridge, in Clarke County, Virginia, Web Washington was the 5th child among 11 siblings. His father was the manager of the farm and his mother was a stay-at-home mom, taking care of Web and his brothers and sisters.

Although Mr. Washington does not dwell on it, as an African-American man born on a farm in Clarke County in the early 20th Century, his opportunities were very limited. He did most of his schooling at White Post School, involving a 2 mile walk each way. Because he didn't have the transportation or money to go on to school in Berryville, as soon as he graduated from White Post in the 7th grade, he started working on the farm, milking cows, cutting corn and doing everything else a farmhand did, even as a young teenager. At 20, he married Pauline Evans from Winchester and over the next several years they had 5 children. During their 42 years of marriage, he and Pauline faced their struggles together. In pursuit of gainful employment, the Washingtons moved to Bethesda, Maryland, where they both worked for well-to-do white people as domestic servants, including, for him, as a chauffeur to a successful lawyer. Thereafter, Web worked on a farm in Berryville, before moving to Winchester in 1947.

And it was at that time, that the Washingtons hit the lowest, most difficult period of their lives. They felt the pressure of caring for their five children and yet, as an African-American family, they had difficulty finding work and a place to live. As Mr. Washington put it, the additional burdens that racial discrimination put on him and his wife meant that ''jobs were scarcer and housing in Winchester was almost impossible to find, even rentals.'' It was shortly thereafter that they became connected to the John Mann church on Cork Street, and, over the next 70 years, that connection has sustained Webster and Pauline and their family in their 42 years of marriage, and after her passing, his second wife, Mattie and him in their marriage of 24 years, until her passing several years ago.

Through his faith in God and the support of his John Mann Church family, Webster Washington says ''I've been down and out, and the Lord brought me back,'' finding work as an orderly at the Winchester Memorial Hospital and later taking care of a doctor's office, he was able to buy his own house, first at 601 Gray Avenue in Winchester and then a home in Stephens City. Asked whether he had time for sports or a social life, he responded that his priority on providing for his family and serving in every possible position in his church, left little time for anything else. The highlight of his life was a wonderful 5-day transoceanic cruise that Mattie and he took in the 1980s. Asked what he believes God will say about his life, he humbly says he doesn't know. ''All I know is that the Lord has been good to me.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in honoring Webster Washington on his 99th birthday, a good and decent man of faith, who has made a success of his life by humbly dedicating himself to his family and his church.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on July 16th, I missed Roll Call votes No. 329 and 330. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on both bills to designate post offices in honor of members of the military.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE HOLDING

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded for votes on July 16th because I was absent due to a funeral. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 329 and YEA on Roll Call No. 330.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, due to inclement weather, I was unable to attend this vote series. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 329 and Yea on Roll Call No. 330.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MR. NATHANIEL REED

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. Nathaniel Reed. Nathaniel was a stellar supporter of national parks, a staunch environmental advocate and co-author of the Endangered Species Act. Nathaniel was a powerhouse of Florida politics, but more than that, he was a dear friend and a mentor to me, as well as to countless others.

In a long career spent both in and out of government service, Nathaniel played a role in stopping construction of the world's largest airport in Big Cypress Swamp, helped establish a national park in Biscayne Bay, and assisted in preserving more than 100 million acres of parks and wildlife refuges in Alaska.

During his six decades of activism, he was a tireless crusader for the environment and the Everglades. Nathaniel inspired generations of conservationists, and what he did for America's River of Grass is immeasurable.

Mr. Reed is survived by his wife of 54 years, Alita, three children, Adrian, Nathaniel Jr. and Lia, and five grandchildren. I offer my thoughts and prayers to Alita, his family, and all who called Nathaniel a friend during this great time of sadness. I am so pleased to honor his life and legacy. He will be dearly missed.

IN HONOR OF THE CHARTERING OF THE LOVETTSVILLE AMERICAN LEGION POST 1836

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate the Lovettsville

American Legion Post 1836 on receiving their charter from the American Legion Department of Virginia. This new Post, located in the heart of Lovettsville, Virginia, will play a vital role in supporting the Lovettsville community of veterans, active military and their families by offering support and camaraderie as well as honoring the many sacrifices of service members at local community events such as this past Memorial Day and Fourth of July. This kind of community service is extremely inspiring to see in Virginia's 10th District as this American Legion Post will improve the quality of life for Virginians and bring awareness of the incredible sacrifices made every day by our service members.

I would like to give special recognition to Post Commander, Nathaniel Fontaine, as well as American Legion Officers: Lizzy Fontaine, Harold Baker, David Steadman, Scott Barton and Nick Hayward. These officers are an inspiration to men and women everywhere, and their efforts to the American Legion Post are truly honorable.

With the chartering of this Post, our Lovettsville community takes another step forward in the care and service to our Veterans and service members. I look forward to the positive impact this American Legion Post will have upon all individuals in Virginia's 10th Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in celebrating with you and our colleagues the establishment of American Legion Post 1836. I ask that you join me in congratulating the entire leadership and I wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

PROMOTING FLOOD RISK MITIGATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 2018

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the National Flood Insurance Program shortchanges taxpayers and those who pay flood insurance premiums, while placing communities and families at risk. For more than 20 years, I have worked to reform the program, and I am pleased that a small piece of our broader reform effort—the Promoting Flood Risk Mitigation Act—has passed the House of Representatives.

The flood insurance program is currently more than $20 billion in debt. This figure keeps rising as we see more devastating hurricanes and extreme weather events across our country. Part of the runaway cost of the program is due to the insuring of properties that have flooded repeatedly. In fact, a quarter of all claims paid by the flood insurance program are for repeatedly flooded properties, even though they make up less than two percent of properties covered by the program. For the safety of our communities and fiscal security of the country, Congress must do more to help those trapped in flood-prone areas move to safer land.

The Promoting Flood Risk Mitigation Act tasks the Government Accountability Office (GAO) with studying the efficacy of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) buyout programs for properties at high risk of flooding and those that are repeatedly flooded.

While this bill is just a small step, if we invest in our communities before disasters occur, we will save money, save property, and most importantly, save lives. My hope is that Congress can actually implement the recommendations of this study in an upcoming reauthorization, saving taxpayer dollars and providing help to those stuck in repeatedly flooded properties.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on Monday, July 16, 2018. I had intended to vote ''yes'' on Roll Call vote 330, and ''yes'' on vote 329.

RECOGNIZING NICKI VAUGHAN'S LEADERSHIP IN JUVENILE LAW

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Hall County Chief Assistant Public Defender Nicki Vaughan for her work in the field of juvenile law. Recently, the State Bar of Georgia honored the Georgia Bar's Child Protection and Advocacy Section—chaired by Ms. Vaughan—with the 2017–2018 Section Award of Achievement.

Under Ms. Vaughan's leadership, the Child Protection and Advocacy Section stood out among the state bar's 48 other Sections for its dedication and service to local families.

As chair of the Child Protection and Advocacy Section, Nicki volunteers her time to mentoring young people. Moreover, she educates other legal professionals on current legal issues affecting children and government policies designed to assist children and families.

As a fellow attorney, I am proud to honor Nicki Vaughan for her exceptional leadership and congratulate her section on earning this achievement award.

