United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 2019 *No. 109*

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ESCOBAR).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 27, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VERONICA ESCOBAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

God, You created us endowed with freedom. We give You thanks for giving us another day.

As Congress heads into a recess to celebrate the Fourth of July, America's national holiday, may all citizens be mindful of the wonder of our Nation's inception.

Men and women of goodwill from various backgrounds and sections of the Colonies from disparate faith traditions came together in prayer and united by a vision of political and economic autonomy, courageously placed their lives, their liberty, and their fortunes on the line to found these United States.

May all Americans be renewed in their commitment to our representative government. May each American expect of themselves intelligent participation in the political process so that the Members of Congress they elect might be statesmen and -women who are able to represent the interests of their constituents while also faithfully honoring their oath to defend the Constitution in doing what is best for our Nation.

In all the celebrations of this week to come, may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland 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.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3401, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SECURITY AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER ACT, 2019

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116–130) on the resolution (H. Res. 466) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

IT IS TIME TO PUT HARRIET TUBMAN ON THE $20 BILL

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Speaker, it is time to put Harriet Tubman on the $20 bill.

The Treasury has had this design in the works for years, and now, all of a sudden, it is backpedaling. It takes 10 years, they say, to complete this work.

During a 10-year period, Harriet Tubman made 19 round trips on the underground railroad to lead over 300 slaves to freedom; and, in less time, Treasury can't put this American hero on a piece of paper.

How long must it take to reflect our Nation's rich diversity on our currency?

Printed on recycled paper.

How long must it take to recognize an icon of freedom and courage?

How long must it take to rightfully acknowledge the work of a woman who helped countless enslaved Americans of African descent?

How long must it take when the American people overwhelmingly selected her as the face of the new $20 bill?

Harriet Tubman embodies the American spirit of strength and hope.

It is time to put a woman on the $20 bill. In this year, the 100th anniversary of women's suffrage, we want to guarantee that Treasury will follow through on this promise and this commitment.

RECOGNIZING DuBOIS AREA MIDDLE SCHOOL

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the hardworking students, teachers, and staff at DuBois Area Middle School. For the fourth consecutive time, DuBois Area Middle School was one of over 465 schools from around the country named as a school to watch by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform.

The Schools to Watch recognition is based on a comprehensive 3-year review of the entire school. Only one other middle school in Pennsylvania has remained at the top with DuBois for their continuous designations.

The students, teachers, and faculty members have joined together to create a learning community where everyone is supported. Every year, the community is challenged to maintain their success by continuing to put their best foot forward. This week, they were recognized for their 12 years of excellence at the National Forum Schools to Watch Conference here in Washington, D.C.

I look forward meeting representatives from the DuBois Area Middle School later today. Madam Speaker, the entire 15th Congressional District of Pennsylvania is proud of their continuous success.

CRISIS AT THE BORDER

(Ms. SPEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, this is not my America. This is not the values of our America. Look at this picture.

Now, some critics think that this should not have been published, but I disagree, because these people are not rapists or murderers or drug dealers.

This is Oscar Ramirez and his 23-month-old daughter, Angie Valeria. They died on the Rio Grande River, Angie clinging to Oscar's neck and tucked under his shirt in a desperate attempt to survive.

Their story isn't unique. Last Saturday, a mother and three children were found dead on U.S. soil. Children have been found freezing. We now know that many of them don't even have simple items of hygiene like soap and toothbrushes.

A group of women from my district, 20 of them, created a nonprofit called Bay Area Border Relief. They are in McAllen right now. They took 490 boxes of clothes, and it was actually reduced in less than 2 weeks.

We need to address this issue now.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT GENERAL ROBERT SCOTT WILLIAMS ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant General Robert Scott Williams as he retires after 32 years of service to the United States Air Force.

On June 20, General Williams completed his tour as dual commander of Air Forces Northern and First Air Force headquarters at Tyndall Air Force Base, capping a long and distinguished career.

His service to the Air Force included a tour as commander of the 169th Operations Group and Fighter Wing at McEntire Joint National Guard Base in South Carolina.

General Williams' leadership during and after Hurricane Michael was top tier. He and his team at Tyndall Air Force Base overcame numerous obstacles and exceeded expectations by opening First Air Force headquarters way ahead of schedule. This is only 2 short months after the category 5 storm Michael devastated the panhandle.

Madam Speaker, I applaud the work he has accomplished over his last 3 years of command and his 32-year career. Please join me in saluting Lieutenant General Robert Scott Williams for his great service to the Air Force.

RECOGNIZING AMERICAN GROWN FLOWERS MONTH

(Ms. PINGREE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Speaker, I rise in recognition of July as American Grown Flowers Month.

As co-chair of the House Cut Flowers Caucus, I know the buy local movement has encouraged customers to buy not only their food, but also their flowers, from local farmers. People want to support the small family farm down the road, whether it is lettuce or lilies.

The cut flower industry creates jobs, benefits our local economies, and naturally encourages us to embrace our planet's natural beauty.

For farmers, cut flowers allow us to preserve open spaces, participate in sustainable agriculture, and, many times, support women-owned businesses.

In my home State of Maine, where I represent many small farms, more than 250 farms sell cut flowers, from the Snell Family Farm in Buxton to Lazy Acres Farm in Farmingdale.

This is an industry worth upwards of $1 million to our economy and has seen such rapid growth in recent years that we have many flower CSAs for local customers. The new interest in locally sourced flowers has allowed farmers to diversify their crops and boost their income.

In Maine, nationally recognized as ''Vacationland,'' cut flowers are essential to our tourism industry. Flowers decorate wedding venues, hotels, and restaurants across our State. And when you are celebrating something as special as a wedding or a long-awaited vacation, shouldn't everything, down to the flowers on the table, have some meaning?

RECOGNIZING PARALYMPIC ATHLETE LIZZI SMITH

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an individual from Muncie, Indiana, who has made her community and State proud.

Lizzi Smith, a Paralympic athlete who competed in the 2016 Paralympic Games, is now working toward her goal of swimming in the 2020 Paralympic Games in Tokyo.

Lizzi has already accomplished so much in her swimming career. She helped Muncie Central High School win a sectional in high school. She won two world medals at the age of 17, and she came away from the 2016 Paralympics with two medals. Just this year, Lizzi set the Pan American record in the S10 100-meter butterfly.

I thank Lizzi for inspiring us to dream big and for setting a strong example for young Hoosiers and all Americans. I wish her the best of luck on the road to Tokyo.

Bring home the gold.

HIGHLIGHTING THE DAIRY MARGIN COVERAGE PROGRAM

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

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the end of Dairy Month, which is recognized throughout June. I also rise to highlight the USDA's new Dairy Margin Coverage program, which is enrolling farmers right now.

My district in upstate New York is home to hundreds of dairy farmers, and way too many are struggling to survive with years of plummeting milk prices.

Now at the mercy of not just a complex pricing system, but also trade wars, our farmers need real support. I

encourage all dairy farmers in New York's 19th Congressional District to begin making coverage decisions.

The Dairy Margin Coverage program is retroactive until the beginning of the year, with applicable payments following soon after enrollment.

As dairy farmers continue to face low prices and increased market consolidation, I hope this program will provide much-needed support during this challenging farm economy.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I am deeply committed to supporting our dairy farmers, and I will be closely following implementation of the Dairy Margin Coverage program. I will continue fighting to give our farmers the support and the certainty they need.

□ 0915

RECOGNIZING JUDY GENSHAFT

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize Dr. Judy Genshaft, a truly outstanding leader whose contributions to the Tampa Bay area as the sixth president of the University of South Florida have been unmatched, in my opinion.

President Genshaft has completely transformed USF by helping it achieve elite status as a preeminent research university. The National Science Foundation has ranked USF as one of the Nation's top 25 research universities.

Under Judy's leadership, USF has nearly quadrupled its research portfolio to expand lifesaving research and develop cutting-edge technologies. The school's success has attracted some of the brightest young minds to the Tampa Bay area of Florida, growing enrollment by 40 percent, and USF's graduation rate has tripled with Dr. Genshaft at the helm.

Summarizing the many accomplishments of President Genshaft in just 1 minute is impossible. She is a remarkable woman who has made the Tampa Bay region a better place. As she prepares to retire, it is my honor to say congratulations to her.

Go Bulls.

CARING FOR THE CHILDREN

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

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, there is a Gospel reading I like: Matthew 25: ''For I was hungry and You gave me food, I was thirsty and You gave me drink, a stranger and You welcomed me, naked and You clothed me, ill and You cared for me, in prison and You visited me.''

That spirit of welcoming and compassion is a part of what defines us as Americans. In fact, we have enshrined it in our legal code, including laws requiring safe and sanitary conditions for migrant children. Yet right now, children are imprisoned in appalling and unconscionable conditions.

These children have not been welcomed in the spirit of Matthew. Instead, they are in cages, in prison without adequate food, clean clothing, clean diapers, toothbrushes, access to showers, and a comfortable place to lay their head.

''Whatever you did unto the least of these, you did unto me.''

Madam Speaker, we will be judged as a nation, as a government, and a people for our failure to look out for the least of these. May this imprisonment end.

SECURING AMERICA'S FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 460, I call up the bill (H.R. 2722) to protect elections for public office by providing financial support and enhanced security for the infrastructure used to carry out such elections, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 460, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–20, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116–126, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2722

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 ''Securing America's Federal Elections Act'' or the ''SAFE Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE

Subtitle A—Voting System Security Improvement Grants

PART 1—PROMOTING ACCURACY, INTEGRITY, AND SECURITY THROUGH VOTER-VERIFIED PERMANENT PAPER BALLOT

Sec. 101. Short title.
Sec. 102. Paper ballot and manual counting requirements.
Sec. 103. Accessibility and ballot verification for individuals with disabilities.
Sec. 104. Durability and readability requirements for ballots.
Sec. 105. Paper ballot printing requirements.
Sec. 106. Study and report on optimal ballot design.
Sec. 107. Effective date for new requirements.

PART 2—GRANTS TO CARRY OUT IMPROVEMENTS

Sec. 111. Grants for obtaining compliant paper ballot voting systems and carrying out voting system security improvements.
Sec. 112. Coordination of voting system security activities with use of requirements payments and election administration requirements under Help America Vote Act of 2002.
Sec. 113. Incorporation of definitions.

Subtitle B—Risk-Limiting Audits

Sec. 121. Risk-limiting audits.
Sec. 122. Funding for conducting post-election risk-limiting audits.
Sec. 123. GAO analysis of effects of audits.

TITLE II—PROMOTING CYBERSECURITY THROUGH IMPROVEMENTS IN ELECTION ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 201. Voting system cybersecurity requirements.
Sec. 202. Testing of existing voting systems to ensure compliance with election cybersecurity guidelines and other guidelines.
Sec. 203. Requiring use of software and hardware for which information is disclosed by manufacturer.
Sec. 204. Treatment of electronic poll books as part of voting systems.
Sec. 205. Pre-election reports on voting system usage.
Sec. 206. Streamlining collection of election information.

TITLE III—USE OF VOTING MACHINES MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES

Sec. 301. Use of voting machines manufactured in the United States.

TITLE IV—SEVERABILITY

Sec. 401. Severability.

TITLE I—FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE

Subtitle A—Voting System Security Improvement Grants

PART 1—PROMOTING ACCURACY, INTEGRITY, AND SECURITY THROUGH VOTER-VERIFIED PERMANENT PAPER BALLOT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Voter Confidence and Increased Accessibility Act of 2019''.

SEC. 102. PAPER BALLOT AND MANUAL COUNTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(a)(2) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) PAPER BALLOT REQUIREMENT.—

''(A) VOTER-VERIFIED PAPER BALLOTS.—

''(i) PAPER BALLOT REQUIREMENT.—(I) The voting system shall require the use of an individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballot of the voter's vote that shall be marked and made available for inspection and verification by the voter before the voter's vote is cast and counted, and which shall be counted by hand or read by an optical character recognition device or other counting device. For purposes of this subclause, the term 'individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballot' means a paper ballot marked by the voter by hand or a paper ballot marked through the use of a nontabulating ballot marking device or system, so long as the voter shall have the option to mark his or her ballot by hand. The paper ballot shall be printed or marked in such a way that vote selections, including all vote selections scanned by voting systems to tabulate votes, can be inspected and verified by the voter without training or instruction or audited by election officials without the aid of any machine or other equipment.

''(II) The voting system shall provide the voter with an opportunity to correct any error on the paper ballot before the permanent voter-verified paper ballot is preserved in accordance with clause (ii).

''(III) The voting system shall not preserve the voter-verified paper ballots in any manner that makes it possible, at any time after the ballot has been cast, to associate a voter with the record of the voter's vote without the voter's consent.

''(ii) PRESERVATION AS OFFICIAL RECORD.—The individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballot used in accordance with clause (i) shall constitute the official ballot and shall be preserved and used as the official ballot for purposes of any recount or audit conducted with respect to any election for Federal office in which the voting system is used.

''(iii) MANUAL COUNTING REQUIREMENTS FOR RECOUNTS AND AUDITS.—(I) Each paper ballot used pursuant to clause (i) shall be suitable for a manual audit, and shall be counted by hand in any recount or audit conducted with respect to any election for Federal office.

''(II) In the event of any inconsistencies or irregularities between any electronic vote tallies and the vote tallies determined by counting by hand the individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots used pursuant to clause (i), and subject to subparagraph (B), the individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots shall be the true and correct record of the votes cast.

''(iv) APPLICATION TO ALL BALLOTS.—The requirements of this subparagraph shall apply to all ballots cast in elections for Federal office, including ballots cast by absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act and other absentee voters.

''(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR TREATMENT OF DISPUTES WHEN PAPER BALLOTS HAVE BEEN SHOWN TO BE COMPROMISED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the event that—

''(I) there is any inconsistency between any electronic vote tallies and the vote tallies determined by counting by hand the individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots used pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i) with respect to any election for Federal office; and

''(II) it is demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence (as determined in accordance with the applicable standards in the jurisdiction involved) in any recount, audit, or contest of the result of the election that the paper ballots have been compromised (by damage or mischief or otherwise) and that a sufficient number of the ballots have been so compromised that the result of the election could be changed,

the determination of the appropriate remedy with respect to the election shall be made in accordance with applicable State law, except that the electronic tally shall not be used as the exclusive basis for determining the official certified result.

''(ii) RULE FOR CONSIDERATION OF BALLOTS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH VOTING MACHINE.—For purposes of clause (i), only the paper ballots deemed compromised, if any, shall be considered in the calculation of whether or not the result of the election could be changed due to the compromised paper ballots.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT CLARIFYING APPLICABILITY OF ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE ACCESSIBILITY.—Section 301(a)(4) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)(4)) is amended by inserting ''(including the paper ballots required to be used under paragraph (2))'' after ''voting system''.

(c) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 301(a)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking ''counted'' and inserting ''counted, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3)'';

(2) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''counted'' and inserting ''counted, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3)'';

(3) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking ''counted'' each place it appears and inserting ''counted, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3)''; and

(4) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''counted'' and inserting ''counted, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3)''.

SEC. 103. ACCESSIBILITY AND BALLOT VERIFICATION FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(a)(3)(B) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)(3)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

''(B)(i) ensure that individuals with disabilities and others are given an equivalent opportunity to vote, including with privacy and independence, in a manner that produces a voter-verified paper ballot as for other voters;

''(ii) satisfy the requirement of subparagraph (A) through the use of at least one voting system equipped for individuals with disabilities, including nonvisual and enhanced visual accessibility for the blind and visually impaired, and nonmanual and enhanced manual accessibility for the mobility and dexterity impaired, at each polling place; and

''(iii) meet the requirements of subparagraph (A) and paragraph (2)(A) by using a system that—

''(I) allows the voter to privately and independently verify the permanent paper ballot through the presentation, in accessible form, of the printed or marked vote selections from the same printed or marked information that would be used for any vote counting or auditing; and

''(II) allows the voter to privately and independently verify and cast the permanent paper ballot without requiring the voter to manually handle the paper ballot;''.

(b) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENT OF STUDY, TESTING, AND DEVELOPMENT OF ACCESSIBLE PAPER BALLOT VERIFICATION MECHANISMS.—

(1) STUDY AND REPORTING.—Subtitle C of title II of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 247 as section 248; and

(B) by inserting after section 246 the following new section:

''SEC. 247. STUDY AND REPORT ON ACCESSIBLE PAPER BALLOT VERIFICATION MECHANISMS.

''(a) STUDY AND REPORT.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall make grants to not fewer than 3 eligible entities to study, test, and develop accessible paper ballot voting, verification, and casting mechanisms and devices and best practices to enhance the accessibility of paper ballot voting and verification mechanisms for individuals with disabilities, for voters whose primary language is not English, and for voters with difficulties in literacy, including best practices for the mechanisms themselves and the processes through which the mechanisms are used.

''(b) ELIGIBILITY.—An entity is eligible to receive a grant under this part if it submits to the Director (at such time and in such form as the Director may require) an application containing—

''(1) certifications that the entity shall specifically investigate enhanced methods or devices, including non-electronic devices, that will assist such individuals and voters in marking voter-verified paper ballots and presenting or transmitting the information printed or marked on such ballots back to such individuals and voters, and casting such ballots;

''(2) a certification that the entity shall complete the activities carried out with the grant not later than December 31, 2020; and

''(3) such other information and certifications as the Director may require.

''(c) AVAILABILITY OF TECHNOLOGY.—Any technology developed with the grants made under this section shall be treated as non-proprietary and shall be made available to the public, including to manufacturers of voting systems.

''(d) COORDINATION WITH GRANTS FOR TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS.—The Director shall carry out this section so that the activities carried out with the grants made under subsection (a) are coordinated with the research conducted under the grant program carried out by the Commission under section 271, to the extent that the Director and Commission determine necessary to provide for the advancement of accessible voting technology.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection (a) $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended—

(A) by redesignating the item relating to section 247 as relating to section 248; and

(B) by inserting after the item relating to section 246 the following new item:

''Sec. 247. Study and report on accessible paper ballot verification mechanisms.''.

(c) CLARIFICATION OF ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS UNDER VOLUNTARY VOTING SYSTEM GUIDANCE.—In adopting any voluntary guidance under subtitle B of title III of the Help America Vote Act with respect to the accessibility of the paper ballot verification requirements for individuals with disabilities, the Election Assistance Commission shall include and apply the same accessibility standards applicable under the voluntary guidance adopted for accessible voting systems under such subtitle.

(d) PERMITTING USE OF FUNDS FOR PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY SYSTEMS TO SUPPORT ACTIONS TO ENFORCE ELECTION-RELATED DISABILITY ACCESS.—Section 292(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21062(a)) is amended by striking ''; except that'' and all that follows and inserting a period.

SEC. 104. DURABILITY AND READABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOTS.

Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) DURABILITY AND READABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOTS.—

''(A) DURABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PAPER BALLOTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—All voter-verified paper ballots required to be used under this Act shall be marked or printed on durable paper.

''(ii) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this Act, paper is 'durable' if it is capable of withstanding multiple counts and recounts by hand without compromising the fundamental integrity of the ballots, and capable of retaining the information marked or printed on them for the full duration of a retention and preservation period of 22 months.

''(B) READABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PAPER BALLOTS MARKED BY BALLOT MARKING DEVICE.—All voter-verified paper ballots completed by the voter through the use of a ballot marking device shall be clearly readable by the voter without assistance (other than eyeglasses or other personal vision enhancing devices) and by an optical character recognition device or other device equipped for individuals with disabilities.''.

SEC. 105. PAPER BALLOT PRINTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REQUIRING PAPER BALLOTS TO BE PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER MANUFACTURED IN UNITED STATES.—Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 104, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) PRINTING REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOTS.—All paper ballots used in an election for Federal office shall be printed in the United States on recycled paper manufactured in the United States.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to elections occurring on or after January 1, 2021.

SEC. 106. STUDY AND REPORT ON OPTIMAL BALLOT DESIGN.

(a) STUDY.—The Election Assistance Commission shall conduct a study of the best ways to design ballots used in elections for public office, including paper ballots and electronic or digital ballots, to minimize confusion and user errors.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2020, the Election Assistance Commission shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 107. EFFECTIVE DATE FOR NEW REQUIREMENTS.

Section 301(d) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with the requirements of this section on and after January 1, 2006.

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 105(b) of the Securing America's Federal Elections Act and subparagraphs (B) and (C), the requirements of this section which are first imposed on a State and jurisdiction pursuant to the amendments made by the Voter Confidence and Increased Accessibility Act of 2019 shall apply with respect to voting systems used for any election for Federal office held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

''(B) DELAY FOR JURISDICTIONS USING CERTAIN PAPER RECORD PRINTERS OR CERTAIN SYSTEMS USING OR PRODUCING VOTER-VERIFIED PAPER RECORDS IN 2018.—

''(i) DELAY.—In the case of a jurisdiction described in clause (ii), subparagraph (A) shall apply to a voting system in the jurisdiction as if the reference in such subparagraph to '2020' were a reference to '2022', but only with respect to the following requirements of this section:

''(I) Paragraph (2)(A)(i)(I) of subsection (a) (relating to the use of voter-verified paper ballots).

''(II) Paragraph (3)(B)(iii)(I) and (II) of subsection (a) (relating to access to verification from and casting of the durable paper ballot).

''(III) Paragraph (7) of subsection (a) (relating to durability and readability requirements for ballots).

''(ii) JURISDICTIONS DESCRIBED.—A jurisdiction described in this clause is a jurisdiction—

''(I) which used voter-verified paper record printers attached to direct recording electronic voting machines, or which used other voting systems that used or produced paper records of the vote verifiable by voters but that are not in compliance with paragraphs (2)(A)(i)(I), (3)(B)(iii)(I) and (II), and (7) of subsection (a) (as amended or added by the Voter Confidence and Increased Accessibility Act of 2019), for the administration of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2018; and

''(II) which will continue to use such printers or systems for the administration of elections for Federal office held in years before 2022.

''(iii) MANDATORY AVAILABILITY OF PAPER BALLOTS AT POLLING PLACES USING GRANDFATHERED PRINTERS AND SYSTEMS.—

''(I) REQUIRING BALLOTS TO BE OFFERED AND PROVIDED.—The appropriate election official at each polling place that uses a printer or system described in clause (ii)(I) for the administration of elections for Federal office shall offer each individual who is eligible to cast a vote in the election at the polling place the opportunity to cast the vote using a blank pre-printed paper ballot which the individual may mark by hand and which is not produced by the direct recording electronic voting machine or other such system. The official shall provide the individual with the ballot and the supplies necessary to mark the ballot, and shall ensure (to the greatest extent practicable) that the waiting period for the individual to cast a vote is the lesser of 30 minutes or the average waiting period for an individual who does not agree to cast the vote using such a paper ballot under this clause.

''(II) TREATMENT OF BALLOT.—Any paper ballot which is cast by an individual under this clause shall be counted and otherwise treated as a regular ballot for all purposes (including by incorporating it into the final unofficial vote count (as defined by the State) for the precinct) and not as a provisional ballot, unless the individual casting the ballot would have otherwise been required to cast a provisional ballot.

''(III) POSTING OF NOTICE.—The appropriate election official shall ensure there is prominently displayed at each polling place a notice that describes the obligation of the official to offer individuals the opportunity to cast votes using a pre-printed blank paper ballot.

''(IV) TRAINING OF ELECTION OFFICIALS.—The chief State election official shall ensure that election officials at polling places in the State are aware of the requirements of this clause, including the requirement to display a notice under subclause (III), and are aware that it is a violation of the requirements of this title for an election official to fail to offer an individual the opportunity to cast a vote using a blank pre-printed paper ballot.

''(V) PERIOD OF APPLICABILITY.—The requirements of this clause apply only during the period in which the delay is in effect under clause (i).

''(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR JURISDICTIONS USING CERTAIN NONTABULATING BALLOT MARKING DEVICES.—In the case of a jurisdiction which uses a nontabulating ballot marking device which automatically deposits the ballot into a privacy sleeve, subparagraph (A) shall apply to a voting system in the jurisdiction as if the reference in such subparagraph to 'any election for Federal office held in 2020 or any succeeding year' were a reference to 'elections for Federal office occurring held in 2022 or each succeeding year', but only with respect to paragraph (3)(B)(iii)(II) of subsection (a) (relating to nonmanual casting of the durable paper ballot).''.

PART 2—GRANTS TO CARRY OUT IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 111. GRANTS FOR OBTAINING COMPLIANT PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AND CARRYING OUT VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF GRANTS.—Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART 7—GRANTS FOR OBTAINING COMPLIANT PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AND CARRYING OUT VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

''SEC. 297. GRANTS FOR OBTAINING COMPLIANT PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AND CARRYING OUT VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.

''(a) AVAILABILITY AND USE OF GRANT.—The Commission shall make a grant to each eligible State—

''(1) to replace a voting system—

''(A) which does not meet the requirements which are first imposed on the State pursuant to the amendments made by the Voter Confidence and Increased Accessibility Act of 2019 with a voting system which does meet such requirements, for use in the regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in November 2020, or

''(B) which does meet such requirements but which is not in compliance with the most recent voluntary voting system guidelines issued by the Commission prior to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2020 with another system which does meet such requirements and is in compliance with such guidelines;

''(2) to carry out voting system security improvements described in section 297A with respect to the regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in November 2020 and each succeeding election for Federal office; and

''(3) to implement and model best practices for ballot design, ballot instructions, and the testing of ballots.

''(b) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—The amount of a grant made to a State under this section shall be such amount as the Commission determines to be appropriate, except that such amount may not be less than the product of $1 and the average of the number of individuals who cast votes in any of the two most recent regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in the State.

''(c) PRO RATA REDUCTIONS.—If the amount of funds appropriated for grants under this part is insufficient to ensure that each State receives the amount of the grant calculated under subsection (b), the Commission shall make such pro rata reductions in such amounts as may be necessary to ensure that the entire amount appropriated under this part is distributed to the States.

''(d) SURPLUS APPROPRIATIONS.—If the amount of funds appropriated for grants authorized under section 297D(a)(2) exceed the amount necessary to meet the requirements of subsection (b), the Commission shall consider the following in making a determination to award remaining funds to a State:

''(1) The record of the State in carrying out the following with respect to the administration of elections for Federal office:

''(A) Providing voting machines that are less than 10 years old.

''(B) Implementing strong chain of custody procedures for the physical security of voting equipment and paper records at all stages of the process.

''(C) Conducting pre-election testing on every voting machine and ensuring that paper ballots are available wherever electronic machines are used.

''(D) Maintaining offline backups of voter registration lists.

''(E) Providing a secure voter registration database that logs requests submitted to the database.

''(F) Publishing and enforcing a policy detailing use limitations and security safeguards to protect the personal information of voters in the voter registration process.

''(G) Providing secure processes and procedures for reporting vote tallies.

''(H) Providing a secure platform for disseminating vote totals.

''(2) Evidence of established conditions of innovation and reform in providing voting system security and the proposed plan of the State for implementing additional conditions.

''(3) Evidence of collaboration between relevant stakeholders, including local election officials, in developing the grant implementation plan described in section 297B.

''(4) The plan of the State to conduct a rigorous evaluation of the effectiveness of the activities carried out with the grant.

''(e) ABILITY OF REPLACEMENT SYSTEMS TO ADMINISTER RANKED CHOICE ELECTIONS.—To the greatest extent practicable, an eligible State which receives a grant to replace a voting system under this section shall ensure that the replacement system is capable of administering a system of ranked choice voting under which each voter shall rank the candidates for the office in the order of the voter's preference.

''SEC. 297A. VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS DESCRIBED.

''(a) PERMITTED USES.—A voting system security improvement described in this section is any of the following:

''(1) The acquisition of goods and services from qualified election infrastructure vendors by purchase, lease, or such other arrangements as may be appropriate.

''(2) Cyber and risk mitigation training.

''(3) A security risk and vulnerability assessment of the State's election infrastructure which is carried out by a provider of cybersecurity services under a contract entered into between the chief State election official and the provider.

''(4) The maintenance of election infrastructure, including addressing risks and vulnerabilities which are identified under either of the security risk and vulnerability assessments described in paragraph (3), except that none of the funds provided under this part may be used to renovate or replace a building or facility which is used primarily for purposes other than the administration of elections for public office.

''(5) Providing increased technical support for any information technology infrastructure that the chief State election official deems to be part

of the State's election infrastructure or designates as critical to the operation of the State's election infrastructure.

''(6) Enhancing the cybersecurity and operations of the information technology infrastructure described in paragraph (4).

''(7) Enhancing the cybersecurity of voter registration systems.

''(b) QUALIFIED ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE VENDORS DESCRIBED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this part, a 'qualified election infrastructure vendor' is any person who provides, supports, or maintains, or who seeks to provide, support, or maintain, election infrastructure on behalf of a State, unit of local government, or election agency, who meets the criteria described in paragraph (2).

''(2) CRITERIA.—The criteria described in this paragraph are such criteria as the Chairman, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall establish and publish, and shall include each of the following requirements:

''(A) The vendor must be owned and controlled by a citizen or permanent resident of the United States.

''(B) The vendor must disclose to the Chairman and the Secretary, and to the chief State election official of any State to which the vendor provides any goods and services with funds provided under this part, of any sourcing outside the United States for parts of the election infrastructure.

''(C) The vendor agrees to ensure that the election infrastructure will be developed and maintained in a manner that is consistent with the cybersecurity best practices issued by the Technical Guidelines Development Committee.

''(D) The vendor agrees to maintain its information technology infrastructure in a manner that is consistent with the cybersecurity best practices issued by the Technical Guidelines Development Committee.

''(E) The vendor agrees to meet the requirements of paragraph (3) with respect to any known or suspected cybersecurity incidents involving any of the goods and services provided by the vendor pursuant to a grant under this part.

''(F) The vendor agrees to permit independent security testing by the Commission (in accordance with section 231(a)) and by the Secretary of the goods and services provided by the vendor pursuant to a grant under this part.

''(3) CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A vendor meets the requirements of this paragraph if, upon becoming aware of the possibility that an election cybersecurity incident has occurred involving any of the goods and services provided by the vendor pursuant to a grant under this part—

''(i) the vendor promptly assesses whether or not such an incident occurred, and submits a notification meeting the requirements of subparagraph (B) to the Secretary and the Chairman of the assessment as soon as practicable (but in no case later than 3 days after the vendor first becomes aware of the possibility that the incident occurred);

''(ii) if the incident involves goods or services provided to an election agency, the vendor submits a notification meeting the requirements of subparagraph (B) to the agency as soon as practicable (but in no case later than 3 days after the vendor first becomes aware of the possibility that the incident occurred), and cooperates with the agency in providing any other necessary notifications relating to the incident; and

''(iii) the vendor provides all necessary updates to any notification submitted under clause (i) or clause (ii).

''(B) CONTENTS OF NOTIFICATIONS.—Each notification submitted under clause (i) or clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) shall contain the following information with respect to any election cybersecurity incident covered by the notification:

''(i) The date, time, and time zone when the election cybersecurity incident began, if known.

''(ii) The date, time, and time zone when the election cybersecurity incident was detected.

''(iii) The date, time, and duration of the election cybersecurity incident.

''(iv) The circumstances of the election cybersecurity incident, including the specific election infrastructure systems believed to have been accessed and information acquired, if any.

''(v) Any planned and implemented technical measures to respond to and recover from the incident.

''(vi) In the case of any notification which is an update to a prior notification, any additional material information relating to the incident, including technical data, as it becomes available.

''SEC. 297B. ELIGIBILITY OF STATES.

''A State is eligible to receive a grant under this part if the State submits to the Commission, at such time and in such form as the Commission may require, an application containing—

''(1) a description of how the State will use the grant to carry out the activities authorized under this part;

''(2) a certification and assurance that, not later than 5 years after receiving the grant, the State will carry out voting system security improvements, as described in section 297A; and

''(3) such other information and assurances as the Commission may require.

