



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2020

No. 29

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 12, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2020, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

SUPPORTING THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

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

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, the great poet and pioneer of righteous rage, Audre Lorde, once said: "I am not free while any woman is unfree, even when her shackles are very different from my own."

The year is now 2020, and here we women are, still in so many ways not fully free, still shackled.

Today, I rise to affirm the humanity and the dignity of all women. I rise in strong, unapologetic, righteous support of H.J. Res. 79, which will strike the arbitrary deadline for ratification of the equal rights amendment, an amendment that should already be the law of the land.

Women are strong, hardworking, bright, and resilient. We are the backbones of our families, our communities, and our democracy. We do not live in checked boxes; we live in an intersectionality of lived experiences and identities. Our issues are everyone's issues, because our destinies are all tied.

Tomorrow's vote on H.J. Res. 79 is a vote for the preservation of our collective humanity.

Despite our commitment to hard work, both within our households and on the job, we are still paid less than our male counterparts. In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, women are paid 83 cents for every dollar paid to a man; but nationally, women are paid only 80 cents for every dollar a man is paid.

Even worse, the modern-day wage gap disproportionately impacts women of color, with Black women earning 61 cents, Native women earning 58 cents, Latinx women earning only 53 cents, and AAPI women making as little as 50 cents per dollar paid to a White man.

In addition to pay discrimination, we face pregnancy discrimination, discrimination in the criminal legal system, sexual and domestic violence, and inadequate healthcare access.

But this isn't an accident. The American Constitution is sexist by its very design. This country's laws have historically treated us like second-class citizens, depriving us of the right to vote, to enter most jobs, and to own property.

While some of these injustices may cease to exist, we still face tremendous barriers to our full participation in so-

ciety. With tomorrow's vote, we have an opportunity to right this country's wrong and to take a stand in the name of equality.

I am honored to be serving and representing the Massachusetts Seventh Congressional District during these unprecedented times, where we have a record 127 women serving in the U.S. House of Representatives. These women are some of the fiercest table-shakers, justice-seekers, and truth-tellers that have ever served in this august body, and it is my privilege and joy to call them my sisters in service:

My sister in service Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, who has faithfully served the people of Washington, D.C., for 29 years and continues to lead in the fight for D.C. statehood;

My sister in service Congresswoman KATIE PORTER, who is fighting for economic justice for domestic violence survivors who are financially dependent on their partners;

My sister in service Congresswoman DEB HAALAND, a member of the Pueblo of Laguna Tribe, who continues to shine daylight on the silent crisis of missing and murdered indigenous women;

My sister in service Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB, whose unique experiences as a Palestinian American have given a voice to unheard Palestinians around the world fighting for their humanity;

My sister in service Congresswoman LAUREN UNDERWOOD, who remains clear-eyed in her fight for healthcare justice as both a nurse and someone living with a preexisting condition; and

My sister in service Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER, for her leadership on this issue and for introducing this critical joint resolution.

Tomorrow's vote is a vote for equality. It is a vote for fairness. It is a vote to actualize the movements built on the backs of women.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1049

HONORING THE LEGACY OF FRANK LOSONSKY

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the legacy of the last remaining AVG Flying Tiger, Frank Losonsky, who passed away last week at 99 years of age.

Mr. Losonsky was one of 300 men who comprised the American Volunteer Group, which sailed to China in 1941 to defend against the Imperial Japanese in World War II.

Mr. Losonsky was the crew chief of the Hell's Angels Squadron, where he was responsible for maintaining three to four, maybe five, aircraft at a time.

The Flying Tigers were a unique unit because most of their pilots and support personnel were enlisted in the United States Army Air Corps, the U.S. Navy, and the U.S. Marine Corps, but they flew under Chinese colors.

This elite group was devised and commanded by Louisianian and LSU graduate Lieutenant General Claire Chennault. On his recommendation, President Franklin Roosevelt signed an order allowing American regulars to be lent to the Chinese Air Force. They first flew combat 12 days after Pearl Harbor on December 20, 1941.

Mr. Losonsky's legacy lives on at the Chennault Aviation and Military Museum in Monroe, Louisiana, and we are proud to host it.

Please join me in honoring the contributions of Frank Losonsky and the rest of the AVG Flying Tigers to the liberation of the Pacific from Imperial Japan.

STARTING OVER ON THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be voting on H.J. Res. 79, which attempts to remove the deadline for ratification contained in the equal rights amendment, which passed Congress in 1972.

Over the decades, we have made great strides in our Nation in promoting and protecting women's rights. This year, we are celebrating the 100th anniversary of the 19th Amendment, which guaranteed women the right to vote across our country.

A few months ago, I visited the Susan B. Anthony Birthplace Museum in Adams, Massachusetts. It is a small but powerful museum that tells the story of Susan B. Anthony and her work, along with other suffragists, for the right to vote and for other rights for women.

When talking about how far we have come in equal rights for women, I can't help but think of my own mother, who is now in her eighties. When I graduated from eighth grade, she fulfilled

her goal of graduating from college, which she had never had a chance to do. When I went off to college, she fulfilled a lifelong dream and went to law school; and, in 1988, she graduated from Georgetown University Law School with her law degree. It took her a long time to finally have these opportunities, but she persevered and succeeded.

So I am thinking about my mother as well as my wife, who is an actuary, and my sister, who is an attorney. I think about them when I work on protecting women from discrimination and harassment in the workplace, when I work for legislation for equal pay for women and for other bills to guarantee equal treatment for women.

The equal rights amendment, as we now consider it, was passed by Congress in 1972. There was a 7-year deadline placed by Congress on States for ratification, just as there had been on a number of other constitutional amendments. At the deadline, three-fourths of States had not ratified it.

This week, Congress will be considering H.J. Res. 79, which retroactively removes the deadline for ratification. There is much controversy over whether this is constitutional. In addition, H.J. Res. 79 also requires a simple majority to pass.

Article V of the Constitution gives Congress the power to propose constitutional amendments but requires a two-thirds vote in both the House and the Senate. The original resolution introduced in the House this year to remove the ERA deadline, H.J. Res. 38, required a two-thirds vote in both the House and the Senate.

In addition, we know that the Senate is highly unlikely to take up this resolution. So, if Congress is interested in the equal rights amendment being added to the Constitution, we should be considering H.J. Res. 35, which would restart the process.

Just a couple of days ago, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, a longtime supporter of the ERA, said Congress should do just this. Justice Ginsburg said:

I would like to see a new beginning. I'd like to start over.

She added:

There is too much controversy about latecomers. Plus, a number of States have withdrawn their ratification. So, if you count a latecomer on the plus side, how can you disregard States that have said "we've changed our minds"?

H.J. Res. 35, which would restart the process, could go through committee, where it could be debated, potentially amended, and then brought to the floor for further debate and possible amendment. In doing so, we can clear up any points of contention about the impact of the ERA and raise a consensus.

If we truly want to support the addition of the equal rights amendment to the Constitution, this is what we should do. I support doing this. Otherwise, we are simply casting a message vote.

This week when we vote on H.J. Res. 79, my message is yes. I will be voting

"yes" to demonstrate my support for protecting equal rights for my wife, my mother, my sister, and for all women.

HONORING BRANDON RENZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to recognize the departure of a long-term servant of the House, Brandon Renz.

Brandon has served the House of Representatives for nearly two decades and has been a trusted leader of my staff for well over a decade. Most recently, he has worked with me and fellow Members on the Education and Labor Committee as Republican staff director and has provided trustworthy counsel and excellent organizational prowess.

He also served as my chief of staff during my time in leadership as House Republican Secretary and was a respected liaison for me and other Members, staff, and House offices over my eventful time in that office.

While Brandon has been a tremendous asset and key contributor in all those significant positions, he did some of his best work in the same trenches that many of our staff do, in positions and in rooms that do not receive attention from C-SPAN or grab headlines.

Brandon started as a staff assistant for a Member from his home State of Iowa, Representative STEVE KING, reluctantly coming to Washington on the recommendation of a friend and only after committing to himself that he would stay only 1 year.

In less than 3 years on Capitol Hill, Brandon earned a reputation as an astute legislative mind with bedrock conservative principles and became my legislative director. In him, I found a partner who shared my commitment to accurate, grammatically correct documents of all types.

He labored with me on constituent letters and on many important legislative projects, including providing the Puerto Rican people with an opportunity to express all their preferences when considering their territory's future, developing legislation to lessen unfunded mandates, and expressing Congress' disapproval of the bailout funds expended on the TARP program.

He also worked as a rules associate with the House Rules Committee, sitting through interminable hearings at all hours of the day and night. He did important work there, ensuring Members' voices were heard and that the House could work its will on legislation considered on the House floor.

After several years guiding my legislative staff and agenda, he accepted my request to serve as chief of staff and used his terrific skills to benefit constituents and ensure my offices paid back the trust given to them by America's taxpayers.