IN HONOR OF MAYOR ROBERT J. ''BOB'' ZOLDOS II

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and thank an extraordinary leader from the 10th Congressional District, Mayor Robert J. ''Bob'' Zoldos II of Lovettsville, as he completes 20 years of service to the town, first as a member of the Town Council and then as Mayor for three consecutive terms from 2012 to 2018. Incredibly, during the same time frame, Mayor Zoldos has excelled in his full-time job as Deputy Fire Chief with the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department that has included international rescue mission deployments with Virginia Task Force One, Virginia's Urban Search and Rescue Team, to Kenya, Turkey, Taiwan, Iran, and Haiti. Most recently, he was Task Force Leader of U.S.A. Search and Rescue Team One's response to Japan's catastrophic earthquake and tsunami in 2011.

Inspired for a career in public service by his father, Robert J. Zoldos, who was a volunteer firefighter and town council member in Leesburg, Virginia, Mayor Zoldos has been an outstanding team leader in all that he has undertaken. Upon announcing his run for Mayor on February 6, 2012, he stated, ''While I don't covet the title of mayor, I feel the same need that many of you have expressed . . . that we must keep politics out of our Lovettsville and keep the 'love' in it.'' Indeed, as an inspirational team leader for his colleagues in the government of Lovettsville and for the residents of the town, Mayor Zoldos has kept his promise to keep Lovettsville ''a wonderful and neighborly place in which to live and to own a business.''

No one has worked harder than Mayor Zoldos in championing town activities and events that have brought Lovettsville's creative initiatives regional recognition and have attracted participants from all over the East coast. In fact, the Mayor has often been seen climbing ladders, moving barrels, acting as master of ceremonies, setting up tents, installing decorations and cleaning up trash at the close of events. To create a stronger community, he also instituted a weekly email known as the ''Mayor's Message,'' writing more than 300 weekly messages in his unique conversational style, in order to keep everyone informed about what was happening in the town and the actions taken by the Town Council.

As Mayor, he has understood that economic development is critically important to the enhancement of the quality of life of Lovettsville's residents, especially for the ability to provide community based services and generate additional revenue to support the town's infrastructure. For this reason, he worked diligently to attract and maintain businesses in the town, and is deservedly proud of the opening of the Lovettsville Town Center during his tenure. Mayor Zoldos also advocated the transition from outsourcing water and wastewater services in the town as well as the development of an in-house capability which included the hiring of skilled utility workers to operate and manage the town's water and wastewater treatment facilities, that has resulted in considerable cost savings and improved customer service for the town's residents. Mayor Zoldos also supported the establishment of Lovettsville's first Fiscal Policy Manual which provides professional guidelines for building financial reserves to meet future requirements and achieve financial stability.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in thanking Mayor Robert ''Bob'' Zoldos II, a gifted leader and public servant, as he completes 20 years of extraordinary service to the people of the town of Lovettsville and the 10th Congressional District of Virginia.

HONORING THE CAREER OF JOHN RUSSELL DEANE III

HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the service of John Russell Deane III,

who has led a distinguished career in support of motorsports and the automotive performance industry.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of getting to know Russ over the years through my service in the Florida State Legislature and a shared interest in racing.

Russ is an accomplished race car driver, but I stand here today to highlight his years of service as general counsel to the Specialty Equipment Market Association (SEMA), the National Hot Rod Association (NHRA), and many other race sanctioning bodies, which benefited Americans like me who are passionate about cars, racing and protecting our rights as enthusiasts.

While enrolled at Georgetown University Law Center, Russ started his career working as an aide to U.S. Representative Clark MacGregor (R–MN) and then served in various positions in the Nixon administration, including as a White House aide. In 1975, Russ left government to enter the private practice of law. It was there that he stood up for millions of automotive enthusiasts by helping shape federal and state laws and regulations to protect their hobby and the nation's automotive heritage.

Russ is a leading expert on laws and regulations that apply to motor vehicles and equipment as practiced by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and other agencies. Russ worked closely with NHTSA, EPA and CARB as they established rules governing the installation of specialty automotive parts that customize and enhance vehicle performance.

Russ played an instrumental role in implementing the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977 and in crafting the 1990 revisions. Similarly, one of Russ' most enduring accomplishments was his role in developing the CARB Executive Order program to test and certify the emissions performance of specialty auto parts sold across the country. He also helped shape state inspection programs based on testing rather than the mere presence of aftermarket parts.

Russ helped to establish the Congressional Automotive Performance and Motorsports Caucus, which held its inaugural events in 1996 over a two-day period at the Smithsonian National Museum of American History, on the National Mall, and in the halls of Congress. I am proud to have served as co-chair of this caucus since 2011, which now has over 65 members in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Beyond the automotive world, Russ has worked with the U.S. Government, the American Bar Association and many universities to help develop democracies in countries such as Estonia, Ukraine, Georgia and Afghanistan. The Government of Estonia awarded him the Order of the White Star, the highest civilian honor, for helping the country develop a market-based economy after the fall of the Soviet Union.

Russ is a true Renaissance man, with interests and expertise in areas well outside the practice of law. He is a skilled yachtsman, pilot, diver, and connoisseur of fine wines and cigars. In his spare time, he also races sports cars and motorcycles. In 2012, he accomplished a longtime goal of setting an SRT-4 land speed record and being installed as a proud member of the Bonneville 200 MPH Club.

I wish Russ Deane all the best in his retirement and thank him for his years of service to the automotive hobby and racing community.

HONORING DR. JEREMY REYNALDS

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Jeremy Reynalds, who passed away last week at the age of 60. Dr. Reynalds touched so many members of our community over the years as Founder and Chief Executive Officer of Joy Junction, New Mexico's largest faith-based homeless shelter.

After growing up in England, Dr. Reynalds immigrated to the United States in 1978. He struggled at first after moving to our country, and was homeless for some time. However, he turned his difficulties into a positive for the community, and founded a coffeehouse in Santa Fe that eventually became the city's only facility for the homeless.

In 1986, Dr. Reynalds moved to Albuquerque and founded Joy Junction. Today, the organization provides assistance to as many as 300 people each night and serves more than 200,000 meals every year. In addition to addressing the physical needs of guests by providing food and shelter, the ministry also provides counseling programs that tackle their emotional and spiritual needs. In the 32 years since its founding, Joy Junction has expanded to several buildings sitting on over 50 acres, including a new 55-room apartment building that will soon be completed.

While serving as CEO of Joy Junction, Dr. Reynalds also earned a Master's Degree in Communication from the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque and a Ph.D. in Intercultural Education from Biola University in Los Angeles. In addition to his work at Joy Junction, Dr. Reynalds traveled to the Middle East to focus on social justice issues in that part of the world. He was also a prolific writer who authored several books on the topic of homelessness.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my heartfelt condolences to all of Dr. Reynalds' loved ones including his wife Elma, who has been named Interim CEO of Joy Junction. I am confident that his organization's extraordinary work for our community will continue for years to come.

HONORING THE PHI SIGMA PHI NATIONAL FRATERNITY

HON. EVAN H. JENKINS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Phi Sigma Phi National Fraternity. Phi Sigma Phi is a national social and philanthropic college fraternity with chapters in Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and my home state of West Virginia.

The Phi Mu Chapter at Concord University in Athens, West Virginia, is one of the Founding Seven Chapters of Phi Sigma Phi. The organization was founded on the belief that men of modest means could form a brotherhood and help their communities. Over the last 30 years, this organization has made its universities and their communities better places by raising countless funds for charitable organizations, volunteering in the community, and developing college-aged men into leaders.

May God bless the members of this organization as they celebrate their 30th Anniversary. I am thankful for their service to my district, the people of West Virginia, and this great nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 13, I missed the following votes due to needing to attend to a close family member in the hospital.