''SEC. 297C. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

''Not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Commission shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, including the Committees on Homeland Security, House Administration, and the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Judiciary, and Rules and Administration of the Senate, on the activities carried out with the funds provided under this part.

''SEC. 297D. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this part—

''(1) $600,000,000 for fiscal year 2019; and

''(2) $175,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2020, 2022, 2024, and 2026.

''(b) CONTINUING AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Any amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of this section shall remain available until expended.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subtitle D of title II the following:

''PART 7—GRANTS FOR OBTAINING COMPLIANT PAPER BALLOT VOTING SYSTEMS AND CARRYING OUT VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

''Sec. 297. Grants for obtaining compliant paper ballot voting systems and carrying out voting system security improvements.

''Sec. 297A. Voting system security improvements described.

''Sec. 297B. Eligibility of States.

''Sec. 297C. Reports to Congress.

''Sec. 297D. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 112. COORDINATION OF VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY ACTIVITIES WITH USE OF REQUIREMENTS PAYMENTS AND ELECTION ADMINISTRATION REQUIREMENTS UNDER HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2002.

(a) DUTIES OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—Section 202 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20922) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''by'' and inserting ''and the security of election infrastructure by''.

(b) MEMBERSHIP OF SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY ON BOARD OF ADVISORS OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—Section 214(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20944(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''37 members'' and inserting ''38 members''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(17) The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary's designee.''.

(c) REPRESENTATIVE OF DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY ON TECHNICAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.—Section 221(c)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20961(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

''(E) A representative of the Department of Homeland Security.''.

(d) GOALS OF PERIODIC STUDIES OF ELECTION ADMINISTRATION ISSUES; CONSULTATION WITH SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—Section 241(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20981(a)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''the Commission shall'' and inserting ''the Commission, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security (as appropriate), shall'';

(2) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) will be secure against attempts to undermine the integrity of election systems by cyber or other means; and''.

(e) REQUIREMENTS PAYMENTS.—

(1) USE OF PAYMENTS FOR VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.—Section 251(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21001(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) PERMITTING USE OF PAYMENTS FOR VOTING SYSTEM SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.—A State may use a requirements payment to carry out any of the following activities:

''(A) Cyber and risk mitigation training.

''(B) Providing increased technical support for any information technology infrastructure that the chief State election official deems to be part of the State's election infrastructure or designates as critical to the operation of the State's election infrastructure.

''(C) Enhancing the cybersecurity and operations of the information technology infrastructure described in subparagraph (B).

''(D) Enhancing the security of voter registration databases.''.

(2) INCORPORATION OF ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION IN STATE PLANS FOR USE OF PAYMENTS.—Section 254(a)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21004(a)(1)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting '', including the protection of election infrastructure.''.

(3) COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEE RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPING STATE PLAN FOR USE OF PAYMENTS.—Section 255 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21005) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

''(b) GEOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATION.—The members of the committee shall be a representative group of individuals from the State's counties, cities, towns, and Indian tribes, and shall represent the needs of rural as well as urban areas of the State, as the case may be.''.

(f) ENSURING PROTECTION OF COMPUTERIZED STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION LIST.—Section 303(a)(3) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21083(a)(3)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting '', as well as other measures to prevent and deter cybersecurity incidents, as identified by the Commission, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Technical Guidelines Development Committee.''.

SEC. 113. INCORPORATION OF DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21141) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 901. DEFINITIONS.

''In this Act, the following definitions apply:

''(1) The term 'cybersecurity incident' has the meaning given the term 'incident' in section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 659).

''(2) The term 'election agency' means any component of a State, or any component of a unit of local government in a State, which is responsible for the administration of elections for Federal office in the State.

''(3) The term 'election infrastructure' means storage facilities, polling places, and centralized vote tabulation locations used to support the administration of elections for public office, as well as related information and communications technology (including the technology used by or on behalf of election officials to produce and distribute voter guides to elections), including voter registration databases, voting machines, electronic mail and other communications systems (including electronic mail and other systems of vendors who have entered into contracts with election agencies to support the administration of elections, manage the election process, and report and display election results), and other systems used to manage the election process and to report and display election results on behalf of an election agency.

''(4) The term 'State' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by amending the item relating to section 901 to read as follows:

''Sec. 901. Definitions.''.

Subtitle B—Risk-Limiting Audits

SEC. 121. RISK-LIMITING AUDITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.— Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

''SEC. 303A. RISK-LIMITING AUDITS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) RISK-LIMITING AUDIT.—The term 'risk-limiting audit' means, with respect to any election contest, a post-election process that—

''(A) has a probability of at least 95 percent of correcting the reported outcome if the reported outcome is not the correct outcome;

''(B) will not change the outcome if the reported outcome is the correct outcome; and

''(C) involves a manual adjudication of voter intent from some or all of the ballots validly cast in the election contest.

''(2) REPORTED OUTCOME; CORRECT OUTCOME; OUTCOME.—

''(A) REPORTED OUTCOME.—The term 'reported outcome' means the outcome of an election contest which is determined according to the canvass and which will become the official, certified outcome unless it is revised by an audit, recount, or other legal process.

''(B) CORRECT OUTCOME.—The term 'correct outcome' means the outcome that would be determined by a manual adjudication of voter intent for all votes validly cast in the election contest.

''(C) OUTCOME.—The term 'outcome' means the winner or set of winners of an election contest.

''(3) MANUAL ADJUDICATION OF VOTER INTENT.—The term 'manual adjudication of voter intent' means direct inspection and determination by humans, without assistance from electronic or mechanical tabulation devices, of the ballot choices marked by voters on each voter-verified paper record.

''(4) BALLOT MANIFEST.—The term 'ballot manifest' means a record maintained by each jurisdiction that—

''(A) is created without reliance on any part of the voting system used to tabulate votes;

''(B) functions as a sampling frame for conducting a risk-limiting audit; and

''(C) accounts for all ballots validly cast regardless of how they were tabulated and includes a precise description of the manner in which the ballots are physically stored, including the total number of physical groups of ballots, the numbering system for each group, a unique label for each group, and the number of ballots in each such group.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) AUDITS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Each State and jurisdiction shall administer risk-limiting audits of the results of all election contests for Federal office held in the State in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (2).

''(ii) EXCEPTION.—Clause (i) shall not apply to any election contest for which the State or jurisdiction conducts a full recount through a manual adjudication of voter intent.

''(B) FULL MANUAL TABULATION.—If a risk-limiting audit conducted under subparagraph (A) corrects the reported outcome of an election contest, the State or jurisdiction shall use the results of the manual adjudication of voter intent conducted as part of the risk-limiting audit as the official results of the election contest.

''(2) AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) RULES AND PROCEDURES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, the chief State election official of the State shall establish rules and procedures for conducting risk-limiting audits.

''(ii) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The rules and procedures established under clause (i) shall include the following:

''(I) Rules and procedures for ensuring the security of ballots and documenting that prescribed procedures were followed.

''(II) Rules and procedures for ensuring the accuracy of ballot manifests produced by jurisdictions.

''(III) Rules and procedures for governing the format of ballot manifests and other data involved in risk-limiting audits.

''(IV) Methods to ensure that any cast vote records used in a risk-limiting audit are those used by the voting system to tally the results of the election contest sent to the chief State election official of the State and made public.

''(V) Rules and procedures for the random selection of ballots to be inspected manually during each audit.

''(VI) Rules and procedures for the calculations and other methods to be used in the audit and to determine whether and when the audit of each election contest is complete.

''(VII) Rules and procedures for testing any software used to conduct risk-limiting audits.

''(B) PUBLIC REPORT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—After the completion of the risk-limiting audit and at least 5 days before the election contest is certified, the State shall publish a report on the results of the audit, together with such information as necessary to confirm that the audit was conducted properly.

''(ii) FORMAT OF DATA.—All data published with the report under clause (i) shall be published in machine-readable, open data formats.

''(iii) PROTECTION OF ANONYMITY OF VOTES.—Information and data published by the State under this subparagraph shall not compromise the anonymity of votes.

''(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with the requirements of this section for the first regularly scheduled election for Federal office held more than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Securing America's Federal Elections Act and for each subsequent election for Federal office.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO ENFORCEMENT.—Section 401 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21111) is amended by striking ''sections 301, 302, and 303'' and inserting ''subtitle A of title III''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following new item:

''Sec. 303A. Risk-limiting audits.''.

SEC. 122. FUNDING FOR CONDUCTING POST-ELECTION RISK-LIMITING AUDITS.

(a) PAYMENTS TO STATES.— Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21001 et seq.), as amended by section 111(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART 8—FUNDING FOR POST-ELECTION RISK-LIMITING AUDITS

''SEC. 298. PAYMENTS FOR POST-ELECTION RISK-LIMITING AUDITS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall pay to States the amount of eligible post-election audit costs.

''(b) ELIGIBLE POST-ELECTION AUDIT COSTS.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible post-election audit costs' means, with respect to any State, costs paid or incurred by the State or local government within the State for—

''(1) the conduct of any risk-limiting audit (as defined in section 303A) with respect to an election for Federal office occurring after the date of the enactment of this part; and

''(2) any equipment, software, or services necessary for the conduct of any such risk-limiting audit.

''(c) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) RULES AND PROCEDURES.—The Commission shall establish rules and procedures for submission of eligible post-election audit costs for payments under this section.

''(2) INSUFFICIENT FUNDS.—In any case in which the amounts appropriated under subsection (d) are insufficient to pay all eligible post-election audit costs submitted by States with respect to any Federal election, the amount of such costs paid under subsection (a) to any State shall be equal to the amount that bears the same ratio to the amount which would be paid to such State (determined without regard to this paragraph) as—

''(A) the number of individuals who voted in such Federal election in such State; bears to

''(B) the total number of individuals who voted in such Federal election in all States submitting a claim for eligible post-election audit costs.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as are necessary to carry out this part.

''(2) AVAILABILITY.—Any amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain available without fiscal year limitation until expended.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act, as amended by section 111(b), is further amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subtitle D of title II the following:

''PART 8—FUNDING FOR POST-ELECTION RISK-LIMITING AUDITS

''Sec. 298. Payments for post-election risk-limiting audits.

SEC. 123. GAO ANALYSIS OF EFFECTS OF AUDITS.

(a) ANALYSIS.—Not later than 6 months after the first elections for Federal office is held for which States must conduct risk-limiting audits under section 303A of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (as added by section 121), the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an analysis of the extent to which such audits have improved the administration of such elections and the security of election infrastructure in the States receiving such grants.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report on the analysis conducted under subsection (a) to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

TITLE II—PROMOTING CYBERSECURITY THROUGH IMPROVEMENTS IN ELECTION ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 201. VOTING SYSTEM CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) BALLOT TABULATING DEVICES.— Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 104 and section 105, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9) BALLOT TABULATING METHODS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The voting system tabulates ballots by hand or through the use of an optical scanning device that meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).

''(B) REQUIREMENTS FOR OPTICAL SCANNING DEVICES.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the requirements of this subparagraph are as follows:

''(i) The device is designed and built in a manner in which it is mechanically impossible for the device to add or change the vote selections on a printed or marked ballot.

''(ii) The device is capable of exporting its data (including vote tally data sets and cast vote records) in a machine-readable, open data standard format required by the Commission, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

''(iii) The device consists of hardware that demonstrably conforms to a hardware component manifest describing point-of-origin information (including upstream hardware supply chain information for each component) that—

''(I) has been provided to the Commission, the Director of Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security, and the chief State election official for each State in which the device is used; and

''(II) may be shared by any entity to whom it has been provided under subclause (I) with independent experts for cybersecurity analysis.

''(iv) The device utilizes technology that prevents the operation of the device if any hardware components do not meet the requirements of clause (iii).

''(v) The device operates using software for which the source code, system build tools, and compilation parameters—

''(I) have been provided to the Commission, the Director of Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security, and the chief State election official for each State in which the device is used; and

''(II) may be shared by any entity to whom it has been provided under subclause (I) with independent experts for cybersecurity analysis.

''(vi) The device utilizes technology that prevents the running of software on the device that does not meet the requirements of clause (v).

''(vii) The device utilizes technology that enables election officials, cybersecurity researchers, and voters to verify that the software running on the device—

''(I) was built from a specific, untampered version of the code that is described in clause (v); and

''(II) uses the system build tools and compilation parameters that are described in clause (v).

''(viii) The device contains such other security requirements as the Director of Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security requires.

''(C) WAIVER.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Director of Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, may waive one or more of the requirements of subparagraph (B) (other than the requirement of clause (i) thereof) with respect to any device for a period of not to exceed 2 years.

''(ii) PUBLICATION.—Information relating to any waiver granted under clause (i) shall be made publicly available on the Internet.

''(D) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with the requirements of this paragraph for the regularly scheduled election for Federal office in November 2024, and for each subsequent election for Federal office.''.

(b) OTHER CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 301(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 104, section 105, and subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(10) PROHIBITION OF USE OF WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS DEVICES IN SYSTEMS OR DEVICES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No system or device upon which ballot marking devices or optical scanners are configured, upon which ballots are marked by voters (except as necessary for individuals with disabilities to use ballot marking devices that meet the accessibility requirements of paragraph (3)), or upon which votes are cast, tabulated, or aggregated shall contain, use, or be accessible by any wireless, power-line, or concealed communication device.

''(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with the requirements of this paragraph for the regularly scheduled election for Federal office in November 2020, and for each subsequent election for Federal office.

''(11) PROHIBITING CONNECTION OF SYSTEM TO THE INTERNET.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No system or device upon which ballot marking devices or optical scanners are configured, upon which ballots are marked by voters, or upon which votes are cast, tabulated, or aggregated shall be connected to the Internet or any non-local computer system via telephone or other communication network at any time.

''(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with the requirements of this paragraph for the regularly scheduled election for Federal office in November 2020, and for each subsequent election for Federal office.''.

(c) SPECIAL CYBERSECURITY RULES FOR CERTAIN BALLOT MARKING DEVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 104, section 105, and subsections (a) and (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(12) BALLOT MARKING DEVICES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a voting system that uses a ballot marking device, the ballot marking device shall be a device that—

''(i) is not capable of tabulating votes;

''(ii) except in the case of a ballot marking device used exclusively to comply with the requirements of paragraph (3), is certified in accordance with section 232 as meeting the requirements of subparagraph (B); and

''(iii) meets the requirements of clauses (iii) through (viii) of section 301(a)(9)(B).

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A ballot marking device meets the requirements of this subparagraph if, during a double-masked test conducted by a qualified independent user experience research laboratory (as defined in section 232(b)(4)) of a simulated election scenario which meets the requirements of clause (ii), there is less than a 5 percent chance that an ordinary voter using the device would not detect and report any difference between the vote selection printed on the ballot by the ballot marking device and the vote selection indicated by the voter.

''(ii) SIMULATED ELECTION SCENARIO.—A simulated election scenario meets the requirements of this clause if it is conducted with—

''(I) a pool of subjects that are—

''(aa) diverse in age, gender, education, and physical limitations; and

''(bb) representative of the communities in which the voting system will be used; and

''(II) ballots that are representative of ballots ordinarily used in the communities in which the voting system will be used.

''(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with the requirements of this paragraph for the regularly scheduled election for Federal office in November 2022, and for each subsequent election for Federal office.''.

(2) PROCEDURE FOR TESTING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20971 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 232. TESTING AND CERTIFICATION OF BALLOT MARKING DEVICES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Any State or jurisdiction which intends to use a ballot marking device (other than a ballot marking device used exclusively to comply with the requirements of section 301(a)(3)) in an election for Federal office may submit an application to the Commission for testing and certification under this section.

''(b) APPLICATION, ASSIGNMENT, AND TESTING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An application under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 18 months before the date of the election for Federal office in which the ballot marking device is intended to be used and shall contain such information as the Commission requires.

''(2) ASSIGNMENT.—Upon receipt of an application for testing under this section, the Commission shall contract with a qualified independent user experience research laboratory for the testing of whether the ballot marking device intended to be used by the State or jurisdiction meets the requirements of section 301(a)(12)(B).

''(3) REQUIREMENTS FOR TESTING.—Any contract described in paragraph (2) shall require the qualified independent user experience research laboratory to—

''(A) not later than 30 days before testing begins, submit to the Commission for approval the protocol for the simulated election scenario used for testing the ballot marking device;

''(B) use only protocols approved by the Commission in conducting such testing; and

''(C) submit to the Commission a report on the results of the testing.

''(4) QUALIFIED INDEPENDENT USER EXPERIENCE RESEARCH LABORATORY.—For purposes of this section:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified independent user experience research laboratory' means a laboratory accredited under this subsection by the Election Assistance Commission in accordance with standards determined by the Commission, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the Secretary of Homeland Security.

''(B) CRITERIA.—A laboratory shall not be accredited under this subsection unless such laboratory demonstrates that—

''(i) no employee of, or individual with an ownership in, such laboratory has, or has had during the 5 preceding years, any financial relationship with a manufacturer of voting systems; and

''(ii) any group of individuals conducting tests under this section collectively meet the following qualifications:

''(I) Experience designing and running user research studies and experiments using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

''(II) Experience with voting systems.

''(c) REVIEW BY INDEPENDENT BOARD.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall submit for approval to an independent review board established under paragraph (3) the following:

''(A) Any protocol submitted to the Commission under subsection (b)(3)(A).

''(B) Any report submitted to the Commission under subsection (b)(3)(C).

''(2) FINAL APPROVAL.—Not later than the date that is 12 months before the date of the election for Federal office in which a State or jurisdiction intends to use the ballot marking device, the independent review board shall report to the Commission on whether it has approved a report submitted under paragraph (1)(B).

''(3) INDEPENDENT REVIEW BOARD.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An independent review board established under this paragraph shall be composed of 5 independent scientists appointed by the Commission, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

''(B) QUALIFICATIONS.—The members of the independent review board—

''(i) shall have expertise and relevant peer-reviewed publications in the following fields: cognitive psychology, experimental design, statistics, and user experience research and testing; and

''(ii) may not have, or have had during the 5 preceding years, any financial relationship with a manufacturer of voting systems.

''(4) PUBLICATION.—The Commission shall make public—

''(A) any protocol approved under this subsection;

''(B) any report submitted under subsection (b)(3)(C); and

''(C) any determination made by an independent review board under paragraph (2).

''(d) CERTIFICATION.—If—

''(1) a ballot marking device is determined by the qualified independent user experience research laboratory to meet the requirements of section 301(a)(12); and

''(2) the report submitted under subsection (b)(3)(C) is approved by a majority of the members of the independent review board under subsection (d)(2),

then the Commission shall certify the ballot marking device.

''(e) PROHIBITION ON FEES.—The Commission may not charge any fee to a State or jurisdiction, a developer or manufacturer of a ballot marking device, or any other person in connection with testing and certification under this section.''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) Section 202(2) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20922(2)) is amended by inserting ''and ballot marking devices'' after ''hardware and software'').

(ii) The heading for subtitle B of title II of such Act is amended by inserting at the end ''**; Ballot Marking Devices**''.

(iii) The table of contents of such Act is amended—

(I) by inserting ''; Ballot Marking Devices'' at the end of the item relating to subtitle B of title II; and

(II) by inserting after the item related to section 231 the following:

''Sec. 232. Testing and certification of ballot marking devices.''.

SEC. 202. TESTING OF EXISTING VOTING SYSTEMS TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH ELECTION CYBERSECURITY GUIDELINES AND OTHER GUIDELINES.

(a) REQUIRING TESTING OF EXISTING VOTING SYSTEMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 231(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20971(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) TESTING TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH GUIDELINES.—

''(A) TESTING.—Not later than 9 months before the date of each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the Commission shall provide for the testing by accredited laboratories under this section of the voting system hardware and software which was certified for use in the most recent such election, on the basis of the most recent voting system guidelines applicable to such hardware or software (including election cybersecurity guidelines) issued under this Act.

''(B) DECERTIFICATION OF HARDWARE OR SOFTWARE FAILING TO MEET GUIDELINES.—If, on the basis of the testing described in subparagraph (A), the Commission determines that any voting system hardware or software does not meet the most recent guidelines applicable to such hardware or software issued under this Act, the Commission shall decertify such hardware or software.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2020 and each succeeding regularly scheduled general election for Federal office.

(b) ISSUANCE OF CYBERSECURITY GUIDELINES BY TECHNICAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.—Section 221(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20961(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) ELECTION CYBERSECURITY GUIDELINES.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of the Securing America's Federal Elections Act, the Development Committee shall issue election cybersecurity guidelines, including standards and best practices for procuring, maintaining, testing, operating, and updating election systems to prevent and deter cybersecurity incidents.''.

SEC. 203. REQUIRING USE OF SOFTWARE AND HARDWARE FOR WHICH INFORMATION IS DISCLOSED BY MANUFACTURER.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by sections 104, 105, 201(a), 201(b), and 201(c), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(13) REQUIRING USE OF SOFTWARE AND HARDWARE FOR WHICH INFORMATION IS DISCLOSED BY MANUFACTURER.—

''(A) REQUIRING USE OF SOFTWARE FOR WHICH SOURCE CODE IS DISCLOSED BY MANUFACTURER.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the operation of voting systems in an election for Federal office, a State may only use software for which the manufacturer makes the source code (in the form in which will be used at the time of the election) publicly available online under a license that grants a worldwide, royalty-free, non-exclusive, perpetual, sub-licensable license to all intellectual property rights in such source code, except that the manufacturer may prohibit a person who obtains the software from using the software in a manner that is primarily intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation that is unrelated to carrying out legitimate research or cybersecurity activity.

''(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Clause (i) does not apply with respect to—

''(I) widely-used operating system software which is not specific to voting systems and for which the source code or baseline functionality is not altered; or

''(II) widely-used cybersecurity software which is not specific to voting systems and for which the source code or baseline functionality is not altered.

''(B) REQUIRING USE OF HARDWARE FOR WHICH INFORMATION IS DISCLOSED BY MANUFACTURER.—

''(i) REQUIRING DISCLOSURE OF HARDWARE.—A State may not use a voting system in an election for Federal office unless the manufacturer of the system publicly discloses online the identification of the hardware used to operate the system.

''(ii) ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR CUSTOM OR ALTERED HARDWARE.—To the extent that the hardware used to operate a voting system or any component thereof is not widely-used, or is widely-used but is altered, the State may not use the system in an election for Federal office unless—

''(I) the manufacturer of the system publicly discloses online the components of the hardware, the design of such components, and how such components are connected in the operation of the system; and

''(II) the manufacturer makes the design (in the form which will be used at the time of the election) publicly available online under a license that grants a worldwide, royalty-free, non-exclusive, perpetual, sub-licensable license to all intellectual property rights in the design of the hardware or the component, except that the manufacturer may prohibit a person who obtains the design from using the design in a manner that is primarily intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation that is unrelated to carrying out legitimate research or cybersecurity activity.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

SEC. 204. TREATMENT OF ELECTRONIC POLL BOOKS AS PART OF VOTING SYSTEMS.

(a) INCLUSION IN DEFINITION OF VOTING SYSTEM.—Section 301(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(b)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''this section'' and inserting ''this Act'';

(2) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (1);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) any electronic poll book used with respect to the election; and''.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 301 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) ELECTRONIC POLL BOOK DEFINED.—In this Act, the term 'electronic poll book' means the total combination of mechanical, electromechanical, or electronic equipment (including the software, firmware, and documentation required to program, control, and support the equipment) that is used—

''(1) to retain the list of registered voters at a polling location, or vote center, or other location at which voters cast votes in an election for Federal office; and

''(2) to identify registered voters who are eligible to vote in an election.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 301(e) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21081(e)), as amended by section 107 and as redesignated by subsection (b), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2) and (3)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR ELECTRONIC POLL BOOKS.—In the case of the requirements of subsection (c) (relating to electronic poll books), each State and jurisdiction shall be required to comply with such requirements on or after January 1, 2020.''.

SEC. 205. PRE-ELECTION REPORTS ON VOTING SYSTEM USAGE.

(a) REQUIRING STATES TO SUBMIT REPORTS.—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 301 the following new section:

''SEC. 301A. PRE-ELECTION REPORTS ON VOTING SYSTEM USAGE.

''(a) REQUIRING STATES TO SUBMIT REPORTS.—Not later than 120 days before the date of each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the chief State election official of a State shall submit a report to the Commission containing a detailed voting system usage plan for each jurisdiction in the State which will administer the election, including a detailed plan for the usage of electronic poll books and other equipment and components of such system.

''(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2020 and each succeeding regularly scheduled general election for Federal office.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 301 the following new item:

''Sec. 301A. Pre-election reports on voting system usage.''.

SEC. 206. STREAMLINING COLLECTION OF ELECTION INFORMATION.

Section 202 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20922) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Commission'' and inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) WAIVER OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—Subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to the collection of information for purposes of maintaining the clearinghouse described in paragraph (1) of subsection (a).''.

TITLE III—USE OF VOTING MACHINES MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 301. USE OF VOTING MACHINES MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES.

Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 104, section 105, section 201(a), 201(b), 201(c), and section 203(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(14) VOTING MACHINE REQUIREMENTS.—By not later than the date of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office occurring in November 2022, each State shall seek to ensure that any voting machine used in such election and in any subsequent election for Federal office is manufactured in the United States.''.

TITLE IV—SEVERABILITY

SEC. 401. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 2722.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2722. The SAFE Act is critical legislation to invest in and upgrade the machinery of American democracy. It will help us combat the national emergency facing our country. It will improve the resilience of election infrastructure used in Federal elections.

Aging equipment, under-resourced jurisdictions, and interference by foreign entities or non-state actors leaves the system vulnerable to exploitation that can undermine confidence in election outcomes. Ineffective and vulnerable equipment can also discourage participation in Federal elections.

It comes to the floor after the Committee on House Administration held three hearings in the first 6 months of this year that addressed the integrity of our elections. In February the committee held the ''For the People: Our American Democracy'' hearing, where the integrity of our democracy—including critical steps to improve the security and reliability of our election infrastructure—was addressed.

On May 8 the committee held an election security hearing where we heard testimony about the urgent need to upgrade our election infrastructure and the lack of ongoing investment in the wake of new threats.

And on May 21 the committee held an oversight hearing of the Election Assistance Commission, an agency that plays a central role in supporting election administration in this country.

I will remind this House that earlier this year, the Director of National Intelligence published a report stating that our adversaries and strategic competitors ''probably already are looking to the 2020 U.S. elections as an opportunity to advance their interests.

''They may also use cyber means to 'directly manipulate or disrupt elections systems—such as by tampering with voter registration or disrupting the vote tallying process—either to alter data or to call into question our voting process.'''

Last year he said that ''the warning lights are blinking red''. . . .

Special Counsel Robert Mueller noted in Volume One of his report that the Russian military ''targeted individuals and entities involved in the administration of the elections. Victims included U.S. State and local entities, such as State boards of elections, secretaries of State, and county governments, as well as individuals who worked for those entities. The GRU also targeted private technology firms responsible for manufacturing and administering election-related software and hardware, such as voter registration software and electronic polling stations.''

In April, FBI Director Christopher Wray called Russia's interference efforts a ''significant counterintelligence threat,'' and said that the 2018 midterms were a ''dress rehearsal for the big show'' of the 2020 Presidential elections.

Early voters in Georgia in 2018 saw machines deleting votes and switching them to other candidates. The machines where voters saw this occur were purchased in 2002. During early voting in Texas in 2018 some electronic voting machines deleted votes and switched them between candidates. The machines were used in 78 of 254 Texas counties.

In June of 2016 the Russian GRU compromised the computer network of the Illinois State Board of Elections by exploiting a vulnerability in their website. They gained access to a database with information on millions of Illinois voters and extracted data on thousands before the activity was detected.

H.R. 2722 responds to this emergency that we find ourselves in as a nation. We ought to be doing everything we can to bolster the security and integrity of our elections from interference and hacking.

The bill's section 102 requires that States transition to voting systems that use individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots, which means a paper ballot marked by the voter by hand or through the use of a non-tabulating ballot marking device or system. Voter-verified paper ballots are the best way to ensure that a voter's ballot accurately reflects their choices and is counted as cast. Paper can be audited. In the last Presidential election, approximately 20 percent of registered voters cast their ballot on voting machines that do not have any kind of paper backup.

The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine concluded that paperless systems ''should be removed from service as soon as possible.''

In at least 40 States, elections are carried out using machines that are at least a decade old. And like any technology, they are susceptible to increasing failure with age. One witness at our election security hearing, Lawrence Norden of the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU Law School, explained that some State officials have ''had to turn to eBay to find critical components like dot-matrix printer ribbons, decades old storage devices, and analog modems.'' Aging systems also frequently rely on unsupported software like Windows XP and 2000, which may not receive regular security patches and are thus more vulnerable to the latest methods of cyberattack.

This bill addresses many other cybersecurity best practices besides paper-based systems.

The bill in section 111 authorizes a $600 million Election Assistance Commission grant program to assist States in securing election infrastructure. States may use the money to replace their aging equipment with voter-verified paper ballot voting systems, but also ongoing maintenance of election infrastructure, enhanced cybersecurity and operations of IT infrastructure, and enhanced cybersecurity of voter registration systems.

Originally, the bill, as introduced, would have authorized $1 billion for this initial round of surge funding; however, during the Committee on House Administration's markup, the committee approved an amendment in the nature of a substitute that authorized $600 million instead. Combined with the $380 million that Congress appropriated last year in election security grants, this funding reaches the $1 billion that experts have said is necessary to implement these necessary protections.

The bill also provides in section 111 $175 million in biennial maintenance funding. Cybersecurity threats will not dissipate, they will only evolve. State election officials have told us repeatedly they need more funding and a sustainable source of funding.

Section 103 of the SAFE Act fosters innovation for voters living with disabilities. It provides grant funding for the study, development, and testing of accessible paper ballot voting, verification, and casting mechanisms. It expressly requires States to ensure that individuals with disabilities and others are given an equivalent opportunity to vote, including with privacy and independence, in a manner that produces voter-verified paper ballots as for other voters.

The bill fosters accountability for election technology vendors. It would create a qualified election infrastructure vendor designation where the Election Assistance Commission, in coordination with the Department of Homeland Security, would craft criteria that vendors would follow to receive the qualified designation. This would include reporting any known or suspected cybersecurity incidents involving election infrastructure to both the EAC and DHS, as well as affected election agencies.

The bill in sections 201 and 203 also includes open-source provisions, requiring use of software and hardware for which information is disclosed by manufacturers. This will allow cybersecurity experts and the public to vet the security of election systems regardless of the technology used.

As amended in the committee, the bill in section 121 requires States to adopt risk-limiting audits. Risk-limiting audits are the gold standard of post-election audits. They involve hand counting a certain number of ballots using advanced statistical methods to determine with a high degree of confidence that the reported election outcome is accurate. The SAFE Act requires States to implement risk-limiting audits because they go hand in hand with paper ballots. We need audits to ensure that ballot marking devices or optical scanners were not hacked and that the reported results are accurate.

Second, as amended in committee, the bill in section 201 includes specific cybersecurity standards to apply to optical scanner voting systems and another set of standards to apply to ballot marking devices. These will apply equally to current and future technology. For example, H.R. 2722 prohibits the use of wireless communications devices and internet connectivity in voting systems upon which ballots are marked by voters or that otherwise mark and tabulate ballots.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2722 is an essential step forward in shoring up our election infrastructure and investing in secure elections. I ask the House to pass this legislation and bolster the trust and confidence in our system that all Americans expect and deserve. Every American—no matter what their choice in politics—should know that their vote will be counted as cast.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in the 2016 election, we saw a very real threat to our Nation when Russia interfered in our elections by using a misinformation campaign through social media and attacking voter registration databases. While this interference from Russia is unacceptable, I feel it is necessary to point out that there is no evidence that any voting machines were hacked in the 2016 or even in the 2018 elections.

However, this does not mean that there isn't a need for election and cybersecurity improvements for State election systems. On this point, I know my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle, including the distinguished chairperson of our Committee on House Administration, we all agree that no one—and I mean, no one—should interfere with our elections. Every Americans' vote should be counted and protected.