□ 1015

After seeing his success there, it was easy to entrust the responsibilities of staff director to him when I became the chairwoman of the House Education and Workforce Committee.

Both then and now in the minority, Brandon has been a leader on the issues before the committee, including education and regulatory reform, government accountability, and this week on the issue of surprise medical billing.

It has been a joy to work with and learn from Brandon as a colleague and as an individual. While his parents clearly reared him right, his wise, beautiful wife, Kate, has been a key part of his recent life. She was, herself, a fine staff member in both the U.S. House and Senate and is here today. It is comforting to know they are passing on their principles to their sons, Cole and Hunter. Brandon and Kate are an example to us all.

As Brandon leaves the service of the House to embark on new responsibilities in the private sector, I thank him deeply for his years of dedication to the work of the House, to me and my constituents, and to our Nation.

He truly has lived up to the oath he swore when he first started with the U.S. House of Representatives, to “support and defend the Constitution of the United States,” and to “well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter.”

Mr. Speaker, I know he will continue to faithfully discharge the duties of his future offices, as he did so honorably for me. So, sadly, I discharge him to that work, so help him God.

TRUMP'S VISION FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE IS BLEAK

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Trump administration released its budget proposal for fiscal year 2021. It was titled “A Budget for America's Future,” but its vision for that future is bleak.

Its vision of the future is the true American carnage that President Trump described in his inaugural address. It envisions an America that is less than it can or should be.

It envisions an America where working families are left to struggle while the wealthy continue to prosper. Rather than expanding economic opportunity to all, it would force families to choose between food and other essentials by cutting nutrition assistance by \$182 billion so more children and more people would go hungry in America, the richest nation on the face of the Earth.

It would completely eliminate the Community Development Block Grant, which helps local communities keep millions out of poverty.

Rather than ensuring healthcare is accessible to all, this budget cuts Medi-

caid by \$900 billion and slashes Medicare by half a trillion dollars, even though the President promised he would never touch the program's funding from that podium just a few days ago.

It would also cut research into life-saving cures at the National Institutes of Health by \$3.3 billion—penny-wise, pound-foolish. It cuts the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention by more than half a billion dollars, at a moment when we need to protect our people against the coronavirus and other public health threats.

Mr. Speaker, a true budget for America's future wouldn't increase the cost of attending college, as this budget does, by cutting student loan programs by \$170 billion. The education of our young people is our greatest investment in a successful future.

This budget discourages those who want to serve their communities by eliminating the Public Service Loan Forgiveness program. It would slash the Department of Education's budget by \$5.6 billion this year alone, while eliminating after-school programs for kids. Kids would be less safe, less educated.

Ignoring another of his pledges, this time on infrastructure, President Trump's budget proposes cutting the Department of Transportation by 13 percent this year and reducing funding for the Army Corps of Engineers by 22 percent, both agencies that deal with infrastructure.

It proposes a future devoid of innovation, as well, eliminating several programs that fund and promote research and innovation to support advanced manufacturing, new energy technologies, and entrepreneurship. On all of those, the President's budget sounds the trumpet of retreat.

This budget promotes a future that is less secure by reducing funding for public diplomacy and foreign aid. For 3 years now, and in our fourth year, our public diplomacy has been put at risk.

Moreover, this budget extends the 2017 tax cuts for the wealthy, while once again asserting the debunked and discredited theory that the tax cuts pay for themselves. They didn't do it in 1981; they didn't do it in 2001 and 2003; and they haven't done it now.

The evidence is clear: The President's tax cuts for the wealthy did not provide the trickle-down benefits that he promised or give our economy the kind of boost he said that it would. Yet, the administration is back again, promoting the notion that if we give tax cuts for the wealthy one more try, they will produce growth well above what every mainstream economist projects, period.

This budget is not a serious proposal, nor is it fiscally sustainable. Budgets are about priorities. The priorities in this budget, giving tax cuts to the wealthy while cutting the programs that help working Americans get ahead, are the wrong priorities for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk about who is going to offer a budget. The President has offered a budget, and we have offered a budget. And that budget, Mr. Speaker, was incorporated in the appropriations bills signed by the President of the United States.

We now have an agreement on what the level of discretionary expenditures will be. So I want to tell my friends not only on the Republican side of the aisle, but I want to tell everybody in America that we have a budget. We have set forth our priorities, and those priorities were in the bills that we passed last year and the President signed.

The marginal increase in those is very, very small this year. That was the deal that was made between Secretary Mnuchin and Speaker PELOSI. We will pass our appropriations bills consistent with those priorities that we have already articulated at the numbers agreed upon, unlike the President of the United States who sent us a budget that completely abandoned the agreement we made in July, just 8 months ago, 7 months ago.

What is the point of making an agreement if it is looked at as a ceiling? It is like going and bargaining on a house and saying, “I will pay you \$100,000,” and then coming to the settlement table, and saying, “Well, I am really going to pay you \$90,000. That \$100,000 was just a ceiling.”

Mr. Speaker, we are going to pass through this House and send to the Senate appropriations bills that will represent the priorities of the American people, and that budget will be for the people. I am hopeful that, one more time, we can adopt those priorities, have them signed by the President, and have no drama about shutting down government, as we did not this past year. That is our responsibility. That is our duty to the American people.

CONGRATULATING LIBERTY CLARK ON MEDICAL DEVICE INNOVATION

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Liberty Clark in Elk River, Minnesota, for receiving an award from Enterprise Minnesota for attaining their ISO 9001:2015 certification.

Liberty Clark specializes in precision pad printing for medical device and industrial manufacturers, and this certification verifies to their clients that they are a reliable producer of high-quality products.

The medical device industry in Minnesota employs over 30,000 Minnesotans, driving our State's economy by producing devices that save lives. Recently, I was able to tour Liberty Clark and see firsthand how remarkable this company is and how it is contributing to the marketplace.

Liberty Clark's ISO certification, paired with the end-of-the-year repeal

of the medical device tax, are two important indicators that our best days of medical innovation are ahead for our manufacturers, as well as the millions of Americans who rely on lifesaving medical devices.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate everyone at Liberty Clark on achieving this certification, and I thank them for being one of the best manufacturers in Minnesota.

HONORING REVEREND GORDON GRIMM

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Reverend Gordon "Gordy" Grimm, who passed away last month at the age of 86.

Reverend Grimm was an ordained Lutheran minister and a leader in the field of addiction recovery in Minnesota. Through his work with the Hazelden Foundation, he pioneered the Minnesota model of treatment, which revolutionized addiction treatment and brought dignity to recovering alcoholics and addicts.

Reverend Grimm's work was recognized on the national stage. President Ronald Reagan selected him as a part of the White House Conference for a Drug Free America. He also served as a goodwill ambassador in Minnesota and alongside First Ladies Betty Ford and Rosalynn Carter at the United States Capitol.

Reverend Grimm was known not only for his work but for his kindness. A colleague described him as a man with "no sharp elbows, only open arms." His life's work touched so many in need.

We offer our condolences to his wife, Esther; his three children, John, Mary, and Jim; and the many who knew and were impacted by Reverend Gordon.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Gordon's legacy lives on through his family and all the people he helped. I thank him for a life well-lived.

RECOGNIZING BRAXTON BATTAGLIA, A TRUE MINNESOTA HERO

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Braxton Battaglia of Blaine, Minnesota.

Braxton is a 10-year-old gymnast who is currently fighting B-cell acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Despite the overwhelming nature of a diagnosis like this, Braxton has shown a drive to overcome by focusing on others and starting the TeamBraxl Fund, an effort designed to help other kids and families at the University of Minnesota Masonic Children's Hospital.

Not surprisingly, Braxton has been recognized for her strength and heart for service. The University of Minnesota's gymnastics program presented her with the Abby Szott Courage Award, which recognizes an individual's incorporation of gymnastics to overcome major life obstacles. She also recently received her very own spot in the University of Minnesota Gymnastics Hall of Fame.

Braxton is an inspiration to everyone. While she is currently in remission, her will to fight will remain as strong as ever. Her chemotherapy continues until 2021.

We will all continue to pray for Braxton and her family.

Mr. Speaker, Braxton inspires us all to help others, even in the midst of our own challenges. I thank Braxton, and may God continue to bless her and her family in the months and years ahead.

CONGRATULATING SCANDIA INTERNET FOCUS GROUP

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Scandia Internet Focus Group for receiving the Good Neighbor Award for their efforts to secure additional funding for broadband expansion in Scandia, Minnesota.

Because of the focus group's efforts, more than half a million dollars will go toward building out internet service for more than 200 homes through the State's Border-to-Border Broadband Development Grant Program.

Building out broadband to the last mile will give unserved and underserved communities access to the digital world, allowing access to vital educational resources, telehealth services, and an increasing amount of commerce done online.