For Roll Call Vote 327, on the Motion to Recommit with Instructions, I would have voted ''no.''

For Roll Call Vote 328, final passage of the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, I would have voted ''yes.''

IN HONOR OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE MAY FAMILY FOUNDATION

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an extraordinary leader, colleague, and dear friend, Delegate Joe T. May, as well as his wife Bobby and their two daughters, Elaine and Beth. They are honored today for their incredible philanthropic contributions to Virginia Tech College of Engineering.

Delegate May's life and legislative legacy is certainly one to be recognized as it is full of service to his constituents, commonwealth, and country. It was Delegate May's electrical engineering degree from Virginia Tech that jumpstarted his long and successful career as a businessman, engineer, and dedicated public servant.

Delegate May's experience as only one of a few professional engineers in the entire General Assembly enabled him to play an integral role in passing numerous legislative initiates, including a bill to establish the House Science and Technology Committee, of which he would later serve as chair. When I served in the House of Delegates with Joe May, I was honored to serve on this committee with him. He was a trusted and valued colleague to all who worked with him. This year, Delegate May and his family have gifted his alma mater, Virginia Tech College of Engineering, with $5 million dollars for a pilot program to aid students who will be the first generation college students. His generous gift will inspire many hopeful students to pursue their dreams of a successful career, just as Delegate May did.

With this donation, the college will be able to recruit 60 promising first-generation students from across Virginia into a four-year pre-college educational program in the field of engineering. The overall project is expected to provide 300 students with the gateway to pursue engineering degrees, as well as the monumental courage that will excel their careers for life. These students will experience an interactive engineering discipline, made possible through labs and a mentoring system.

Delegate May is the true embodiment of a public servant and an accomplished engineer. This donation to Virginia Tech's College of Engineering will, in this important age of technology and innovation, provide students from across the state of Virginia with valuable educational opportunities and, without a doubt, will positively impact their lives.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Delegate May and the May Family Foundation for this extraordinary investment to future and prospective engineers, businesspeople, and leaders. This impact which will touch so many young lives will be forever valued as a selfless act meant to serve as a building block for a greater society. I look forward to Delegate Joe T. May's ongoing contributions to future generations of Virginia students, and I wish him and the entire May family the best in their future endeavors.

HONORING HELEN BLANK

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Helen Blank of the Women's Law Center for her lifelong advocacy on behalf of children and families. On July 19th, the Coalition on Human Needs will honor Ms. Blank as a Special Human Needs Hero. Each year, the coalition honors heroes who fight effectively to meet the needs of low income and vulnerable people.

For decades, Helen has been a true champion for families needing high quality and affordable care for their children. Before joining the National Women's Law Center, Helen served for 24 years as the director of the Child Care and Development Division at the Children's Defense Fund (CDF).

I first met Helen when she worked at CDF, and I was Chief of Staff for Senator Chris Dodd. We were partners in highlighting early childhood development before the passage of the Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG)—one of Helen's great achievements. Rarely does an advocate have such influence on the passage of a law, and this is no small or inconsequential law.

Since its enactment in 1990, the CCDBG has served millions of children and families, ensuring that all children can access affordable and enriching early learning experiences during their critical years of development. Perhaps no one has been as dedicated to its success as Helen Blank. She was there to see its funding double at the end of the Clinton Administration, and again to see it receive a huge infusion of resources in the Recovery Act of 2009 during the Great Recession. Most recently, her single focus on the critical nature of funding for CCDBG paid off again as earlier this year the budget agreement included historic investments in child care.

She has built successful campaigns that have brought attention to the importance of early care and education for the development of healthy children. At times, it was an uphill battle to keep the issue front and center. During the second Bush Administration, when they proposed to make Head Start funding dependent on standardized testing, similar to the No Child Left Behind Act, Helen was there along with her powerful coalition to help us fight back.

Through her work, Helen has garnered a reputation as a steadfast and principled defender of the needs of children and their families. Her work has shined a light on the importance of early childhood education, provided guidance on successfully implementing legislation and funding in the best interests of children, and inspired hundreds of advocates who continue to champion the needs of our youngest. It is my honor and privilege today to recognize Helen Blank for her decades of hard work and dedication to the health and well-being of our children.

HONORING ROTARY CLUB OF CLAYTON'S 2018 AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the eight individuals honored by the Rotary Club of Clayton this year.

Members of the Rotary Club of Clayton dedicate their time to their neighbors by illustrating the club's motto of "Service Above Self."

The Rotary Club gave its annual Wheel Award and J.C. Dover Wheel Award to Dan McAfee of Rabun County Habitat for Humanity and Dr. Guy Glover, respectively. Jim Antosiak received the W. Lee Arrendale Award for demonstrating altruism, strong vocation, and ethical standards.

Additionally, three first responders were recognized for their strength during times of crisis. Tony Lima received the Law Enforcement Officer of the Year award, James Reed received the Firefighter of the Year award, and Mike Carnes received the Paramedic of the Year award.

Mary Beth Brundage received the Jean Harris Professional Award, and the Rotary Club presented Tim Ranney with the Golden "R" Award—an honor given to a Rotarian who strives to improve the community and club as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate this year's award recipients and look forward to the continued impact that their service will have on the community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for votes yesterday, July 16, 2018, as I was unavoidably detained due to flight delays.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 329 and YEA on Roll Call No. 330.

CONGRATULATING THE Y QUAD CITIES ROWING PROGRAM'S JUNIOR WOMEN'S CREW FOR WINNING THE DIAMOND JUBILEE CHALLENGE CUP

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Y Quad Cities Rowing program's junior women's crew for winning the Diamond Jubilee Challenge Cup at the Henley Royal Regatta in England. This is a first for the rowers, who are based out of the Sylvan Boat House in Moline, Illinois.

Coached by Dr. Peter Sharis and Assistant Coach Jamie Whalen, scullers Caroline Sharis, Delaney Evans, Emma Mask and Taylor English set a new course record at the prestigious regatta on the Thames River, becoming one of only two American crews to win at Henley this year and the first overseas crew ever to win the Diamond Jubilee Challenge cup. This impressive victory followed the team's win at the USRowing Youth National Championships in June.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate the Y Quad Cities rowers on their title, and I join the rest of the community in wishing them every success in the future.

HONORING SCHENCK FOODS COMPANY ON ITS 90TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Schenck Foods Company, located in the northern Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, for 90 years of extraordinary success under the leadership of four generations of a family-owned and operated business. In 1928, the partnership of Bob Schenck and Howard Cahill founded the Valley Food Company, that manufactured Blossom Potato Chips. Thereafter, the company became the Schenck Cheese Company, distributing retail food items over a radius of 30 to 40 miles for Kraft Foods. And, in 1952, the company incorporated as Schenck Foods Company with a product line that included food service items to support institutional food customers.

Like so many other great American small businesses, the company responded to situations of adversity, such as severe economic downturns and competition from large chain stores, by establishing a corporate culture based on an absolute commitment to excellence both in products sold and in customer service provided, which has generated a stellar reputation for the company and wide regional consumer loyalty. Offering more than 5,000 different products, Schenck Foods

proudly serves more than 4,500 customers, within a 150-mile radius of Winchester, Virginia.