Last Congress $380 million were appropriated to States to upgrade their election security. Also, election infrastructure was designated as critical infrastructure in response to the U.S. Intelligence Community's reports that the Russian Government attacked.

□ 0930

This allowed the Department of Homeland Security to begin providing additional cybersecurity assistance to State and local election officials.

Work has been done to help States improve their election security, and more work must be done. This is why our committee Republicans, all of us on the House Administration Committee, introduced H.R. 3412, the Election Security Assistance Act, to assist States in their election security strengthening efforts.

This realistic legislation provides $380 million in Federal grants to States to update their aging and at-risk election infrastructure, while also requiring State and local officials to have some skin in the game. We require a 25 percent match to ensure that they understand they are getting the best equipment that is going to protect their voters' rights to have their votes counted and protected.

In addition, our bill is the only bill that creates the first ever Election Cyber Assistance Unit, aimed at connecting our State and local election officials with leading election administration and cybersecurity experts from across the country.

Our bill also empowers State officials by providing security clearances to our election officials to better facilitate the sharing of information and requiring the Department of Homeland Security to notify State election officials of cyberattacks and any foreign threats within the State.

It is common sense that if there is an attempt to hack a State election, the State election official should be notified, but they are currently not able to let a State know if it has been attacked. If DHS is the one that sees this attack from a foreign country, they can't notify State election officials because, in many cases, they don't have security clearance.

Our bill clears this up. Those State officials deserve the right to know who is trying to attack their elections in each State in this great Nation.

My good friend, Congresswoman TORRES, stated at the Rules Committee hearing on Monday night that she doesn't trust her State election officials in California to have security clearances. Personally, I don't feel that way, and I think other Members of Congress may agree with me.

State officials should know if there is a threat to their election system, and DHS should be the one telling them.

To sum up the Election Security Assistance Act, our solution provides much-needed election security improvements and reinforcements for local election officials, without overstepping the States' authority to determine and maintain their own elections.

Unfortunately, I can't say the same for the bill we are voting on today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a member of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the SAFE Act.

No matter what my colleagues conclude about the Mueller report, I think we can all agree it shows our elections are under foreign attack.

What would happen if a foreign government actually succeeded in changing the results of a Federal election?

All bad actors have to do is break through the defenses of even one—even one—of the over 10,000 election administration jurisdictions in our country.

As we all know, questionable results in just one county can derail an entire Presidential election and throw our country into a tailspin.

Election security is national security. Election machinery is the machinery of democracy.

The SAFE Act gives States what they need to upgrade and maintain safe and resilient election infrastructure.

In the House Administration Committee, we debated whether paper ballots are the safest way to go. It does seem ironic that our answer to cybersecurity, in fact, is old school, but we know what works.

As Oregon's Secretary of State Dennis Richardson said, ''You can't hack paper.'' We can recount and audit paper ballots with a certainty that we just don't have with machines.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to

the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, keeping our elections safe from cyberattacks and fraud is not and should not be a partisan priority.

H.R. 2722 has been rushed to the House floor without giving the Science, Space, and Technology Committee the opportunity to hold even a single hearing on the bill or the subject matter.

The problem with rushing this bill through Congress is that it will have a significant negative impact on NIST's ability to work with State and local governments to identify standards and best practices for election security.

Our priority in Congress should be to develop useful tools that empower States and local officials to ensure their elections are secure, accessible, and accurate.

In fact, our secretary of state in Indiana, Ms. Connie Lawson, has done a remarkable job leading the effort to add safeguards to our elections process, ensuring it is completed with integrity.

Given the opportunity, I believe that our committee could come to an agreement, in a bipartisan manner, to update NIST's election and security activities.

Congress should focus on legislation that provides much-needed improvements and reinforcements for local officials without overstepping the States' authority to maintain their elections.

Madam Speaker, because of the lack of following regular order, the committee has never been given the opportunity to ensure those issues are addressed.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a member of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the SAFE Act because Vladimir Putin conducted a sweeping and systematic campaign to disrupt and destabilize our Presidential election in 2016.

Some say we can't pass the SAFE Act to guarantee the security of our elections, that because of federalism, we should let the States work it out on their own.

But we are not the fragmented, divided States of America. We are the United States of America, and that is the way we were designed.

Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution, Madam Speaker, says Congress ''shall guarantee to every State in this union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion.''

What does it mean by ''republican form of government''? It doesn't mean a Republican Party form of government. It means a representative form of government. That means we must have a system that accurately translates the popular will into the election of a Congress.

This is a massive technical challenge in a country of hundreds of millions of people, 50 States, and thousands of jurisdictions, especially in the computer age. We need voter-certified, paper-ballot voting systems in every State in the Union. We need risk-reducing audits. We need real accountability for election vendors. We need voting machines manufactured in the United States, where our democracy is created, too.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I certainly hope my good friend from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) changes his mind and wants more Republican governments, but I don't think that is going to happen, even today, on the House floor.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Illinois for yielding.

I rise today as a Member from the great State of Florida. We all recall the 2000 Presidential election. What happened in Palm Beach County turned into a national punch line, ''the hanging chad.''

The Democratic bill before us today would mandate paper ballots and make our elections a technology-free zone. I, too, am worried about malign actors like Russia and China when it comes to our cybersecurity network. However, let us not throw out the baby with the bath water.

Many of my colleagues submitted commonsense amendments that would improve the bill, amendments addressing ballot harvesting and ensuring State matching funds. Yet, Democrats, under another closed rule, are forcing passage on a one-sided bill with no prospect in the Senate and no chance of being signed by the President.

Madam Speaker, I sincerely hope we address these issues in a bipartisan manner that reflects well on this body and the American people.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), a new Member of Congress.

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2722. Our elections are the foundation of our democracy, but they face increasing threats.

There is bipartisan agreement that we must do more to guard against these threats to our most fundamental democratic process. Our elections must allow us to truly hear the voices of every American voter.

My home State of Georgia has recently taken steps to safeguard its voting processes from cybersecurity threats, and this bill would provide necessary funding to support these efforts in Georgia and across our country.

This legislation will strengthen the partnership of the Election Assistance Commission, the Department of Homeland Security, and our State election officials.

Together, we must modernize our election infrastructure and ensure the security of our democracy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this critical measure.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ), another good friend of mine from the great State of Florida.

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, election security is especially significant to Floridians. Two Florida counties were breached in the 2016 election as a result of Russian spear phishing targeting county election officials.

As Members of Congress, obviously, we are not here to relitigate 2016 but to work toward bipartisan solutions to defend the 2020 elections from foreign intrusion.

I am disappointed that the majority is rushing this partisan proposal to the floor this week and has bypassed Republicans who have shown interest in working on election security. Just yesterday, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee held a hearing on election vulnerabilities and potential solutions. That hearing occurred after—after—this proposal had been introduced and a day before it will receive a vote on the House floor.

This proposal throws $1.3 billion at the problem without careful consideration by the authorizing committees. This proposal also excludes bipartisan solutions, like the one I am drafting with Representative STEPHANIE MURPHY from Florida.

Our proposal, the ALERTS Act, would require Federal agencies to report to the Department of Homeland Security if an election intrusion is identified and require DHS to notify State and local officials of the breach, unless the information is deemed to compromise intelligence sources.

Federal, State, and local officials have a duty to notify voters in Florida and voters across the country impacted by election attacks, a duty that was not upheld by the FBI in the wake of the 2016 elections and a duty that the ALERTS Act, this bipartisan proposal, would require.

At yesterday's Science, Space, and Technology Committee hearing, the secretary of Oklahoma's State Election Board recommended a State and local reporting requirement like the ALERTS Act.

So, testimony and a recommendation—both—were not considered by the authors of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I request that my colleagues oppose this bill, and immediately following this vote, I ask Democrats and Republicans to come together to work toward a bipartisan election security package.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2722, the SAFE Act.

Among the many disturbing revelations in the Mueller report, we learned that Russian intelligence officers successfully infiltrated the computer network in my home State at the Illinois

State Board of Elections. They accessed the personal information of millions of voters and stole thousands of voter records before being detected.

As far as we know, this breach has not affected the results of any subsequent elections, but it desperately underscores the need for much greater election security moving forward.

Now, officials in my home State and others around the country have worked tirelessly to secure these vulnerabilities over the past 3 years, but without the help of the Federal Government, they can only do so much. It is past time that we step up and give States the resources they need to ensure our elections and our voters are safe in the upcoming election.

Our democratic system depends on the consent of the governed. That is far too fragile to take lightly. And our constituents' trust and the independence of our democracy depend on it.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote for the SAFE Act on the floor today.

□ 0945

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, look, I respect and agree with my good friend from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN), my colleague. We want to protect our home State. We saw intrusion into our Illinois State Board of Elections voter registration system. It is something that had to be addressed.

I am happy to report, after talking with the State Board of Election officials, they have been given resources already appropriated by a Republican majority Congress, Republicans in the Senate, and President Trump last year to effectively ensure that that information is not vulnerable again.

What we are debating here today is a bill that will put more unfunded and underfunded mandates on States like Illinois. That is not what our local election officials in my district asked for.

The reason Illinois was able to protect itself and ensure that it didn't happen again in the extremely high, historic turnout of the 2018 midterm election was because they were given the flexibility to spend the HAVA funds that Republicans in Congress ensured that the State of Illinois had, leading to a Democratic majority in the midterm elections.

No one is questioning the safety and security of our midterm elections. No one has told me that any foreign entity hacked into any institution, voter registration system, or machines. Maybe DHS hasn't called me, even though I think I have a security clearance, so they could.

But they can't call our local election officials, under this bill, if it happens again because they don't have security clearance. That is why our bill is a better choice.

The one that is on the floor today does not address the concerns of States like mine, and it certainly does not address the concerns of States like California.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, as a Member from California, it is hard for me to believe that the majority could possibly propose an election security bill that doesn't address the major vulnerabilities related to ballot harvesting.

Ballot harvesting is where paid campaign operatives collect up to hundreds or even thousands of ballots and drop them off at polling places or an election office. The practice is ripe for fraud and a recipe for disaster. Any serious effort to secure elections would address it.

Let's be clear: We want to give people who need it an opportunity to vote by mail, and we want to look for ways to make it easier for disabled or elderly Americans to participate in our elections. My concern is inserting campaign operatives into the ballot-handling process without any safeguards.

In California, paid campaign staff can collect hundreds of ballots without having to disclose who they are working for. When they hand over those ballots to election officials, there is no requirement to even provide their name.

Some of my friends across the aisle claim that the real problem is bad actors committing fraud. But it is the very practice of ballot harvesting being the problem. The reality is this process is an open invitation for fraud. That is why most States have banned the practice.

Ignoring the most notable threat to election security is unacceptable in a so-called election security bill.

Madam Speaker, American voters deserve better. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill until we can get serious about real threats to our democracy.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, in 2016, Russian hackers tried to break into Virginia's election system. In response to this information, Virginia took active steps to secure the integrity of our elections. We sped up our transition to paper ballots to ensure that our elections were secure and the results could be verified and audited.

But it is not just about any one election or just about any one adversary. Passing the SAFE Act is about securing our elections from all threats, foreign or otherwise. These threats are coming for us in every State, red or blue, rural or urban.

In 2016, State election websites in Illinois and Arizona were hacked by intruders that installed malware and downloaded sensitive voter information.

In 2018, electronic voting machines in Georgia and Texas deleted votes for certain candidates or switched votes from one candidate to another.

In Johnson County, Indiana, e-poll books failed in 2018, halting voting entirely for 4 hours, with no extension of polling hours.

It is clear that Congress must take action. Passage of the SAFE Act will secure our elections by updating our election infrastructure, speeding up the transition to paper ballots, and making necessary investments in cybersecurity.

Every Member of Congress took an oath to protect this Nation from threats foreign and domestic, and I urge my colleagues to honor that oath. Let's protect our democracy while we still have one.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), my fellow House Administration Committee Republican and one of my good friends here in Congress.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from Illinois, an exceptional baseball player, as well, for yielding this time.

Look, this is something I am very passionate about, and I am a bit surprised that one of my colleagues from Georgia would speak against this bill or even support this bill.

Let's be frank. Yes, the Russians are bad. They are very bad. They seek to do harm to America, and they have been attempting to influence our elections for many years.

Yes, we need to be concerned about election security. But if you want to secure our election system, this is the exact opposite of what we should be doing.

The State of Georgia has recognized this. Just this year, our State legislature overwhelmingly passed a bill to spend $150 million to upgrade our electronic voting machines so that they will produce a verifiable ballot that represents the way the person voted at the machine.

This is the direction we should be going, not to eliminate electronic ballots, not eliminate the efficiency that you get when you can walk in.

The verifiable aspect of it, a voter is given a card, after it is verified who the voter is. When a voter walks into a voting precinct, they fill out the paperwork and show their ID, and they are given a card that identifies that they have been certified. They insert that card and vote electronically, and then it will produce a printed receipt that they can verify that this is the way they voted. That receipt goes into a box that is used for a recount. That is a secure voting system that also embraces technology.

This bill would take us back decades. It is like when a student takes an SAT exam. They fill out the little bubbles, and then it runs through an electronic counter.

Look, even in our own hearing, the chief technologist at the Center for Democracy and Technology agreed when I brought this scenario forward, that we use the technology of DREs that then will print a verifiable ballot or a receipt. He said that those were absolutely safe.

Now, here is the problem. When we go to paper ballots, and everyone is going to fill out these paper ballots, we are talking long lines. We are talking about fewer people being able to get to the polls.

Madam Speaker, when we decide to vote on this bill, the last thing you are going to say from that rostrum is Members will cast their votes via electronic device. Why? It is efficient. We have a verifiable way of making sure that we can see the way we voted on this board up here or on a printed piece of paper we can get in the back. This is because of efficiency.

Madam Speaker, can you imagine if we had to do paper ballots or voice vote every one of the many amendments we have on these appropriations bills? We would never go home. We would be here 24 hours a day.

The American people expect us to live by the same laws that they have to live by. We should embrace technology and make it secure, not revert back decades to old technology.

Look, the reality is, this bill would subject us to the problem of people walking up with boxes full of preprinted ballots, all across the Nation, and they could drop those in at the last minute. We need to verify that people voting are who they are.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my colleague from the House Judiciary Committee and Homeland Security Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership.

There is not a time that I go home that they don't ask me how we will secure our elections. I am proudly supporting the Securing America's Federal Elections Act, the SAFE Act, and I am asking why our colleagues are fighting against Americans having the right to vote.

The SAFE Act authorizes a $600 million Election Assistance Commission grant program. It provides States with $175 million in biannual sustainment funding to help maintain election infrastructure.

Voting machines are required to be manufactured in the United States. States are mandated to conduct risk-limiting audits.

Another very important feature of the SAFE Act is that it requires accountability for election technology vendors and sets cybersecurity standards.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, recognizing what happened in 2016, I want to make sure that the Russian adversaries, the Russian military, are not our poll watchers, are not our secretaries of states, are not the vendors for our machines.

I want to make sure for minorities, every vote counts, and for every American, every vote counts.

I want to end voter suppression. The way we do this is to have safe elections.

I am very proud of this legislation, and I am proud of this Speaker, proud of the leadership, to say that we are going to be first on the line to tell America we believe in safe, equal, and fair elections.

I ask my friends to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2722, the "Securing America's Federal Elections Act" or SAFE Act.

I strongly support this legislation because the linchpin of representative democracy is public confidence in the political system, regime, and community.

That confidence in turn rests upon the extent to which the public has faith that the system employed to select its leaders accurately reflects its preferences.

At bottom, this means that all citizens casting a vote have a fundamental right and reasonable expectation that their votes count and are counted.

This concern is particularly salient because of the unprecedented interference by a hostile foreign power to secure victory for its preferred candidate in the 2016 presidential election and the determination of that hostile power to repeat its success in future American elections.

That is why it is necessary to pass H.R. 2722, the SAFE Act, so comprehensive election security reform measures can be implemented.

Specifically, the SAFE Act authorizes a $600 million Election Assistance Commission (EAC) grant program to assist in securing election infrastructure and a $5 million grant program to study and report on accessible paper ballot voting systems.

The bill provides grants to State and local election officials to replace aging voting machines with voter-verified paper ballot voting systems and grants to support hiring IT staff, cybersecurity training, security and risk vulnerability assessments, and other activities to secure election infrastructure.

The bill also provides states with $175 million in biannual sustainment funding to help maintain election infrastructure and, to ensure States can maintain security gains, provides each State with no less than $1 per voter who participated in the most recent election to maintain election security.

Under the legislation, voting machines are required to be manufactured in the United States and states are mandated to conduct risk-limiting audits, a critical tool to ensuring the integrity of elections.

These audits, which involve hand counting a certain number of ballots and using statistical methods to determine the accuracy of the original vote tally, are effective at detecting any incorrect election outcomes, whether caused by a cyberattack or something more mundane like a programming error.

The SAFE Act also directs the National Science Foundation to administer a $5 million grant program to study and report on accessible paper ballot verification mechanisms, including for individuals with disabilities, voters with difficulties in literacy, and voters whose primary language is not English.

Madam Speaker, another salutary feature of the SAFE Act is that it requires accountability for election technology vendors and sets cybersecurity standards and prohibits wireless and internet connectivity on systems that count ballots or upon which voters mark their ballots or systems are configured.

The SAFE Act also limits state expenditures on goods and services with grant monies provided under this Act to purchases from "qualified election infrastructure vendors."

The EAC, in coordination with DHS, establishes the criteria for achieving the status of "qualified election infrastructure vendor," which includes maintaining IT infrastructure in a manner consistent with the best practices provided by the EAC and agreeing to report any known or suspected security incidents involving election infrastructure.

Madam Speaker, there is compelling reason for the Congress to pass the SAFE Act by overwhelming margins in the House and Senate because to date the President and his Administration has shown little interest or inclination in taking effective action to deter and prevent interference by foreign powers in American elections.

Let us remember that the Intelligence Community Assessment ("ICA") of January 2017 assessed that Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. presidential election in which Russia's goals were to undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process, denigrate Democratic presidential candidate and implacable foe of Vladimir Putin, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, facilitate the election of Vladimir Putin's preferred candidate, Donald J. Trump.

Russia's interference in the election processes of democratic countries is not new but a continuation of the "Translator Project," an ongoing information warfare effort launched by Vladimir Putin in 2014 to use social media to manipulate public opinion and voters in western democracies.

Instead of supporting the unanimous assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community, the President attacked and sought to discredit and undermine the agencies and officials responsible for detecting and assessing Russian interference in the 2016 presidential election as well as those responsible for investigating and bringing to justice the conspirators who committed crimes against the United States our law enforcement.

And to add shame to insult and injury, at a meeting in Helsinki, Finland, rather than embracing the conclusions of the U.S. Intelligence Community, the President of the United States sided with Russian President Vladimir Putin in heaping scorn on the IC's assessment regarding Russian interference and called the U.S. Justice Department investigation into Russia's interference led by Special Counsel Robert Mueller "the greatest political witch hunt in history."

As the Mueller Report concluded, "The Russian government interfered in the 2016 presidential election in sweeping and systematic fashion."

In his only public remarks made since he was appointed Special Counsel, Robert Mueller reiterated at his farewell press conference held at the Department of Justice on May 29, 2017, the "central allegation of our indictments—that there were multiple, systematic efforts to interfere in our election" and that "allegation deserves the attention of every American."

Madam Speaker, American elections are to be decided by American voters free from foreign interference or sabotage, and that is why I support and urge all my colleague to vote to pass H.R. 2722, the "Securing America's Federal Elections Act" or SAFE Act.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), our Republican Policy Committee chair.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois, who is also a good friend, for the work he is doing on this, trying to bring some transparency to what is really going on here.

There are numerous reasons that mandating paper ballots isn't workable. They are susceptible to fraud; they are inefficient; and they are antiquated. I have seen, over the years, where the joke was ''one man, one vote,'' where it was ''one suitcase, one vote,'' with people bringing in paper ballots. We have seen a situation around the country now where that is still a bit of a problem.

For argument's sake, though, let's just say that paper ballots were foolproof and didn't come with their own set of problems or security concerns. I would still be concerned about the impact this bill would have on the majority of our States.

The mandate, in and of itself, is troubling. Twenty-nine out of our 50 States, plus the District of Columbia, would have to completely revamp their current election systems. This is both costly and time-intensive. There is nearly zero chance this can be adopted by the 2020 elections. The funding in the bill makes it clear that they realize this is not enough money to pay for this and, if it is not, it would be on a pro rata share. That means it is an unfunded mandate in violation of the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act.

It is easy for Federal lawmakers here in D.C. to gloss over the impact this Federal mandate would have, but the numbers don't lie. Only 18 States currently use a paper-only voting system, as the bill would mandate. Not to mention, this bill would also impact those 18 States, including my home State of Alabama.

Just a few days ago, the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology held a hearing on ''Election Security: Voting Technology Vulnerabilities,'' where Oklahoma's Secretary of the State Election Board Ziriax pointed out that this bill would require the use of recycled paper, which would be impossible to use with Oklahoma's current paper ballot system because the fibers found in recycled paper would cause repeated false readings.

While this may seem like a small or silly detail, this is just one example of the great impact this bill will have on all States, with many considerations that have yet to be vetted properly.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield the gentleman from Alabama an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PALMER. My colleagues on the other side continue to offer radical and unworkable policies to revamp our election system. Security risks do exist within our ballot boxes, but this bill is not the answer. This bill will just add to the existing risks, and I cannot support it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 12½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

□ 1000

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I very strongly support the SAFE Act. This is something that the Democrats have been focused on from day one. Day one meaning, the day after the 2016 election, when we saw the attacks that had come in against our democracy, we realized we were very exposed, and we needed to take action.

This is our chance to stand up against interference from foreign adversaries who are trying to hack in, sow discord, undermine our elections, and create havoc here in our own country. This is fundamental to protecting our democracy.

So we were on the case from the beginning. We convened the Election Security Task Force, which was led by ZOE LOFGREN, Bob Brady, BENNIE THOMPSON and others. They looked at all of the best practices that we need to put in place to make sure that our elections are strong and sturdy, and how do we fortify them, and they produced those recommendations.

We then took those recommendations and we put them into H.R. 1, the For the People Act, and we passed those on March 8 of this year, because we knew that this was a priority and that there is no time to waste.

Now, our Republican colleagues, unfortunately, did not want to go along with those broad, sweeping reforms that were contained in H.R. 1, including election security measures. So we made it easy for them, we said, ''Okay. We will start to break those things out. We will take the election security piece and we will bring it as a separate bill to the floor of the House.'' That is the SAFE Act. But we still, apparently, don't have their support.

This is their opportunity, this is their chance to stand up and show their patriotism, to defend our democracy, to protect our Constitution, to make sure that our elections are going to be safe.

So let's talk about what is in the SAFE Act, the Safeguarding America's Federal Elections Act.

We have significant resources that are going to be brought to bear to build up, to fortify the election security infrastructure of our country. This is what the public wants to see. They want to be ready for the 2020 election.

We have risk-limiting audits to make sure that States across the country are figuring out what is going on. Where do we make changes? How do we protect ourselves?

Paper ballots. We have had a lot of discussion about that today. Paper ballots are incredibly important in terms of boosting the confidence of the public that elections will be carried out in a way that you can verify the tally, people have the confidence that when they go to the ballot box, they put their ballot in there, that that vote will be counted.

We have no time to waste. We need to get this done now if we are going to be ready for the 2020 election.

Bob Mueller came along with his report and he said that the Russian interference was sweeping and systematic in 2016.

Every leader in our intelligence community has also echoed the fact that 2016 was a dress rehearsal. They are coming in 2020.

We need to be ready. We need to protect our elections. Let's support the SAFE Act.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

Madam Speaker, I agree with my good friend from Maryland. We as Republicans and Democrats need to do the patriotic thing and make sure that our elections are protected.

And I do agree that the Russians tried to interfere in our election process with misinformation campaigns. But I also want to ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if their concentration on election security happened the day after the 2016 election, why in the world didn't the administration who was in the White House at the time when the intelligence analysts were talking about how other foreign entities, including Russia, were wanting to interfere in our elections, why didn't they do something about it?

Why are we here today?

Why didn't it happen before the 2016 election, when our intelligence analysts said nefarious activity was moving against the United States of America?

They did nothing. The Obama administration did nothing. They let it go.

Now we are here watching the new Democrat majority that was elected in 2018, after explosive turnout in our midterm elections, their first bill, H.R. 1, that every member of the Democratic majority cosponsored and supported, that is the solution?

The solution is to add millions of taxpayer dollars and then the first ever corporate dollars into their own congressional campaign accounts?

No one has ever said that is the solution to too much money in politics or

to election security. Not one time have I had a constituent say that to me.

Now, we have got to come together and do what is right.

We have yet to address any of the issues that were laid out in the Mueller report. This bill we are debating today does not address any of them. This is a discussion about what happened in 2016 without a discussion of what is needed in our States and local election authorities.

That is what is wrong with this bill, too. It is hypocrisy at its greatest.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, the chair of the House Administration Committee, Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN, of whom we are very proud in California. I thank her for leading us on this path of patriotism and respecting the oath of office we take.

Madam Speaker, it is just a joy to be having this opportunity to speak out for the sacred oath to vote, the sacred blessing, the right to vote as we leave to go on the Fourth of July break.

Madam Speaker, I thank the members of the House Administration Committee: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, whom we heard from yesterday; Mr. RASKIN; Mr. AGUILAR; Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, who presented to us earlier; and to all of you.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. SARBANES. He has been the face of the future. He has been speaking out against the misrepresentations that have happened, the propagandizing that has happened by foreign governments in our election.

Yes, we won the election. We won the election because the American people were sick and tired of what the Republicans were putting forth. We won the election in the most gerrymandered, voter suppressed political arena you could imagine, and yet the American people came forward.

One the biggest messages we had in the campaign was H.R. 1, to reduce the role of dark, special-interest money in politics, to stop the systemic intentional voter suppression by the Republicans across the country, to stop political gerrymandering on all sides.

Let's do it in a nonpartisan way. Let the chips fall where they may, and to do so in a way that we are taking a piece of it today to talk about protecting our electoral system.

In a short while, we will take up the Voting Rights Act that is also part of H.R. 1.

So this H.R. 1 was very supported by the Democrats, very publicized to the American people, and part of our For the People agenda: lower healthcare costs by lowering the cost of prescription drugs and protecting the preexisting conditions benefit; bigger paychecks by building the infrastructure of America in a green way; cleaner government by passing H.R. 1—one of the component parts of what we are coming together around today.

As we approach the Fourth of July, we must remember the oath that we take to support and defend the Constitution and to protect the American people, which demands that this House of Representatives take urgent action.

We must legislate, we must investigate, and we must litigate to protect our national security, defend our democracy for the people.

Special Counsel Robert Mueller's report revealed an all-out attack on our elections by the Russians, concluding that they ''interfered in the 2016 Presidential election in sweeping and systemic fashion.''

Top intelligence and security officials have made clear that these attacks continue. They are happening, and they are happening now.

This spring, FBI Director Chris Wray warned of a ''365-day-a-year threat'' from the Russians, explaining that their attacks in our elections were simply ''a dress rehearsal for the big show in 2020.''

This House has a patriotic duty to protect our democracy from these attacks. This is a matter of national security. That is why the Democrats first act in the majority was to advance, as I mentioned, H.R. 1, For the People Act, to secure our elections.

Today we are building on that progress with the Securing America's Federal Elections Act, which takes urgently needed action to further strengthen America's defenses.

This bill closes dangerous gaps in our election systems and brings our security into the 21st century.

I know that other Members have spoken about the provisions of the bill, but I just would really like to know from my Republican friends what is wrong with replacing outdated, vulnerable voting equipment? What is wrong with requiring paper ballot voting systems to ensure the integrity of our elections? What is wrong with enacting strong cybersecurity requirements for elections technology vendors and voting systems?

We must be relentless in the defense of our democracy, fighting on all fronts to keep America safe.

There is a reason why the Russians are interfering in our elections, and other countries may be too, but we can document with full confidence from the intelligence community that the Russians are. It is because they want to affect the outcome of the elections, so they can affect the policy.

I think it was really sad, I was sad to hear, and, hopefully, it will be retracted, that the President gave a green light to the Russians to do it again. Really? Really?

This week, we are advancing appropriations legislation that provides $600 million for election security grants to States, and increases funding for the Election Assistance Commission, which has been starved for funding for years, a couple of dollars for every person in our country to honor the vision of our Founders of a democracy where everyone who is eligible to vote can vote and everyone's vote is counted as cast.

Next month, we will advance further legislation to protect our national security and prevent foreign interference in our elections.

Madam Speaker, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON, for the great work that he has been doing with his task force and his committee and other members who are working with him as we go forward.

We are pleased that the administration has agreed to provide an all-Member briefing on election security that will happen in July, so we can get the facts. We have been trying to get the facts.

Some people around here may think that it is okay to just make policy without the facts. We are evidence-based, scientifically oriented, truth-and-knowledge based on how we go forward, and we look forward to that briefing.

We also look forward to July 17, when Special Counsel Robert Mueller will come forward and give testimony.

Our national security is being threatened, and the American people need answers.

This is not to be fearmongering. This is to be smart and to anticipate a known challenge that exists and to do something about it.

We can't just talk about the Mueller report and saying what it says about the Russian interference in our elections, unless we are ready to do something about it. Today we are, thanks to our distinguished chair, Chairwoman LOFGREN.

There is a need for bipartisan support for our critical commonsense action to secure our elections.

Unfortunately, Senator MCCONNELL, a self-described crepehanger, has vowed to kill our bills in the Senate, while the President openly declares that he sees no problem with foreign interference in our elections.

The GOP Senate and the White House are giving foreign countries the green light to attack our country, but the House will do our patriotic duty to protect America.

Madam Speaker, as we approach the Fourth of July holiday, I urge my colleagues to remember the oath we took and the democracy we defend, and to join me in a strong bipartisan vote to defend America's security.

This isn't about politics. It is about patriotism. As our Founders said at the beginning of the Constitution in its preamble, we do this for the people.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I agree with my distinguished colleague from California that we do need to have the ability for the Department of Homeland Security

and our intelligence officials to notify our State and local election officials if they see nefarious activity, but right now under the bill we are debating today, that would not be the case, because in many cases, DHS won't talk to local election officials or State election officials because they don't have security clearances.

Our bill, pushed by the Republicans on the House Administration Committee, would allow the communication to take place.

□ 1015

You know, we hear a lot of talk about patriotism coming up on the Fourth of July. I believe we are all patriots in this institution, but I believe, also, we have to govern together.

We were working on a bipartisan solution to election security, and all of the sudden, we were told no more negotiations. That is not how I thought this institution worked. I thought we could work together.

Well, I do want to respond to a couple of comments that my colleague from California made. She may have mentioned H.R. 1. H.R. 1 was the Democrats' attempt to address not only too much money in politics, they said; they also wanted to address election security.

Clearly, what H.R. 1 did was do nothing to affect the money that is coming into politics, and it is not doing enough to ensure that our elections are not impacted by foreign entities with nefarious intentions.

Our bill today that we hoped could have been debated but was voted down on a party-line vote in the House Administration Committee earlier this week, just a few days ago, we hoped we could have come up with that, that is a bipartisan solution that would have worked. What works, our last speaker said, was this. Clearly, that is not what works.

What works isn't voting for a bill like H.R. 1 that votes to put the first ever corporate money directly into every Member of Congress' campaign accounts. What works, clearly, is not taxpayer money to fix that problem when there are not enough corporate malfeasance funds. That is not what the American people wanted.

And what would have worked would have been the last administration, the Obama administration, listening to their intelligence agencies and doing something about nefarious activities before the 2016 election, not the day after, when Democrats decided to take this issue on.

And then all I ever hear is they are going to blame MITCH MCCONNELL. Well, I had no idea, before 2016, that the Obama administration ceded Presidential authority to the Senate majority leader. I had no idea that happened.