Thanks to the Scandia Internet Focus Group, this service will meet and exceed the State's goals for 2022 and 2026.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Steve Kronmiller, Patti Ray, Beth Mohr, Eric Mohr, Aron Larson, Christopher Johnson, Chris Frymire, Jesse Pereboom, Travis Waite, Kristen Novaak, John Carney, and Andy Brogan.

□ 1030

AMERICANS MUST BE PROTECTED FROM SURPRISE MEDICAL BILLING

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, surprise medical bills can be financially devastating for families. Patients must be protected from this harmful practice.

As Congress considers solutions to this issue, I urge Speaker PELOSI to reject any proposals that include government price-setting.

Setting price controls on private transactions gives more power to the Federal Government and reduces access to healthcare.

Congress must pursue solutions that hold patients harmless, increase transparency, and resolve disputes that arise from surprise bills.

CONGRATULATING MELANI SHAFFMASTER

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Melani Shaffmaster of New Castle High School on being named the 2019-2020 Gatorade Indiana Volleyball Player of the Year.

This is Melani's second time honored with this title, having led her team to three straight volleyball State championships. Melani has had a remarkable high school career with thousands of assists, and kills, and hundreds of aces and digs. Not only has she been a mas-

ter on the court, but she has also maintained a 3.9 GPA.

Mr. Speaker, Melani is a true role model for any student athlete, and I wish her the best of luck in college and in her future.

CONGRATULATING RIVER VALLEY RESOURCES ON ITS 30TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate River Valley Resources on celebrating their 30th anniversary.

On a recent visit to RVR Clearinghouse in Madison, Indiana, I was able to witness the wonderful services that are provided to both adults and children. RVR currently provides programs and services in 14 counties in southeastern Indiana and central Indiana.

RVR strives to create a competitive workforce through job readiness training, life skills management, job placement, and is also a Child Care and Development Fund voucher agent in 12 counties.

Mr. Speaker, I thank RVR for the wonderful work that they do, and I wish them a happy anniversary.

RECOGNIZING MATT PEIFFER

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Muncie resident and Ball State student Matt Peiffer. His Muncie-based organization, A Voice for Kids, is one of 30 winners in T-Mobile's second annual Changemaker Challenge.

The Changemaker Challenge asks kids aged 13 to 23 to come up with ideas to help their local communities. A Voice for Kids advocates for the improvement of the foster care system.

A former child in Indiana's foster system, Peiffer has already helped improve the system, and this award shows that people around the Nation are noticing his good work.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Matt and A Voice for Kids for making their community and the Hoosier State a better place.

CELEBRATING SHELBYVILLE ROTARY CLUB'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Shelbyville Rotary Club for celebrating 100 years of service.

The rotary club has been a beacon of service in the Shelbyville community for this century. Last year alone, the club raised funds for the Shelbyville Boys Club Youth Football program, Pantry Pals, SCUFFY, the Blue River Community Foundation, and Girls Inc. The rotary club also provides scholarships for every high school in Shelby County.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the members of the Shelbyville Rotary Club for their service and dedication to Shelbyville and congratulate them on their 100th anniversary.

RECOGNIZING JUAN GUAIDO

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, last week Venezuelan interim President Juan Guaido was welcomed with

bipartisan support in this Chamber as President Trump's guest for the State of the Union.

For years, Venezuela's united Socialist party has pushed a once prosperous country towards desperate poverty and open tyranny.

The wrongful detention of the Citgo Six for more than 2 years demonstrates the corrupt nature in which Maduro will do anything to remain in power.

The United States and the Organization of American States should institute greater pressure and tighten sanctions against the Maduro regime and his cronies in order to support a return to a democratic Venezuela.

I stand with President Guaido and the people of Venezuela and call on Maduro to step down and release the Citgo Six and all political prisoners or face greater sanctions.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF WILMER PLATE

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of one of Arkansas's great veterans, Lieutenant Colonel Wilmer Plate, who recently passed away at the age of 99.

Will was born in 1919 and began his long career of service shortly after the start of World War II. Will led numerous missions during the war as a commander of a 10-man crew in a B-24.

Following the end of World War II, Will continued his service for more than three decades until his retirement from the Air Force as a chief warrant officer 4 and shortly after as a lieutenant colonel in the Air Force Reserve.

Lieutenant Colonel Plate continued to provide crucial insight into World War II by publishing his memoir entitled, "The Storm Clouds of War: Reflections of a World War II Bomber Pilot."

Will earned numerous medals and awards for his service, including, among many others, the Purple Heart and the Distinguished Flying Cross.

Will was a true American patriot, one of which all Americans and Arkansians can admire, and I extend my deepest respect, affection, and prayers to his friends, family, and loved ones.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF FORREST WOOD

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of one of Arkansas's great outdoorsmen, Mr. Forrest Wood, who recently passed away at the age of 87.

Born in Flippin, Arkansas, Forrest was considered a pioneer in the fishing industry and the father of the modern bass boat.

He founded Ranger Boats, a bass boat company that he designed and built principally for black bass fishing with his wife Nina. In 1968, Forrest was instrumental in the formation of the bass fishing tournament circuit.

As a long-time Arkansas game and fish commissioner, he was a strong conservationist and devoted to Arkansas, the Natural State. Forrest was awarded the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Sport Fishing Associa-

tion of America and the BASS Federation. Forrest was also inducted into the Arkansas Game and Fish Foundation Outdoor Hall of Fame and the Arkansas Business Hall of Fame.

Forrest was an inspiration and friend to many across our State, and I extend my respect, affection, and prayers to his friends, family, and loved ones.

RECOGNIZING RON CHASTAIN

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Major General Ron Chastain for recently being appointed as the civilian aide to the secretary of the Army.

General Chastain was born in Paris, Arkansas, and was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Army Reserve upon graduation from the ROTC program at Arkansas Tech University.

General Chastain's distinguished military service in the Arkansas National Guard spanned nearly four decades, including service as adjutant general and receiving Federal recognition as a major general of the line in 2005.

General Chastain spent over 30 years working for the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Farm Service Agency where he was responsible for the administration of Federal farm programs at the county, district, and State level.

General Chastain has received numerous awards and decorations throughout his career, including the Army Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, and the Bronze Star.

I thank General Chastain for his decades of service to our Nation, and I wish him well in his new position with the U.S. Army.

HONORING KRISTEN MUSGROVE

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Kristen Musgrove from Nassau County, Florida, for having earned the Milken Educator Award.

This distinguished award recognizes teachers, principals, and educational specialists who have made a profound impact on their students and school communities.

Ms. Musgrove teaches math to the sixth grade students at Hilliard Middle-Senior High School and was the only teacher in the State of Florida chosen for this very prestigious award.

Our educators are tasked with teaching and inspiring the next generation of Americans and Ms. Musgrove has gone above and beyond as demonstrated by preparing and guiding her students in the development of valuable problem-solving skills.

In fact, under Ms. Musgrove's instruction, her classes lead the Nassau County School District with a 97 percent math proficiency. Ms. Musgrove's dedication to her students extends beyond the classroom, as she also offers tutoring at a weekly after school math camp.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Florida and the grateful students and parents of Hilliard Middle-Senior High School, I thank Ms. Musgrove for her lifelong dedication to excellence in the classroom and congratulate her on receiving the recognition she so well deserves.

HONORING THE HIDTA PROGRAM

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor 30 years of the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area program known as HIDTA. This program has played a vital role in helping keep our communities safe and drugs off our streets.

For the last several years, law enforcement officers have been on the front line of the opioid crisis that our country is facing, and now for the first time in decades, the CDC has indicated that the overdose death rates are expected to decline. This is thanks to the HIDTA program and our local, State, and Federal partners taking down the drug smugglers and traffickers.

I would like to highlight some of the incredible officers from the north Florida HIDTA who received recognition on February 6 at the 2020 National HIDTA Conference and Awards banquet.

Winning the team award for Outstanding Investigative Support Center were: Kim Jones, Louis Ceragioli, Joe Delaney, Robert Hoisington, Ralph Little, Kevin Miller, Stefanie Miller, Paul Pilliod, Jared Padilla, and John Watson.

Winning an award for Outstanding Task Force Commander was Florida's own Corey M. Taylor of the Ocala Police Department.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate each and every one of them. These awards are well deserved, and I thank them for helping to keep our communities safe.

THANKING DR. WILLIAM GRISCOM

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate, to honor, and to give thanks to Dr. William Griscom, the President of Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology, who retired recently at the end of January.

Dr. Griscom, across his 23 years at the helm of Thaddeus Stevens, transformed the institution into one of the most successful 2-year-degree granting institutions in the Nation, boasting an over 96 percent placement rate for its graduates. In fact, last year, there were 1,400 employers seeking to fill 4,000 jobs all looking to hire Thaddeus Stevens' 365 graduates.