The company's relentless commitment to innovation has resulted in important partnership initiatives with local, organic, sustainable and farm-to-table providers and a revamped and comprehensive walk-in ''warehouse store'' that includes a large professional kitchen where chef-created tasting dinners will be held and food vendors may demonstrate their products and buyers may learn to use them. The Schenck Foods corporate culture of excellence includes not only a strong commitment to its more than 100 employees but also an unwavering commitment to philanthropy and giving back to the Winchester and northern Shenandoah Valley community that it serves. On behalf of the people of the 10th Congressional District, I thank the leaders and employees of Schenck Foods for their compassion and generosity.

In the invitation to its 90th anniversary celebration, current president and CEO, Jason Huntsberry, summed up the critical importance of the close relationships that have been established over the past nine decades, when he wrote: ''On behalf of my family and the entire Schenck Foods family, both past and present, we want to thank you for allowing us to serve this great community for the last ninety years. Without the dedication and loyalty of our employees, customers and partners, our near century of success would not be a reality.'' Mr. Speaker, as we reflect on the past and look to the future of this great company, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating Schenck Foods Company for 90 years of amazing success and in anticipating for the company, an exciting future of innovation and outstanding corporate citizenship in the community that it has served so faithfully.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I missed two votes on 7/16/2018. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 329 and YEA on Roll Call No. 330.

REGARDING SPECIAL COUNSEL INVESTIGATION

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following op-ed by former Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist about the need to protect Special Counsel Mueller's investigation from partisan political interference. The piece recently appeared in the Washington Post.

THE SENATE I LED PUT COUNTRY OVER PARTY. THIS ONE MUST DO THE SAME FOR ROBERT MUELLER.

(By Bill Frist)

Bill Frist is a heart and lung transplant surgeon, former U.S. Senate majority leader and senior fellow at the Bipartisan Policy Center.

When I retired from the U.S. Senate in 2007 as its majority leader, my parting words were a prayer for my colleagues to rise above the passions of the moment and protect the institution as a bulwark for our country's enduring values. The Senate I served in was not devoid of partisanship, nor should it be, but my hope was that patriotism would always take priority over party.

It is with some trepidation that I offer thoughts on how the good people still serving in the Senate should address a current crisis, but staying silent is no longer an option. Special counsel Robert S. Mueller III is under assault, and that is wrong. No matter who is in the White House, we Republicans must stand up for the sanctity of our democracy and the rule of law.

Certainly, my former colleagues face difficult pressures. They go to work in a Washington that is divided. They want to ensure a Supreme Court that, like most of our citizens, understands that government power must be limited. They want a fair tax code that supports a growing economy. They want less regulation. By those measures, President Trump is a great partner at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. But we can't look the other way as, tweet by tweet, with each new assault on the Justice Department's independence, the bedrock principles of our party crumble.

I'm a Republican because I stand for small government and also, as a physician, for the dignity of every life. But I am also a Republican because I believe in the rule of law. Republicans must fight for that principle today—even if it means pushing back against a Republican administration. As a party, we can't let the president or his allies erode the independence of the Justice Department or public trust in the vital work of law enforcement. That would be true even if the stakes were much lower, but it is overwhelmingly so when it comes to investigating foreign interference in our elections. Congress must ensure that Mueller is able to do his job without interference or intimidation.

Nobody knows what the special counsel's investigation will conclude. I, for one, do not think the president colluded with Russian President Vladimir Putin to win the 2016 election. But I do believe Putin purposely tried to undermine our democratic process.

It isn't easy to tell a president of your own party that he is wrong. But the assault on Mueller's investigation does not help the president or his party. When Trump talks about firing the special counsel or his power to pardon himself, he makes it seem as though he has something to hide. The president must remember that only Mueller's exoneration can lift the cloud hanging over the White House.

The special counsel's investigation is not about Trump. It is about our national security. Every American should be rooting for Mueller's success in determining precisely how Russia interfered in our fundamental democratic process. I had no illusions about the Soviet Union during the Cold War, and I have none about Putin now. Mueller's most recent court filings indicate that Putin is seeking to meddle in this year's elections. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, Director of National Intelligence Daniel Coats and FBI Director Christopher A. Wray—all Trump appointees confirmed by the Republican-led Senate—have also warned of foreign interference. We should heed these warnings and empower Mueller to see his important work through to its conclusion.

I have worried over the years about runaway legal authority, and I've battled against activist judges. I don't worry about Robert Mueller. He is a lifelong Republican with a career of distinguished service running the Criminal Division of the Justice Department for President Ronald Reagan and serving as President George W. Bush's FBI director, twice unanimously confirmed by the Senate. And his investigation is getting results: By any objective standard, he has moved swiftly, obtaining 23 indictments and five guilty pleas in just more than a year.

Congress must never abandon its role as an equal branch of government. In this moment, that means protecting Mueller's investigation. We're at our best as senators and Republicans when we defend our institutions. But more than that, it's our best face as Americans.

People around the world admire not just the material well-being of the United States but our values, too. The rule of law is something many die trying to secure for their countries. We can't afford to squander it at home.

RECOGNIZING THE GENEROSITY OF CAROL GREGG

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Carol Gregg for her 20 years of service to foster care children in Northeast Georgia.

As a Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) volunteer and employee of Prevent Child Abuse in Georgia, Mrs. Gregg discovered that foster care children and babies are in need of blankets. This inspired her to use crochet, a longtime hobby of hers, to connect with these children by creating blankets and afghans for them.

Mrs. Gregg's crocheted pieces reflect the warmth of the local community and benefit not only children in foster care, but families that open their homes. Moreover, her advocacy through CASA has inspired more residents to volunteer and offer support to the children and families.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. Carol Gregg for her generosity and dedication to the foster children of Northeast Georgia.

IN HONOR OF THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF SACRED HEART

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate Sacred Heart Academy, a Christ-centered school awarded the National Blue Ribbon of Distinction, on the occasion of its 60th year of excellent service to the people of Winchester, Virginia and the northern Shenandoah Valley. Sacred Heart Academy was founded by the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary in 1957. From the beginning, it has been committed to providing for its students, a safe and nurturing environment that is conducive to academic excellence and guided by a strong set of morals

and values. The school currently has 245 students enrolled in grades pre-K through 8 and although it is now staffed by laity, the school continues the tradition of teaching daily religion classes and guiding students in living a prayerful, spiritual life. Furthermore, the parish priests visit the school weekly to aid in the teaching of the faith, and the students participate in weekly Mass.

During its 60-year history, Sacred Heart Academy has developed into a school with extraordinarily high academic standards. A milestone in the school's academic development was the completion, in 2009, of a 14,000 square foot addition to the school, that included a state-of-the-art science lab, media center, a music room, an art room, conference rooms and additional classrooms, as well as a peaceful courtyard that is conducive to meditation. This addition made it possible to house the entire student population under one roof, bringing social cohesiveness and a new vitality to the student population.

Sacred Heart Academy prides itself on its STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) initiative that included the acquiring of a 30-unit iPad2 mobile lab in the summer of 2012. With the use of digital responders purchased the year before, the mobile lab integrates many technological applications into the classroom and allows teachers to obtain immediate feedback on how well the students are understanding the scientific concepts being presented.

The opening last year of the Rev. Stanley Krempa gymnasium, named after the longtime priest at the Sacred Heart of Jesus Catholic Church, marks another important milestone in the mission of Sacred Heart Academy to ''nurture the development of the whole child.'' With high standards in academics, the arts, and sports, the school offers a rich environment in which each child can excel and explore his or her unique potential.

The award of Sacred Heart Academy with the National Blue Ribbon of Distinction in 2013 celebrates the extraordinary academic success of the wonderful students of the school. It also recognizes the extraordinary dedication of the administrators and teachers at the school to high standards of learning for all students, to data collection and honest analysis of their teaching effectiveness, and to staying at the forefront of best professional practices.