Everything is MITCH MCCONNELL's fault, right? He is the one who told the intelligence agencies to stand down. Are you kidding me?

And now we hear we should have done something. You are darn right we should have done something. You are darn right the Obama administration should have done something. You are darn right they should have done it when they first heard about it before the 2016 election, and now here we are to fix it.

And today's bill is clearly not a fix.

We have got some issues, and it is really interesting to see my colleagues from California come up and not want to address a practice like ballot harvesting that is illegal in the State of North Carolina, where a Republican who did it is likely to go to jail for it, but the same process is legal in the State of California—disastrous.

You want to talk about trying to determine the outcome of elections? We have put forth amendment after amendment to address ballot harvesting, with complete party-line votes against making sure the process that is illegal in North Carolina that a Republican operative will likely go to jail for is completely legal in States like California.

And you want to talk about determining the outcome of an election? Come on.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), my good friend.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Illinois for yielding this minute to me.

The distinguished Speaker talked about misinformation, and I agree. There is a lot of misinformation out there about elections and election security and a lot of that that goes on around here. Let's be factual here.

There has been zero solid evidence of voter suppression during the last election, which had the largest turnout in the history of this Nation. Our own committee held seven field hearings across the Nation, with zero solid evidence of voter suppression, but the only acts of voter suppression that they tried to bring up had to deal with purging voter rolls.

We actually had one hearing in Broward County. What is Broward County known for? Voter irregularities. Why? Many times, why? Because of paper ballots.

But yet this is the direction we are going in, and the distinguished Speaker said we are taking it into the 21st century. Show me how. How is this taking us into the 21st century? It is taking us back decades.

Look, if the Russians were actually physically invading our Nation with bombers and tanks, this bill would be the equivalent of giving our military pellet guns and paper airplanes to thwart the attack. This is taking us away from election security.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), a valued member of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I thank the chair of our committee for yielding me time this morning.

Madam Speaker, I rise this morning in strong support of H.R. 2722. It is past time that this Congress act boldly in response to the foreign interference that took place in our 2016 elections, and that is exactly what this bill does.

The gentleman from Ohio, the ranking member of the committee, I say to him it is disingenuous to point the finger at the Obama administration. That may or may not be accurate, but let us look forward.

This legislation provides $600 million in grants to State and local officials to secure election infrastructure and replace aging voting machines with voter-verified paper ballot voting systems; $175 million to States every 2 years to maintain elections infrastructure. It requires States to implement risk-limiting audits; it prohibits internet accessibility or connectivity for devices on which ballots are marked or tabulated; and it sets long-needed cybersecurity standards for vendors.

I ask my colleagues, let us look forward. Let us protect the right to vote. Let us protect the ballot of every American citizen.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I really respect my colleague from North Carolina, and I do want to correct him a little bit.

I am from Illinois, not Ohio. I would never mistake the gentleman from North Carolina as being from someplace like South Carolina. But the gentleman from North Carolina is a good friend.

Look, we all have disagreements on this House floor, but that doesn't mean we are disagreeable when it comes to having good friendships, and I thank him for his courtesies and thank him for his friendship.

The State of North Carolina is a great example of why we need to do better, why we ought to go back to the drawing board.

Let's take this bill off the floor. Let's get back to bipartisan negotiations, because in States like North Carolina and States like Illinois where local election officials have bought machines, they bought machines, maybe they have current optical scan machines, but the requirement in this bill, as the Oklahoma secretary of state said, the requirement of this bill to have recycled paper through ballots, many of the already purchased optical scan machines that would be required for every local and State election official to purchase after the year 2022 may not be able to read the ballots on recycled paper. So you are going to have to reinvest hard-earned tax dollars where many local communities in our great States have already invested in updating their election security with the most secure election equipment that they felt was going to protect them.

Washington should not be telling our local officials what to buy, especially when there are provisions in this bill that make equipment that would fit

those guidelines illegal to use or are inoperable even if they have purchased it. We have got to do better.

We all want to protect this great Nation. We all want free and fair elections so that every vote is counted and protected. Let's do it together. Let's do it right.

Let's make sure we address some DHS concerns. Let's put a cybersecurity assistance unit together like we have tried to do.

Let's outlaw ballot harvesting, because I know we have got bipartisan support in working together on that issue, especially with my good friend from North Carolina, Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I look forward to working with him on this. I know he and I both have concerns about this process, and I thank him for his willingness to sit down and talk.

We can do better. The bill on the floor today is not better. Let's do it. Let's work together. Pull this bill off the floor. We have got a lot of other issues to debate today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, we have no additional speakers, so if the gentleman would like to yield back, I will close.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The gentleman from Illinois has 2¾ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, well, clearly the timekeeper is wrong. I obviously thought I had more, but I am not able to debate that today. I will go ahead and close.

I do want to thank my colleague from California and also the members of the House Administration Committee, where we have an opportunity to come together, but this bill is just simply another partisan bill by the majority aimed at federally mandating election standards, like mandating that States exclusively use paper ballots, effectively banning any type of digital recording device that would have even a verified paper backup.

The committee even had one hearing on this issue with Commissioners from the EAC—remember, that agency that one speaker earlier said was getting a pittance of dollars, small amounts of dollars over the last few years. Only in this institution is $380 million given by the Republican majority here in the House in the last Congress and signed into law by the President of the United States, only in this institution is $380 million a little bit. A lot of that money still hasn't even been spent by our local election officials.

So here we are today debating a bill that is going to basically commit 1.3 billion taxpayer dollars toward so-called election security. We still have not addressed the problem that if DHS, if our same intelligence officials who told the Obama administration that there was foreign interference in our 2016 elections and the Obama administration did nothing about it—because, why? Because of MITCH MCCONNELL. It is MITCH MCCONNELL's fault.

Seriously, come on. Get real here. We are legislators. We are an equal branch of government. There is absolutely no way any administration cedes authority to anybody in this legislative institution.

The Obama administration failed to address the problem of election interference in 2016, and here we are today trying to make sure that we fix it. This attempt to fix it is a partisan attempt at ensuring that our elections authorities and our States and our local election officials have a top-down, federally mandated approach that is going to potentially cost them millions of taxpayer dollars that they have already inserted into their own budgets over the last few years.

Our local officials have told us they want flexibility. Cybersecurity concerns are where they have invested much of the $380 million that we put forth in the last Congress.

Let's make sure we spend the money that we have already appropriated; let's make sure we take a commonsense approach; and let's give our election officials, Republicans and Democrats from throughout this great Nation, the ability to address the concerns they know are weakest in their own system. Let's not have some bureaucrat out here in a concrete building determining what is going to work best in the State of Texas, in the State of Illinois, in the State of California, or anywhere else.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is important to address a few of the issues that have been raised in the course of this debate.

First, we are moving forward with the SAFE Act because of a sense of urgency that we have about the 2020 election. That sense of urgency was fueled by the Director of National Intelligence, and it was fueled by the Director of the FBI who told us that red lights, warning lights were flashing and that the 2016 election was just a prelude to what the Russians were going to do in the 2020 election. We feel a sense of urgency.

As has been mentioned by others, H.R. 1 included provisions about ballot security. But I introduced this bill, the SAFE Act, on May 14 because it was specifically addressing election security, and, also, we made some additional enhancements to H.R. 1 relative to cybersecurity and the like.

□ 1030

We drafted the bill with the assistance of the Parliamentarian so that it was entirely within the jurisdiction of the House Administration Committee, with one exception. There was a line on page 11 of the committee mark that authorized a study by the NSF. The Science, Space, and Technology Committee waived jurisdiction on markup because it was just a study, and that was very clear.

This bill has proceeded in the regular order. It has been noticed according to our rules. And it brings us here today to test whether we are going to meet the challenge that faces us in ballot security: whether we are going to allow the Russians to attack our country by trying to steal our election next year or not.

Mention has been made about the need for bipartisanship. I work often on a bipartisan basis with Members of the other party. I will say that we have tried in vain to have the Republican Members buy into the need to require best practices for next year's election, and we couldn't reach agreement.

We decided that it is our responsibility to move forward, and that is why we are here today.

Just a mention on unfunded mandates, we are authorizing about $1 billion. $380 million was appropriated last year, and as the Speaker mentioned, we are appropriating this year an additional $600 million for ballot security.

This bill authorizes the $600 million that we are appropriating, and we think it is important that that money flow to the States to harden our systems so the election cannot be stolen by our enemies. It is ironic that some on the other side of the aisle have complained about unfunded mandates at the same time they tried to impose a 25 percent match requirement on States for receiving these funds that they need to get to harden our system.

Just a comment on DREs, DREs are not as unsafe as pure electronic voting, but they are not best practices.

Much has been mentioned about the State of Georgia. It is worth noting that the Georgia legislature ignored the advice they got from computer scientists that what they were doing did not meet best practices for ballot security.

A study published by Georgia Tech indicated that most voters did not actually look at the receipt when it was printed. They also point out that even though printed ballots, when voters do look at them, include the names of candidates, votes will be encoded in barcodes that humans can't authenticate and that are subject to hacking.

''There's nothing speculative about these vulnerabilities,'' said a Georgia Tech computer professor and former chief technology officer for Hewlett-Packard. ''If exploited, it would affect the result of the election. It's not a secure system.''

We need to fix these things not because it is partisan but because we need to protect America.

The idea that we would allow this just to be decided at a local level is

wrongheaded. If the Russians launched missiles at the counties of the United States, we wouldn't say, well, that is just a local issue. We would say, no, that is an attack on the United States of America.

We need to harden our systems and protect our country.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge the adoption of this measure.

I would like to read from a letter that we received just yesterday from the NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice. In their last paragraph, the Catholics say:

In a secular democracy, elections are the closest thing we have to a sacrament. We know that nefarious foreign and domestic actors continue to meddle in our democratic systems, and we have been put on notice that previous efforts were only trial runs, presumably for our next election in 2020. The NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice considers our elections to be sacrosanct and that Congress must pass the SAFE Act to protect them.

This bill is supported by a broad sector of civil rights groups, including the NAACP and Common Cause. It deserves all of our support.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2722 to ensure the security of our Nation's election infrastructure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 460, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2722 is postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3401, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SECURITY AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER ACT, 2019

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 466 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 466

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–21. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule, House Resolution 466.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the point of order prescribed in section 425 of that same act.

House Resolution 466 makes in order a motion ''without intervention of any point of order.'' Therefore, I make a point of order, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget Act, that this rule may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule and the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

Madam Speaker, the bill before us today provides no CBO cost estimate, so we literally have no idea as to whether or not there are additional unfunded mandates being imposed on the States. We do know that the States are already having to use their scarce resources to deal with this border crisis, and the legislation before us today does nothing to alleviate that.

Indeed, my colleague from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) made that very point and offered an amendment, which was rejected by the committee, to consider reimbursing the State of Texas over $800 million for their expenses. Those same kinds of expenses—probably not to that magnitude—have been undertaken by other States. Madam Speaker, we don't think that we should proceed until we have that information and the House has a chance to consider that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Madam Speaker, what we are trying to do here is bring a bill to the floor to help alleviate the suffering of children who, in my opinion, have been abused under U.S. custody at our border. Everybody has read the news articles and everybody has seen the pictures. We have a moral obligation to move forward. To try to delay consideration of a bill to help these children I think is a mistake.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, actually, on that, we have a great deal in common with one another. We, too, think we ought to address this matter quickly.

As I am sure my friend recalls, we have tried on 16 different occasions over the last 8 weeks to bring legislation that would alleviate this problem to the floor. Our friends rejected that every single time.

We also have a bill that has been passed by the Senate 84–7: a bill where 35 Democrats—about three-quarters of the number of Democrats—supported, a bill that we know would solve, a bill that if we would bring to this floor we can pass immediately and it would go to the President's desk; it wouldn't have to go back to the Senate. So my friends, by not accepting an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill by the Senate and simply moving it on, are the ones who are actually imposing a delay here.

What they have got in front of us that we will consider later today, if they are successful, frankly, is something we know the Senate is unlikely to accept. I have not heard from the President, but given the scope of the changes inside the bill, these are all changes that, in some cases, failed yesterday in the Senate—reductions in spending for the military and for the Border Patrol—that the administration has already signaled they will reject.

There is a simple solution here. We could simply take the Senate bill up that has passed 84–7—overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle—get that bill down to the President, and the money could start flowing immediately. If we proceed as my friends want to proceed, we are simply going to be playing ping-pong back and forth.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am surprised that my colleagues on the Republican side hold this institution in such low esteem. We are the House of Representatives. Our voice matters.

On this issue, the House voted first on a measure to try to help provide some assistance to these children at the border. Then the Senate passed a different version. The way it is supposed to work is we have a negotiation and we try to come to agreement and come up with a compromise bill. So the idea that somehow we don't matter in the House, that we shouldn't matter in the House, that we should just accept whatever the Senate does, to me, I find

that disrespectful of the House of Representatives.

What we are doing is we are sending the Senate basically all that they want, plus we are adding things to help protect children and to provide for more transparency. We are strengthening requirements for children's health. We are tightening restrictions for children's safety. We are supporting nonprofits in communities caring for children's well-being. I mean, we are embracing compassionate processing for children's comfort. Again, we are enhancing accountability in transparency and mandating fiscal responsibility.

Who can possibly be opposed to those things? That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to insist that the House's voice matters, and we are trying to make the Senate bill even better.

Again, what motivates us here is the well-being of these children. We are here because we are for the children. We are here because we are outraged at the way they have been mistreated by this administration. We are tired of excuses as to why we can't protect the children. We are moving forward with legislation that will protect the children against any abuse at our border.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1045

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

Madam Speaker, I don't doubt my friend's sincerity and compassion and concern for these young people for one minute. I know him well as a person and value him as a friend. Although, I must say, this would have been much nicer 8 weeks ago when the administration first asked for it.

While my friend lays out some of the changes in the House bill, he neglected to mention that the House bill cuts the administration's request for reimbursement to the military by $124 million. It cuts the administration's request for money to the Border Patrol, which is probably where the most difficult part is, by, I think, $89 million. So we have substantive disagreements.

Again, we have a bill that has passed overwhelmingly. Many of the items my friends want to add have already been considered by the Senate and rejected by the Senate. So it seems to me, when we have a bipartisan product that has got substantial support on both sides and that the White House has signaled it would accept, that is the way we should go.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), my good friend and the ranking Republican member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Oklahoma for leading in this discussion.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the question on consideration. We should be taking up the Senate-passed bill. It has already been mentioned that it passed 84–8.

We don't have a CBO score for the changes made by the House amendments to the bill, and without a CBO score, we don't know the cost this bill would have on State and local governments.

Yesterday, in a budget hearing on matters of immigration, we heard testimony from the mayor of Yuma, Arizona, which clearly demonstrates the economic impacts and costs that States and local governments are incurring due to the crisis at the border.

My friends just said changes made by the House on this Senate-passed bill take tens of millions of dollars away from the Department of Defense for reimbursement and limit the ability of Customs and Border Patrol to adequately pay for the services incurred as a result of this ongoing crisis.

Madam Speaker, Democrats have had many opportunities to advance bipartisan solutions that would provide the kind of relief to these communities and begin to address the crisis at the border, and for nearly 2 months, they have refused to act.

This week has been an unfortunate loss of precious time. This is a situation where Congress clearly needs to come together and act swiftly. I am sorry to say, we are falling short in this basic obligation of the duties of the Congress of the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, again, I rise in support of the question that we have under consideration.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am a little confused. My Republican friends say they want to delay things to have a CBO score, then they say they want to get something to the President's desk right away. They can talk all they want about a CBO score; we are going to talk about the children.

It is an emergency, and what is happening to these children on the border is unconscionable. It should weigh heavily on the hearts of every single person in this Chamber—Democrats and Republicans, alike.

Enough is enough. We need to make sure that we not only provide the necessary resources to alleviate this crisis, but we need to make sure that those resources we provide are provided in such a way that they do go to the purposes that we want them to go to.

And as far as the Department of Defense money, I mean, the bottom line is this administration has been diverting funds from the Department of Defense for this stupid wall, and they have created that crisis.

The bottom line is we are here for the children, and, again, I urge my colleagues to stop the bickering and get down to business. Let us pass this rule; let us go on to pass the legislation; and let us get a deal with the Senate that is better than what is on the table right now.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my very good friend and distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I think folks are going to have a tough time containing their emotions today. We met in the House Rules Committee at 8 a.m. this morning, and folks already had fuses that were running short.

I agree with my friend from Massachusetts, enough is enough.

We had an amendment offered in the Rules Committee this morning. I don't think most folks in this body know because folks weren't at the Rules Committee this morning. We had an amendment offered in the Rules Committee this morning that said, if the gentleman wants to do this new bill that has been crafted by the Democratic majority, bring that new bill to the floor, but let's at least consider the bipartisan bill that passed the Senate, resoundingly, 84–8 yesterday.

I agree with my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), enough is enough, Madam Speaker. We could send a bill to the White House today to start the money going today.

My friend from Massachusetts said: Let the Republicans talk if they want to. We want to talk about the children.

I am tired of talking about the children. Let's serve the children. Let's do it. Let's do it. Let's stop talking about it.

It has been almost 60 days that we have been talking about it, with one tragic picture after another rolling across the national headlines. Let's stop talking about it.

If folks have an alternative view, they can share alternative view as they have, but allow us to vote on what the Senate agreed, 84–8, after roundly rejecting the previously passed House language, was an opportunity to serve the children today.

Madam Speaker, I don't believe the Members of this institution know what happened in the Rules Committee this morning. I don't believe the Members of this institution know we rejected that bipartisan opportunity this morning. With this, under a point of order, we will bring the Members of this institution down here to the House floor where they will hear it themselves.

We have an opportunity to act now, as my friend from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) has offered. The question is: Are we going to take ''yes'' for an answer or are we just going to continue to talk about the children?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am really puzzled here. Why is it that the Senate can say no, but the House can't say no to something? Why is it that we always have to do what the Senate wants?

If the gentleman is so enamored with the Senate, maybe he should work over in the Senate.

But the bottom line is, those of us in the House deserve to have our voices heard, and what we are saying here is that we want to provide a bill that will alleviate this crisis, that will help the children.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I will not yield. I do not have enough time to yield.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, the gentleman has mischaracterized my statement.

Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would like us to make sure we provide resources to the border that actually alleviate the crisis.

I do not want to be part of an effort to send money to the border to be diverted for whatever this President wants. He has shown us where he is on this issue of the children and on the issue of immigration. And, quite frankly, many of us on this side of the aisle—and, I think, some on the other side of the aisle—are offended by that.

So we want to make sure, when we say we are providing relief to this crisis that is affecting so many children, that, in fact, we are providing relief to those children. And that is all we are saying here.

Madam Speaker, strengthening requirements for children's health, why would anybody in the Senate want to be opposed to that?

Tightening restrictions for children's safety, people are dying in our custody. We should want to prevent that from ever occurring again by supporting nonprofits and community caring for children's well-being.

Madam Speaker, this stuff is something that should not be controversial no matter how you look at it, and yet it is for my Republican friends, and I regret that very much.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I am puzzled as well. I am puzzled why this wasn't dealt with 8 weeks ago when the administration asked. I am puzzled why, for 16 times when we tried to bring this matter up on the floor, our friends in the majority rejected that.

Now we are in a hurry. Well, if we are in a hurry, the way to act is to take the vehicle that has actually passed the United States Senate in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion and send it to the President of the United States.

That is not what my friends want to do. They want to prolong the debate. They have prolonged it for 2 months, for 8 weeks, by not taking the matter up. They are prolonging it today by not taking what has already been passed and moving along.

So, obviously, we oppose this rule, and we want to move on. We will be happy to work with them to move on the Senate legislation. I think it would pass in an overwhelmingly bipartisan way; the President would sign it; and that aid would begin flowing. What my friends are proposing is quite the opposite. It is a prolonged back-and-forth with the United States Senate.

I have deep respect for the institution, but what is going to come out of here is going to be partisan; what came out of there is bipartisan.

What is going to come out of here won't be signed by the President; what has come out of the United States Senate will be. So if they are in a hurry to get the money moving, that is the way we should proceed.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me remind my colleagues, this is not the House bill that passed. This is a compromise that we have moved forward.

And, again, here is what my friends are saying is partisan: that we put into this bill that for children's health we must ensure a higher standard for medical care, nutrition, and hygiene. That is what they are calling partisan. That is what they are saying, oh, it is awful, we can't move forward on that.

The bill we are putting forward, this compromise bill, will meet the needs of the children. That is all that it does. So I don't know why we in the House can't, in a bipartisan way, stand together and say: Look, we want to improve on what the Senate did, and we want to guarantee that the moneys we send actually go to help the children and not get diverted to other things like we know this administration has a habit of doing.

Madam Speaker, anybody who has seen the pictures in the newspapers recently, anybody who has read the news articles, again, our hearts should ache.

This is not America. This is not what our country is about. We can do much, much better, and that is why we should move forward with consideration.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close and will yield back the balance of my time at the conclusion of my remarks.

Madam Speaker, we don't think the House bill is a better bill. We don't think reducing the amount the Senate gave to the military by $124 million is a good idea. We don't think reducing the amount of money that is going to Border Patrol, which is one of the areas that is a problem, by $89 million is a good idea. We don't think a lot of this effort to micromanage a crisis that is thousands of miles away from us by this body here has good suggestions.

We want some flexibility. We think the Senate bill does take care of the needs on the border in terms of unaccompanied minors who have crossed over into our territory. So we just don't think this does it, and we think this prolongs the process.

We have a bipartisan bill—a perfect bill? No. Is our bill a perfect bill? No. As a matter of fact, we like the Senate bill on our side better than this bill. Regardless, that one can pass. That one can pass on this floor. That one can be signed into law.

This one that my friends are embarking on, they think it is an improvement. I will just tell them, politically, not passing the Senate, not likely to be signed by the President.

So if we want to get help there immediately, we have a way to do it in the Senate bill. We think this leads us to a political dead-end.

Madam Speaker, I would press for my motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, my colleagues have seen the pictures and they have heard the stories. And if that is not convincing to them to move forward, to increase protections for children who are held in our custody, then I don't know what else to say.

What we are asking for here in this compromise bill that we are moving forward is to make sure that there are stronger protections in here, to make sure that the abuse that we have all read about and that we have all seen stops and never, ever happens again. That is what this is all about.

So I am at a loss because, to me, the evidence is overwhelming that we need to provide stronger protections for these children. If my colleagues disagree, then they can vote against the bill and against consideration, but I would urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' so that we can move forward with this rule in consideration of this bill and get this passed as soon as possible and get on to either urging the Senate to pass it or to continue in negotiation, but we can do better than the Senate bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 188, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

YEAS—226

Adams	Beatty	Bonamici
Aguilar	Bera	Boyle, Brendan F.
Allred	Beyer	Brindisi
Axne	Bishop (GA)	Brown (MD)
Barragán	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Bass	Blunt Rochester	

Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—188

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—18

Abraham
Castro (TX)
Crenshaw
DesJarlais
Gabbard
Hastings
Huffman
Kustoff (TN)
Lucas
Marchant
Moulton
Mullin
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Ryan
Scott, David
Swalwell (CA)
Walorski

□ 1128

Messrs. BIGGS, YOUNG, and TIMMONS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, 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. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 466, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3401. One hour of general debate has been provided, controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I think, by now, we all have seen the horrific images showing the bodies of Oscar Alberto Martinez Ramirez and his nearly 2-year-old daughter, Valeria. They were taken on Monday as these Salvadoran migrants tried to cross the Rio Grande after leaving a Mexican migrant camp. Like so many others, they were exercising their legal right to seek asylum here in the United States. They wanted to be free from the violence, gangs, poverty, and inequality that is rampant in El Salvador, just as it is all across Central America.

I visited El Salvador and I visited Honduras recently, and, Mr. Speaker, I saw the unbearable conditions with my own eyes. It is no wonder that organizations like the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime have said this and other Central American countries are more dangerous than Afghanistan and only slightly better than Syria.

Syria, Mr. Speaker, is the site of an ongoing civil war. Let that sink in for a moment.

But, unfortunately, Alberto and Valeria didn't survive their journey. Alberto's wife, Tania, was forced to watch in horror as a current washed her family away.

I am telling their story today because this is what migrants face as they risk their lives to come to this country—not to transport drugs, not to commit crimes, as the President suggests, but to find refuge, to raise their daughter in a safe place, and to have a chance at building a better life, a life that they could only find in America.

Isn't this what each of us wants for our own families?

They came to present themselves at a legal port of entry and to seek legal asylum, as is their right under U.S. law.

And they weren't the only ones to die. Just this past weekend, Border Patrol agents found four more bodies in the river west of Brownsville, Texas: three more young children and a young woman in her twenties.

Every single week, people drown in the river and perish in the deserts, invisible and unknown.

It wasn't too long ago that we celebrated how immigration made our country stronger, whether it was a Democratic or a Republican administration.

I am reminded of President Reagan's final speech in office, where he said:

> Anybody, from any corner of the world, can come to America to live and become an American. This, I believe, is one of the most important sources of America's greatness.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration apparently has the complete opposite view of immigration. They don't celebrate it; they demonize it.

Consider what may have happened to Oscar and his family if they did make it to our border, forced to sleep on concrete floors with the lights on 24 hours a day, with no soap, no medicine, maybe not even a toothbrush, Valeria separated from her parents, because that is what migrants are forced to endure at border facilities under this President.

A physician who visited one recently said: ''The conditions within which they are held could be compared to torture facilities.''

Mr. Speaker, when Lady Liberty encourages us to give her our poor, huddled masses, I don't think she means so the administration can turn around and throw them in a cage. I don't think she lifts her torch so their legal plight could be criminalized and crying children could be ripped from the arms of their parents.

But that is what is happening under this President, and, Mr. Speaker, it is sickening. It should tear at the hearts of every single Member of this House, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

This week, the House passed bipartisan emergency legislation to address this humanitarian crisis at the border. The Senate had its own ideas. So, today, we are back with a compromise to get a bill quickly signed into law.

This is a compromise that lives up to our core values and protects children and families. It adds critical protections for children who were included in the House version of the bill. It includes language to improve care for children by forcing influx facilities to comply with the Flores settlement and capping, at 90 days, the amount of time a child can spend in such a facility.

We are also reducing funding for ICE, while rejecting additional and unnecessary dollars for the Pentagon.

This is a crisis, Mr. Speaker. We cannot treat compromise as though it is a dirty word, not when migrants are literally losing their lives in unsafe, unhealthy, and unsanitary conditions and children are being torn apart from their families. That is what is at stake here.

The horrors at detention centers shouldn't get lost in the latest tweet-athon by the President, just as the plight of migrants shouldn't go unseen by the American people. This should shake our conscience and make clear the urgent need to act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill, and let's send a message to the President and to the world that America is better than this. This is not who we are, what is happening at our border.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say one final thing. In the compromise package today that seems to bother so many people are merely items that would protect the well-being of these children, that would provide more transparency. For the life of me, I don't understand the controversy. I don't understand why we can't make the Senate bill better, why we can't do more for these children.

I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel as we do, that what is happening is unacceptable. Let us strengthen that bill. Let us actually give a bill to the President that we all know will help these children.

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

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

I want to begin by thanking my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Chairman MCGOVERN) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, well, we are here for the third time this week and the second time on a supplemental appropriations bill for the southern border.

Earlier this week, I spoke on this floor and expressed my concerns about the House bill. Make no mistake, we need emergency funding for the crisis on the southern border. We needed it 2 months ago, and we need it even more desperately today.

Two days ago, I warned that the bill the House was considering would not pass the Senate and would not become law, and I was proven correct. The House bill failed in the Senate. In fact, it only received 37 votes in support. In contrast, the Senate amendment passed in a bipartisan vote of 84–8.

If the Democratic leadership would allow a vote on the Senate text, I believe it would pass this Chamber today and be on its way to the President's desk—today. But, instead, we are here considering a rule that would further amend the bill, bringing back in provisions that have already failed to garner support in the Senate.

If this bill fails to pass the Senate, as I expect will happen, then we will be leaving town for a week without actually having passed anything to deal with the crisis. And I do remind my friends on the other side we have attempted on our side, 16 times, to bring up legislation to deal with this, and the President asked for this money 2 months ago.

So, I am glad they have a sense of urgency now, because we have not seen it in the past.

My sense is that this is more about maintaining the unity of the Democratic Caucus than it is about pressing legislation that can be enacted into law. But that has been true for this entire Congress, and it is why my friends have, so far, failed to enact any significant legislation during their tenure in the majority.

Mr. Speaker, we are out of time. We desperately need to get these emergency funds to the Federal agencies responsible for managing this crisis. They are out of money and need additional resources to take care of people, many of them innocent children, who are affected by this crisis. We do not have the luxury of time in responding to this emergency.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are about to make the exact same mistake that they made on Tuesday when they pushed forward a partisan bill that would not pass the Senate and that the President would not sign into law.

What I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, is why the majority is so resistant to acting in a bipartisan manner here. Both Republicans and Democrats agree that we need additional funding to address the crisis on the southern border. There is a real chance to send a bipartisan bill to the President that will become law. And, instead of doing what will immediately help children and families at the border, the majority is attempting to cut the needed funding from the Senate bill, add partisan riders back into it, and then send it back to the Senate, where it can fail again.

Madam Speaker, we do not have time to waste on purely political exercises. There is still an opportunity to correct that mistake, Madam Speaker, and I would urge the majority to take that opportunity seriously.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, 58 days—58 days—is the amount of time since the administration asked and said there was a crisis on the border, that they needed funding.

Madam Speaker, 18 times—18 times—we had the opportunity to take a vote on this floor, and we did not come to a solution, and it did not pass.

Madam Speaker, two times—two times—The New York Times wrote editorials in those 58 days calling upon this body to put politics aside, that this crisis on the border was greater than the politics that we want to play.

The Mexican Government realizes there is a crisis on the border and just sent 15,000 troops. We have seen the pictures. We have heard the words. On either side they talk of it.

We were in this well just a few days ago having a debate. Many of us said: Why would we take this moment to do a political maneuver that will not go anywhere in the Senate?

Don't take our word for it. Take the votes for it. The bill did not pass.

There is a time for every season. The season to continue to play politics is over. The season to put people before politics is now.

Don't take my word for it. Take the example of the Chamber that is just across the way. It is not far. You can see it if you look out those doors; you can walk it without taking much breath; and you can understand what bipartisanship looks like, Madam Speaker.

The Senate took up a bill to take up this crisis. The vote was 84–8.

□ 1145

Madam Speaker, 84–8. There has been historic legislation that was passed with much less, but there have been very few that have ever been defeated that have gone 84–8.

But today, we are going to take hours to learn the exact same experience that we had just a few, short hours ago. The 84–8—when I listen to the other side and say that this—the Democratic Party, Madam Speaker, wants to do this.

Let me read the names of some of those who voted for this bill to understand what bipartisan sounds like: Senator CHUCK SCHUMER, Senator DICK DURBIN, Senator TIM KAINE, Senator PATTY MURRAY, and Senator DIANE FEINSTEIN all voted ''yes.'' Every single member of the Senate Democratic leadership voted ''yes'' to end the crisis on the border.

But why, Madam Speaker, are we on this floor now? Why does the Democratic leadership on this side want to continue to play politics when the Democrat leadership in the Senate says no?

Fifty-eight days is enough. Eighteen votes over there are too many.

But, yes, people are dying. But, yes, the money is out. We have all acknowledged it on this floor.

Madam Speaker, it makes me begin to wonder, how can a few control so many?

On that opening day, when we are on this floor, we all raise our hand individually. We all swear to uphold the Constitution. Our names are individually on the ballot when we are voted to come in here.

This is not a moment to let somebody else control your name or your voting card. This is not a moment to say, my party tells me to go here, because that is not the case.

CHUCK SCHUMER is the leader of the Democratic Party. DICK DURBIN is the leader of the Democrats when it comes to immigration. I have spent hours and months with DICK DURBIN in a room trying to come to an immigration agreement, and we have seen places far, far apart. We have spent months trying to come to a conclusion.