Dr. Griscom increased enrollment at the school from nearly 500 students when he started in 1996 to over 1,200 students enrolled today, completing capital projects worth tens of millions of dollars to increase the school's capacity, and led the school through accreditation with the Commission of Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools.

Mr. Speaker, the lives of thousands of individuals across south central Pennsylvania and across Lancaster County have been put on the path to success because of Dr. Griscom's leadership. It has been an honor to work with him over the past decade during my time in the State senate chairing the education committee, and now as a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. Bill Griscom for his years of committed and thoughtful leadership of Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology and wish him continued success and happiness in retirement.

□ 1045

RECOGNIZING CLERMONT HUGER LEE

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Clermont Huger Lee for being one of the 2020 honorees at the Savannah College of Art and Design's Women of Vision recognition ceremony.

During the middle 1900s, Mrs. Lee was a true trailblazer in our community for her groundbreaking work as a landscape architect. In Savannah, she became the first female landscape architect with her own practice. Additionally, she was considered the foremost expert in re-creating the historic landscapes that are so critical to Savannah's downtown.

Although she passed away in 2006 at the age of 92, her work is still extensively studied at SCAD and can be seen across Savannah in gardens at theavenport House, the Juliette Gordon Low Birthplace, the Owens-Thomas House, and more.

Now, in the 21st century, female landscape architects are leading a number of important projects across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank everyone involved with the Savannah Women of Vision recognition ceremony for honoring such an important woman.

RECOGNIZING FREDDIE SMITH

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Freddie Smith, who retired this past year as pastor of the Sweat Memorial Baptist Church in Waycross, Georgia, after leading the church for the last 25 years.

Leading people to the Word of God has been Mr. Smith's passion since he was 13 years old. At the time, he was headed with his family to a revival in Ocala, Florida, when he asked his father to pull over the car so that he could walk to the church with the day's guest preacher. The preacher told him: Don't be afraid to walk toward the Lord. Pastor Smith started preaching only a few years later.

During his time at Sweat Memorial in the First Congressional District of Georgia, the services he led were

known by everyone in the area for being beautifully orchestrated and welcoming, reflecting the personality of Pastor Smith.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Pastor Smith for his work in Waycross over the last 25 years. Even in his retirement, I know he will continue working in the community to make it a better place to live.

Congratulations.

RECOGNIZING SUZANNE SHANK

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Suzanne Shank, who is one of the 2020 honorees at the Savannah College of Art and Design's Women of Vision recognition ceremony.

A native of Savannah, Ms. Shank is the president, CEO, and cofounder of Siebert Williams Shank & Company. Under her watch, the company has grown from a startup investment banking firm to now being involved in over \$2 trillion in municipal and corporate bonds.

In 2010, the company became the first female- and minority-owned firm in Wall Street history to be ranked in the top 10 municipal bond underwriters. Additionally, U.S. Banker Magazine ranked Ms. Shank as one of the most powerful women in finance.

But her work transcends finance through her commitment to mentor inner city youth, her service on industry associations, and her work with the Spelman College Board of Trustees.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Ms. Shank on her honor as a 2020 Savannah Woman of Vision.

Keep up the great work.

Mr. Speaker, I thank SCAD for honoring this Savannahian, who is a true trailblazer.

RECOGNIZING THE SAVANNAH ART ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Savannah Art Association, which will be 100 years old this February.

The oldest art association in Georgia, it was founded in February of 1920 in the basement of Mills B. Lane's home. From there, the Savannah Art Association moved to the Telfair Museum and, now, has two galleries at Chippewa Square and the Savannah/Hilton Head International Airport. It has come a long way over the 100 years since those members meeting in the Lanes' home.

Today, the Savannah Art Association has over 150 members from all artistic levels, beginner to professional, who are constantly helping each other and improving their techniques. They work diligently to make our community a better place to live through their exhibits, demonstrations, workshops, education programs, and partnerships with local businesses to showcase their artwork.

Mr. Speaker, I thank everyone involved with the Savannah Art Association for their work in our area.

Congratulations on your 100-year anniversary.

THE NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE TURNS 100 YEARS OLD

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, growing up on our family farm in rural Kansas, one thing was for sure: Every day at about 12:20, over the lunch hour, and then again at about 10:20 at night, our family would be gathered around the television set to watch the latest weather forecast for the upcoming day.

From aviation to agriculture, accurate and timely weather forecasts are essential to a number of industries across the United States, and especially to farmers and ranchers back home in Kansas.

150 years ago, on February 9, 1870, President Ulysses S. Grant signed into law a joint resolution creating what was known as the Signal Service, laying the foundation for what would become today's National Weather Service.

While the organization has evolved over the years, the National Weather Service provides important weather data, forecasting, and warnings aimed at protecting life and property across the United States.

There are four National Weather Service offices across Kansas working to analyze data and provide timely weather information. They are located in Topeka, Dodge, Wichita, and Goodland, and I have had the opportunity to visit several of these locations and the fine ladies and gentlemen that run those stations.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say happy 150th birthday to the National Weather Service and to say thank you for the around-the-clock work they do to keep us all safe and informed.

SURPRISE BILLING

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, if you or a loved one has ever experienced a medical emergency, you know how stressful these situations can be; but for far too many, the stress and heartache does not end when help arrives or treatment is delivered.

Nearly one in four Kansans seeking medical treatment either through planned surgery or emergency medical care are hit with a surprise bill because the care they received was from a provider outside of their network. In Kansas, this can happen after a trip to the emergency room for, say, a child's broken arm, a motor vehicle accident, or chest pain.

Surprise billing may occur when a patient receives emergency care from a professional outside of their insurance network. Unfortunately, surprise billing can also occur in nonemergency situations where a surgery is planned out well in advance, but you later find out one of the doctors or services was not in your plan's network.

These unplanned expenses can leave Kansans on the hook for thousands—if not tens of thousands—of dollars in additional medical bills, often depleting

family savings or forcing individuals into long-term debt and even bankruptcy.

The nightmare of unplanned medical billing has gone on far too long. Working alongside the White House and President Trump's leadership and my fellow members of the House Doc Caucus, I am proud of the solutions we have developed that would put an end to the unfair practice of surprise billing.

I am encouraged by the widespread agreement in Congress to address the issue and am optimistic we can agree to commonsense policies that President Trump is eager to sign into law.

We should all be able to agree on sensible reforms that address surprise billing. Specifically, patients should always be protected from surprise medical bills when receiving emergency or nonemergency care. Patients should only pay in-network rates for emergency care, and claims should be settled between healthcare providers and the insurer without roping in the patient.

In the 21st century, we should expect that consumers have a right to accurate, transparent information about providers and their network with real and honest cost estimates before they make healthcare decisions.

When referring a patient to another specialist as a physician myself, I always told my patients to check their health plan's provider directory, but also encouraged them to double-check with the physician's office directly in case the information was not up to date.

This process can be confusing, time consuming, and unnecessary to physicians' offices as well as the patients, and it is my priority to fix it. These solutions have been more than a year in the making, and I am optimistic we are very close to accomplishing our shared goal of lowering the cost of healthcare and ending surprise billing once and for all.

RECOGNIZING STEPHANIE SIGLER

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, later today, a Kansan from my district will be honored at the Next Generation 911 Institute's Annual 911 Honor Award Showcase to recognize emergency response heroes and leaders from across the country for their excellence in emergency response.

Stephanie Sigler works as a 911 phone operator for the Rice County Emergency Communications Center in Lyons, Kansas, and will be honored as a 911 public safety professional for her superior response efforts on the job.

In April of last year, Stephanie received a 911 phone call reporting the shooting of a Rice County sheriff and undersheriff, which led to an hours-long standoff involving numerous law enforcement agencies. Thanks to the swift and professional job done by Stephanie, many lives were spared.

Hundreds of millions of 911 callers, every year, rely on the dedication and cooperation of our public safety profes-

sionals like Stephanie. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Stephanie Sigler for dedicating herself to help Kansans in need.

I would like to also recognize Rice County Sheriff Bryant Evans and Undersheriff Chad Murphy, who were wounded in the shooting, as well as those who were heroically responding during this situation.

HONORING REVEREND OTIS LIVINGSTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Reverend Otis Livingston, a decorated veteran and lifelong resident of Decatur, Illinois, who passed away a few weeks ago at the age of 90.

With the exception of his military service, Otis spent his entire life in Decatur. He graduated from Decatur Public Schools and spent 33 years working as a lead operator at A.E. Staley's.

During the Korean war, Otis served as a combat medic in the 15th Medical Division and the 1st Cavalry Division. For his bravery, Otis was awarded a Bronze Star and a medal from the President of South Korea.

Otis was strong in his faith and dedicated himself to serving God and his neighbors. He served in numerous church and community positions, including chaplain for the Macon County Jail.

It was in this role that he and his wife were inspired by the need to minister to the incarcerated. They founded Reach Prison Ministry, which has served central Illinois communities for decades.