The National Blue Ribbon of Distinction was also awarded to Sacred Heart Academy because of the faithful commitment and resourcefulness of the entire school community to overcome all obstacles that it has faced. The families of the school make up a close-knit community on which the school is heavily dependent. The volunteer in-service program asks that each family serves at least twenty-five hours a year performing volunteer tasks such as lunch and recess duty, chaperoning field trips and even assisting in the classroom. An active Parent Teacher Organization holds major annual fundraisers, without which the school could not function successfully. The generosity of other members of the Sacred Heart Parish and that of the Diocese of Arlington has also helped to accomplish important goals for the school.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me and our other colleagues in congratulating the entire ''family'' of Sacred Heart Academy on its extraordinary success over the last 60 years and wishing that, in the second half century of its existence, it continues to be a special blessing to the people of Winchester and the northern Shenandoah Valley.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ANTHONY B. KRUPSKI, JR.

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the extraordinary life and legacy of Mr. Anthony B. Krupski, Jr. who passed away on July 1, 2018 at the age of 76.

Born in Buffalo and raised in Cheektowaga, Anthony Kruspski first heard music in his home as his dad played the accordion and became his son's first teacher. Tony's passion for this unique instrument and his family led him to start his own band at just age 17. This polka band, Krew Brothers, would grow to include all six of his brothers.

This proud son with strong Polonia roots picked the perfect name for what would become one of the country's leading polka bands as ''Krew,'' means blood in the Polish language. Having kept his family united after his Mother's passing, Tony would lead his band of brothers to great heights as they appeared on national television, performed at gatherings in Western New York and toured extensively to major polka conventions and festivals throughout the Northeast and Midwest. Their hits, including the Birds 'n Bees Polka, The Thing Polka, Michael Polka, Judy Polka, New Father Polka and the Babcia & Deidamia Polka, were recorded over four albums, three on their own private label.

Tony remained an in-demand musician even after the Krew Brothers disbanded as he played with ''Full Circle'' and was as much as an attraction as the traditional food stands as he entertained thousands of shoppers visiting the legendary Buffalo Broadway Market during the Easter season. His sound helped enhance the authenticity of the Forgotten Buffalo Tours and lifted the spirits of nursing home residents as he shared his talents with those whose memories of polka parties remained strong.

Always a hard worker, Tony's dedication to his family extended to his decades of work as a stationery engineer in both the private and public sectors.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in expressing our deepest condolences to his wife, Marie, his children, grandchildren, family, friends and legions of fans as we commemorate the musical contributions of the first Krew Brother, Anthony Krupski, Jr.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I was not present to vote from July 10, 2018 through July 13, 2018 due to the passing of my father, Leonard Perlmutter.

Had I been present for roll call No. 321 on passage of H.R. 200, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act, I would have voted ''NAY.''

Had I been present for roll call No. 325 on passage of H.R. 3281, the Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act, I would have voted ''NAY.''

Had I been present for roll call No. 326 on passage of H.R. 6237, the Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019, I would have voted ''YEA.''

Had I been present for roll call No. 328 on passage of H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, I would have voted ''NAY.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 16, 2018 I missed the following vote due to travel delay and was not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 329.

CELEBRATING THE 115TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VILLAGE PRESS FOUNDED BY FREDERICK W. GOUDY IN PARK RIDGE, ILLINOIS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 2018

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the artistry and craftsmanship of The Village Press, founded in 1903 by Frederick W. Goudy in Park Ridge, Illinois. Goudy modeled his Village Press venture on the world-famous ideals of William Morris and the Arts and Crafts movement, inspired by Nature and expressed through artful, traditional, hand-wrought crafts. Goudy's publication of the William Morris essay, Printing, was awarded prizes at the 1904 World Exhibition in St. Louis, Missouri. The Village Press also produced The Door in the Wall & Other Stories by H. G. Wells, Rip Van Winkle by Washington Irving, and more than 160 other literary works.

In 1947, the United States Library of Congress held a retrospective exhibition of the work of Frederick W. Goudy and The Village Press, which received critical acclaim.

The Village Press was extraordinary due to Frederick Goudy's legendary typeface design. Typefaces have distinct personalities that help convey ideas, just as images and words do. The handsome, hand-forged elegance of typefaces designed by Frederick Goudy earned international fame. Many of Goudy's more than 100 magnificent typefaces are still in popular use today, including Copperplate Gothic, Californian, Italian Old Style and Goudy Old Style.

Frederick Goudy remains America's superstar designer of the shapes that dress our words. His designs bridge the gap between the print and digital ages with an elegance and energy that are eloquent—and timeless.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4973–S5026

Measures Introduced: Eleven bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3218–3228. **Pages S5003–04**

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany H.R. 1900, to designate the Veterans Memorial and Museum in Columbus, Ohio, as the National Veterans Memorial and Museum. (S. Rept. No. 115–304)

S. Res. 557, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the strategic importance of NATO to the collective security of the transatlantic region and urging its member states to work together at the upcoming summit to strengthen the alliance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble.

S. 2497, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S5003**

Measures Passed:

E-Visit Verification Delay: Committee on Finance was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 6042, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to delay the reduction in Federal medical assistance percentage for Medicaid personal care services furnished without an electronic visit verification system, and the bill was then passed. **Page S5006**

Oldham Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit. **Pages S4981–83**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 50 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 159), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S4983**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Wednesday, July 18, 2018; that the time until 2 p.m. be equally divided; and that at 2 p.m., notwithstanding Rule XXII, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate. **Page S5006**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 50 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. EX. 156), James Blew, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, Department of Education. **Pages S4978–81, S5026**

By 66 yeas to 33 nays (Vote No. EX. 158), Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. **Pages S4981–83, S5026**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 66 yeas to 33 nays (Vote No. 157), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S4981**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

James Morhard, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Martin J. Oberman, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 2018.

Martin J. Oberman, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board for a term expiring December 31, 2023.

Kevin K. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Nicaragua.

Damon Ray Leichty, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

John Milton Younge, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Nicholas A. Trutanich, of Nevada, to be United States Attorney for the District of Nevada for the term of four years.

G. Zachary Terwilliger, of Virginia, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia for the term of four years.

William Travis Brown, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States Marshal for the Middle District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

Nick Edward Proffitt, of Virginia, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Virginia for the term of four years. **Page S5026**

Messages from the House: **Page S5002**

Measures Referred: **Pages S5002–03**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S5003**

Executive Communications: **Page S5003**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S5003**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5004–05**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Page S5005**

Additional Statements: **Pages S5001–02**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S5005**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S5005–06**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S5006**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—159) **Pages S4981, S4983**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10:09 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, July 18, 2018. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5006.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SEMIANNUAL MONETARY POLICY REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress, after receiving testimony from Jerome H. Powell, Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

DOI CRITICAL MINERALS LIST

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Department of the Interior's final list of critical minerals for 2018 and opportunities to strengthen the United States' mineral security, after receiving testimony from Steven M. Fortier, Director, National Minerals Information Center, Geological Survey, Department of the Interior; Roderick G. Eggert, Deputy Director, Advanced Manufacturing Office, Critical Materials Institute, The Ames Laboratory, Department of Energy; Greg Gregory, Materion Natural Resources, Delta, Utah; Aaron Mintzes, Eathworks, Washington, D.C.; Laurel Sayer, Midas Gold Idaho, Inc., Boise; and Jim Sims, NioCorp Developments Ltd., Centennial, Colorado.