But you know what? We have this time. We have found a more perfect union when we found bipartisanship.

But are we going to allow a few to continue to deny it?

Fifty-eight days. You do not have more. The money is gone. The time is now.

We all know that we are better than this. I do not accuse anybody on either side of what they truly believe about a crisis. I have heard.

I have heard people on the other side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, that said they want to vote for the Senate bill. Can we allow them to vote for the Senate bill?

Can we allow them to join with the 84 Senators out of 100 on the other side that said ''yes'' to it? Or do we have a few that control what can come to the floor?

Now, I heard in this rule debate that there are some amendments; that somehow they are going to make it better. What makes it better? That we do not fund to pay any overtime costs for Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers, or provide funding for the active duty of the National Guard troops working with them on the front line of the crisis at the border?

Is that making it better?

Is that really what you want to stake your political career on?

Is that really what you want to stand up against bipartisanship for?

Madam Speaker, I have heard a lot of names on the other side say they would vote for it. I think everybody in this body knows that that Senate bill will pass. I think everybody in their heart knows that is where we are going to end up.

But do we have to go through it one more time?

You do not have to worry about what the outcome will be. The leader of the Senate has already said what will happen; because I will promise you this, on this side of the aisle, we will stay here until this is done. We will not leave, and we will stand with the bipartisan vote in the Senate.

If you are worried about getting to 218, do not worry. Put that bill on suspension, I promise you it will pass.

I call upon all of our better angels for this one moment, for this one time, when America is watching, that we rise to the occasion; that we put the partisanship aside; that we have swapped; that the Senate has actually taught us, given us the adult supervision to show that, yes, we have had that fight; yes, you tried to make it and it didn't make it. But there is something better. There is a window, and there is an opportunity.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

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

Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I do not yield for that purpose. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

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

I want to assure the distinguished minority leader that I am not asking Members of Congress to vote for what we are bringing before the House today based on their party. I am asking Members to vote their conscience.

And to be totally frank, we want to make sure there are protections built in this legislation so that funds are not misused as they have been in the past; so we don't see any more children being abused; so we don't see the mismanagement that we have witnessed.

With all due respect to the Senate majority leader, and to many of my friends on the other side of the aisle, when children were being ripped apart from their parents, we heard silence. When we read about the terrible conditions that these children were in, being denied soap, and toothpaste, and toothbrushes, and not being cared for, we heard silence.

When we saw the picture of Oscar and Valeria dead, trying to seek asylum in this country, there is nothing.

So the bottom line is, we want to get this done, and we will stay here as long as it takes, I assure the minority leader. We are not going anywhere.

But we are going to stand for the children, and that is what our purpose is here today.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I am so glad that our colleagues across the aisle agree that the conditions at the border are intolerable, because they are.

A few months ago, I had the opportunity to go to the southern border, meet with Border Patrol agents and advocates on the ground, including a woman who had been separated from her children, and we toured detention facilities.

The humanitarian crisis then, in February, was undeniable, and it has only gotten worse. But the cause of this crisis has raised serious questions, particularly as to why it has escalated.

In addition to suspending critical aid designed to relieve conditions causing desperate families to flee their homes, the Trump administration is failing to use longstanding lawful processes and available resources to provide relief to children and refugees at the southern border.

The Trump administration's policies are not making our border safer, but they are worsening the situation, at the expense of the health and well-being of desperate children and families.

There are unused beds at facilities in my home State of Pennsylvania and in Texas, and many refugee children have sponsors, family members available here, but they are being denied access.

Prior to coming to Congress, I represented immigrants and asylum seekers who, by definition, lawfully enter this country seeking refuge. I can confidently say that international law is being violated on a daily basis by this administration, and it has abandoned longstanding legal norms for processing asylees, with the apparent purpose of exacerbating the crisis for political gain.

I agree that we need to send additional resources to relieve the inhumane conditions affecting refugees at our border. But we also have a responsibility to make sure that those resources are not misused to worsen rather than relieve this crisis.

Therefore, I urge that we support the border relief bill that is before us, which will provide resources to relieve the crisis and improve the health and well-being of innocent children, while allowing transparency and oversight.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SCANLON. It is important that we allow transparency and oversight on how those funds are used.

To our Republican colleagues in the Senate, especially Majority Leader MCCONNELL, if you fail to work with us to address this humanitarian crisis, not only will your legacy be your legislative graveyard in the Senate, but the deaths of these children and families.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate overwhelmingly. Ten times more Senators voted for this bill than voted against it. That is the essence of bipartisanship.

I ask that we make this House proud. I ask that we make our colleagues proud. And I ask that we pass this bill and send it to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair would advise Members that even though a unanimous consent request to consider a measure is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such requests constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

We must not adjourn. We will stay and do the people's work and take care of this humanitarian crisis on the border. Send this to the President's desk immediately, today, for signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained. Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, as an FBI agent who worked border security on the border, understanding it all too well, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to concur with the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1200

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes, and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

We must show the American people that bipartisanship is about solving these children's problems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose.

Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate 84–8 and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amount thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BERGMAN), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could immediately be sent to the President's desk for his signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Judge Carter, my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes. It could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, for the love of God and this country, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today, so help us, God.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose and therefore the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Oklahoma.

□ 1215

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles, one from The New York Times entitled: ''There is a Stench': Soiled Clothes and No Baths for Migrant Children at a Texas Center''; the other, ''The Taliban Gave Me Toothpaste': Former Captives Contrast U.S. Treatment of Child Migrants.''

[From the New York Times, June 21, 2019]

'THERE IS A STENCH': SOILED CLOTHES AND NO BATHS FOR MIGRANT CHIDREN AT A TEXAS CENTER

(By Caitlin Dickerson)

A chaotic scene of sickness and filth is unfolding in an overcrowded border station in Clint, Tex., where hundreds of young people who have recently crossed the border are being held, according to lawyers who visited the facility this week. Some of the children have been there for nearly a month.

Children as young as 7 and 8, many of them wearing clothes caked with snot and tears, are caring for infants they've just met, the lawyers said. Toddlers without diapers are relieving themselves in their pants. Teenage mothers are wearing clothes stained with breast milk.

Most of the young detainees have not been able to shower or wash their clothes since they arrived at the facility, those who visited said. They have no access to toothbrushes, toothpaste or soap.

[Hundreds of migrant children have now been transferred out of the facility.]

''There is a stench,'' said Elora Mukherjee, director of the Immigrants' Rights Clinic at Columbia Law School, one of the lawyers who visited the facility. ''The overwhelming majority of children have not bathed since they crossed the border.''

Conditions at Customs and Border Protection facilities along the border have been an issue of increasing concern as officials warn that the recent large influx of migrant families has driven many of the facilities well past their capacities. The border station in Clint is only one of those with problems.

In May, the inspector general for the Department of Homeland Security warned of ''dangerous overcrowding'' among adult migrants housed at the border processing center in El Paso, with up to 900 migrants being held at a facility designed for 125. In some cases, cells designed for 35 people were holding 155 people.

''Border Patrol agents told us some of the detainees had been held in standing-room-only conditions for days or weeks,'' the inspector general's office said in its report, which noted that some detainees were observed standing on toilets in the cells ''to make room and gain breathing space, thus limiting access to the toilets.''

Gov. Greg Abbott of Texas on Friday announced the deployment of 1,000 new National Guard troops to the border to help respond to the continuing new arrivals, which the governor said have amounted to more than 45,000 people from 52 countries over the past three weeks.

''The crisis at our southern border is unlike anything we've witnessed before and has put an enormous strain on the existing resources we have in place,'' Mr. Abbott said, adding, ''Congress is a group of reprobates for not addressing the crisis on our border.''

The number of border crossings appears to have slowed in recent weeks, possibly as a result of a crackdown by the Mexican government under pressure from President Trump, but the numbers remain high compared to recent years. The overcrowding crisis has been unfolding invisibly, with journalists and lawyers offered little access to fenced-off border facilities.

The reports of unsafe and unsanitary conditions at Clint and elsewhere came days after government lawyers in court argued that they should not have to provide soap or toothbrushes to children under the legal settlement that gave Ms. Mukherjee and her colleagues access to the facility in Clint. The result of a lawsuit that was first settled in 1997, the settlement set the standards for the detention, treatment and release of migrant minors taken into federal immigration custody.

Ms. Mukherjee is part of a team of lawyers who has for years under the settlement been allowed to inspect government facilities where migrant children are detained. She and her colleagues traveled to Clint this week after learning that border officials had begun detaining minors who had recently crossed the border there.

She said the conditions in Clint were the worst she had seen in any facility in her 12–year career. ''So many children are sick, they have the flu, and they're not being properly treated,'' she said. The Associated Press, which first reported on conditions at the facility earlier this week, found that it was housing three infants, all with teen mothers, along with a 1–year-old, two 2–year-olds and a 3–year-old. It said there were dozens more children under the age of 12.

Ms. Mukherjee said children were being overseen by guards for Customs and Border Protection, which declined to comment for this story. She and her colleagues observed the guards wearing full uniforms—including weapons—as well as face masks to protect themselves from the unsanitary conditions.

Together, the group of six lawyers met with 60 children in Clint this week who ranged from 5 months to 17 years old. The infants were either children of minor parents, who were also detained, or had been separated from adult family members with whom they had crossed the border. The separated children were now alone, being cared for by other young detainees.

''The children are locked in their cells and cages nearly all day long,'' Ms. Mukherjee said. ''A few of the kids said they had some opportunities to go outside and play, but they said they can't bring themselves to play because they are trying to stay alive in there.''

When the lawyers arrived, federal officials said that more than 350 children were detained at the facility. The officials did not disclose the facility's capacity but said the population had exceeded it. By the time the lawyers left on Wednesday night, border officials told them that about 200 of the children had been transferred elsewhere but did not say where they had been sent.

''That's what's keeping me up at night,'' Ms. Mukherjee said.

Some sick children were being quarantined in the facility. The lawyers were allowed to speak to the children by phone, but their requests to meet with them in person and observe the conditions they were being held in were denied.

The children told the lawyers they were given the same meals every day—instant oats for breakfast, instant noodles for lunch, a frozen burrito for dinner, along with a few cookies and juice packets—which many said was not enough. ''Nearly every child I spoke with said that they were hungry,'' Ms. Mukherjee said.

Another group of lawyers conducting inspections under the same federal court settlement said they discovered similar conditions earlier this month at six other facilities in Texas. At the Border Patrol's Central Processing Center in McAllen, Tex.—often known as ''Ursula''—the lawyers encountered a 17–year-old mother from Guatemala who couldn't stand because of complications from an emergency C-section, and who was caring for a sick and dirty premature baby.

''When we encountered the baby and her mom, the baby was filthy. They wouldn't give her any water to wash her. And I took a Kleenex and I washed around her neck black dirt,'' said Hope Frye, who was leading the group, adding, ''Not a little stuff—dirt.''

After government lawyers argued in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco this week that amenities such as soap and toothbrushes should not be mandated under the legal settlement originally agreed to between the government and migrant families in 1997 and amended several times since then, all three judges voiced dismay.

Among the guidelines set under the legal settlement are that facilities for children must be ''safe and sanitary.''

The Justice Department's lawyer, Sarah Fabian, argued that the settlement agreement did not specify the need to supply hygienic items and that, therefore, the government did not need to do so.

''Are you arguing seriously that you do not read the agreement as requiring you to do anything other than what I just described: cold all night long, lights on all night long, sleeping on concrete and you've got an aluminum foil blanket?'' Judge William Fletcher asked Ms. Fabian. ''I find that inconceivable that the government would say that is safe and sanitary.''

___

'THE TALIBAN GAVE ME TOOTHPASTE': FORMER CAPTIVES CONTRAST U.S. TREATMENT OF CHILD MIGRANTS

(By Deanna Paul)

[June 25, 2019]

The federal government told a panel of Ninth Circuit appellate judges last week that U.S. border detention facilities are ''safe and sanitary,'' as required by law, even though migrant children are denied soap, toothbrushes and dark places to sleep.

Judge William A. Fletcher called the position of Sarah Fabian, a senior attorney from the Office of Immigration Litigation, ''inconceivable.''

Senior U.S. Circuit Judge A. Wallace Tashima told the government attorney, ''If you don't have a toothbrush, if you don't have soap, if you don't have a blanket, it's not safe and sanitary.''

Fabian's argument spread rapidly across the Internet—and so did several tweets supporting the notion that the United States treats migrant detainees less humanely than foreign pirates and the Taliban treat their captives.

American journalist Michael Scott Moore, abducted in 2012 while reporting in Somalia, watched Fabian argue that minimal necessities, like toiletries and sleeping conditions, were not essential to meet minimum ''safe and sanitary'' standards.

''That was—let's say—below my experience in Somalia,'' he told The Washington Post Tuesday of his more than two years in captivity.

''The conditions were about as miserable as you could imagine,'' he said, describing a barren and concrete prison house. Often there was no electricity, he said, ''but we had certain minimum things that kept it from being completely wretched.''

He said he was given toothpaste, soap, a daily shower and a foam mattress.

Recent reports have surfaced describing U.S. border detainees held in cages of chain-link fencing, sleeping on concrete and covered with blankets made of aluminum foil, allegations that Customs and Border Protection officials dispute.

On Tuesday, the agency said that children in custody receive ''continuous access to hygiene products and adequate food'' while awaiting shelter placement.

Somali pirates gave me toothpaste & soap. https://twitter.com/nowthisnews/status/1142151178177978368 . . .

An executive editor at newyorker.com, David Rohde, contributed to the online conversation, too.

''The Taliban gave me toothpaste & soap,'' he wrote on Twitter, drawing from the seven months he spent as a hostage of the Taliban. Rohde said he was not abused in their custody, though the group is known for abusing its captives.

The online thread with former prisoners has been liked nearly half a million times. Washington Post Global opinions writer Jason Rezaian, who was held in Iranian custody for a year and a half and has an ongoing lawsuit against the Iranian government, also responded on Twitter.

''I felt if I didn't chime in, it would be the height of hypocrisy,'' Rezaian told The Post on Tuesday, calling U.S. treatment of children at the border misaligned with ''what this country stands for.'' ''The government is treating them like they're statistics, 'the other' and not deserving of basic humanity.''

From the first day in captivity, Rezaian was permitted to shower regularly. He was also given a toothbrush and toothpaste. Rezaian asked, ''If we're going to treat the most vulnerable people this way, what does that say about our actual values?''

I had a toothbrush and toothpaste—not exactly Aquafresh or Tom's—from the first night. Actually, I had almost nothing else in my cell while I was in solitary confinement. I was allowed to shower every couple of days. https://twitter.com/yashar/status/1142546005688311808 . . .

The case heard on Tuesday stems from a motion filed under the Obama administration. In part, it argued that Customs and Border Protection was holding children in detention facilities that were not ''safe and sanitary,'' in violation of a 1997 precedent.

The Trump administration, however, opted to bring the appeal, asking the panel of three judges to condone current custody conditions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, the last thing I would want to see is a repeat of the other night when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle laughed and jeered as I described the situation at the border and what is happening to the children in our custody.

Madam Speaker, the minority leader earlier asked why are we here again—one word, ''oversight''—''oversight.''

We have seen, as Members of Congress, too often, our desire to provide oversight, which is a fundamental responsibility, a fundamental duty of ours, we have seen it thwarted and we have seen it obstructed.

There is no one in this Chamber right now who feels more of a sense of urgency than the Representative from Texas 16, El Paso, where we have had a front row to the atrocities occurring at the hands of this government.

And I will tell you, part of the challenge for many of us who have worked with goodwill and charity has been witnessing the fact that Congress has not been able to provide fundamental guardrails for the treatment of these kids.

What is the main difference between the Senate bill and the House bill? Ours is far more humane. Ours ensures that money will not be diverted for things that have turned a challenge into a crisis.

A few examples include ripping children from the arms of their parents or sending vulnerable populations back into Mexico. In fact, Madam Speaker, in my district, one of the individuals sent back to Mexico under this administration's policy was kidnapped and raped. We have also seen people legally blocked at our ports of entry, sent to more treacherous crossings. That is why Oscar and Valeria died.

So oversight is why our bill is the better bill.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), my very good friend, for the purpose of unanimous consent.

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in this Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill was passed in the Senate with 84 votes, Madam Speaker, and could be sent today to the President's desk for his signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Kentucky (Mr. COMER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and can be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great

State of Idaho (Mr. FULCHER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to concur in that Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and can be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and can be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), my friend and newest Member of the House of Representatives, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent directly to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Illinois (Mr. BOST) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), my very good friend, for the purpose of unanimous consent request.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, my good friend (Mr. RIGGLEMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the great State of Tennessee (Mr. ROSE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the great State of Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the great State of South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur with the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and it could be sent to the President for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the great State of Virginia (Mr. CLINE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk today for his signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Kansas (Mr. ESTES), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the great State of Ohio, (Mr. BALDERSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and should be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the United States Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his immediate signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate 84–8 and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today. Let's vote on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk immediately for his signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Florida (Mr. DUNN), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. GOODEN), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with only 6 nay votes from Democrats. There is overwhelming support for this in the Senate, and I urge my colleagues to join them in passing this bill today and sending it to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), my very good

friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I ask that we do the right thing here. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today to solve this crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, has the gentleman from Massachusetts yielded the floor by taking his seat?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has reserved his time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto. And if we would like to talk about accountability and if we would like to talk about oversight, I would prefer we start right here. Let your Members vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose and, therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I think you will be delighted to hear that I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, it is nice to know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle now recognize it as a crisis.

The President asked 58 days ago for a supplemental appropriation to deal with this issue. It was ignored. We have tried 18 times to bring up a bill on the floor to deal with supplemental appropriations for humanitarian aid at the border, and it was ignored.

My friends on the other side of the aisle said they want to improve the bill. They want to ignore the fact that the Senate took up the House bill and overwhelmingly rejected it on a bipartisan basis.

Then they passed a bipartisan bill 84–8, which doesn't happen over there very often. We have gone through a list of those who voted in favor, including Senator SCHUMER and Senator DURBIN, yet somehow the House wants to ignore it. At least the majority in the House want to ignore it.

How they want to improve the bill, you may ask? Well, let's start by simply reducing or eliminating border security, that appears to be optional to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They want to take a hatchet to ICE. These are law enforcement personnel.

My son is a police officer. He puts on a vest every day. If you told me we were going to withhold payroll or overtime when they are doing the job, I would be offended, I would be disgusted, and I am, at this moment in time.

Let me ask how many over there would put on a vest, go out and do the job, and then hear, we may or may not pay you? Do I see any hands raised? I doubt it.

Law enforcement is struggling to do a job, an extraordinarily tough job, and we want to make it harder. So let me suggest, as the UC request was made, that we take up the bill that was passed by the Senate and we pass it.

And I ask for your attention over there, sir, unless, of course, you decided that policy is being made by a fragment of your conference, unless you decided that you are going to turn over the gavel to a fragment of your conference to make decisions for you, which may well appear to be the case. But let's be honest to the American people and tell them that a fragment, a small portion, of your conference is now functioning as a Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. What we just witnessed was really interesting. In the amount of time that it took my friends on the other side of the aisle to get through those antics, we could have passed this bill. That is what urgency looks like. Not political theater. These kids that we are here to try to protect deserve more than grandstanding. They deserve things like medicine. They deserve things like soap and clothing.

And my Republican friends say they don't want to waste time, but they wasted a hell of a lot of time with what we just saw happen.

And just one other observation. In all the other editorial comments that were made, I didn't hear the word ''children'' mentioned once. I mean, it is telling, because that is what this debate is all about. It is not about grandstanding, and it is not about more money for cages to put kids in. It is about the children. And I am sorry that the children who are suffering under U.S. custody are such an afterthought.

And to the gentleman from Michigan, I am outraged, too. I am outraged that the terrible conditions that these kids have been forced to experience happened under U.S. custody. I am outraged that that would happen in the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the distinguished chairwoman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this emergency supplemental bill.

Madam Speaker, the principles guiding this bill were clear from the outset. It is a response to a humanitarian crisis.

By increasing the housing capacity at Health and Human Services to moving these vulnerable children from the detention centers at Customs and Border Protection as quickly as possible to Health and Human Services, because we know what the conditions are at CBP. They are deplorable. In fact, it is government-sponsored child abuse.

We wanted to build in the protections for children that have been nonexistent in the past, and we uncovered those abuses. They have been reported in the press. The Miami Herald just recently said they are ''prison-like conditions'' at Homestead.

And we wanted to place children with a sponsor in a safe placement, a safe environment, as expeditiously as possible to reverse the administration's policy of frightening sponsors to come forward.

This bill includes strong protections and safeguards for these vulnerable children; it extends to the influx shelters' enhanced standards of care. And, my friends, it is for the first time ever. These protections have never been required of these influx shelters.

It continues to prevent the waiving of core standards and protections after 6 months.

It continues to hold influx shelters accountable by requiring HHS to remove an operator if they do not comply with these core standards.

□ 1245

If the shelter is not in compliance, then HHS is required to award the contract to a new service provider, and the bill continues to protect sponsors and potential sponsors by extending a provision that prohibits funds from being used to put anyone into a removal proceeding based on information from HHS' sponsor-vetting process.

The bill continues to require HHS to maintain the directives that they issued in December that removed bureaucratic barriers and have helped to place these children with sponsors as expeditiously as possible. And the bill continues to require HHS to report to Congress within 24 hours if an unaccompanied child dies in HHS custody.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Connecticut an additional 1 minute.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, a child did die in HHS custody. No one knew about this for 8 months, and it was only the news media that uncovered it. A child died.

This bill continues to ensure that Members of Congress can conduct oversight visits of shelters without being required to provide advance notice, and the bill continues to protect taxpayer funding by prohibiting funds from being diverted to programs outside of Health and Human Services. This bill provides clear direction, legal guardrails, about how our emergency funds should be used, and this bill wages the battle for the vulnerable.

Madam Speaker, I urge every Member of this House to support this bill.

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to simply concur in the Senate amendment without further amendment. This will immediately send the bill to the President and deliver the necessary resources needed to respond to this humanitarian crisis.

Madam 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, let me just say again, we can solve this problem now.

I respect that my friends have strong feelings about their legislation. We all do. The reality is that that legislation is not going to get through the Senate; it is not going to be signed by the President.

We have a vehicle that has already gotten through the Senate, that 75 percent of the Democrats in the Chamber voted for, including the entire Democratic leadership, and that could go, if this House would act on it, straight to the President's desk and be signed into law.

Now, my friends are, I know, concerned about resources. And, again, it is nice that they are. It would have been nice if, in the 18 previous times we have tried to bring this matter up before the House, they would have helped. It would have been nice if, 2 months ago, we had actually seen them respond.

We share their concern for these young people. That is why we asked for extra resources. The administration asked for extra resources 58 days ago. So I think, again, this ought to be pretty easy to resolve here.

My friends, with all due respect, have a partisan bill that will pass along partisan lines in this House, that will not be enacted by the Senate, and that will not be signed by the President.

The Senate has a bill they have already passed in a bipartisan fashion. It, frankly, has more money to help the people who are being paid overtime in the Border Patrol to—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The gentleman from Oklahoma may continue.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker personally for taking control of a difficult situation.

So, Madam Speaker, just to resume my point, we have a vehicle. It could literally pass on this floor in less than an hour. It could head to the President. It satisfies almost all—not all, but almost all—of my friends' concerns. I would just ask them, in all seriousness, to just consider political reality here and let's get this done and get these resources to where they are needed. We can do that. We can do it in a bipartisan fashion.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles: One from Vox, entitled, ''The Horrifying Conditions Facing Kids in Border Detention, Explained,'' and another from Time magazine, entitled, ''Lawyers Say Migrant Children Are Living in 'Traumatic and Dangerous' Conditions at Border Detention Site.''

[From Vox, June 25, 2019]

THE HORRIFYING CONDITIONS FACING KIDS IN BORDER DETENTION, EXPLAINED

(By Dara Lind)

On any given day, 2,000 children are in Border Patrol custody, and the problems are hardly confined to one facility.

At any given time, for the past several weeks, more than 2,000 children have been held in the custody of US Border Patrol without their parents. Legally, they're not supposed to be held by border agents for more than 72 hours before being sent to the Department of Health and Human Services, which is responsible for finding their nearest relative in the US to house them while their immigration cases are adjudicated.

In practice, they're being held for days, sometimes weeks, in facilities without enough food or toothbrushes—going days without showering, overcrowded and undercared for.

Late last week, the conditions of that detention in one facility in Clint, Texas, became public when investigators, checking on the US government's obligations under the Flores agreement (which governs the care of immigrant children in US custody), were so horrified that they turned into public whistleblowers and spoke to the Associated Press about what they saw.

The stories they told have horrified much of America. The past several days have seen growing outrage, and the acting commissioner of Customs and Border Protection (which oversees CBP) announced his resignation Tuesday (though officials maintain the outrage didn't cause the resignation).

But the problem goes beyond one official—or one facility.

The story gained even wider traction after Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez's (D–NY) reference to the detention facilities as ''concentration camps,'' and the ensuing debate over whether that term was appropriate.

The US government's response was to move the children out of the Clint facility—and move another group of children in.

On Monday, officials confirmed that all 350 of the children there last week would be moved to other facilities by Tuesday; about 250 of them have been placed with HHS, and the remainder are being sent to other Border Patrol facilities. But on Tuesday morning, a Customs and Border Protection official told a New York Times reporter on a press call that about a hundred children were currently being housed at Clint.

That's illustrative of the hectic improvisation that's characterized much of the Trump administration's response to the current border influx. It's a problem that is much, much bigger than the problems at a single facility. Indeed, the problems investigators identified at Clint are problems elsewhere as well.

The lone member of the team of legal investigators who visited the El Paso facility in which many children were sent from Clint—called ''Border Patrol Station 1''—told Vox that conditions there were just as bad as they were in Clint, with the same problems of insufficient food, no toothbrushes, and aggressive guards.

The problem isn't the Clint facility. The problem is the hastily-cobbled-together system of facilities Customs and Border Protection (the agency which runs Border Patrol) has thrown together in the last several months, as the unprecedented number of families and children coming into the US without papers has overwhelmed a system designed to swiftly deport single adults.

It is apparent that even an administration acting with the best interests of children in mind at every turn would be scrambling right now. But policymakers are split on how much of the current crisis is simply a resource problem—one Congress could help by sending more resources—and how much is deliberate mistreatment or neglect from an administration that doesn't deserve any more money or trust.

Border Patrol isn't prepared to care for children at all. It's now housing 2,000 a day.

According to statistics sent to congressional staff last week and obtained by Vox, between May 14 and June 13, US Border Patrol facilities were housing over 14,000 people a day—and sometimes as many as 18,000. (The most recent tally, as of June 13, was nearly 16,000.)

Most of these were single adults, or parents with children. But consistently, over that month, around 2,000—2,081 as of June 13—were ''unaccompanied alien children,'' or children being held without adult relatives in separate facilities.

In an early June press call, a Customs and Border Protection official said, referring to the total number of people in custody, ''when we have 4,000 in custody, we consider that high. 6,000 is a crisis.''

Traditionally, an ''unaccompanied alien child'' refers to a child who comes to the US without a parent or guardian. Increasingly—as lawyers have been reporting, and as the investigators who interviewed children in detention last week confirmed—children are coming to the US with a relative who is not their parent, and being separated.

Because the law defines an ''unaccompanied'' child as someone without a parent or legal guardian here, border agents don't have the ability to keep a child with a grandparent, aunt or uncle, or even a sibling who's over 18, though advocates have also raised concerns that border agents are separating relatives even when there is evidence of legal guardianship.

Under the terms of US law—and especially the 1997 Flores settlement, which governs the treatment of children in immigration custody—immigration agents are obligated to get unaccompanied children out of immigration detention as quickly as possible, and to keep them in the least restrictive conditions possible while they're there. Barring emergencies, children aren't supposed to be

in Border Patrol custody for more than 72 hours before being sent to HHS—which is responsible for finding and vetting a sponsor to house the child (usually their closest relative in the United States).

That hasn't been happening. Attorneys, doctors, and human rights observers have consistently reported that children are being held by Border Patrol for days or longer before being picked up by HHS. And in the meantime, they're being kept in facilities that weren't built to hold even adults for that period of time, or in improvised ''soft-sided'' facilities that look like (and are commonly referred to as) tents.

The detention conditions crisis doesn't just affect children. But conditions for children are under special legal scrutiny.

Since late last year, US immigration agents have been overwhelmed by the number of families coming across the border. The US immigration system, which was built to quickly arrest and deport single Mexican adults crossing into the US to work, doesn't have the capacity to deal with tens of thousands of families (mostly from Central America) who are often seeking asylum in the US.

The length of time migrants are spending in Border Patrol custody (and the conditions there) have attracted some alarm before. In April, pictures of migrants being held outside under a bridge in El Paso, fenced in and sleeping on the ground, attracted outrage and led Border Patrol to stop holding migrants there. And in May, the DHS Office of the Inspector General released an emergency report about dangerous overcrowding of adults in two facilities: with up to 900 people being held in a facility designed to hold 125.

Because of the Flores settlement, lawyers have the opportunity to investigate conditions for children to see if the government is complying—and possibly ask a judge to intervene if it is not. That's what spurred the fact-finding mission that led to last week's stories.

The reports about Clint broke at a time when the Trump administration was already playing defense about its compliance with the Flores settlement. (While the administration is working on a regulation that would supersede the terms of the agreement, that regulation isn't expected to be published in final form until fall, and may well be held up in court.)

In a 9th Circuit Court of Appeals hearing earlier last week about whether the administration needed to allow a court appointee to monitor conditions for children in ICE and CBP custody, Department of Justice lawyer Sarah Fabian told judges that children didn't necessarily need towels or toothbrushes to be in ''safe and sanitary'' conditions—a clip that looked especially bad when the Clint stories came out showing the children were being denied just that.

The court hearing was not specifically about the Clint facility—it wasn't about what investigators found last week at all. And as Ken White explained for the Atlantic, Fabien's cringeworthy ''safe and sanitary'' argument came from the awkward stance the Trump administration has taken in this litigation: In order to challenge the court appointment of a special monitor, they argued that there's a difference between a promise to keep kids in ''safe and sanitary'' conditions (which the government has agreed to for decades) and a guarantee of particular items like toothbrushes.

The court appeared unimpressed. And the stories about Clint and other facilities that have come out in the ensuing days certainly bolstered the case that the Trump administration has either willingly violated its agreement to keep kids safe and healthy, or has been unable to keep it—or a mix of both.

The problem isn't Clint.

The problems that investigators identified at Clint—too many people, not enough food, no toothbrushes—weren't inherent to that facility. They were indications of an overloaded (or neglected) system.

And it's already clear that those problems go beyond Clint.

ABC News obtained testimony from a doctor who visited another facility for children in Texas—the Ursula facility—and witnessed ''extreme cold temperatures, lights on 24 hours a day, no adequate access to medical care, basic sanitation, water, or adequate food.'' She said the conditions were so bad that they were ''tantamount to intentionally causing the spread of disease.''

The children are now being sent from Clint to a facility that is just as bad, according to Clara Long of Human Rights Watch, who was the only member of last week's investigative team who visited it.

Long told Vox that when she was there, the facility in El Paso known as ''Border Patrol Station 1'' was mostly being used as a transit center where migrants were staying only a few hours before going elsewhere. But she spoke to one family who had been held in a cell there for six days, and who voiced the same concerns that children in the Clint facility did.

The mother of the family, Long said, was so ashamed of not having clean teeth—the El Paso facility, like Clint, wasn't providing enough toothbrushes—that ''when she was talking to you she would put her hand up in front of her mouth and wouldn't take it down.'' The teenage son said he was afraid of the guards because when he'd gotten up to go to the bathroom in the middle of the night, a guard had shoved him back into his cell and slammed the door on him. For two nights, the family had had to sleep on the cold floor without blankets.