Otis was a very well-loved part of the Decatur community for years. He was a true example of public service, and he led others to faith by his faith. I know the impact he has left on Decatur, and I know that he will be truly missed.

HONORING CRAIG LINDVAHL

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Craig Lindvahl, a native of my hometown of Taylorville, who passed away earlier this year after a 4-year battle with pancreatic cancer.

Craig was an award-winning educator, filmmaker, composer, and author. He was a teacher in the Teutopolis School District for 34 years. He followed his parents, Ron and Ann, who taught me in the Taylorville schools. My prayers go out to both of them.

Craig started the Creating Entrepreneurial Opportunities program in Effingham, a yearlong course for high school students designed to utilize partnerships that provide an overview of business development and processes. Today, over 200 schools offer the program that Craig created for their students.

Craig was dedicated to his students. He served on the Illinois State Board of

Education, and, in 2015, Craig was honored as the Effingham County Citizen of the Year. He also won an Emmy Award.

As many know, Craig's mantra for himself was: "Who will be better because of what I do today?" I think it is safe to say that everyone who knew Craig is better for it. He impacted so many throughout his life, and he will not be forgotten.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN) at noon.

PRAYER

Dr. Lance Watson, St. Paul's Baptist Church, Richmond, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, we gather today in this House of Representatives, in the people's House, to acknowledge that You alone are sovereign. Thank You that we share in a nation where life, liberty, and happiness are inalienable rights, rights which we hold as self-evident.

We praise You for the responsibility we have to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with You. Give us the power to find needs and meet them, find problems and solve them, find hurts and heal them.

For every elected official, we ask the blessings of civility, truth, wisdom, and grace. Even amid diversity, enable us to embrace unity. Open our hearts in courage and imagination that we might envision a better tomorrow where Your purpose will prevail on Earth as in Heaven.

Let Your grace and favor rest upon us. In the matchless, marvelous, magnificent, majestic name that is above every name, we pray and give thanks.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND LANCE WATSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Reverend Lance Watson for his thoughtful opening prayer this morning. His service to central Virginia and his accomplishments as a spiritual and community leader are an example to all of us.

For more than 30 years, Reverend Watson has served as the senior pastor of St. Paul's Baptist Church in the Richmond area. Dr. Watson has been honored as an outstanding community leader, outstanding contributor to education, and Minister of the Year by multiple organizations, and he leads a congregation of nearly 12,000 people.

While Reverend Watson has focused on the spiritual development of the community through his ministry, he has also supported the social and economic development of the community in a variety of ways. Under his leadership, St. Paul's Baptist Church has initiated a bold plan to build housing, a park, an urban farm, and community gardens to improve the central Virginia community.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Reverend Watson; his wife, first lady Rose Watson, herself an accomplished singer; and the entire Watson family for their service to the St. Paul's community in central Virginia.

I also thank Reverend Watson for being here today to offer us inspiration through the opening prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

UNFAIR TREATMENT OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL ALEXANDER VINDMAN AND AMBASSADOR MARIE YOVANOVITCH

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, during his testimony before the Intel Committee, Lieutenant Colonel Alexander Vindman had a message for his father: "Do not worry. I will be fine for telling the truth."

Lieutenant Colonel Vindman is a war hero who has earned far better than the treatment he received from the admin-

istration last week. But this behavior should not surprise us. It is part of a pattern.

Let us remember the campaign waged against Ambassador Marie Yovanovitch last year. Ambassador Yovanovitch is an exemplary public servant who deserved our gratitude. Instead, the administration shamelessly attacked her and fired her to further the President's personal agenda.

But I agree with the Ambassador when she wrote:

I remain optimistic about the future. The events of the past year, while deeply disturbing, show that even though our institutions and our fellow citizens are being challenged in ways that few of us ever expected, we will endure and we will persist.

Indeed.

CELEBRATING 110TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

(Ms. FOXX of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, the Boy Scouts of America celebrated its 110th anniversary. With over 2 million active participants, it is one of the largest youth organizations in the country.

Since its founding in 1910, the Boy Scouts of America has shaped the lives of young men by teaching them character development, self-reliance, and principles of responsible citizenship.

In my district, the Old Hickory Council of the Boy Scouts of America, originally a single troop organized in Winston-Salem, serves over eight counties and has almost 5,000 members. In 2018, they provided more than 17,600 service hours at local charities and organizations.

I congratulate the Boy Scouts of America on 110 years of service, and I am confident that they will continue to positively impact communities across our country for many years to come.

VALENTINES FOR VETERANS

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, it can be easy to feel disheartened in Washington amid the partisan strife and bitter political division. I want to take a moment to change that narrative and thank my district for their profound display of community.

My office is leading a Valentines for Veterans drive this week, which encourages members of our community to make valentines for those who have bravely served our Nation. The number of heartfelt cards we have seen thanking our servicemembers for their commitment to this country has been truly heartening.

I would like to especially give a shout-out to the students in my dis-

trict whose classes have dropped off a number of incredibly creative cards: Ms. Walsh's fourth grade class at Northside School in Fairport; the Klem North Elementary School in Webster; TLC Adventure in Child Care daycare; the Joseph C. Wilson Foundation Academy in Rochester; the Mary Cariola Center; and my granddaughter Harper's class at Paddy Hill Elementary School in Greece.

I am so proud of our Nation's veterans and of our community for coming together in such a touching display of support for them.

CONGRATULATING THE GRANDVIEW HIGH SCHOOL ZEBRAS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the 2019 Grandview High School fighting Zebras football team on back-to-back State championship titles.

For Texans, high school football isn't just a sport; it is a way of life. Each week in the fall, we gather under Friday night lights and cheer our team on to victory.

The young men and women and coaches on our teams spend countless hours running drills, watching film, and getting ready for their moment in history.

During the 2019 season, Grandview's dedication paid off, as they defeated the Pottsboro Cardinals 42-35 at AT&T Stadium for their second straight title.

On behalf of the 25th Congressional District, I congratulate the fighting Zebras on their victory, and I wish them the very best in the future.

In God we trust.

THE NEED FOR A MILITARY PILOT CANCER INCIDENCE STUDY

(Mrs. LURIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LURIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on my colleagues to join me in addressing the need for preventive healthcare for our military's aviators. As a 20-year Navy veteran, I am concerned by the alarming anecdotal evidence by former Air Force and Navy pilots of increased incidence of cancer at a young age due to cockpit exposure.

We have a duty to ensure that our servicemembers receive the best care possible. That is why I am introducing the Military Pilot Cancer Incidence Study Act. This bipartisan bill will help the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs understand the causes of cancer among our military pilots so that we can ensure that our aviators receive the preventive cancer screenings they have earned through their service to our country.

By analyzing the correlation between cockpit radiation exposure and cancer, health professionals at DOD and the

VA can determine the appropriate age to screen pilots for cancer so they can live longer and healthier lives.

RECOGNIZING COURTNEY VEATCH

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding member of my staff who has been selected by the Trump administration to be the oversight counsel for the Department of Homeland Security, Dr. Courtney Veatch.

Courtney graduated from the University of North Florida and the Florida State University College of Law in 2015. She has been with my office for 3 years as a legislative assistant and as general counsel. She has been an expert on veterans affairs, healthcare, and tax policy, and she has always served with both grit and grace.

Because of her love for the law and for policy, she also served on the campaigns of Senator MARCO RUBIO and Governor Ron DeSantis.

In 2018, I had the honor of swearing her in to the District of Columbia Bar in this very building.

We are so very proud of all Courtney has accomplished serving the people of the Second Congressional District of Florida.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Dr. Courtney Veatch and wishing her luck in all of her future endeavors.

HONORING NAVY MIDSHIPMAN THIRD CLASS DUKE ANTHONY CARILLO

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the accomplishments of Navy Midshipman Third Class Duke Anthony Carillo, who died suddenly and unexpectedly, training to serve his country in the United States military.

Duke was just 21 years old but had already distinguished himself as a hard-working, patriotic American. Duke was a gifted student and athlete from Flower Mound, Texas, where he was captain of his high school football and wrestling teams and earned the highest rank of Eagle Scout.

Kind, generous, and fun-loving, Duke enriched the lives of his friends and family as well as the lives of his classmates at the Naval Academy.

I knew Duke personally. He was my son Ryan's roommate and best friend at Annapolis.

We mourn his loss. Our country lost a dedicated public servant, one of those special people whose entire purpose was the defense of our great country so the rest of us can live in peace.

Duke never expected acclaim or accolades. He was doing his duty, just like

his twin brother, Dylan, and younger brother, Jake, also midshipmen at the Naval Academy, a strong testament to the faith and devotion of their parents.

Though he left us at a young age, we can all learn from Duke's example.

My thoughts and prayers are with his family.

HONORING CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, February is Career and Technical Education Month, and I rise today to bring attention to the importance of technical skills to our economy and our education system.