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT AMENDMENTS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine an original bill entitled, ''Endangered Species Act Amendments of 2018'', after receiving testimony from Wyoming Governor Matthew H. Mead, Cheyenne; Bob Broscheid, Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife, Denver; and Matthew J. Strickler, Virginia Secretary of Natural Resources, Richmond.

REDUCING HEALTH CARE COSTS

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reducing health care costs, focusing on eliminating excess health care spending and improving quality and value for patients, after receiving testimony from Jeffrey R. Balser, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee; Steven M. Safyer, Montefiore Medicine, New York, New York; David Lansky, Pacific Business Group on Health, San Francisco, California; and Brent C. James, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 21 public bills, H.R. 6393–6413; and 5 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 129; and H. Res. 999–1002 were introduced. **Pages H6462–63**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6464–65**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 6138, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for ambulatory surgical center representation during the review of hospital outpatient payment rates under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–831, Part 1);

H.R. 4952, to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study and submit a report on the effects of the inclusion of quality increases in the determination of blended benchmark amounts under part C of the Medicare program, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–832, Part 1);

H.R. 1482, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain or replace certain facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–833); and

H. Res. 1001, providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 119) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy (H. Rept. 115–834). **Page H6462 Speaker:**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Byrne to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6265**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:52 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H6271**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Page H6271**

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 1000, electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives. **Page H6282**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Pro bono Work to Empower and Represent Act: S. 717, amended, to promote pro bono legal services as a critical way in which to empower survivors of domestic violence; **Pages H6282–85**

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Nation now faces a more complex and grave set of threats than at any time since the end of World War II, and that the lack of full, on-time funding related to defense activities puts servicemen and servicewomen at risk, harms national security, and aids the adversaries of the United States: H. Res. 995, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Nation now faces a more complex and grave set of threats than at any time since the end of World War II, and that the lack of full, on-time funding related to defense activities puts servicemen and servicewomen at risk, harms national security, and aids the adversaries of the United States; **Pages H6285–89**

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Navy's total readiness remains in a perilous state due to high operational demands, increased deployment lengths, shortened training periods, and deferred maintenance all while the Navy is asked to "do more with less" as financial support for critical areas waned in the era of sequestration and without consistent Congressional funding: H. Res. 998, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Navy's total readiness remains in a perilous state due to high operational demands, increased deployment lengths, shortened training periods, and deferred maintenance all while the Navy is asked to ''do more with less'' as financial support for critical areas waned in the era of sequestration and without consistent Congressional funding; **Pages H6289–93**

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Marine Corps faces significant readiness challenges and that budgetary uncertainty impedes the Corps' ability to meet ongoing and unexpected national security threats, putting United States national security at risk: H. Res. 994, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Marine Corps faces significant readiness challenges and that budgetary uncertainty impedes the Corps' ability to meet ongoing and unexpected national security threats, putting United States national security at risk; **Pages H6293–95**

Encouraging Employee Ownership Act: S. 488, amended, to increase the threshold for disclosures required by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to compensatory benefit plans, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 406 yeas to 4 nays, Roll No. 333; **Pages H6295–H6312, H6342–43**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: ''To modernize U.S. markets and to promote capital formation, investor confidence, and economic growth, and for other purposes.''. **Pages H6342–43**

Defending Economic Livelihoods and Threatened Animals Act: H.R. 4819, amended, to promote inclusive economic growth through conservation and biodiversity programs that facilitate transboundary cooperation, improve natural resource management, and build local capacity to protect and preserve threatened wildlife species in the greater Okavango River Basin of southern Africa; **Pages H6312–15**

Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act: H.R. 3030, amended, to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 406 yeas to 5 nays, Roll No. 334; **Pages H6315–19, H6343–44**

Protecting Diplomats from Surveillance Through Consumer Devices Act: H.R. 4989, to require the Department of State to establish a policy regarding the use of location-tracking consumer devices by employees at diplomatic and consular facilities, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 412 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 335; **Pages H6319–20, H6344**

Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018: H.R. 5105, amended, to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation; **Pages H6320–33**

Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act of 2018: H.R. 5480, amended, to improve programs and activities relating to women's entrepreneurship and economic empowerment that are carried out by the United States Agency for International Development; **Pages H6333–37**

East Rosebud Wild and Scenic Rivers Act: H.R. 4645, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System; **Pages H6337–38**

Juab County Conveyance Act of 2018: H.R. 3777, amended, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain National Forest System land containing the Nephi Work Center in Juab County, Utah, to Juab County; and **Pages H6339–40**

Gila River Indian Community Federal Rights-of-Way, Easements and Boundary Clarification Act: H.R. 4032, amended, to confirm undocumented Federal rights-of-way or easements on the Gila River Indian Reservation, clarify the northern boundary of the Gila River Indian Community's Reservation, to take certain land located in Maricopa County and Pinal County, Arizona, into trust for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community. **Pages H6340–42**

Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2019: The House considered H.R. 6147, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, July 18th. **Pages H6274–82, H6344–H6461**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–81 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. **Page H6274**

Agreed to:

Soto amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases funding for the National Wildlife Refuge System by $500,000 for the Wildlife and Habitat Management of invasive species; **Pages H6434–35**

Lance amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases funding for the Delaware River Basin Restoration Program by $1 million; **Pages H6435–36**

Courtney amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that designates $300,000 within the Operation of the National Park System for the New England Scenic Trail; **Page H6436**

Courtney amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases the Historic Preservation Fund by $5 million to restore level funding with FY 2018; **Pages H6436–37**

Sewell amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases funding for competitive grants to preserve the sites and stories of the Civil Rights Movement by $2,500,000, and reduces departmental operations for the Office of the Secretary of Interior by the same amount; **Page H6437**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases by $500,000 the amount of funds provided for the Historic Preservation Fund to be used for competitive grants for the survey and nomination of properties to the National Register of Historic Places and as National Historic Landmarks associated with communities currently under-represented; **Pages H6437–38**

Clyburn amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases funding by $2 million for Historic Preservation Fund grants to Historically Black Colleges and Universities; **Pages H6438–39**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 10 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that states that of the funds provided for the Historic Preservation Fund, increase by $1,000,000 those funds allocated for grants to Historically Black Colleges and Universities; **Pages H6439–40**

Olson amendment (No. 11 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that reduces by $20,000,000 and then increases by the same amount the National Recreation and Preservation account with intent to use the funds for the National Maritime Heritage grant program; **Page H6440**

Dingell amendment (No. 12 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases USGS funding by $250,000 for fisheries assessment to continue and expand advanced technologies research in the Ecosystem Fisheries Program in accordance with Congressional direction that mission areas and accounts would be maintained at the enacted level; **Pages H6440–41**

Courtney amendment (No. 13 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that provides funding for the U.S. Geological Survey to develop a map showing pyrrhotite occurrences across the United States; **Page H6441**

Gabbard amendment (No. 14 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases the USGS Surveys, Investigations and Research account by $4,798,500, intended to be used for the Volcano Hazards Program to ameliorate impacts caused by volcanic eruptions; **Pages H6441–42**

Kildee amendment (No. 15 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases funding to USGS to eradicate grass carp by $1 million; reduces funding from the Office of the Interior Secretary by the same amount; **Pages H6442–43**