The fundamental question: Why is it taking so long to get kids out of custody—and is it happening on purpose?

Most of the children who were at Clint when the team visited last week—about 250 of the 350—were set to be sent to HHS custody by Tuesday.

Questions remain about what is happening to the other 1,750 or so children who were in Border Patrol detention on Thursday if levels have remained static since mid-June, and why the government was able to place only 250 children over five days with the agency that's supposed to take responsibility for all children within 72 hours.

It's not clear where the bureaucratic breakdown really is—and whether it's the result of resource constraints or choices about how resources are used.

The Trump administration definitely has made a choice to keep single adults in detention, even if it could release them. Border Patrol chief Carla Provost has told Congress that ''if we lose (the ability to keep and deport) single adults, we lose the border.'' That does raise questions about whether the overcrowding in adult facilities could be avoided.

But it doesn't address the issue of unaccompanied children, who can't simply be released with a notice to appear in immigration court. While children with parents in the US could theoretically be placed with those parents, the government is supposed to vet potential sponsors to make sure it's not placing children with traffickers—but that's the job of HHS, and the vetting doesn't begin until children are released from Border Patrol custody.

Observers and policymakers agree that HHS simply doesn't have the capacity to take migrant kids in. One Democratic Hill staffer compared it to a ''jigsaw puzzle'': Not only are there only so many spaces available to place a child, but the facilities available might not match the child's particular needs. (You can't put an infant in an HHS shelter for teens, for example.) But another Hill staffer told Vox that HHS claims it's never refused a transfer for space reasons, muddying the waters.

Then there's the question of whether CBP is really doing all it can to care for kids in the time they're in CBP's care.

One of the Clint observers told Isaac Chotiner of the New Yorker stories of cruelty from some guards, indicating that they were deliberately punishing children for the sin of coming to the US without papers. But she also said that many guards were sympathetic, and told the observers that children shouldn't be in their custody—implying that they were doing the best they could and simply didn't have the resources to do more. (Advocates also say they've tried to donate supplies to Border Patrol facilities but had their donations rejected; it's not clear if this was a Border Patrol decision, or if there's a legal complication banning outside donations.)

Congress is considering a package right now to give the Trump administration billions more dollars to deal with migrants coming into the US. To Democratic leadership, including the appropriators led by Rep. Lucille Roybal-Allard (D–CA), who drafted the House version of the supplemental package, the solution to poor conditions in custody is to provide more money specifically to improve those conditions. They emphasize that the bulk of the funding will go to HHS to increase capacity for migrant kids and that funding for ICE and CBP will be strictly limited to humanitarian use.

But to some progressives, led in Congress by Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, giving any money to immigration enforcement agencies right now is an endorsement of the current state of affairs.

The not-one-more-dime camp, in part, is taking a bright-line stance against the detention of children. But in part, they're demonstrating a lack of trust in the administration to adhere to any law or condition. And they assume that any money given to ICE for transit of migrant kids will, in some way or another, encourage ICE to detain more families and arrest more immigrants in the United States.

The ''smart money'' camp, on the other hand, believes firmly that without funds to improve conditions in detention, the conditions will only get worse.

That's especially relevant in the case of kids deemed ''unaccompanied,'' who have to remain in custody until a sponsor is found. The past few days have demonstrated that those children are extremely vulnerable and that much of the American public wants their situation to change. It just may not be clear how.

[From Time, June 20, 2019]

LAWYERS SAY MIGRANT CHILDREN ARE LIVING IN 'TRAUMATIC AND DANGEROUS' CONDITIONS AT BORDER DETENTION SITE

(By Ccedar Attanasio, Garance Burke and Martha Mendoza)

CLINT, TEXAS.—In a tiny Texas town about a half-hour drive from El Paso, a nondescript Border Patrol station operated for six years primarily as a hub for agents on patrol, drawing little scrutiny from immigration attorneys who have been loudly advocating against mass U.S. detention camps that can hold more than 2,000 teens at a time.

And so attorneys visiting the Border Patrol station in Clint, Texas, this week said they were shocked to find more than 250 infants, children and teens inside the complex of windowless buildings, trying to care for each other with what they described as inadequate food, water and sanitation. ''This facility wasn't even on our radar before we

came down here,'' said law professor Warren Binford, a member of the team that has interviewed 60 detainees in Clint.

Binford's group warned that because Customs and Border Protection facilities are overwhelmed with migrants, they feared similar situations could be unfolding elsewhere.

Attorney Toby Gialluca, who visited teens and their babies last week in a McAllen, Texas, Border Patrol station, said everyone she interviewed was very sick with high fevers, coughing, and wearing soiled clothes crusted with mucus and dirt after their long trip north. Fifteen kids at Clint had the flu, another 10 were quarantined. ''Everyone is sick. Everyone. They're using their clothes to wipe mucus off the children, wipe vomit off the children. Most of the little children are not fully clothed,'' she said.

Migrant teens in McAllen told her they were offered frozen ham sandwiches and rotten food, Gialluca said. In both stations, the children told attorneys that guards instructed girls as young as age 8 to care for the babies and toddlers.

Border Patrol stations are designed to hold people for less than three days, but some children held in Clint and McAllen have been in there for weeks. Legally, migrants under 18 should be moved into Office of Refugee Resettlement care within 72 hours.

But federal officials have said they have hit a breaking point, with too many migrant children and nowhere to put them. That's in part because over the last year, migrant children have been staying longer in federal custody than they had historically, meaning there are fewer shelter beds in the separate Office of Refugee and Resettlement program where kids are sent from the Border Patrol stations.

Unlike privately contracted child detention facilities, Border Patrol stations are federal facilities, exempt from state health and safety standards, according to Texas Department of Health and Human Services spokesman John Reynolds. Child abuse and neglect investigators are not allowed to investigate the stations because they not licensed by the state.

In Clint, Binford described that during interviews with children in a conference room at the facility, ''little kids are so tired they have been falling asleep on chairs and at the conference table.'' An 8-year-old taking care of a very small 4-year-old with matted hair could not convince the younger girl to take a shower, Binford said.

The lawyers inspected the Border Patrol facilities as part of a President Bill Clinton-era legal agreement known as the Flores settlement that governs detention conditions for migrant children and families.

Neha Desai, director of Immigration at the National Center for Youth Law, said Friday that the U.S. government, attorneys involved in the Flores settlement and an independent monitor appointed by the judge overseeing the Flores settlement are in conversation about the situation of children held in McAllen and Clint.

The Clint facility opened in 2013 with little fanfare on a country road not far from the town's water tower, a liquor store and the sandwich shop where Border Patrol agents eat lunch and dinner. The advocate lawyers who negotiated access to the complex said Border Patrol officials knew of their impending visit three weeks in advance.

Customs and Border Protection officials had no immediate comment, but have said for months that the agency is at its breaking point for housing migrants, calling the situation in the El Paso area a humanitarian and security crisis.

In an interview earlier this week with The Associated Press, Customs and Border Protection John Sanders acknowledged that children died after being in the agency's care, and said Border Patrol stations are currently holding 15,000 people—more than three times their maximum capacity of 4,000.

He urged Congress to pass a $4.6 billion emergency funding package includes nearly $3 billion to care for unaccompanied migrant children.

A migrant father, speaking on condition of anonymity because of his immigration status, said he did not know where his daughter was until one of the attorneys visiting Clint this week found his phone number written in permanent marker on a bracelet the girl was wearing. ''She's suffering very much because she's never been alone. She doesn't know these other children,'' her father said.

Republican Congressman Will Hurd, whose district includes Clint, said ''tragic conditions'' playing out on the southern border were pushing government agencies, nonprofits and Texas communities to the limit.

''This latest development just further demonstrates the immediate need to reform asylum laws and provide supplemental funding to address the humanitarian crisis at our border,'' he said.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, before I yield to our next speaker, I would remind my colleagues that a vote to defeat the previous question really isn't a vote to bring up the Senate bill. It is a vote to give control of the House floor to the Republicans.

They say they would bring up the Senate bill, but there is absolutely no guarantee that they would. They could bring up a bill to fund a wall, for all we know.

Madam Speaker, we are here to find a way to alleviate the suffering of these children at our border and not to play political games. So I would urge my colleagues to make sure that they vote ''yes'' on the previous question.

And, by the way, I just say to my colleague from Oklahoma, a lot of us aren't satisfied with the Senate bill the way it has been drafted because there are protections that we want to see in that bill because, quite frankly, speaking for myself, I don't trust this administration.

I don't trust this administration to do the right thing, an administration that separated—knowingly and deliberately separated—children from their parents at the border, an administration that tolerated the conditions that have horrified the entire country.

So I want it clear that the moneys that we are appropriating are going to help children, not to continue this insane inhumane policy that has horrified this Nation.

I won't trust this administration to tell me the correct time, at this particular point. So, no, we are not satisfied. We want more protections in here for the children. We want more transparency. The American people, I think, expect that. We should provide them that information.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), the distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

Yes, indeed, we have a responsibility to act. As Speaker PELOSI has said, we must do this for the sake of the children, and I thank her for not capitulating to the Senate demands for a blank check.

When I reflect on the number of deaths that we have seen at the border, when I reflect on the horrific conditions in facilities where children are being held in ice-cold cells with no one to care for them but a child stranger—conditions in these facilities are horrific—I ask myself: Is this the America that I came to as a young child? Is this the America that my son swore to protect when he joined the U.S. Air Force? This surely isn't the country that welcomed me as a young child from Guatemala.

But we must work toward that American ideal that we all share. We cannot simply allocate funds to agencies where we have seen numerous children die in their custody.

No blank checks.

No more torturing of babies.

No more separating infants from their mothers.

This legislation brings funds to the children that are urgently needed.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. TORRES of California. It brings more transparency to CBP and ICE and HHS, and it contains important provisions to protect children. It ensures that the emergency funding that Congress provides is spent on what it is intended for and not the President's deportation force.

So I look forward to supporting this rule, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my very good friend and distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, well, here we are again, and I talked on this before.

I am from the State of Arizona, so border security is top and center of the discussion in Arizona and it has, quite frankly, been for years.

We have all known there has been a crisis at our border for many, many years, and that is why I am at least hopeful and inspired a little bit that my Democratic colleagues are actually admitting—finally—that there is a crisis at our border. So that is good.

The thing that is bad about this rule today is that I just don't understand. I guess some of my Democratic colleagues are just being stubborn because, on the one hand, you have the Senate that already passed an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill, where Senator SCHUMER voted for it. You have a President who said we are not in favor of this House version of the bill.

So here you have a President who, seemingly, is willing to sign the Senate bill; you have a Senate bill that has vast bipartisan support, even with the

top leadership in the Democrat Party; but, yet, here we are in the House, and I guess Members just want to make sure they have what they want in their bill, even if it is not going to pass and even if the money isn't going to actually get to solving the problem.

And so I ask my Democrat colleagues to put your stubbornness a little bit aside, because if we all have the goal, as has been said on both sides, to help solve this problem, to help with the children who are dying at the border, you know—what was it? Yesterday we saw the picture of the father and the daughter, and then June 14, we had a story in Arizona of a young 7-year-old girl who died, and the Arizona Air National Guard helped find and rescued other members of the party. I think we are united in trying to solve the problem, and I am glad that my Democrats finally say there is a crisis, to have acknowledged it.

But if you really want to help, let's stop this. Okay. Let's stop what you are doing, because I don't think you are going to win. You have the President on one side, the Senate on one side with bipartisan support, including Mr. SCHUMER, and yet we are here today, right before the July Fourth recess, and instead of giving in and saying let's just put up the Senate bill that we know is going to pass, that we know is going to help, you continue to, I guess, try to make a point.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Arizona an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I sincerely hope the Members have made their points, have made their talking points. Now let's get down to the business of doing what we are supposed to do in Congress: Pass a bill, pass the bipartisan Senate bill, but, also, let's work together on actually reforming our immigration laws, the root of the problem that is causing this problem, so we are not back here in 6 months or 1 year doing this again.

□ 1300

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would like to remind the gentlewoman that we are members of the Democratic Party, not the Democrat Party, and I would appreciate it if we were characterized correctly.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule.

Right now, there are thousands of children detained in temporary facilities, facilities like the ones in Homestead, which is right in the middle of my district. We have no answers. We have no idea of when these kids are going to be released. It is an overcrowded facility, with kids who are sleeping in warehouse areas on bunk beds, of more than 144 kids.

They are living in prison-like conditions. Many have been there for months. These kids should not be detained without their freedom and their rights. What we are asking from the Senate are reasonable requests for the safety and for the well-being of thousands of children.

We have to pass these provisions put forth by the House. We must put in writing that no child can be held and detained in a temporary facility like Homestead for more than 90 days.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, many of the children have families living right here in the United States that they could be reunited with. But those who are running the facilities have no incentive for reuniting them.

The Senate bill does not have a timeline. The Senate bill is inadequate. We must pass the House-amended bill.

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

I know my friends are aware of this, but the Senate bill is actually—well, I certainly would vote for it. I think it would have overwhelming support on our side. The President, in the past, has expressed some concerns, and that is an important thing, but the Senate has really worked through a lot of these differences.

The bill that we would like to see put on this floor and that we know would pass with overwhelming, bipartisan support is a product of compromise, so much compromise that the entire Democratic leadership felt comfortable voting for it.

With all due respect to my friends, their bill is not the product of compromise. It is not going to get very many Republican votes here, if any. I would be surprised, frankly, if it did. It is not going to get accepted by the United States Senate. It absolutely won't be signed by the President of the United States.

We are all concerned about the conditions. We have been expressing that concern for 8 weeks. We never called this a manufactured crisis. We never said that this was made up for political purposes. The administration recognized it 8 weeks ago.

We have tried multiple times to get this House to focus on it. I am very pleased that we finally reached a point that both sides are focusing on it. But we also ought to focus on what is possible to achieve in a limited timeframe.

We know we are running out of money. We know there are real-life consequences to that. They are starting to unfold right now. There are services being cut back. For a lot of these conditions, frankly, we ought to look in the mirror, as Congress, and ask why we didn't get these resources there a long time ago.

Frankly, the House rule that we are discussing on the House bill, that bill actually reduces resources at the border. It doesn't expand them. It reduces them. It reduces them also for the American military. That is part of it.

The Senate bill, in my view, frankly, is much superior to my friends' product, but it has one virtue above all: All we have to do is put it on the floor and pass it, and it goes to the President of the United States to be signed immediately. Resources begin to move to where they are desperately needed immediately.

That is not true with my friends' bill. All it does is reopen the dialogue with the Senate, where it has very little prospect of passing. Then, frankly, if it did pass—not likely—it would be vetoed.

I am befuddled, Madam Speaker, that they are pursuing a goal that they know will not work, but we have seen this time and time again. It is more important to get a bill across the floor in a partisan fashion than it is to put something on the floor that is bipartisan, that can pass the Senate and come into law.

Now, my friends know we live in an era of divided government, and we have wasted 6 months, in my view, dealing with a lot of things that we knew would never pass. But I respect my friends' right to bring their agenda to the floor.

This is different. This is a national emergency. It has to pass. We have one vehicle where it can be passed and be signed so that help can go immediately. We have my friends' vehicle, which I know they believe in passionately, and I respect that, but it can't pass.

It is pretty simple. Sooner or later, I hope we get to the obvious answer and pass the Senate bill and send it to the President.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I take offense to my colleague from Arizona saying we are not going to win. This is not a game. These are people's lives.

When my colleague says we need to try, we have tried. I am asking them to try harder because we are creating a whole generation of children, Madam Speaker, who will remember what we did. They will remember that we caged them up like animals. We ripped them away from their parents and pumped them with drugs to make them stop crying for their mothers.

No amount of apologizing and no amount of debating in this Chamber will make it better, Madam Speaker. I am asking my colleagues to be more humane, to debate real policy change that will address the crisis at the border, like comprehensive immigration reform.

We must do better for these children. Again, no amount of apologizing, no amount of debating, no amount of politicking will make it better.

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

I will just make the same point I have been making for days on end. We have something that can pass versus something that can't. I don't doubt for a minute that my friends are sincere in their concerns, but I also respect my colleagues on the other side of the rotunda in the United States Senate. I think they are sincere, too.

They have worked through and found a way to get something that got 84 votes. Three-quarters of the Democratic minority in the Senate voted for it. The entire Democratic leadership voted for it. The President has signaled that he will sign it.

We can continue the debates on some of these other things at a later point. My friends might want to come back with another piece of legislation addressing some of their concerns that they think are not appropriately addressed in the Senate bill. But the reality is that is the bill that can pass. The bill that they want to bring to this floor cannot.

We all agree there is a crisis. We all agree we need resources there. I think my friends know, if they would just put the Senate bill on the floor, it could pass, and it would go to the President.

We can continue to have this debate. We can even end it, launch some vehicle over to the Senate, and waste more time. That is all it will be, a waste of time.

I would hope we have all had our say. We all feel strongly about our points, but let's agree on the one thing we know can pass and the President would sign, which would get us resources and relief immediately on the border where we desperately need it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the gentleman from Oklahoma, but I am an optimist.

More importantly, I stand here in the name of Mr. Ramirez and his little, baby girl who were found on the shores of the Rio Grande. The question is: How did they wind up there? They wound up there because of this administration's policies that rejected them as they stood on the Brownsville-Matamoros International Bridge.

There was no reason to say the bridge was closed. They had a legal right to claim asylum, fleeing from the horrible violence of El Salvador. Yet, they could not stand there, and so this is their end.

I am supporting this bill because I believe we should not settle for just anything. This bill particularly provides for the requirements that have additional resources for these children so that they don't die, so that they do have toothpaste, that they are clean, that they are living in clean places. It acknowledges that children cannot be held like cattle in one place beyond 90 days, that you must find their family members, and, yes, there are family members.

This is a process that has been the law of the land and the international law for decades. It is an asylum that can be sought so the Nation can address it. It takes no one's place. It does nothing to hurt this Nation.

I support the underlying legislation because, in the name of Mr. Ramirez and his child, we must do what is right.

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

I personally thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), for the professional and very patient manner in which she handled the Chair and presided over this body. I wanted to recognize that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO), my very good friend.

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I, too, want to recognize my colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for having the coolest scarf in the House today, the American flag.

Bipartisanship has broken out in the Senate. They passed H.R. 3401, as amended, 84–8.

I am now happy to report to the House that bipartisanship has broken out on the floor of the House of Representatives, for I am announcing that 23 Democrats and 23 Republicans from the Problem Solvers Caucus have just issued the following statement: ''Given the humanitarian crisis at the border, the Problem Solvers Caucus is asking for the immediate consideration on the House floor today of H.R. 3401, as amended by the Senate.''

We now are certain that H.R. 3401 will pass. I ask us to let the bipartisanship spread to the rest of this House and put an end to this now, once and for all, and get the help to the border that is so badly needed.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 8¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I have the honor and privilege to be born as an American citizen. There are billions of people around the world who don't have that privilege, that honor, and that blessing.

Today, I get to exercise my privilege as a Member of Congress to bring my two grandchildren, ages 1 and 3, to the floor of the House of Representatives. It is a very emotional moment for me because when I see their beautiful brown eyes, I see their grandparents who were born in another country, and I see their great-grandparents born in another country, just like many people on this House floor whose grandparents and great-grandparents came from Germany, Guatemala, Mexico, or any other place on the planet.

We are fighting to do what is right, to do what is right for the gold standard that the world has seen in the United States of America, a place of hope and a place of future for people who are fleeing persecution for religious reasons or otherwise to be able to come to this country, kiss the ground that they walk on, and start anew.

My beautiful grandkids get to be American citizens because somebody made the journey sometime before them.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I will close by saying this: The United States of America has always been the gold standard, and that is the argument that we are making here today.

This is not a game. We are fighting for the lives of human beings who should have the opportunity to be just like every person on this floor: to be allowed the freedom to be who they choose to be, who God made them to be, by being in the greatest place on the planet. That is why we are fighting today.

□ 1315

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), who is my good friend.

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. We have a crisis on our southern border, and H.R. 3401 with the Senate amendments gets resources to give humanitarian assistance to those seeking asylum.

It also adds judges and judge teams to hear the claims of asylum. Many people have to wait up to 3 years to get their hearing. That is too long. I have twice in the last 2 weeks attempted to offer an amendment to add judge teams. Both times, the Rules Committee has failed to include it.

My amendment this week would have included the amount that was in the Senate bill, but it is now in the bill because we have the Senate bill sitting at the Speaker's desk.

I urge my colleagues to take up the bill with the Senate amendments that include judge teams. That is the only way to solve this real crisis: adjudicate the claims of these people who want asylum, reunite families, and stop people from being held in detention as long.

Mr. GONZALEZ from Texas and I have worked together on this. It is a bipartisan effort. This is a no-brainer. We need to add judges. The Senate bill does that.

Madam Speaker, I hope we can take up the Senate bill and make it happen.

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

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

Madam Speaker, in closing, I urge opposition to this rule. Once again, the majority is making the exact same mistake it made earlier this week. We have a bipartisan bill already approved by the Senate. The House should simply take it up and work its will on that bill.

Frankly, we all know, if that bill were allowed to come to the floor, it would pass overwhelmingly with a majority of each side voting in favor of it. Then it wouldn't have to go back to the Senate. It would go immediately to the President of the United States. He could sign it, and these resources would begin to flow.

Now, again, we have had a robust debate today, and I respect the passions on both sides and every point of view about this. Actually, I see a great deal of common agreement. We agree, which we did not 8 weeks ago, that there is an emergency on the southern border. We agree it is a humanitarian crisis. We agree there need to be resources that go there immediately. We agree that time is short.

We are also all elected officials who are privileged to be in this Chamber, and my experience with my friends on both sides of the aisle is that they are basically pretty practical people. They came here to solve problems. They have different viewpoints, but they are almost always very practical and try to get something done.

We know the Senate bill is not everything that my side would want. We certainly know it is not everything that my friend's side would want. But we know it is bipartisan. We know three-quarters of the Democrats in the other Chamber voted for it. We know it will pass.

With all due respect to my friends, they have clung so tightly to their bill, which I know they believe in. It will pass here, but it won't pass the Senate, and it certainly won't be signed by the President.

Where will we be if we continue down the road that they are laying out in front of us?

I know they are sincerely concerned about children on the border, but we are better off with a bill that passes so we have billions of dollars moving to where they are supposed to go, and a bill, by the way, that the entire Democratic leadership thought was appropriate and good enough.

Let's not sit here and make the perfect the enemy of the good. Let's be practical and deliver to the American people what they want, which is a solution, a solution that both parties will vote for and a solution that the President will sign.

How many times do we go home and hear that from our own constituents: Can't you guys get together and do anything? Can't you work together? Can't you put aside your differences and put the American people first?

It pains me as a House Member to admit it, I suppose, but the United States Senate did that in this case before we did. We can accept that and move on, and my friends can continue to fight for the things they believe. It is not as if, for these things that are in this bill that the administration won't accept, they can't wrap them up again and put them back in another bill and start the process.

If we do not act, the resources will not get to the border where they are needed, and these conditions that concern us all will continue.

I urge us to step back a little bit, accept that in this case the Senate has a bipartisan solution that will work, and for goodness' sake, just put it on the floor to see what happens.

We know what will happen. My friends will vote for it in overwhelming numbers. My friends on my side of the aisle will vote for it in overwhelming numbers. It will go straight to the President of the United States.

That isn't going to solve the problem, but it is going to ease the problem, and that is going to move us in the right direction and provide our very hard-pressed people—who are working this problem by caring for the migrants, trying to protect our borders, and trying to provide justice—the resources they need to continue to work on this problem while, frankly, we continue to try to arrive at a legislative solution.

Madam Speaker, I want to end with a point I made just a little bit earlier. I thank the Chair for the patient and professional manner in which she has allowed us to conduct this debate. I thank her very much for making sure that when we had an outside disturbance, it was quickly dealt with.

I urge my friends to reconsider and, hopefully, come together around a bill that neither of us thinks is perfect but both of us could probably vote for and the President could sign.

Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for his participation in debate. It is always helpful and always enlightening. He is a good friend and a person I admire a great deal, even when we differ on a particular issue.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I think what is so frustrating to so many of us is that there is controversy around language to guarantee the protection of these children. The reason we think that is important is because this administration has ignored all the warnings.

We have had whistleblowers talk about the abuse at the border and how these children were being mistreated, and they did nothing.

This administration oversaw a policy of literally tearing children away from their parents. As a dad, I can't imagine what that must be like for any of those parents, and yet this administration thought it was fine.

We have a crisis at the border largely as a result of this President's policies. We need to deal with it, and we need to deal with it now. But we want to make sure we are actually dealing with the crisis and not giving him more money to create other crises.

I appreciate what the gentleman from Oklahoma said about the need for us to continue to work together, and while these negotiations are continuing.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is withdrawn.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 866. An act to provide a lactation room in public buildings.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 528. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide a lactation room in public buildings, and for other purposes.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1530

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CÁRDENAS) at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3401, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SECURITY AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER ACT, 2019

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 466 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 466

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–21. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be

considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), 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. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we had a robust debate here today surrounding the tragedy that is unfolding on our southern border where children are being ripped from their families; forced to sleep on cold concrete floors; denied soap, medicine, diapers—I could go on and on and on—all because of the President's failed policies.

That is what many of us believe, and that is what most national and international human rights organizations have also made clear.

Quite frankly, this should shake all of us to our core. I, for one, am very disappointed, and I will never forget the images and the stories. I will continue to fight for a better outcome and fight for these kids.

Having said all of that, it has been decided that we should move forward, so we are amending this rule so we can take up the Senate-passed bill.

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

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

I want to begin by thanking my friend. I think this is a wise decision. I know it was a difficult decision, but I think it is the right thing because I know we have a common objective here.

We know we need resources at the border right away. We know, by the action my friend is taking, we now have the possibility of making that happen and doing it in a very bipartisan way; that is, taking a bill that passed the Senate 87–8, moving it here with a very substantial bipartisan majority, and, frankly, getting resources to exactly where I know my friend and his colleagues want them to go, which is to help folks at the border deal with this ever-mounting crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we accept the amendment. I thank my friend. I thank our friends on the other side for making what I know is a tough but, I think, a very wise decision. I think the country will be better off for it.

I appreciate the fact that we will pass this legislation in a bipartisan manner. As the Senate did, we will here. The President will sign it, and the resources that we all want to arrive and help alleviate the difficult situation at the border will start moving immediately.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Oklahoma working with us. We have spent many hours up in the Rules Committee and on the floor, and I know he is committed to trying to get this issue right.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 322, nays 85, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

YEAS—322

Adams
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Cheney
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Clyburn
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Fudge
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gibbs
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Morelle
Murphy
Neal
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Tipton
Torres Small (NM)
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—85

Amash
Barragán
Beyer
Biggs
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester

Bonamici	Gomez	Moore
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	Mucarsel-Powell
Brown (MD)	Griffith	Nadler
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Napolitano
Buck	Grothman	Neguse
Chu, Judy	Haaland	Norcross
Cicilline	Higgins (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez
Cisneros	Jackson Lee	Omar
Clark (MA)	Jayapal	Perry
Clarke (NY)	Jordan	Pocan
Cloud	Keating	Porter
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Pressley
Connolly	Kennedy	Roy
DeFazio	Khanna	Ruiz
DeGette	Lawrence	Schakowsky
Delgado	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
DeSaulnier	Levin (MI)	Soto
Dingell	Lewis	Takano
Doggett	Lofgren	Titus
Escobar	Lowenthal	Tlaib
Espaillat	Luján	Tonko
Frankel	Malinowski	Trahan
Gaetz	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Vela
Gallego	Massie	Velázquez
García (IL)	Meeks	Watson Coleman
Garcia (TX)	Meng	Wild
Gohmert		

NOT VOTING—25

Abraham	Lucas	Steube
Aderholt	Moulton	Swalwell (CA)
Castro (TX)	Mullin	Taylor
Gabbard	Richmond	Thornberry
Hastings	Rogers (AL)	Torres (CA)
Johnson (LA)	Rooney (FL)	Walorski
Kaptur	Ryan	Wilson (FL)
Kinzinger	Schrader	
Kustoff (TN)	Sensenbrenner	

□ 1609

Ms. WILD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE, Messrs. HIGGINS of New York, TONKO, ESPAILLAT, COHEN, KEATING, NADLER, GOHMERT, LEWIS, MALINOWSKI, NORCROSS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mrs. DINGELL changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. GRAVES of Missouri, CARTER of Texas, CORREA, GOTTHEIMER, CARSON of Indiana, THOMPSON of Mississippi, JOHNSON of Ohio, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, BISHOP of Utah, and Ms. FUDGE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING MIGRANTS WHO HAVE DIED ATTEMPTING TO REACH THE SHORES OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, today I ask that we observe a moment of silence for the migrants who have died as they have tried to reach the shores of the America that they dream of.

The photograph that all of us saw this week should tear all of us up, for those of us who are parents, to see a toddler with her little arms wrapped around the neck of her father.

There is nothing that we wouldn't do for our children, nothing, to give them a better life.

Oscar and Valeria represent tens of thousands of migrants who have died as they have tried to build a better life for themselves, only to find that they are demonized and locked out of the promise that those of us who are natural born citizens are so fortunate to enjoy.

In their name, let us never forget their sacrifice and the sacrifice that so many parents make for the most vulnerable among us.

□ 1615

SECURING AMERICA'S FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2722) to protect elections for public office by providing financial support and enhanced security for the infrastructure used to carry out such elections, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am in its current form.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2722 to the Committee on House Administration with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 72, insert after line 3 the following (and conform the succeeding provisions accordingly):

TITLE IV—DISCLOSURE OF FOREIGN NATIONAL ACCESS TO ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 401. DISCLOSURE OF ACCESS TO ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.), as amended by section 121, is further amended by inserting after section 303A the following new section:

''SEC. 303B. ACCESS TO ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each chief State election official shall disclose to the Commission the identity of any foreign national known by the chief State election official—

''(1) to have physically handled—

''(A) ballots used in an election for Federal office; or

''(B) voting machines; or

''(2) to have had unmonitored access to—

''(A) a storage facility or centralized vote tabulation location used to support the administration of an election for public office; or

''(B) election-related information or communications technology, including voter registration databases, voting machines, electronic mail and other communications systems (including electronic mail and other systems of vendors who have entered into contracts with election agencies to support the administration of elections, manage the election process, and report and display election results), and other systems used to manage the election process and to report and display election results on behalf of an election agency.

''(b) TIMING.—The chief State election official shall make the disclosure under subsection (a) not later than 30 days after the date on which such official becomes aware of an activity described in such subsection.

''(c) FOREIGN NATIONAL DEFINED.—The term 'foreign national' has the meaning given that term in section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303A the following new item:

''Sec. 303B. Access to election infrastructure by foreign nationals.''.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit.

For months, we have heard about the interference in our elections and the report of Special Counsel Robert Mueller, this report right here. But nothing in this bill that we are debating today and voting on today before this body now addresses the concerns that have been raised in this report.

Mr. Speaker, nothing in the bill we are debating today addresses the concerns of foreign interference raised in the special counsel's report that I am holding right now. What we know is that Russia attempted to interfere in our 2016 election through a misinformation campaign, email hacking, and by exploring vulnerabilities of registration databases. This is gravely concerning to every Republican and Democrat in this institution.

But what does the Federal Government telling States that they must replace their safe, new, and auditable machines have to do with addressing these concerns? What does a hand recount mandate have to do with these concerns? What does recycled paper have to do with these concerns?

The tremendous costs associated with these Federal mandates only serve to draw resources away from the real vulnerabilities our States face.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have also represented that Republicans have done nothing to address foreign interference in our elections, and that, Mr. Speaker, is simply not true.

In 2017, this country's election infrastructure was designated as critical infrastructure, thereby allowing the Department of Homeland Security to immediately begin offering voluntary assistance to State and local election officials in the form of cybersecurity advisers, assessments, threat detection and prevention tools, information sharing, and incident response.