Teaching our students the skills they need to thrive in the modern economy should be our top education priority. Our economy depends on a workforce that is capable of doing jobs in the fields of welding, automotive, and electrical work, among others.

While the current state of our economy is strong, we must strive to remain competitive with the rest of the world. Developing a highly skilled workforce is a key part of that effort and a top priority of mine. That is why I was happy to see President Trump prioritize technical education in his budget with a proposed \$900 million increased investment.

I am very proud of our high schools and technology centers in Kentucky's First Congressional District that are working to equip our students with crucial vocational skills. I am hopeful that Congress can work to provide them with the support necessary to build on their success in creating a 21st century workforce.

PEGGY WILLIAMS DANIEL: A TRUE AMERICAN PATRIOT

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

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable life of Peggy Williams Daniel.

Peggy was a true friend not only to me, but, really, to everyone she met.

A graduate of Lambeth College and earning her postgraduate degree from the University of Memphis, Peggy loved watching and rooting for her Memphis Tigers.

Peggy also knew that her roots were in west Tennessee. She was married to a great man, Jimmy Daniel, who predeceased her.

Peggy was an active leader at the Girl Scouts, a Cub Scout leader, and deeply involved in the political process. She and Jimmy worked hard to build the Republican Party in west Tennessee; and, frankly, there are few people that I can think of who are as

patriotic as Peggy. Peggy was a true American patriot. She loved wearing her red, white, and blue.

Peggy's daughter, Melanie, summed it up best when she said: "Peggy Williams Daniel entered this world with a star-spangled bang and has showered all with her firecracker wit and enthusiastic energy throughout her colorful life."

Peggy leaves behind her three children, my friends: Mike, Melanie, and Drew. We will all deeply miss Peggy but know that her spirit lives on.

□ 1215

RESTORING LIMITS OF CLEAN WATER ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last month, the EPA announced the new navigable waters rules that would replace the disastrous waters of the U.S. proposal.

I strongly support this rule, which will finally restore the limits of the Clean Water Act, providing farmers, ranchers, and landowners true clarity on the law's reach.

To help bring more certainty to farm producers, I recently introduced with my friend, Representative COLLIN PETERSON, H.R. 5799, the Bridging Responsible Agricultural Conservation Efforts Act of 2020, which addresses wetland determinations under the Clean Water Act.

Under current law, EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, and USDA are tasked with such determinations on farmlands. However, farmers have experienced confusion and undue burdens for decades due to the discoordination between the agencies when making such determinations. This bill will foster cohesion between the agencies and clarify what defines normal farming practices.

Modernizing modern farming practices and clearly defining converted croplands will bring long-overdue certainty to this process.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this legislation, which is a win for our Nation's farmers and ranchers.

AMERICA'S ECONOMY WILL CONTINUE TO THRIVE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the January jobs report with gains is terrific.

Over 225,000 jobs were created and wages increased. New job creation has achieved a 50-year high with record highs for women and younger citizens.

I am grateful that President Donald Trump and Republican policies have put the American economy into high gear, reducing taxes and regulations.

This first job report of the decade shows that America's economy will continue to thrive in 2020, thanks to President Trump.

Following an acquittal after the impeachment hoax; providing a peace plan for Israel; inspiring the Nation with the State of the Union Address; providing new trade agreements with China, Mexico, and Canada; and the announcement of Opportunity Now, this job report rounds out another week of winning for President Donald Trump.

All Americans celebrate the lowest levels of unemployment ever for African Americans, Hispanics, and Asian Americans.

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

PRESIDENT ON PATH TO BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, no wonder Americans elected a President who struck a chord with voters disappointed with business as usual in Washington and with the fake news media.

This week, after the President released his budget plan, his opponents here on the floor and in the media breathlessly are spouting fake news, falsely claiming that the President's budget cuts Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. But just like seeing the impeachment phone call transcript for themselves that exposed the impeachment as a hoax, every American should look at the budget for themselves and see how fake the claims are that Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid are cut.

In fact, what they would see is a budget that doesn't touch Social Security and Medicare benefits, and they would see a Medicaid budget that not only isn't cut but increases 3.1 percent per year.

By controlling other spending, the President's budget, like all of his three previous budgets, actually sets us on a path to finally balancing our budget.

That is much better than the last administration, which, in 8 years, never, ever submitted a budget that would balance.

RECOGNIZING RANDY ROUTON

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend, Mr. Randy Routon, for his nearly 34 years of dedicated service in mental health as the CEO of LifePath Systems, a mental health provider in Collin County.

Randy's steadfast leadership helped thousands of families and individuals

throughout our community gain access to life-changing mental healthcare. Randy's inspiring dedication was also illustrated by his role on many boards, committees, task forces, and clubs throughout our community.

I proudly worked with him during my time in the State legislature toward our shared goal of ensuring everyone in Collin County had a chance to receive high-quality mental healthcare.

I know Randy looks forward to spending more time with his wife, Diane, as well their six children and six grandchildren, during his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, as Randy prepares for his next chapter, I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in thanking Randy for his selfless and dedicated career of serving those around him.

PROTECTING NEWBORNS WHO SURVIVE ABORTION

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Senate Judiciary Committee had a hearing on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

In the House, Democratic leadership continues to block the near 80 times that my Republican colleagues and I have tried to consider this legislation on this floor, let alone even holding a hearing.

I am willing to bet most Americans assume that doctors and nurses will do everything they can to help a baby that has somehow miraculously survived an abortion. They would be surprised and sad to know that that is not always the case.

In 2002, Congress recognized the simple fact that an infant who survives an abortion is indeed a person. So why is there no legal protection for those newborn babies who have run the gauntlet, who survived and have been born alive after a failed abortion attempt?

It is way past the time to hold abortion providers accountable for ensuring the best possible care for any newborn baby, despite what the Governor of Virginia might say, regardless of whether that baby survived an abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues, Whip STEVE SCALISE and Representative ANN WAGNER, for their great work on this issue. It is time the House passes this important legislation to protect the sanctity of innocent newborn life.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 12, 2020.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 12, 2020, at 9:36 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H.J. Res. 80.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,
Deputy Clerk.

COLORADO WILDERNESS ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. DEGETTE. 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. 2546.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LURIA). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 844 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2546.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1223

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2546) to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes, with Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in the first section of House Resolution 844 and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased today to rise in support of H.R. 2546, the Protecting America's Wilderness Act.

As a fourth-generation Coloradan, I know how important our public lands are to the people of my State and to millions of Americans across the West.

Wilderness areas provide us a glimpse of what our world looked like before it was taken over by man. They are some of the most pristine and majestic areas on the planet.

For many of us, the access that we have to these lands is a large part of why we are so proud to call our Western States home and why so many others come to visit us each year.

While we may be the stewards of some of these lands, our Nation's public lands belong to everyone. We, as Members of Congress, should be doing everything we can to protect them.

The bill before us today would permanently protect nearly 1.4 million acres of land across three States. It is one of the largest wilderness protection packages Congress has considered in over a decade, and it is the largest Congress has considered for Colorado in a generation.

The areas that this bill will protect include some of the most unique and irreplaceable landscapes that our Nation has to offer, from the winding canyons of Colorado to the native grasslands of California and to the mossy forests of Washington State.

The designations in this bill will do more than protect the land itself. They will help protect the air we breathe and the water we drink. They will help protect wildlife and some of our favorite, world-class recreation areas. They will provide a boost to the nearby economies and help grow our Nation's multi-billion-dollar outdoor recreation industry that directly supports thousands of jobs across the U.S.

Perhaps most importantly, in preserving these lands, the bill will do what we need to do to further fulfill the House's commitment to takes steps to combat the climate crisis.

Preserving more of our public lands is one of the best short-term solutions that we, as a Nation, can take to respond to this crisis. Experts agree that we must strive to protect 30 percent of our public lands by 2030 to protect our planet.

The Protecting America's Wilderness Act combines six bills, each introduced by a different Member of Congress.

Title I of the bill consists of my legislation, the Colorado Wilderness Act, which will permanently protect more than 600,000 acres of wilderness in over 32 unique areas.

For more than 20 years now, I have been working closely with a group of citizens from my State, as well as countless local residents and community leaders, to craft and recraft the legislation we have before us today. I personally have been to most of the areas in my bill, by foot, by horse, and by raft, to experience the areas for myself. I have met with landowners and ranchers across my State to get their feedback and, when necessary, to adjust the bill to address their concerns.

It includes areas like the dramatic ridgeline vistas of Grand Hogback and the sprawling plateaus of Little Book Cliffs, areas like the stunning red cliffs

of the Dolores River Canyon that we see here in this poster and the winding riverways of Browns Canyon, areas like the desert slopes of Cross Canyon and the highest peaks of the San Juan Mountains, places that have been untouched by man.

These are just some of the more than 1.3 million acres of wilderness this bill will protect. It will also add more than 1,000 river miles to the National Wild and Scenic River System and would expand or designate new recreation areas, national monuments, scenic and special management areas, restoration areas, and trails.