Johnson (OH) amendments printed in H. Rept. 115–830: (No. 16) that provides for a balanced distribution of funds among Appalachian states for reclamation of abandoned mine lands in conjunction with economic and community development, offset by funds from the Environmental Programs and Management account; and (No. 17) that restores the number of Appalachian states eligible for grants for the reclamation of abandoned mine lands to be used for economic and community development from 3 to 6; **Page H6443**

O'Halleran amendment (No. 18 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that reduces and increases by $36,000,000 the amount of funding appropriated to the Bureau of Indian Affairs construction account for public safety and justice facility construction; **Page H6444**

Plaskett amendment (No. 20 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that strengthens necessary support for insular territories of the United States (to equal Senate levels); **Pages H6445–46**

Moore amendment (No. 21 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that boosts funding for the Smithsonian by $500,000 to better support efforts, including the creation of temporary or permanent exhibits, that better tell and increase understanding and education about the history, voices, and narratives of underrepresented communities, including African-Americans and tribal Communities; **Pages H6446–47**

Welch amendment (No. 22 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases funding for the Lake Champlain Basin Program by $4 million to the FY18 enacted level; decreases the Office of the Secretary of Interior account by the same amount; **Page H6447**

Esty amendment (No. 24 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that helps cities and towns clean up brownfield sites in their local communities by increasing funding to "brownfields projects" within the State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) by $7 million by pulling $7 million from the Office of the Secretary; **Page H6448**

Denham amendment (No. 26 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases the WIFIA administrative expenses account by $2 million and decreases the DOI Office of the Secretary account by the same amount; **Pages H6449–50**

Heck amendment (No. 28 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that directs EPA to fund the Clean Watersheds Needs Survey; **Page H6451**

Soto amendment (No. 30 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases funding for the National Estuary Program by $468,000; **Pages H6452–53**

LaMalfa amendment (No. 34 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases funding to the National Forest System account for purposes of eradicating, enforcing, and remediating illegal marijuana grow operations on National Forest System land; **Pages H6454–55**

Welch amendment (No. 35 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases and decreases the State and Private Forestry Account account by $5 million to indicate that the amount should be used to help mitigate the spread of and the Emerald Ash Borer; **Page H6455**

Ruiz amendment (No. 36 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases state and forestry private account by $2 million to add funding for Volunteer Fire Assistance grant program, and decreases Wildland Fire Management account by the same amount; and **Pages H6455–56**

Carbajal amendment (No. 37 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that increases funds for hazardous fuels management activities by $10 million, decreases funds provided for forest products by the same amount. **Pages H6456–57**

Rejected:

O'Halleran amendment (No. 19 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that reduces Interior operations funds and increase BIA construction funds by 10 million dollars; **Pages H6444–45**

Vargas amendment (No. 23 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that sought to increase funding for the

U.S.-Mexico Border Water Infrastructure Program by $5 million; **Pages H6447–48**

Jayapal amendment (No. 32 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that sought to reduce then add back $12 million to EPA's Superfund account to underscore the importance of Superfund enforcement; **Page H6453**

Carbajal amendment (No. 37 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that sought to increase funds for hazardous fuels management activities by $10 million, decrease funds provided for forest products by the same amount; **Pages H6456–57**

Beyer amendment (No. 40 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that sought to strike section 430, which allows a loophole in Federal water quality permitting requirements for pollution discharges; and **Pages H6458–60**

Beyer amendment (No. 41 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that sought to strike section 431, which repeals the Clean Water Rule. **Pages H6460–61**

Withdrawn:

Langevin amendment (No. 31 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have provided funding for the Southern New England Estuaries Program under EPA Geographic Programs. **Page H6453**

Proceedings Postponed:

Biggs amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that seeks to transfer funds from the BLM Land acquisition account to the NPS Parks Maintenance Backlog; **Page H6434**

Grijalva amendment (No. 25 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that seeks to increase the budget for the Department of the Interior Inspector General's Office by $2.5 million; **Page H6449**

O'Halleran amendment (No. 27 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that seeks to move $3,000,000 from the Office of the Special Trustee to the Office of Navajo-Hopi Indian Relocation; **Pages H6450–51**

Adams amendment (No. 29 printed in H. Rept. 115–830) that seeks to decrease and then increase the EPA Environmental Programs and Management account fund by $742,000; this increase is to emphasize the need for greater funding for the Environmental Justice program area within the account; and **Pages H6451–52**

Grothman amendment (No. 39 printed in H. Rept. 115–830), as modified, that seeks to reduce funding for the National Endowment on the Arts and the Humanities by 15 percent. **Pages H6457–58**

H. Res. 996, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6147) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 229 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 332, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 230 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 331. **Pages H6274–82**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

Authorizing the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs: H.R. 1037, amended, to authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs. **Pages H6338–39**

Quorum Calls Votes—Four yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6281, H6282, H6342–43, H6343–44, H6344. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 11:35 p.m.

Committee Meetings

EXAMINING THE SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education held a hearing entitled "Examining the Summer Food Service Program". Testimony was heard from Kathryn Larin, Director of Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; Gil Harden, Assistant Inspector General for Audit, Office of Inspector General, Department of Agriculture; and public witnesses.

REALIZING THE BENEFITS OF RURAL BROADBAND: CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled "Realizing the Benefits of Rural Broadband: Challenges and Solutions". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING STATE EFFORTS TO IMPROVE TRANSPARENCY OF HEALTH CARE COSTS FOR CONSUMERS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "Examining State Efforts to Improve Transparency of Health Care Costs for Consumers". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment held a markup on H.R. 3128, to amend section 111 of the Clean Air Act to clarify

when a physical change in, or change in the method of operation of, a stationary source constitutes a modification, and for other purposes. H.R. 3128 was forwarded to the full Committee, as amended.

EXAMINING CAPITAL REGIMES FOR FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled "Examining Capital Regimes for Financial Institutions". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FACEBOOK, GOOGLE AND TWITTER: EXAMINING THE CONTENT FILTERING PRACTICES OF SOCIAL MEDIA GIANTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Facebook, Google and Twitter: Examining the Content Filtering Practices of Social Media Giants". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Federal Lands held a hearing on H.R. 5171, the "Ski Fee Retention Act"; H.R. 5262, to redesignate the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area as the Maurice D. Hinchey Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; H.R. 5347, the "Lyon County Economic Development and Environmental Remediation Act"; H.R. 5532, the "Reconstruction Era National Historical Park Act"; H.R. 5923, the "Walnut Grove Land Exchange Act"; H.R. 5979, the "Mill Springs Battlefield National Monument Act"; H.R. 6013, the "Migratory Bird Framework and Hunting Opportunities for Veterans Act"; and H.R. 6146, to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in Yavapai County, Arizona, and for other purposes. Testimony was heard from Chairman Bishop of Utah, and Representatives Tipton, Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Amodei, Clyburn, Westerman, Rogers of Kentucky, and Gosar; Randy Garrison, Vice Chairman, Yavapai County Board of Supervisors, Arizona; and public witnesses.