Additionally, the 115th Congress, last Congress, a Republican-controlled Congress, appropriated $380 million to States prior to the 2018 midterms to bolster election security and $26 million to DHS to add additional staff and carry out their assessment efforts, allowing for unprecedented cooperation between DHS and all 50 States and 1,400 localities in 2018.

Earlier this year, $33 million was appropriated to DHS to continue these assistance efforts, and earlier this week, the Republicans, my fellow Republicans, Mr. WALKER and Mr. LOUDERMILK, on the House Administration Committee, introduced our own Election Security Assistance Act.

So don't tell me we are not taking this seriously.

While so much of the focus has been on foreign interference today, we must not forget that we had a Member not seated this Congress following evidence that political operatives illegally harvested unsealed and only partially filled-out ballots. This practice is legal in many States, but as we have seen, it is ripe for fraud and abuse.

Republicans have offered multiple amendments to prohibit this practice in H.R. 1 and, now, the SAFE Act, each failing on a party-line vote. If we can't agree that this fraudulent practice should be banned, let us at least agree that foreign nationals should not be harvesting the ballots of American citizens.

Right now, a Russian operative could walk freely around States like California, for example, collecting and turning in absentee ballots, completely altering the outcome of an election. But my colleagues have shown no interest in addressing this huge vulnerability simply because it serves their interest only in certain States.

This practice invites a constitutional crisis. America, Mr. Speaker, is watching this vote right now. My amendment today would require the chief election official of each State to disclose to the Election Assistance Commission the identity of any known foreign national who has physically handled ballots, machines, or has had unmonitored access to the storage facilities or tabulation centers used to support elections, or even unmonitored access to election-related information or communication technology. This takes an additional step in rooting out foreign interference and lets the process of legislating about election security finally begin.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit. Vote to protect our elections from interference from foreign countries like Russia, China, and all others. Vote to preserve the integrity of our ballot, and vote to restore the American people's trust in our institutions.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make an important observation. The gentleman has said that what happened in North Carolina is perfectly legal in other States. Fraud is not legal in any of the 50 States.

I would like to note that, in our bill, we do have provisions that vendors must be owned and controlled by citizens or permanent residents of the United States and certain other provisions relative to security; but to conflate the allowance in some States—of 27 States and 9 others that designate allowing your mother or your brother or your neighbor to take your ballot with fraud is really pretty low.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

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

In our democracy, we should actively be seeking ways to involve more people rather than shutting them out of the process. Some States have done this by making voting accessible for homebound voters and others who have trouble physically getting to the polls and allowing an absentee voter to designate anyone of their choosing to drop off a marked ballot. This policy allows for greater participation in elections because some homebound voters have no family or individuals to delegate that role to. They should not be disenfranchised by our laws.

Ballot drop-off laws are, in and of themselves, perfectly appropriate election administration laws. If your aunt or uncle is a physician of an H1B visa holder, if you are working a double shift and you hand your ballot to someone who is a Dreamer, if you are married to an individual with TPS status, this would require you to report that individual to the Federal Government.

The House Administration Committee is already reviewing the foreign influence on American elections as the chairwoman mentioned, and we welcome the minority working with us in this regard. We know, from a Washington Post story published earlier this year, in which Members here in this Chamber are quoted as developing a strategy to engage in that practice themselves.

In fact, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle were quoted as being laser focused on ballot collection in the 2020 elections. So they will have to forgive me if I don't buy into the argument they are making today that their favorite examples of potential problems with the system are actions of a political operative on behalf of a Republican candidate who illegally changed and threw away ballots.

This is a suppression tactic. It is the height of hypocrisy that our Republican colleagues would be creating a new Federal standard after this entire debate they had been railing against the same. They will forgive us if we feel that that is a little disingenuous.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would close by urging every Member to vote against this motion to recommit and further note that the House Administration Committee will soon be examining foreign influence on our elections. We would welcome the participation of the minority in that important work.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 220, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

AYES—189

Aderholt	Chabot	Fulcher
Allen	Cheney	Gaetz
Amodei	Cline	Gallagher
Armstrong	Cloud	Gianforte
Arrington	Cole	Gibbs
Axne	Collins (GA)	Gohmert
Babin	Collins (NY)	Gonzalez (OH)
Bacon	Comer	Gooden
Baird	Conaway	Gosar
Balderson	Cook	Granger
Banks	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Barr	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Bergman	Cunningham	Graves (MO)
Biggs	Curtis	Green (TN)
Bilirakis	Davidson (OH)	Griffith
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Grothman
Bost	DesJarlais	Guest
Brady	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Hagedorn
Brooks (IN)	Duncan	Harris
Buchanan	Dunn	Hartzler
Buck	Emmer	Hern, Kevin
Bucshon	Estes	Herrera Beutler
Budd	Ferguson	Hice (GA)
Burchett	Finkenauer	Higgins (LA)
Burgess	Fitzpatrick	Hill (AR)
Byrne	Fleischmann	Holding
Calvert	Flores	Hollingsworth
Carter (GA)	Fortenberry	Hudson
Carter (TX)	Foxx (NC)	Huizenga

Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Zeldin

NOES—220

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

NOT VOTING—23

Abraham
Castro (TX)
Gabbard
Hastings
Johnson (LA)
Kaptur
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
Lucas
Moulton
Mullin
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Ryan
Schrader
Sensenbrenner
Steube
Swalwell (CA)
Thornberry
Walorski
Wilson (FL)
Young

□ 1632

Mr. ROY changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. 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 225, noes 184, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

AYES—225

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

NOES—184

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—23

Abraham
Castro (TX)
Gabbard
Hastings
Johnson (LA)
Kaptur

Kinzinger	Rogers (AL)	Swalwell (CA)
Kustoff (TN)	Rooney (FL)	Thornberry
Lucas	Ryan	Walorski
Moulton	Schrader	Wilson (FL)
Mullin	Sensenbrenner	Young
Richmond	Steube	

□ 1641

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SECURITY AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER ACT, 2019

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 466, I call up the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That 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 JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW

For an additional amount for ''Executive Office for Immigration Review'', $65,000,000, of which $45,000,000 shall be for the hiring of 30 additional Immigration Judge Teams, of which $10,000,000 shall be used for the purchase or lease of immigration judge courtroom space and equipment, and of which $10,000,000 shall be used only for services and activities provided by the Legal Orientation Program: Provided, That Immigration Judge Teams shall include appropriate attorneys, law clerks, paralegals, court administrators, and other support staff: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

FEDERAL PRISONER DETENTION

For an additional amount for ''Federal Prisoner Detention'', for necessary expenses related to United States prisoners in the custody of the United States Marshals Service, to be used only as authorized by section 4013 of title 18, United States Code, $155,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $92,800,000, for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied minors and family unit aliens at the southwest border and related activities: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $13,025,000, for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied minors and family unit aliens at the southwest border and related activities: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $18,000,000, for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied minors and family unit aliens at the southwest border and related activities: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $21,024,000, for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied minors and family unit aliens at the southwest border and related activities: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT

For an additional amount for ''Operations and Support'' for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in aliens at the southwest border and related activities, $1,015,431,000; of which $819,950,000 shall be available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That of the amounts provided under this heading, $708,000,000 is for establishing and operating migrant care and processing facilities, $111,950,000 is for consumables and medical care, $35,000,000 is for transportation, $110,481,000 is for temporary duty and overtime costs including reimbursements, and $50,000,000 is for mission support data systems and analysis: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Construction, and Improvements'' for migrant care and processing facilities, $85,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023: Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT

For an additional amount for ''Operations and Support'' for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in aliens at the southwest border and related activities, $208,945,000: Provided, That of the amounts provided under this heading, $35,943,000 is for transportation of unaccompanied alien children, $11,981,000 is for detainee transportation for medical needs, court proceedings, or relocation from U.S. Customs and Border Protection custody, $20,000,000 is for alternatives to detention, $45,000,000 is for detainee medical care, $69,735,000 is for temporary duty, overtime, and other on-board personnel costs including reimbursements, $5,000,000 is for the Office of Professional Responsibility for background investigations and facility inspections, and $21,286,000 is for Homeland Security Investigations human trafficking investigations: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for ''Federal Assistance'', $30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, for the emergency food and shelter program under title III of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11331 et seq.) for the purposes of providing assistance to aliens released from the custody of the Department of Homeland Security: Provided, That notwithstanding sections 315 and 316(b) of such Act, funds made available under this section shall be disbursed by the Emergency Food and Shelter Program National Board not later than 30 days after the date on which such funds become available: Provided further, That the Emergency Food and Shelter Program National Board shall distribute such funds only to jurisdictions or local recipient organizations serving communities that have experienced a significant influx of such aliens: Provided further, That such funds may be used to reimburse such jurisdictions or local recipient organizations for costs incurred in providing services to such aliens on or after January 1, 2019: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 301. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available under each heading in this title shall only be used for the purposes specifically described under that heading.

SEC. 302. Division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 116–6) is amended by adding after section 540 the following:

''SEC. 541. (a) Section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall be applied—

''(1) In subsection (a), by substituting 'September 30, 2019,' for 'September 30, 2017,'; and

''(2) In subsection (c)(1), by substituting 'September 30, 2019,' for 'September 30, 2017'.

''(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security, under the authority of section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391(a)), may carry out prototype projects under section 2371b of title 10, United States Code, and the Secretary shall perform the functions of the Secretary of Defense as prescribed.

''(c) The Secretary of Homeland Security under section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391(d)) may use the definition of nontraditional government contractor as defined in section 2371b(e) of title 10, United States Code.''.

SEC. 303. None of the funds provided in this Act under ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Operations and Support'' for facilities shall be available until U.S. Customs and Border Protection establishes policies (via directive, procedures, guidance, and/or memorandum) and training programs to ensure that such facilities adhere to the National Standards on Transport, Escort, Detention, and Search, published in October of 2015: Provided, That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall provide a detailed report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of

Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the House Judiciary Committee regarding the establishment and implementation of such policies and training programs.

SEC. 304. No later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a report on the number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers assigned to northern border land ports of entry and temporarily assigned to the ongoing humanitarian crisis: Provided, That the report shall outline what resources and conditions would allow a return to northern border staffing levels that are no less than the number committed in the June 12, 2018 Department of Homeland Security Northern Border Strategy: Provided further, That the report shall include the number of officers temporarily assigned to the southwest border in response to the ongoing humanitarian crisis, the number of days the officers will be away from their northern border assignment, the northern border ports from which officers are being assigned to the southwest border, and efforts being made to limit the impact on operations at each northern border land port of entry where officers have been temporarily assigned to the southwest border.

SEC. 305. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 116–6) for the Department of Homeland Security may be used to relocate to the National Targeting Center the vetting of Trusted Traveler Program applications and operations currently carried out at existing locations unless specifically authorized by a statute enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 306. The personnel, supplies, or equipment of any component of the Department of Homeland Security may be deployed to support activities of the Department of Homeland Security related to the significant rise in aliens at the southwest border and related activities, and for the enforcement of immigration and customs laws, detention and removals of aliens crossing the border unlawfully, and investigations without reimbursement as jointly agreed by the detailing components.

TITLE IV

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for ''Refugee and Entrant Assistance'', $2,881,552,000, to be merged with and available for the same period as funds appropriated in Public Law 115–245 ''for carrying out such sections 414, 501, 462, and 235'', which shall be available for any purpose funded under such heading in such law: Provided, That if any part of the reprogramming described in the notification submitted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (the ''Secretary'') to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on May 16, 2019 has been executed, such amounts provided by this Act as are necessary shall be used to reverse such reprogramming: Provided further, That amounts allocated by the Secretary for costs of leases of property that include facilities to be used as hard-sided dormitories for which the Secretary intends to seek State licensure for the care of unaccompanied alien children, and that are executed under authorities transferred to the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) under section 462 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That ORR shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 72 hours of conducting a formal assessment of a facility for possible lease or acquisition and within 7 days of any acquisition or lease of real property: Provided further, That not less than $866,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the provision of care in licensed shelters and for expanding the supply of shelters for which State licensure will be sought, of which not less than $27,000,000 shall be available for the purposes of adding shelter beds in State-licensed facilities in response to funding opportunity HHS–2017–ACF–ORR–ZU–1132, and of which not less than $185,000,000 shall be available for expansion grants to add beds in State-licensed facilities and open new State-licensed facilities, and for contract costs to acquire, activate, and operate facilities that will include small- and medium-scale hard-sided facilities for which the Secretary intends to seek State licensure in an effort to phase out the need for shelter beds in unlicensed facilities: Provided further, That not less than $100,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for post-release services, child advocates, and legal services: Provided further, That not less than $8,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the purposes of hiring additional Federal Field Specialists and for increasing case management and case coordination services, with the goal of more expeditiously placing unaccompanied alien children with sponsors and reducing the length of stay in ORR custody: Provided further, That not less than $1,000,000 of amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the purposes of hiring project officers and program monitor staff dedicated to pursuing strategic improvements to the Unaccompanied Alien Children program and for the development of a discharge rate improvement plan which shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 120 days of enactment of this Act: Provided further, That of the amounts provided under this heading, $5,000,000 shall be transferred to ''Office of the Secretary—Office of Inspector General'' and shall remain available until expended for oversight of activities supported with funds appropriated under this heading: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Health and Human Services (the ''Secretary'') shall prioritize use of community-based residential care (including long-term and transitional foster care and small group homes) and shelter care other than large-scale institutional shelter facilities to house unaccompanied alien children in its custody. The Secretary shall prioritize State-licensed and hard-sided dormitories.

SEC. 402. The Office of Refugee Resettlement shall ensure that its grantees and, to the greatest extent practicable, potential sponsors of unaccompanied alien children are aware of current law regarding the use of information collected as part of the sponsor suitability determination process.

SEC. 403. (a) None of the funds provided by this or any prior appropriations Act may be used to reverse changes in procedures made by operational directives issued to providers by the Office of Refugee Resettlement on December 18, 2018, March 23, 2019, and June 10, 2019 regarding the Memorandum of Agreement on Information Sharing executed April 13, 2018.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary may make changes to such operational directives upon making a determination that such changes are necessary to prevent unaccompanied alien children from being placed in danger, and the Secretary shall provide a written justification to Congress and the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services in advance of implementing such changes.

(c) Within 15 days of the Secretary's communication of the justification, the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall provide an assessment, in writing, to the Secretary and to Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of whether such changes to operational directives are necessary to prevent unaccompanied children from being placed in danger.

SEC. 404. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance'' may be obligated to a grantee or contractor to house unaccompanied alien children (as such term is defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2))) in any facility that is not State-licensed for the care of unaccompanied alien children, except in the case that the Secretary determines that housing unaccompanied alien children in such a facility is necessary on a temporary basis due to an influx of such children or an emergency, provided that—

(1) the terms of the grant or contract for the operations of any such facility that remains in operation for more than six consecutive months shall require compliance with—

(A) the same requirements as licensed placements, as listed in Exhibit 1 of the Flores Settlement Agreement that the Secretary determines are applicable to non-State licensed facilities; and

(B) staffing ratios of one (1) on-duty Youth Care Worker for every eight (8) children or youth during waking hours, one (1) on-duty Youth Care Worker for every sixteen (16) children or youth during sleeping hours, and clinician ratios to children (including mental health providers) as required in grantee cooperative agreements;

(2) the Secretary may grant a 60-day waiver for a contractor's or grantee's non-compliance with paragraph (1) if the Secretary certifies and provides a report to Congress on the contractor's or grantee's good-faith efforts and progress towards compliance;

(3) not more than four consecutive waivers under paragraph (2) may be granted to a contractor or grantee with respect to a specific facility;

(4) ORR shall ensure full adherence to the monitoring requirements set forth in section 5.5 of its Policies and Procedures Guide as of May 15, 2019;

(5) for any such unlicensed facility in operation for more than three consecutive months, ORR shall conduct a minimum of one comprehensive monitoring visit during the first three months of operation, with quarterly monitoring visits thereafter; and

(6) not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, ORR shall brief the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate outlining the requirements of ORR for influx facilities including any requirement listed in paragraph (1)(A) that the Secretary has determined are not applicable to non-State licensed facilities.

SEC. 405. In addition to the existing Congressional notification for formal site assessments of potential influx facilities, the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at least 15 days before operationalizing an unlicensed facility, and shall (1) specify whether the facility is hard-sided or soft-sided, and (2) provide analysis that indicates that, in the absence of the influx facility, the likely outcome is that unaccompanied alien children will remain in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security for longer than 72 hours or that unaccompanied alien children will be otherwise placed in danger. Within 60 days of bringing such a facility online, and monthly thereafter, the Secretary shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report detailing the total number of children in care at the facility, the average length of stay and average length of care of

children at the facility, and, for any child that has been at the facility for more than 60 days, their length of stay and reason for delay in release.

SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary shall ensure that, when feasible, no unaccompanied alien child is at an unlicensed facility if the child—

(1) is not expected to be placed with a sponsor within 30 days;

(2) is under the age of 13;

(3) does not speak English or Spanish as his or her preferred language;

(4) has known special needs, behavioral health issues, or medical issues that would be better served at an alternative facility;

(5) is a pregnant or parenting teen; or

(6) would have a diminution of legal services as a result of the transfer to such an unlicensed facility.

(b) ORR shall notify a child's attorney of record in advance of any transfer, where applicable.

SEC. 407. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to prevent a United States Senator or Member of the House of Representatives from entering, for the purpose of conducting oversight, any facility in the United States used for the purpose of maintaining custody of, or otherwise housing, unaccompanied alien children (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2))), provided that such Senator or Member has coordinated the oversight visit with the Office of Refugee Resettlement not less than two business days in advance to ensure that such visit would not interfere with the operations (including child welfare and child safety operations) of such facility.

SEC. 408. Not later than 14 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and monthly thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and make publicly available online, a report with respect to children who were separated from their parents or legal guardians by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (regardless of whether or not such separation was pursuant to an option selected by the children, parents, or guardians), subsequently classified as unaccompanied alien children, and transferred to the care and custody of ORR during the previous month. Each report shall contain the following information:

(1) the number and ages of children so separated subsequent to apprehension at or between ports of entry, to be reported by sector where separation occurred; and

(2) the documented cause of separation, as reported by DHS when each child was referred.

SEC. 409. Funds made available in this Act under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance'' shall be subject to the authorities and conditions of section 224 of division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 116–6).

SEC. 410. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed spend plan of anticipated uses of funds made available in this account, including the following: a list of existing grants and contracts for both permanent and influx facilities, including their costs, capacity, and timelines; costs for expanding capacity through the use of community-based residential care placements (including long-term and transitional foster care and small group homes) through new or modified grants and contracts; current and planned efforts to expand small-scale shelters and available foster care placements, including collaboration with state child welfare providers; influx facilities being assessed for possible use, costs and services to be provided for legal services, child advocates, and post release services; program administration; and the average number of weekly referrals and discharge rate assumed in the spend plan: Provided, That such plan shall be updated to reflect changes and expenditures and submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate every 60 days until all funds are expended or expired.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 501. Each amount appropriated or made available by this Act is in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 502. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 503. Unless otherwise provided for by this Act, the additional amounts appropriated by this Act to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2019.

SEC. 504. Each amount designated in this Act by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available (or rescinded or transferred, if applicable) only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

SEC. 505. Any amount appropriated by this Act, designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and subsequently so designated by the President, and transferred pursuant to transfer authorities provided by this Act shall retain such designation.

SEC. 506. Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the number of asylum officers and immigration judges, including temporary immigration judges, and the corresponding number of support staff necessary—

(1) to fairly and effectively make credible fear determinations with respect to individuals within family units and unaccompanied alien children;

(2) to ensure that the credible fear determination and asylum interview is completed not later than 20 days after the date on which a family unit is apprehended; and

(3) to fairly and effectively review appeals of credible fear determinations with respect to individuals within family units and unaccompanied alien children.

In addition, the report shall determine if there is any physical infrastructure such as hearing or courtroom space needed to achieve these goals.

This Act may be cited as the ''Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019''.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mrs. Lowey of New York moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3401.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

□ 1645

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the motion currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairwoman for yielding and admire her for her distinguished and hard work to bring a solution to the floor. This is not the one that we had hoped for, but it is one that we will be voting on today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank NITA LOWEY, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, and all of the appropriators for their relentless good faith work on a strong bill that we had hoped would completely protect vulnerable children, keep America safe, and honor our values.

Today, sadly, and almost with a broken heart, those values are being undermined by failed policies which have intensified a situation of heartbreak and horror on the border, all of which challenges the conscience of America.

I will be brief in just saying, right now, children need their families. Right now, little children are enduring trauma and terror; many are living in squalor at the border station, patrol station; some are sleeping on the cold ground without warm blankets or hot meals.

Kids as young as 7 and 8 years old are watching over infants because no one else is there to care for them. As one little girl caring for two infants said: I need comfort, too. I am bigger than they are, but I am a child, too.

Mr. Speaker, we could have done so much better—so much better—than what we are faced with today. It is my belief, my colleagues, that our country is at a moment of truth in acting upon our values as we develop policies.

I am proud of the work that our appropriators in the House have done in passing a bill that received overwhelming Democratic support on Tuesday. It was even bipartisan.

The current situation on the border is shameful and does not reflect America's values. We don't need anyone—especially the United States Senate—to tell us what the needs are on the border and that we have to act expeditiously.

Our Members are very well versed and excellent representatives of the regions they represent and that are affected, but we want to find a path to

improve the conditions under which we are addressing and ministering to the needs of children and families there.

We are gravely disappointed in the actions taken by the Senate in opposing the regular order of the Congress of the United States. We will continue to fight for our values and priorities in our legislation and beyond.

Our strongest ally in getting a better policy than that which was passed by the Republican Senate is public opinion. And people and institutions of good faith in our country, our faith-based institutions who minister to the needs of our immigrants, know that this is not the best way to go. So as we go forward, we will continue to fight for our values with public opinion and faith-based organizations on our side.

The American people are constantly asking the question: Why aren't we doing a better job to respect the dignity and worth of our children? The dignity and worth of our children. The dignity and worth of our children.

That might amuse you, but it is not amusing to the children who are affected.

The children come first. At the end of the day, we have to make sure that the resources needed to protect the children are available. Therefore, we will not engage in the same disrespectful behavior that the Senate did in ignoring the House priorities.

In order to get resources to the children fastest, we will reluctantly put the Senate bill on the floor. As the Senate bill passes—when it does, if it does—it will not be the end of this debate. It will be the battle cry. It will be the battle cry as to how we go forward to protect children in a way that truly honors their dignity and worth, their spark of divinity that they are all children of God.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR), our colleague, for the beautiful moment of silence that she held earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their leadership to protect values, honor our values, keep America safe. As always, with every vote, it is a vote of conscience.

The situation at the border is a challenge to the conscience of America. It should be a challenge to the conscience of each and every one of us. As always, you must vote your conscience.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, the humanitarian situation at our southern border is disgraceful. The Trump administration has exacerbated a crisis that has led to intolerable conditions for children and families in the government's care.

We have been advised that agencies that provide critical services for children, including the Office of Refugee Resettlement and Customs and Border Protection, will imminently run out of funds.

Earlier this week, the House passed a comprehensive bill to fund these agencies and provide important reforms to ensure that children in our government's care are safe, healthy, and comfortable.

Sadly, the White House, which has done so much to create this crisis, refused to work with us to protect the children; and the Senate majority leader, who I am told is selling T-shirts that describe him as the Grim Reaper, refuses to respect the House as a co-equal body of Congress and negotiate the differences in our legislation.

Left in the lurch by this cruelty and callousness are the babies and children in government care. The House refuses to be a party to this cruelty. That is why we are reluctantly bringing the Senate legislation to the floor today.

We could have done better for our children and our families, but, unfortunately, the White House and the Senate would not allow that. So we will fight another day, and we will never stop fighting to protect the children who are our future.

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

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

I rise in very strong support of H.R. 3401, as amended by the Senate.

Hundreds of thousands of people have arrived at our border this year. More than 100,000 have crossed each of the last 3 months, with 144,000 in May alone. Some of these people are coming through points of entry, but the overwhelming majority are walking through the desert or swimming the Rio Grande.

Men and women across agencies and departments have been working together night and day trying to respond to the overwhelming surge, and they desperately need resources to cover the growing costs. This is a real crisis, and this bill provides funds for all those who are representing us and working without adequate pay.

As I said just yesterday, we are out of time. Some of our agencies are spending money they don't have because they have must-pay bills for contracts for food, for shelter, for transportation, and for medical care.

People are waiting in terrible conditions in the desert, and summer in Texas is here. Children are sleeping on the ground and need to be moved to shelters or homes. We need doctors and pediatricians and caregivers.

This bill gives the agencies the funds to care for these children, to reduce the overcrowding at border facilities, to repay the States, and to add immigration judge teams.

The Senate has already passed this bill on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis. Now we should do the same and send this bill to the President for his signature.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong ''yes'' vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion to concur.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to concur will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 305, noes 102, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—305

Aderholt	DesJarlais	Kelly (IL)
Allen	Deutch	Kelly (MS)
Allred	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)
Amodei	Doyle, Michael F.	Kildee
Armstrong	Duffy	Kilmer
Arrington	Duncan	Kim
Axne	Dunn	Kind
Babin	Eshoo	King (IA)
Bacon	Estes	King (NY)
Baird	Ferguson	Kirkpatrick
Balderson	Finkenauer	Krishnamoorthi
Banks	Fitzpatrick	Kuster (NH)
Barr	Fleischmann	LaHood
Beatty	Fletcher	LaMalfa
Bera	Flores	Lamb
Bergman	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Bilirakis	Foster	Langevin
Bishop (GA)	Foxx (NC)	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Frankel	Larson (CT)
Blunt Rochester	Fudge	Latta
Bost	Fulcher	Lawson (FL)
Brady	Gaetz	Lee (NV)
Brindisi	Gallagher	Lesko
Brooks (IN)	Garamendi	Levin (CA)
Brownley (CA)	Gianforte	Lipinski
Buchanan	Gibbs	Loebsack
Bucshon	Golden	Long
Budd	Gonzalez (OH)	Loudermilk
Burchett	Gonzalez (TX)	Luetkemeyer
Burgess	Gooden	Luria
Bustos	Gottheimer	Lynch
Byrne	Granger	Malinowski
Calvert	Graves (GA)	Maloney, Sean
Carbajal	Graves (LA)	Marchant
Carter (TX)	Graves (MO)	Marshall
Cartwright	Green (TN)	Mast
Case	Green, Al (TX)	Matsui
Casten (IL)	Griffith	McAdams
Castor (FL)	Grothman	McBath
Chabot	Guest	McCarthy
Cheney	Guthrie	McCaul
Cleaver	Hagedorn	McClintock
Cline	Harder (CA)	McHenry
Cloud	Harris	McKinley
Clyburn	Hartzler	McNerney
Cohen	Hayes	Meadows
Cole	Heck	Meuser
Collins (GA)	Hern, Kevin	Miller
Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Mitchell
Comer	Hice (GA)	Moolenaar
Conaway	Higgins (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Cook	Hill (AR)	Morelle
Cooper	Himes	Murphy
Costa	Holding	Neal
Courtney	Hollingsworth	Newhouse
Cox (CA)	Horn, Kendra S.	Norman
Craig	Houlahan	Nunes
Crawford	Hoyer	O'Halleran
Crenshaw	Hudson	Olson
Crist	Huizenga	Palazzo
Crow	Hunter	Palmer
Cuellar	Hurd (TX)	Panetta
Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Pappas
Cunningham	Johnson (OH)	Payne
Curtis	Johnson (SD)	Pence
Davids (KS)	Johnson (TX)	Perlmutter
Davidson (OH)	Jordan	Perry
Davis (CA)	Joyce (OH)	Peters
Davis, Rodney	Joyce (PA)	Peterson
Dean	Katko	Phillips
DelBene	Keating	Pingree
Delgado	Keller	Porter
Demings		Posey

Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spano
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Tipton
Torres Small (NM)
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Zeldin

NOES—102

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beyer
Biggs
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)
Butterfield
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Connolly
Correa
Davis, Danny K.
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Engel
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans
Gallego
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gohmert
Gomez
Gosar
Grijalva
Haaland
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Horsford
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Kennedy
Khanna
Lawrence
Lee (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Massie
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Mucarsel-Powell
Nadler
Napolitano
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pascrell
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Takano
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Welch

NOT VOTING—25

Abraham
Buck
Carter (GA)
Castro (TX)
Emmer
Gabbard
Hastings
Johnson (LA)
Kaptur
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
Lucas
Moulton
Mullin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Ryan
Schrader
Sensenbrenner
Steube
Swalwell (CA)
Thornberry
Walorski
Wilson (FL)
Young

□ 1717

Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mses. DELAURO and SPEIER, Messrs. SOTO and SHERMAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. MEADOWS changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 159, nays 149, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

YEAS—159

Adams
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Bacon
Banks
Barr
Beatty
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Brady
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Budd
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Comer
Cooper
Cuellar
Cummings
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
Demings
Deutch
Dingell
Engel
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Gallego
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gonzalez (TX)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Hayes
Heck
Hill (CA)
Horsford
Hoyer
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kim
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Lawrence
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Matsui
McCarthy
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moore
Morelle
Mucarsel-Powell
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pappas
Perry
Phillips
Pingree
Price (NC)
Raskin
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shalala
Sherman
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Soto
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stivers
Takano
Taylor
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walker
Wasserman Schultz
Watkins
Welch
Wild
Wilson (SC)

NAYS—149

Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Bass
Bera
Biggs
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Burchett
Byrne
Chabot
Cline
Cole
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Correa
Craig
Crist
Crow
Curtis
DelBene
Delgado
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Estes
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fudge
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gibbs
Golden
Gomez
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Holding
Horn, Kendra S.
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
LaHood
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Luján
Marchant
Mast
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mooney (WV)
Murphy
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palmer
Panetta
Payne
Pence
Peters
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Roy
Scalise
Schiff
Schrier
Sewell (AL)
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Spanberger
Spano
Stevens
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Turner
Van Drew
Walberg
Waltz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Westerman
Wexton
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Zeldin

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tonko

NOT VOTING—123

Abraham
Barragán
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Cisneros
Cloud
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cunningham
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Dunn
Emmer
Eshoo
Ferguson
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Granger
Griffith
Grijalva
Haaland
Hastings
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hollingsworth
Houlahan
Huffman
Hunter
Jayapal
Johnson (LA)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Keating
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff (TN)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Massie
Meadows
Moulton
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Palazzo
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pocan
Quigley
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan
Schrader
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Steube
Stewart
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Thornberry
Upton
Wagner
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young

□ 1724

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the following votes because I had to travel to my congressional district. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall Vote No. 426, ''no'' on rollcall Vote No. 427, ''yes'' on rollcall Vote No. 428, ''yes'' on rollcall Vote No. 429, and ''yes'' on rollcall Vote No. 430.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 2500, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to file a supplemental report on the bill, H.R. 2500.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2205

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have Representative BRIAN FITZPATRICK's name removed from H.R. 2205 as a cosponsor. His name was added inadvertently.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LURIA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

HONORING 2018–2019 CHAMPIONS: HILLSIDE BASKETBALL ALL-STARS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to commend the Hillside Recreational Basketball All-Star teams for their incredible successes this past season.

These young athletes and their coaches traveled all over the great State of New Jersey to compete in the New Jersey Basketball Association League.

The sixth and seventh grade athletes trained hard with their dedicated coaches which resulted in both teams winning 14 games. The teams then went on to win an additional four games during their championships. The seventh grade team maintained their 2-year champion streak.

These successes were accomplished thanks to each member's commitment to teamwork that allowed them to reach the height of their potential.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to say congratulations to the Hillside Basketball All-Stars.

□ 1730

RECOGNIZING RENA TURNER

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

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Representative Rena Turner for her years of service to North Carolina and in honor of her retirement from the North Carolina General Assembly.

Since 2013, Representative TURNER has been a tireless and effective advocate for Iredell County in the State legislature.