Mr. Chair, I can't thank my colleagues enough for the work that they have done to make this bill a reality, especially Representatives HUFFMAN, CARBAJAL, CHU, SCHIFF, and KILMER. I know each one of them is going to have more to say about their individual titles in this bill, but before I yield to them, I quickly want to address my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

I recognize that we have ideological differences about protecting our public lands through designations such as these, but I want to encourage them to consider the importance of protecting not only our Nation's environment but also our economy and our way of life.

Mr. Chair, I urge them to consider our tireless and ongoing efforts to ensure that this bill will not just protect public lands, but also make a real boost to our economy.

Wilderness is, at its heart, about providing our fellow Americans with truly wild places to escape. If we don't take steps right now to protect those magical places, then one day, they will no longer exist.

A famous conservationist once said: "What a country chooses to save is what a country chooses to say about itself."

These areas are without a doubt deserving of the highest protections we can give them and passing them on to the next generation in the same state they are in today has always been one of our top priorities.

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

□ 1230

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

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2546. Regardless of what the House does, this bill is not going to be signed into law, and I find it only fair to explain why.

This package of bills is based on an ideological thought process that has always failed and is going to continue to fail. It will fail because this will add collectively about 1.5 million new wilderness acres. Yes, that is 1.5 million. Although we already have about 111 million, this is going to add another 1.5 million.

This bill will fail because the sponsors think they are protecting this land. In truth, the opposite is true. This bill will fail because unmanaged

land equals fuel load. Fuel load equals wildfire.

Mr. Chairman, according to the Insurance Information Institute, over the last 5 years, an average of 7.86 million acres per year has burned in the United States. According to the Congressional Research Service, about 78 percent of that is on public land.

The wilderness designation is the most vulnerable public land there is. More wilderness equals more fire. More fire equals more carbon, somewhere in the region of about 40 tons per acre when a wildfire burns.

And it gets worse. If a forest burns, that is God's best tool for absorbing greenhouse gases, and that is destroyed. That is like taking out your lungs.

Mr. Chairman, I can't count the number of times that I have heard the term "climate change" since I have taken office. The same people sponsoring these bills, the climate change fighters, are fighting to increase one of the most major causes of just that.

So, yes, this bill will get stalled. It may pass the House, but it will fail. And all this land happens to be in the west, Colorado, Washington, California. It is easy if you are from Connecticut or New York or some other eastern State to vote for a 1.5-million-acre wilderness designation somewhere in the western U.S. and then not have to explain to constituents the real impact. You can go home and say I expanded wilderness, saved all this land.

Well, guess what, it does impact your constituents and here is why:

Creation of wilderness, scenic rivers, and monuments is a creation of another Federal dependent. Disease and fire are inevitable on these lands. Those of us who live in those States or surrounding States, we are trying to govern in those States, and under these designations, you just can't touch it until there is a fire, and then you have to fight it. Those States that are helping make this decision, your constituents are subsidizing us.

Now, the Senate and the President know that this is not right. The Senate and the President know that having 47 States in this case decide what happens in three is not right, so they will stall this bill. I am simply hoping to raise the truth in this situation in a way that will at least make people think. I am not naive about what is going to happen with this bill.

This package designates about 100,000 acres of national monument expansion, so I will use the same argument there. Ditto. It also has 843 miles of wild scenic rivers. Just to drive home a point, please know this, sometimes our fish need some human help, and this designation will prevent that. Sometimes our fires create devastating silt flow into our waterways, and that would need some human help, but we won't be able to do it under these circumstances.

Massive new management burdens on a Federal Government already \$2.3 trillion in debt. Mr. Chairman, our Federal

Government is in over its head already. We can't afford to manage what we have already got, so we don't.

This is the wrong bill for the West. It is the wrong bill for Idaho.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I also thank her for her leadership not just on her own bill, but for leading the charge on a package of bills that includes my Northwest California Wilderness, Recreation, and Working Forests Act as Title II.

The lands in my district that are included in this legislation represent some of the most biodiverse ecosystems in California. It ranges from old growth trees that are so critical for carbon sequestration to rivers that provide habitat and unparalleled fishing and boating to mountain trails that offer hiking, biking, and other unique backcountry experiences.

Being active in the outdoors, experiencing these wild places, and connecting to a healthy environment is a way of life in the Second District of California. My constituents and visitors from around the State and around the country take pride in these public lands, and we all depend on the ecological resources and economic benefits that they provide. That is why my legislation takes a multifaceted approach.

First, it includes an ambitious restoration plan to improve forest health, promote fire resilience, and protect communities while restoring diverse ecosystems that are naturally adapted to fire and that provide fish habitat. It would also establish a partnership to restore public lands and waters that have been damaged by illegal marijuana growth sites, which pose significant threats to public health and safety, law enforcement, wildlife, and water quality.

Second, it recognizes the importance of the outdoor recreation economy. In my district, residents spend almost \$2 billion in outdoor recreation each year. This legislation would increase recreational opportunities and spur tourism by proposing new visitor centers, overnight lodging, and a significant expansion of trails for multiple uses, including hiking, biking, horseback riding, and off-highway vehicle use.

Expanding these recreational opportunities benefits outdoor enthusiasts and the local businesses that are an integral part of the recreation economy. Investing in our public lands means that we are also investing in communities near our public lands.

As Kent Collard of the Bar 717 Ranch in Trinity County told the Natural Resources Committee last year, "The best thing we can do for these lands, for businesses like mine that depend on untrammeled tracts of wilderness, is to protect them. Like many other busi-

nesses in this area, ours is fueled by people seeking to experience the wild beauty of Trinity County. The Northwest California Wilderness, Recreation, and Working Forests Act recognizes and promotes economic opportunities that recreation presents to our rural communities." Economic opportunities.

Third, this legislation would protect important wild places on public lands in my district. It designates roughly 262,000 acres of wilderness, 51,000 acres of potential wilderness, and 480 miles of wild and scenic rivers.

These areas include critical habitat for endangered salmon and steelhead, rare native plant ecosystems, and some of the largest intact old-growth forests in California. These areas also include some of the best fishing, hiking, and white-water runs in the State.

Like other pieces of legislation in the package we are considering today, this takes conservation seriously because it is urgently needed for the future of our planet.

Lastly, I would like to explain how this bill was developed. Over more than 3 years, in fact, not long after I came to Congress in 2013, I started asking stakeholders what policy issues should be addressed in public lands legislation in my district. I have repeatedly sat down with constituents, presented these proposals at public meetings, and discussed concerns with county supervisors. I have moved boundaries and removed wilderness proposals because of concerns from landowners, the timber industry, and Tribes. This level of stakeholder participation means that I have focused on what people in north-west California want to see with their public lands. I think this comprehensive, carefully crafted legislation has broad support.

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms. JUDY CHU of California). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Chair, I yield the gentleman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Chair, I want to point out this bill has support from conservation organizations, outdoor recreation groups, dozens of businesses, community leaders, adjacent landowners. It is a long and broad list of support.

Madam Chair, I request a favorable vote for this legislation.

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Idaho for yielding.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2546. This package of land bills will impact California, Colorado, and Washington creating nearly 1.5 million acres of new wilderness.

H.R. 2250, one bill included in this package will impact northern California, my area. It adds 262,000 acres of new wilderness designations, despite concerns from local communities as to how they would be impacted.

We have seen the devastation that wildfires cause in northern California time and time again, so why are we putting more land into this restrictive wilderness category, which will make it even more difficult to properly manage forests and to access them?

Potential wilderness is typically treated as wilderness anyway, so you have 51,000 acres that will probably be enforced as if it were wilderness.

We should be prioritizing forest management, not making it more difficult for access and the work needing to be done desperately. In rural northern California, much of the land is already owned by the Federal Government. The local economies depend on access and use of these lands to thrive.

Seventy-six percent of Trinity County is controlled by the Federal Government. Ninety-five percent of the land added to wilderness designation by 2250 is located there.

The town of Weaverville located in Trinity County has had several occasions where fire has burned right up to their doorsteps, and even then, we still pursue endangering them because these lands are not managed.

Even due to the best efforts of our firefighters, our CCC groups out there trying get ahead of it, we put ourselves behind by having wilderness designations that take away options, take away ability to access and properly manage these lands.

Currently within that county, 520,000 acres, or 25 percent, are designated as wilderness. It would increase that number to 770,000, or 37 percent of the county.

There are concerns with these lands being designated as wilderness that should have been addressed with the local communities, ranging from questions about forest management, grazing implications, to road decommissioning and stewardship contracts. How does that help the public have access? How does that help our firefighters and CCC have access to do the work?

Consensus from these local communities most impacted by these designations should be a priority. This legislation does not do that.

None of the language changes recommended to help mitigate local concerns were accepted, so I urge you to vote in opposition.