A NEW HORIZON IN U.S.-ISRAEL RELATIONS: FROM AN AMERICAN EMBASSY IN JERUSALEM TO POTENTIAL RECOGNITION OF ISRAELI SOVEREIGNTY OVER THE GOLAN HEIGHTS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security held a hearing entitled "A New Horizon in U.S.-Israel Relations: From an American Embassy in Jerusalem to Potential Recognition of Israeli Sovereignty over the Golan Heights". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TRIBAL ENERGY RESOURCES: REDUCING BARRIERS TO OPPORTUNITY

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on the Interior, Energy, and Environment held a hearing entitled "Tribal Energy Resources: Reducing Barriers to Opportunity". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 559, the "MERIT Act of 2017"; H.R. 6391, to reauthorize and modify the authority of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and for other purposes; H.R. 5300, the "Federal Information Systems Safeguards Act of 2018"; H.R. 4913, the "Sgt. Maj. Wardell B. Turner Post Office Building"; H.R. 5395, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 116 Main Street in Dansville, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Alexandria Gleason-Morrow Post Office Building"; H.R. 5868, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 530 Claremont Avenue in Ashland, Ohio, as the "Bill Harris Post Office"; H.R. 6020, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 325 South Michigan Avenue in Howell, Michigan, as the "Sergeant Donald Burgett Post Office Building"; H.R. 6059, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 51 Willow Street in Lynn, Massachusetts, as the "Thomas P. Costin, Jr. Post Office Building"; H.R. 6116, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 362 North Ross Street in Beaverton, Michigan, as the "Colonel Alfred Asch Post Office"; H.R. 6167, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5707 South Cass Avenue in Westmont, Illinois, as the "James William Robinson Jr. Memorial Post Office Building"; and H.R. 5935, to designate the facility at the United States Postal Service located at 1355 North Meridian Drive in Harristown, Illinois, as the "Logan S. Palmer Post Office". H.R. 559 was ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 6391, H.R. 5300, H.R. 4913, H.R. 5395, H.R. 5868, H.R. 5935, H.R. 6020, H.R. 6059, H.R. 6116, and H.R. 6167 were ordered reported, without amendment.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H. Con. Res. 119, expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the

United States economy. The Committee granted, by record vote of 7–3, a rule providing for the consideration of H. Con. Res. 119 under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution. The rule provides that the concurrent resolution shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution. Testimony was heard from Representatives Walorski, Blumenauer, Polis, and McKinley.

THE FUTURE OF FOSSIL: ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES LEADING THE WAY

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy; and Subcommittee on Environment held a joint hearing entitled ''The Future of Fossil: Energy Technologies Leading the Way''. Testimony was heard from Roger Aines, Senior Scientist, Atmospheric, Earth and Energy Division, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; Jason Begger, Executive Director, Wyoming Infrastructure Authority; and public witnesses.

ACHIEVING GOVERNMENT-WIDE VERIFICATION OF SERVICE-DISABLED VETERAN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Investigations, Oversight, and Regulations; and Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs held a joint hearing entitled ''Achieving Government-Wide Verification of Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses''. Testimony was heard from Thomas J. Leney, Executive Director, Small and Veteran Business Programs, Department of Veterans Affairs; Robb Wong, Associate Administrator, Office of Government Contracting and Business Development, Small Business Administration; William Gould, Senior Advisor, Office of the Administrator, Small Business Administration; and a public witness.

THE VA ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT: ONE YEAR LATER

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The VA Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act: One Year Later''. Testimony was heard from Peter O'Rourke, Acting Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs; and a public witness.

COMBATING FRAUD IN MEDICARE: A STRATEGY FOR SUCCESS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled ''Combating Fraud in Medicare: A Strategy for Success''. Testimony was heard from Seto J. Bagdoyan, Director, Forensic Audits and Investigative Service, Government Accountability Office; Gloria L. Jarmon, Deputy Inspector General for Audit Services, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services; and Alec Alexander, Director, Center for Program Integrity, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

MODERNIZING STARK LAW TO ENSURE THE SUCCESSFUL TRANSITION FROM VOLUME TO VALUE IN THE MEDICARE PROGRAM

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Modernizing Stark Law to Ensure the Successful Transition from Volume to Value in the Medicare Program''. Testimony was heard from Eric Hargan, Deputy Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

RUSSIA'S OCCUPATION OF GEORGIA

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine Russia's occupation of Georgia and the erosion of the international order, after receiving testimony from David Bakradze, Ambassador of Georgia to the United States, Luke Coffey, Heritage Foundation, and Damon M. Wilson, Atlantic Council, all of Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 18, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine sharks, 10:15 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness, to hold hearings to examine trade and commerce at United States ports of entry, 2:30 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary (Management), and Denise Natali, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary (Conflict and Stabilization Operations), both of the Department of State, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the Administration's government reorganization proposal, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold hearings to examine S. 2154, to approve the Kickapoo Tribe Water Rights Settlement Agreement, S. 3060, to repeal section 2141 of the Revised Statutes to remove the prohibition on certain alcohol manufacturing on Indian lands, and S. 3168, to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to make Reclamation Water Settlements Fund permanent, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine promoting justice for victims of crime, focusing on the Federal investment in DNA analysis, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine supporting economic stability and self-sufficiency as Americans with disabilities and their families age, 9:30 a.m., SD–562.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Cryptocurrencies: Oversight of New Assets in the Digital Age'', 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled ''Powering America: The Role of Energy Storage in the Nation's Electricity System'', 9 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Federal Trade Commission'', 9:15 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Full Committee, markup on H.R. 6351, the ''Advancing U.S. Civil Nuclear Competitiveness and Jobs Act''; and H.R. 6378, the ''Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act of 2018'', 1 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled ''The Future of Money: Digital Currency'', 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, hearing entitled ''Current Developments in Central Asia'', 3 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 5171, the ''Ski Area Fee Retention Act''; H.R. 5347, the ''Lyon County Economic Development and Environmental Remediation Act''; H.R. 5532, the ''Reconstruction Era National Historical Park Act''; H.R. 5556, the ''Environmental Compliance Cost Transparency Act of 2018''; H.R. 5923, the ''Walnut Grove Land Exchange Act''; H.R. 5979, the ''Mill Springs Battlefield National Monument Act''; H.R. 6038, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota; H.R. 6039, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Jamestown Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; H.R. 6040, the ''Contra Costa Canal Transfer Act''; and H.R. 6146, the ''Cottonwood Land Exchange Act of 2018'', 10:45 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Affairs, hearing entitled ''Regulatory Divergence: Failure of the Administrative State'', 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, markup on legislation on the Department of Energy Veterans' Health Initiative Act; and legislation on Chemical Assessment Improvement Act, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 6348, the ''Small Business Access to Capital and Efficiency Act''; H.R. 6347, the ''7(a) Real Estate Harmonization Act''; H.R. 6330, the ''Small Business Runway Extension Act of 2018''; H.R. 6369, the ''Expanding Contracting Opportunities for Small Businesses Act of 2018''; H.R. 6367, ''Incentivizing Fairness in Subcontracting Act of 2018''; legislation on the Clarity on Small Business Participation in Category Management Act of 2018; H.R. 6316, the ''Small Business Advocacy Improvements Act of 2018''; and H.R. 6368, the ''Encouraging Small Business Innovators Act'', 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, hearing entitled ''Are We Ready? Recovering from 2017 Disasters and Preparing for the 2018 Hurricane Season'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, hearing entitled ''An Update on the Implementation of the Forever GI Bill: Is VA Ready for August 1st?'', 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3309, the ''Social Security Online Tools Innovation Act''; and H.R. 6377, the ''Save Community Newspaper Act of 2018'', 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Trade, hearing entitled ''The Effects of Tariffs on U.S. Agriculture and Rural Communities'', 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine the state of transatlantic relations, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 18

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 2 p.m.

Following disposition of the Oldham nomination, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 18

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Complete consideration of H.R. 6147—Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2019. Begin consideration of H. Con. Res. 119—Expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.