Rena has been effective as vice chair of the Appropriations Committee and also served on the Agriculture, Education, and Judiciary Committees.

In my view, she has been a champion for many economic sectors of our State but, in particular, agriculture, which she cared so much about.

Her constituents and I hate to see her go, but we take comfort in knowing that her family will get to spend some more time with her.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representative Rena Turner for her many years of service to Iredell County and to our State, and I wish her nothing but the best in her retirement.

WE MUST AID THE HONDURAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of a U.S.-backed coup that, even now, hangs as a cudgel over the people of Honduras.

Ten years later, Hondurans still face an erosion of human rights amid unimagined violence, an unaccountable government, lack of opportunity, and increasingly militarized internal security forces.

Just last week, in response to civilian protests, President Hernandez deployed the armed forces to quell his critics, a response that not only is recent, but reoccurring.

When you hear horrific accounts of violence and lawlessness in Honduras, it is no wonder so many seek a better life in America.

Ten years after the coup, we must own up to our role in the upheaval in Honduras and come to the aid of the people of Honduras.

HONORING NEBRASKA STATE TROOPER JERRY SMITH

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Nebraska State Trooper Jerry Smith. Jerry was killed last week in a tragic accident while on duty.

Jerry dedicated his life to serving. First, he served our Nation in the Army, where he won a Bronze Star. After his retirement from the Army, he served our great State with the Nebraska State Patrol.

He was highly respected in our community of Scottsbluff and Gering, Nebraska, and we grieve with his family.

His memorial service today was a testament to how many lives he touched and a tribute to his service. People from all around the State, and even law enforcement from out of State, joined together to pay their respects to Jerry.

He is survived by his wife, Karen, their children, and their grandchildren. Our hearts go out to them during this time, and they can be assured the entire State of Nebraska is with them.

We thank Jerry for his service to our State and remember him for his service as well.

GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Gun Violence Awareness Month and to honor the hundreds of thousands of survivors and victims of gun violence.

In 2018, in my city of Philadelphia, there were 351 homicides, and most of these were committed with a gun. What is happening in Philly is consistent with what is happening every day in violence-plagued Black and Brown communities across this country. It is sickening. So is the Senate's lack of action on commonsense gun reform bills that the House has passed.

While we still need commonsense gun reform, Senator CASEY and I have also introduced a bill that Members from both parties should be able to agree on, H.R. 2585, the Resources for Victims of Gun Violence Act.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join the 50 cosponsors and

the many organizations that are putting their concern for gun violence into action by supporting this bill, and I urge the Senate to act on the bills the House has already passed.

BUILD A WALL

(Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, today the House joined the Senate in approving almost $4.6 billion in taxpayer money to address the growing security and humanitarian crisis at our southern border.

We all share sympathy for the children and individuals who find themselves in suffering conditions at our southern border, but we should not confuse that the action that the House took today addresses the real crux of the problem at our southern border. Indeed, less than 5 percent of the funds that we approved will have a realistic impact on reducing the plague of illegal immigration that faces our country.

I call upon my colleagues and I call upon the Speaker, upon our return after the Independence Day recess, to take up this issue and send a clear message around the world that this country intends to enforce its borders and enforce its immigration laws.

Madam Speaker, I support and call upon the Speaker to allow us to provide the funding to build a wall at our southern border and support the President's efforts to control illegal immigration.

THE FIGHT FOR THE CHILDREN WILL CONTINUE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this was a tough week for those of us who, as mothers, have a deep pain for the conditions of our children.

It was a difficult week because Mr. Ramirez and his toddler died trying to seek an opportunity in the United States.

It was a difficult week because this administration rejected Mr. Ramirez from the Matamoros bridge and forced him to cross the Rio Grande.

Today, I voted ''no'' for the $4.5 billion, moneys that I know are needed and that passed and were provided for those in need. If my vote was needed to pass the bill, I would have done so.

But I am saddened by the fact that we passed a bill that does not have the strengthened protocols for treating the difficulties of children and their health needs:

It does not have the provisions dealing with the quality of the treatment of the children, the sanitation and safety;

It does not have the idea that children can only remain in a place for 90 days;

It does not have the ability to have a program that talks about or puts in place how these children are treated as relates to their healthcare and other matters.

So, I will continue to fight because these children's lives are important at the border and around the Nation, and we will get to a point where we can pass legislation that will treat these children who are suffering and fleeing in the right way.

WE MUST DO BETTER

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, once again, I say I am blessed to be an American citizen and honored to be a Member of the United States Congress.

Today is a bittersweet day for me as, today, I was able to bring my two grandchildren on the floor of this House, a courtesy that we afford each other as Members of this luscious body: my 1-year-old granddaughter, Jimena Luna De La Rosa, and my grandson, Joaquin Cruz De La Rosa.

But, at the same time, we voted for less than what we should have for the lives of so many men, women, and children who seek to come to the greatest land on Earth, the United States of America.

We must do better. We must do more. And it is time that we push back on a President who considers the gold standard to be the gold on a toilet instead of the gold standard that we have come to be known for around the world when it comes to having open arms of welcoming good human beings to this great country, to be part of this great land.

CONGRATULATING THE HECTOR GODINEZ FUNDAMENTAL HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS SOFTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Hector Godinez Fundamental High School women's softball team on their first ever CIF Southern Section championship victory. The team clinched their first ever title for the school and for Santa Ana Unified School District.

Their head coach, Ed Medina, has been the coach since the school opened in 2007 and was named the 2019 Orange County Softball Coach of the Year.

His assistant coaches—Clarissa Castellanos, Kevin Pola, and Selene Pola—are also to be commended.

Again, I congratulate the team, the coaches, and, of course, Principal Jesse Church on a job well done.

Congratulations, Grizzlies.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. MCCAUL, Texas
Mr. DUFFY, Wisconsin
Mr. HURD, Texas
Mr. CLOUD, Texas
Mr. SPANO, Florida

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 1903(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy:

Mr. RUTHERFORD, Florida

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, so we just took up the humanitarian crisis that is going on at our border and passed the Senate bill, so there will be a tremendous amount of money that will be going to provide more beds, shelter, food, transportation, whatever is needed. The one thing that the Senate bill is especially void of is money to secure our border.

It is something to say that, with all of the problems in the Senate bill, the things that were not addressed in the Senate bill, the fact that it was so much better than the House bill says an awful lot about the House bill and its shortcomings.

We have, still, and will after this bill is signed into law and money is put into use, a crisis on our southern border.

As was pointed out to me after some of us visited Normandy with the Speaker on the 75th anniversary of D-Day, on D-Day, we had 150,000 or so Allied troops that invaded Normandy, over 150,000, a tremendous number, landing craft, parachuting. Yet just in the month of May, that is about how many invaded our southern border—that we caught. We don't know how many didn't get caught.

Some think that for every one we actually catch and in-process, there is one that gets away. We don't know.

We know that there are a great number of people who are not caught because they are picked up on cameras

and with other information that is gleaned on the border.

But it will continue to be a problem after this money is spent, and there is some concern—it is legitimate—that when you have what the civil litigation would indicate is an attractive nuisance—that is the terminology in a lawsuit—and you don't put up a fence, a wall, something to impede people from coming into property illegally, then, if they hurt themselves—and the example most people think of is a swimming pool or a pool or a pond.

□ 1745

If you have that water on your property, and you don't bother to put up a fence or a wall, and someone comes onto your property and drowns, you are going to end up paying a tremendous amount of money, normally, to the family of whoever drowned coming onto your property when it was not properly secured with a fence or a wall.

That is not to say it has to be electrified or some kind of really intense structure. But you need to have something that would impede somebody from coming in and drowning in your water.

Now, the moment of silence earlier, most of us were deeply moved by the picture, horrendously tragic, of a child, who seemed to be so close, even sharing the father's shirt, with her little arm around his neck.

Having had girls growing up, that is an emotional picture for some of us especially.

But we have what most would say is the highest-evolved justice system, judicial system, litigation system in history. It has come through thousands of years of different types of laws, be them looking up at the bust of Hammurabi, the Code of Hammurabi, the Justinian Code. We have a Napoleonic Code.

We have had thousands of years of laws, and the civil litigation in this country is perhaps at the most perfected—a long way from being perfect, but as perfected as it has ever been anywhere.

That is where this concept of attractive nuisance has evolved and arisen from. There is a responsibility when you know there is something so attractive that people will be tempted to break the law and enter that property illegally, potentially, to their own detriment.

What are you supposed to do if you are a caring individual in charge of property? You put up a fence or wall, just like our former President Obama did.

I understand he built a 10-foot wall around his home. That is a good, responsible thing to do. It was good enough for the President when he was in the White House to raise the height of the fence and wall around the White House, and it is good enough for the former President as he built a wall around his private residence.

It is a good, responsible thing to do by a responsible person in charge of property, not only to provide privacy, but also to keep people from being lured to their own detriment.

It is high time we address that on our southern border. There are very few people in this body, on either side of the aisle, who have not at some point said that we need to secure our border, that we can't keep having people pour into this country illegally.

But something strange has happened as our friends have taken over the majority and Republicans have moved into the minority. Some people have realized: Wait a minute. If these people keep flooding into our country from other countries illegally, and they see us as the party that keeps the border porous and open for them to keep pouring in, they will surely reward us with their votes, so we will be able to develop a permanent majority.

The only trouble with that is that when that happens, we are destroying the goose that had been laying golden eggs of opportunity, freedom, incredible liberty like the world had never seen before, the United States of America and our Constitution, followed with the Bill of Rights.

Yes, it has taken a while to get them continuing to evolve toward greater perfection. But we have to do something, because if we don't, if we continue to have people pouring into the United States—when you look at the example of Normandy with 150,000 or so, we had that many illegally invading America in 1 month.

We have to do something because the people pouring in have not been educated on the responsibilities of maintaining self-government. They will end up forcing this country—not intentionally but because they do not understand the responsibility involved in continuing this little experiment in self-government that has lasted 230 years. They will unintentionally give way to either communism or progressivism, if you prefer that these days, or a pure dictatorship.

It is very disconcerting that, in this country, there is more and more rising emotion between different political thought.

Look at the difference between the American Revolution, the 8 years that it took to win our independence, 1775 to 1783, and toward the end of the year when the Treaty of Paris was signed. It started, ''In the Name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity.'' The British signed that. They thought that would be an oath that they would have to take so seriously in England that they would not breach that oath taken in the name of the ''Most Holy and Undivided Trinity.''

Historians know, normally, a government doesn't last more than 200 years, and they are lucky if they last 200 years. We have gone 230.

People look at the 10 years of the French Revolution, from about 1789, when our Constitution was ratified and when the Bastille was stormed, to 1799. What was the result of the French Revolution? It was an Emperor named Napoleon.

Some historians say that they think the big difference between the U.S. Revolution resulting in liberty and the French Revolution resulting in hundreds of thousands of heads being cut off was our Revolution was about liberty.

The Founding Fathers were not out there to cut off heads. They were out there to grab and preserve liberty, whereas in the French Revolution, there was so much sentiment of getting revenge that it ended up culminating in an Emperor named Napoleon.

We now seem to have so much animus and so much anger. There is some, from time to time, in this body. But some of the most vocal people pushing for impeachment, like my friend AL GREEN, he, literally, is a friend. He is a Christian brother. I disagree with him strongly on the need for impeachment, but I like the guy. He is my brother. I know he would not be saying what he does unless he really believes it.

I would never wish harm on somebody that I cared about like that. We can disagree without being mean. Yet, too often now, that is being lost.

We have to preserve this place. We are about to recognize our anniversary, the Fourth of July, when the Declaration of Independence was made public. This needs to be a time of serious reflection.

It ought to include John Adams' encouragement to celebrate, have parades, enjoy families, enjoy the country. Of course, he says the firing of guns. We try not to do that. Instead, they use fireworks.

He knew there ought to be a celebration to remind us of the sacrifice, what was gained through that great sacrifice, and the responsibility that ensued, along with the liberty.

We should also remember the way they got to the Constitution was when Randolph, from Virginia, proposed that, after 5 weeks of yelling and fussing, that even though they didn't have money to hire a chaplain, why don't they take a few days off and gather together, on our Nation's Independence Day, at a local church there in Philadelphia. They ended up settling on the Reformed Calvinist Church, with the Right Reverend William Rogers presiding, and they worshipped God together. They were led in prayer by Reverend Rogers. They came back after that and gave us the most extraordinary founding document in the history of the world that we still use 232 years later. It was a time of reflection.

Unless we secure our border though, we will not be a shining light on a hill. We will be a transit station for people around the world to pass through, hoping for something great but, instead, only seeing a once-great country whose experiment in self-government was destroyed by too many people coming in too quickly, who did not know, as they hadn't been educated, how to go about preserving self-government.

My hope and prayer for this Independence Day is that we will return to an appreciation for the God from whom all blessings, all good things, flow. If we do that, we can preserve this place for generations to come.

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

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 25, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 559. To amend section 6 of the Joint Resolution entitled ''A Joint Resolution to approve the Covenant To Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, and for other purposes''.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 28, 2019, at 3:30 p.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second quarter of 2019, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, KATE KNUDSON WOLTERS, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 12 AND MAY 15, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Kate Knudson Wolters	5/13	5/15	France		1,434.00		1,473.53				2,907.53
Committee total					1,434.00		1,473.53				2,907.53

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

KATE KNUDSON WOLTERS, June 13, 2019.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1448. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0802; FRL-9994-20-Region 9] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1449. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; SO2 Emission Limitations for United States Steel-Gary Works [EPA-R05-OAR-2018-0126; FRL-9995-67-Region 5] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1450. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Oklahoma; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report [EPA-R06-OAR-2016-0619; FRL-9995-36-Region 6] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1451. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Change of Address for Region 1 Reports; Technical Correction [FRL-9995-50-Region 1] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1452. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0512; FRL-9994-19-Region 9] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1453. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; KY; Attainment Plan for Jefferson County SO2 Nonattainment Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0625; FRL-9995-59-Region 4] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1454. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ethiprole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0493; FRL-9985-41] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1455. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County; Minor New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Program Revisions [EPA-R06-OAR-2018-0176; FRL-9995-44-Region 6] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1456. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mefentrifluconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0002; FRL-9994-51] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1457. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluopyram; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0630; FRL-9994-36] received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1458. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Major final rules — Repeal of the Clean Power Plan; Emission Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Existing Electric Utility Generating Units; Revisions to Emission Guidelines Implementing Regulations [EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0355; FRL-9995-70-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT67) received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1459. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 18-105, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1460. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a notification pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1461. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil Rights, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1462. A letter from the Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 No FEAR Act 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 Reform.

1463. A letter from the Officer, Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 No FEAR Act 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 Reform.

1464. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical corrections to Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA) regulations and disposal sites designated under the MPRSA [FRL-9995-28-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF91) received June 25, 2019, 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.

1465. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to the Marine Radar Observer Refresher Training Regulations [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0100] (RIN: 1625-AC46) received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1466. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Upper Potomac River, National Harbor, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0203] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1467. A letter from the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties: Semiannual Report to Congress, Third and Fourth Quarters, FY 2018 (April 1, 2018 — September 30, 2018), pursuant to 6 U.S.C. 345(b); and 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

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. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Armed Services. Supplemental report on H.R. 2500. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. 116–120, Pt. 2).

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 466. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes (Rept. 116–130). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 3153. A bill to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support research on opioid addiction, and for other purposes (Rept. 116–131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 3196. A bill to designate the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope as the ''Vera Rubin Survey Telescope'' (Rept 116–132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1146. A bill to amend Public Law 115–97 (commonly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act) to repeal the Arctic National Wildlife refuge oil and gas program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept 116–133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 255. A bill to provide for an exchange of lands with San Bernardino County, California, to enhance management of lands within the San Bernardino National Forest, and for other purposes (Rept 116–134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 434. A bill to designate the Emancipation National Historic trail, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept 116–135). 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 Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COX of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 3524. A bill to support the people of Central America and strengthen United States national security by addressing the root causes of migration from El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Education and Labor, Armed Services, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Financial Services, Homeland Security, Ways and Means, and Agriculture, 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 Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 3525. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to establish uniform processes for medical screening of individuals interdicted between ports of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 3526. A bill to authorize certain counter terrorist networks activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 3527. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to assign the highest priority status for hospital care and medical services provided through the Department of Veterans Affairs to veterans who are former prisoners of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3528. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to carry out a program to facilitate the development of digital products for the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. MURPHY (for herself, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SOTO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SPANO, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. MAST, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRIST, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 3529. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to promptly notify appropriate State and local officials and Members of Congress if Federal officials have credible evidence of an unauthorized intrusion into an election system and a basis to believe that such intrusion could have resulted in voter information being altered or otherwise affected, to require State and local officials to notify potentially affected individuals of such intrusion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLOUD (for himself, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 3530. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enforce the licensure requirement for medical providers of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3531. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to allow the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide assistance to reduce the harmful impacts to people and property from multiple hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 3532. A bill to control the export to the People's Republic of China of certain technology and intellectual property important to the national interest of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mrs. ROBY (for herself and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 3533. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the definition of crime of violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. DUNN):

H.R. 3534. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to revise the operations of the United States Preventive Services Task Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 3535. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the work-study allowance program administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 3536. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify lynching as a deprivation of civil rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Mr. SPANO):

H.R. 3537. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to codify the Boots to Business Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 3538. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for new markets tax credit investments in the Rural Jobs Zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 3539. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop best practices for the establishment and use of behavioral intervention teams at schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3540. A bill to ensure that certain loan programs of the Small Business Administration are made available to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, Agriculture, 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. CARBAJAL (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 3541. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish a coastal climate change adaptation preparedness and response program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 3542. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the Indian coal production tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 3543. A bill to ensure that certain entrepreneurial development services of the Small Business Administration are made available to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 3544. A bill to decriminalize cannabis, to establish an Equitable Licensing Grant Program in the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Small Business, 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. BEYER (for himself and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 3545. A bill to provide incentives for hate crime reporting, provide grants for State-run hate crime hotlines, and establish additional penalties for individuals convicted under the Matthew Shephard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3546. A bill to prevent Federal agencies from interfering with the marijuana policy of States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Ms. PORTER):

H.R. 3547. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish the position of the Assistant Director and Student Loan Borrower Advocate of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, to establish the Office for Students and Young Consumers of the Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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 Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 3548. A bill to improve data collection and monitoring of the Great Lakes, oceans, bays, estuaries, and coasts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Education and Labor, 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 Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on deductions for personal casualty losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3550. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit for hiring veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 3551. A bill to ensure that Members of Congress have access to Federal facilities in order to exercise their constitutional oversight responsibilities; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. SIRES, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CASE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MENG, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 3552. A bill to amend the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 to provide notification to relevant law enforcement agencies in the event that a background check conducted by the National Instant Criminal Background Check System determines that a person may not receive a firearm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CASE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MENG, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 3553. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to ensure that all firearms are traceable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MENG, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 3554. A bill to incentivize State reporting systems that allow mental health professionals to submit information on certain individuals deemed dangerous for purposes of prohibiting firearm possession by such individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3555. A bill to amend the Department of Education Organization Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require publication of information relating to religious exemptions to the requirements of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 3556. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced excise tax rate for portable, electronically-aerated bait containers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 3557. A bill to prohibit the imposition of duties on the importation of goods under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 3558. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study on the state of hospital infrastructure in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 3559. A bill to control the export of electronic waste in order to ensure that such waste does not become the source of counterfeit goods that may reenter military and civilian electronics supply chains in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 3560. A bill to provide assistance for the operation of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail Visitor Center in Nebraska City, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MCADAMS, and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH):

H.R. 3561. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to require the Financial Stability Oversight Council to consider alternative approaches before determining that a U.S. nonbank financial company shall be supervised by the Board of Governors of

the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 3562. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. MENG, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ):

H.R. 3563. 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, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 3564. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the Optional Practical Training Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 3565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that eligibility to contribute to health savings accounts is not affected by receipt of, or payment for, hospital care or medical services under any law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for both service connected and non-service connected disabilities to include hospital care medical services and extended care services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio):

H.R. 3566. A bill to help individuals receiving disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act obtain rehabilitative services and return to the workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HOULAHAN (for herself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 3567. A bill to modify the requirements relating to the acquisition and disposal of certain rare earth materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3568. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to award grants to States to implement a tick identification pilot program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H.R. 3569. A bill to provide grants to States to encourage the implementation and maintenance of firearms licensing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BERA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3570. A bill to prohibit commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 3571. A bill to establish an Office of Subnational Diplomacy within the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CORREA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COX of California, Ms. PORTER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BERA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. LEVIN of California):

H.R. 3572. A bill to require States to carry out congressional redistricting in accordance with plans developed and enacted into law by independent redistricting commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Ms. HAALAND, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 3573. A bill to increase research, education, and treatment for cerebral cavernous malformations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. FLEISCHMANN):

H.R. 3574. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the establishment of a small business voucher program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. REED, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3575. A bill to establish the IMPACT for Energy Foundation; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. LYNCH (for himself and Mr. HICE of Georgia):

H.R. 3576. A bill to reestablish the Commission on Wartime Contracting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. MCADAMS:

H.R. 3577. A bill to authorize the United States Postal Service to provide certain nonpostal property, products, and services on behalf of State, local, and tribal governments; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 3578. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish and carry out a grant program to make grants to eligible institutions to plan and implement programs that provide comprehensive support services and resources designed to increase transfer and graduation rates at community colleges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 3579. A bill to direct the Postmaster General to conduct a study on retrofitting mail collection boxes with narrow mail slots to prevent theft of mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself and Mr. PALMER):

H.R. 3580. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act and Public Health Service Act to improve the reporting of abortion data to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3581. A bill to revise the composition of the Board of Zoning Adjustment for the District of Columbia so that the Board will consist solely of members appointed by the government of the District of Columbia, except when the Board is performing functions regarding an application by a foreign mission with respect to a chancery; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 3582. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the scope of the Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3583. A bill to amend section 116 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 3584. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for certain amendments relating to reporting requirements with respect to clinical diagnostic laboratory tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. RUTHERFORD (for himself, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CRIST, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. YOHO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SPANO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MAST, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. WALTZ):

H.R. 3585. A bill to provide for a moratorium on oil and gas leasing and exploration on the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Florida until 2029, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CORREA, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 3586. A bill to promote energy savings in residential and commercial buildings and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. FLETCHER):

H.R. 3587. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the effective date for the modification to net operating loss deductions in Public Law 115-97; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COX of California, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 3588. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to establish an initiative on improving the capacity of military criminal investigative organizations to prevent child sexual exploitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia):

H.R. 3589. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Greg LeMond, in recognition of his service to the Nation as an athlete, activist, role model, and community leader; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 3590. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a refundable tax credit to increase the take-home pay of American workers and enhance their financial stability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MCBATH, and Mr. GUEST):

H.R. 3591. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent certain alcohol and substance misuse; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. GIANFORTE):

H.R. 3592. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise the amount of minimum allotments under the Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HURD of Texas (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution strongly condemning human rights violations, violence against civilians, and cooperation with Iran by the Houthi movement and its allies in Yemen; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H. Res. 467. A resolution recognizing the essential contributions of frontline health workers to strengthening the United States national security and economic prosperity, sustaining and expanding progress on global health, and saving the lives of millions of women, men, and children around the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H. Res. 468. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Defense should review section 504 of title 10, United States Code, for purposes related to enlisting certain aliens in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H. Res. 469. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall Uprising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN of California (for himself, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. ROUDA, and Mr. COX of California):

H. Res. 470. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 1, 2019, as ''National Health Literacy Day'' to recognize the value of health literacy in transforming and improving health and health care for all people in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Res. 471. A resolution expressing support for the designation of 2019 as the ''International Year of the Periodic Table of Chemical Elements''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COSTA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. BASS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H. Res. 472. A resolution requesting the President to strongly condemn Jamal Khashoggi's killing, hold accountable individuals identified as culpable, and condemn imprisonment of and violence against journalists around the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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 Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 3524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a ''uniform rule of Naturalization.''

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 3525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 3526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 3527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 14, and 18 of the Constitution of the United States; the authority to raise and support an army, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. MURPHY:

H.R. 3529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 3530.

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 of Officer thereof.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 3533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:
H.R. 3535.
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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution. [Page H2718]
By Mr. BACON:
H.R. 3536.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
Article III, Section 2
By Mr. SCHNEIDER:
H.R. 3537.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Sec. 8
By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:
H.R. 3538.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mr. FERGUSON:
H.R. 3539.
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. VELÁZQUEZ:
H.R. 3540.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
''The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .''
By Mr. CARBAJAL:
H.R. 3541.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2
By Mr. GIANFORTE:
H.R. 3542.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1
By Mr. GOLDEN:
H.R. 3543.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, whereby Congress shall have the power to provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States
By Mr. EVANS:
H.R. 3544.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
''The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .''
By Mr. BEYER:
H.R. 3545.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the US Constitution
By Mr. BLUMENAUER:
H.R. 3546.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Ms. BONAMICI:
H.R. 3547.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution
By Ms. BONAMICI:
H.R. 3548.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:
H.R. 3549.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment XVI of the U.S. Constitution
By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:
H.R. 3550.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment XVI of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:
H.R. 3551.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
THE U.S. CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS
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. CICILLINE:
H.R. 3552.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.
By Mr. CICILLINE:
H.R. 3553.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.
By Mr. CICILLINE:
H.R. 3554.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.
By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:
H.R. 3555.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. CRIST:
H.R. 3556.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Ms. DELBENE:
H.R. 3557.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. ENGEL:
H.R. 3558.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 1
By Mr. ESPAILLAT:
H.R. 3559.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article One of the United States Constitution, 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
or
Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:
The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;
By Mr. FORTENBERRY:
H.R. 3560.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. FOSTER:
H.R. 3561.
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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. FUDGE:
H.R. 3562.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to ''regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''
By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:
H.R. 3563.
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. GOSAR:
H.R. 3564.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. GOSAR:
H.R. 3565.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. HILL of Arkansas:
H.R. 3566.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 1
By Ms. HOULAHAN:
H.R. 3567.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. KATKO:
H.R. 3568.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. KENNEDY:
H.R. 3569.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8—to provide for the general welfare and to regulate commerce among the states
By Mr. TED LIEU of California:
H.R. 3570.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.
By Mr. TED LIEU of California:
H.R. 3571.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Ms. LOFGREN:
H.R. 3572.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the power to enact laws governing the time, place, and manner of elections for Members of the House of Representatives.
Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution gives Congress the power to enact laws to enforce Section 2 of such Amendment, which requires Representatives to be apportioned among the several States according to their number.
By Mr. LUJÁN:
H.R. 3573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1. Section 8.
By Mr. LUJÁN:
H.R. 3574.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I. Section VIII
By Mr. LUJÁN:
H.R. 3575.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I. Section VIII
By Mr. LYNCH:
H.R. 3576.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. MCADAMS:
H.R. 3577.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution
By Ms. MENG:
H.R. 3578.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Ms. MENG:
H.R. 3579.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution
By Mr. NORMAN:
H.R. 3580.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 3581.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.
By Mr. PAPPAS:
H.R. 3582.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution states that ''Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.'' [Page H473]
By Mr. PERRY:
H.R. 3583.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. PETERS:
H.R. 3584.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. RUTHERFORD:
H.R. 3585.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States
By Mr. SCHRADER:
H.R. 3586.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Necessary and Proper Clause
By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:
H.R. 3587.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: 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 Ms. SPANBERGER:
H.R. 3588.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. THOMPSON of California:
H.R. 3589.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I
By Ms. TLAIB:
H.R. 3590.
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. TRONE:
H.R. 3591.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause XVIII of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. WELCH:
H.R. 3592.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, 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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 35: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 51: Mrs. FLETCHER.
H.R. 96: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 141: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 208: Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 215: Mr. FULCHER.
H.R. 230: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 372: Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. REED, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 397: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 413: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 473: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 497: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 510: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 586: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 594: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H.R. 647: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. LAMB, and Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 649: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 712: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 748: Mr. OLSON and Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 808: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 846: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 849: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 898: Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 919: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 943: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
H.R. 948: Mr. RYAN and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1058: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SPANO, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1059: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 1108: Mrs. HAYES, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1109: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 1111: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1116: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1128: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1140: Ms. CRAIG, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1153: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1154: Ms. UNDERWOOD and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 1155: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 1175: Mr. LAMB and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1228: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 1243: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1274: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MENG, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1301: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1311: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1317: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1327: Mr. HOYER, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1342: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1374: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 1396: Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. ROY, Mr. REED, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 1406: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1423: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1441: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. RATCLIFFE.
H.R. 1474: Mr. SOTO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 1529: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1530: Mr. OLSON and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1534: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1549: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1554: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1570: Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mrs. FLETCHER.
H.R. 1629: Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1641: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CROW, and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 1642: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 1652: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. HECK.
H.R. 1679: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1683: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1692: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1695: Mr. CALVERT and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 1696: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 1709: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1739: Mr. DUNN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1740: Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 1748: Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 1749: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1753: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 1762: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1767: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1768: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1770: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1771: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 1773: Ms. WEXTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. KIM, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CRIST, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KILMER, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. PORTER, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WILD, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1837: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CLAY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. BABIN, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of

Georgia, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 1854: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1855: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1865: Mrs. LURIA, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BEYER, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1869: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 1873: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 1882: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1903: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 1923: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1959: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 1979: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 1980: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. SIRES, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. BERA, Mrs. MURPHY, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 2011: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 2014: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 2062: Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 2075: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2146: Mr. POCAN and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2156: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 2168: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2211: Ms. CRAIG, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2215: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 2219: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 2223: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2235: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 2239: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2256: Ms. MENG, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 2268: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2283: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2314: Mr. BRINDISI and Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 2328: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2354: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2360: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2382: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. DOGGETT, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2388: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 2404: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2408: Ms. OMAR and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 2411: Mr. CORREA, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 2415: Mr. NEGUSE and Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 2424: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2460: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 2467: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 2482: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2483: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 2504: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 2507: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SOTO, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2508: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2521: Mr. HECK and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 2543: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2570: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2571: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 2577: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2585: Ms. BASS and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2600: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2623: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 2668: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 2681: Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 2708: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 2711: Mr. COHEN and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2733: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 2739: Mr. KILMER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BACON, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 2741: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2749: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 2750: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 2763: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2764: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 2775: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 2788: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 2802: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2805: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 2812: Ms. CRAIG, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COOK, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 2829: Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 2852: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 2862: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2875: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2876: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2881: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2901: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2909: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 2931: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2934: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2975: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2988: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 3036: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 3073: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 3080: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 3082: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 3097: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 3098: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 3113: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. WELCH, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. MENG, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TRONE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 3114: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COX of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SHALALA, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 3119: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3128: Mr. BRADY and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3138: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3154: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 3159: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 3162: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 3170: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3175: Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 3182: Mr. GOODEN.

H.R. 3192: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3195: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 3219: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3230: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 3266: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3296: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3298: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 3306: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3315: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 3348: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 3350: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3361: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 3370: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3374: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3376: Mr. MCEACHIN.

H.R. 3394: Ms. HAALAND, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 3396: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3404: Mr. MCEACHIN.

H.R. 3412: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SMUCKER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3423: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3435: Ms. OMAR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3451: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3452: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 3472: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 3483: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3500: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 3502: Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 3522: Mr. WATKINS.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. ENGEL.

H.J. Res. 35: Mr. CASE.

H.J. Res. 64: Mr. SIRES and Mr. TRONE.

H. Con. Res. 20: Ms. HAALAND.

H. Res. 23: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H. Res. 60: Mr. CISNEROS.

H. Res. 138: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H. Res. 246: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. KELLER.

H. Res. 255: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H. Res. 326: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. FLETCHER.

H. Res. 374: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H. Res. 408: Mr. OLSON.

H. Res. 428: Mr. LUJÁN.

H. Res. 442: Ms. MOORE.

H. Res. 444: Mr. HARDER of California and Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 457: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 465: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DELAURO, and Mrs. LURIA.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2205: Mr. FITZPATRICK.