If it is all about protecting lands, what is it we are actually protecting when we are endangering them even more so?

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Chair, I thank Representative DEGETTE for yielding and for her leadership on this very important legislation.

I am honored to represent the central coast of California, one of the most beautiful districts in the Nation.

Places like the Los Padres National Forest and the Carrizo Plain National Monument contain some of the most

stunning, unique, and diverse ecosystems found anywhere in North America.

Today, I am pleased to support H.R. 2546, the Protecting America's Wilderness Act. This bill would preserve the ecological beauty and recreational activities available to communities in my district and beyond as well as for future generations.

This legislation includes my bill, H.R. 2199, the Central Coast Heritage Protection Act. I am proud to have worked with Chairman GRIJALVA and Representative DEGETTE and local stakeholders to ensure that California's central coast was included in this measure.

Title III of this legislation would designate and place into conservation nearly 250,000 acres as wilderness within the Los Padres National Forest and the Carrizo Plain National Monument as wilderness areas, one of the highest forms of protections available.

□ 1245

This is a major step to preserve and protect our community's future for future generations, allows for responsible forest management and firefighting activities.

It also creates a 400-mile-long Condor National Recreation Trail, connecting the northern and southern portions of the Los Padres National Forest by a single hiking route.

This legislation has been the result of years of collaboration with local stakeholders. It is supported by nearly 500 central coast landowners, businesses, farmers, and local officials. This reaffirms that protecting our environment and growing our economy are not mutually exclusive.

Our public lands are an essential asset to our local economies. In California alone, the outdoor recreation economy is worth \$92 billion and employs over 650,000 individuals.

I want to thank Chairman GRIJALVA, Representative DEGETTE, and the committee for their support of this legislation.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" and continue uplifting local businesses and local economies that rely on outdoor recreation.

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER) for his leadership.

I rise in strong opposition to this package of divisive and partisan bills. Collectively, this package of ideologically driven bills impact lands in Colorado, California, and Washington by creating nearly 1.5 million acres of new wilderness, designating 843 miles of Wild and Scenic Rivers, and creating 100,000 acres of National Monument expansion.

In Colorado alone, H.R. 2546 would designate approximately 570,000 acres of new wilderness areas, 23,000 acres of expanded wilderness, and 14,000 acres of

potential wilderness. These new designations would be in addition to the already existing 3.5 million acres of public land in Colorado that is already designated as wilderness.

Now, I commend my colleague from Colorado for her efforts to work with local shareholders to address some of their concerns, but the bills contained in this package do not achieve the type of balance and local consensus necessary for bills of this magnitude.

Many of the local communities impacted by this wilderness package have raised significant concerns, including the loss of motorized access and recreation, the elimination of multiple use, and the overall threat to local economies. If wilderness designation is imposed, fewer people will have access to these lands.

Engaging local stakeholders and considering their on-the-ground expertise are critical steps in making decisions about public lands management. Local communities have concerns with many aspects of this bill.

At the July 10, 2019, subcommittee hearing on this bill, the committee heard testimony from Montezuma County Commissioner Keenan Ertel, who shared the county's concern that this bill would negatively impact "individual landowners, agricultural entities, water providers, first responders, and especially the recreation tourism industry."

Garfield County also opposes this legislation due to concerns with restricting access and increased risk of catastrophic wildfires due to the restrictive management regimes imposed by this legislation.

In addition to local grievances, the affected land management agencies have noted that this bill is inconsistent with previous designations and existing land uses by arbitrarily adding wilderness areas and Wild and Scenic Rivers in areas where those designations are not appropriate. Supporting the declaration of areas that do not actually possess these characteristics undermines the integrity of the Wilderness Act and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, as well as the existing lands that do possess those features.

Because of these concerns, the Trump administration has rightly issued a veto threat against this partisan bill.

To quote from the Statement of Administration Policy: "This bill would impose unnecessary and harmful restrictions on more than 2.5 million acres of land in Colorado, California, and Washington State, including nearly 1.5 million acres in the form of wilderness designations. These restrictions will greatly reduce opportunities for multiple uses on these public lands, limit access to them, and significantly reduce the available productive acreage in working forests, rendering them more prone to catastrophic wildfires."

This highly partisan package is in stark contrast to the omnibus lands package that was passed overwhelmingly last year by both Chambers and

signed into law by President Trump. That package was the most sweeping conservation legislation in the last decade. It had begun under the Republican House and was successful because it featured the input of a wide coalition of our colleagues, and it earned the support of a broad, diverse coalition of advocates for public lands, economic development, and conservation.

Mr. Chair, we are wasting our time here. I ask my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARBAJAL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, I would point out to my close friend from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that there are no multiple use areas in the Colorado Wilderness Act. Two-thirds of the areas are already wilderness study areas and being converted, and the rest have no motorized use or mining or drilling of any kind. So the bill has no conversion of multiple use areas.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2546, the Protecting America's Wilderness Act. This legislation includes the text of my bill, H.R. 2215, the San Gabriel Mountains Foothills and Rivers Protection Act, which is the result of years of grassroots advocacy and community engagement to improve protections and access for these treasured lands.

The San Gabriel Mountains are the crown of the Los Angeles area. They provide 30 percent of our water, comprise 70 percent of Los Angeles County's open space, and are home to historic habitats of species like the California condor and Nelson's bighorn sheep.

This immense natural beauty exists right in the backyard of one of the densest urban areas in our country, offering recreational opportunities like hiking, fishing, and camping to the more than 15 million Americans who live in the urban area nearby.

That is so important because the Los Angeles region is one of the most park-poor areas in the country, which means that too many communities do not have access to outdoor recreational opportunities in their own neighborhoods.

Access to outdoor space has real, documented benefits for public health. That is why protecting these lands is so important.

In 2014, President Obama recognized the decades of grassroots support for this goal and granted my request to designate the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument. Immediately, this made available more resources to the mountains that resulted in cleaner rivers, improved facilities like picnic

areas and hiking trails, and more rangers to interact with visitors. Most importantly, it brought the entire community together to develop a management plan for the San Gabriel Mountains, with over 40 members representing a variety of stakeholders, such as water agencies, local governments, and the business community.

But we are still far from done. This same level of resources and protection is needed across the San Gabriel Mountains and the communities that serve as their gateway.

The legislation before us today would build on the success of the National Monument designation by expanding the monument's boundaries to include the western Angeles National Forest, establishing new and expanded wilderness areas, and protecting more than 45 miles of waterways as Wild and Scenic Rivers.

It would also establish the critical new San Gabriel Mountains national recreation area to bolster the connection between urban and wild spaces, helping communities in the foothills and along the river corridor improve access to the mountains and offer new recreational opportunities for Angelenos.

This bill represents the work of so many, and they have come together for a plan that would complete the vision of a community seamlessly connected to the beautiful wild lands of its backyard.

Today, we have an opportunity to realize that vision, and that is why I urge support for H.R. 2546, the Protecting America's Wilderness Act.

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, when the Republicans were in the majority, we set three overarching objectives for our Federal lands policy: to restore public access to the public lands, to restore good management to the public lands, and to restore the Federal Government as a good neighbor to those communities impacted by the public lands. This bill is the very opposite of these three policies.

The purpose of America's public lands was to set aside our most beautiful tracts, in the words of the original Yosemite Charter, "for public use, resort, and recreation . . . for all time."

The bill before us does exactly the opposite: It imposes severe restrictions on the public's use of 2.5 million acres of their own lands; 1.5 million acres would be put off limits to such innocent things as mountain bikes and strollers; and it would remove roads to reach campsites or even allow emergency equipment to access. It also designates 843 additional miles of our rivers as wild and scenic.

Does anybody think that sounds good?

I can tell my colleagues that that designation on the Merced River in my district has been used to close many traditional tourist amenities at Yo-

semita Park, including swimming pools, raft and bike rentals, horseback riding stables, and ice skating and lodging facilities.

"Public use, resort, and recreation" becomes "Look, but don't touch."

The health and vitality of our forests depends on active scientific forest management. That means carefully tending our forests to protect them from morbid overcrowding, which, in turn, makes them vulnerable to disease, pestilence, drought, and, ultimately, catastrophic wildfire.

Excess timber comes out of the forest in one of two ways: It is either burned out or it is carried out. This bill makes good forest management impossible by forbidding our foresters from using their science to protect and groom and care for our forests by assuring that trees have room to grow strong.

Finally, this bill ignores and insults the communities directly affected by this massive Federal land grab. In case after case, local elected officials, local governments, local fire districts, and local residents in the nearby communities have formally, vigorously, and vocally protested the draconian restrictions imposed by this measure because they imperil public safety from fire, and they do wanton harm to the local economies.

This bill reverses the three objectives set by House Republicans:

Instead of restoring public access to public lands, the Democrats restrict and deny it;

Instead of restoring good management to the public lands, the Democrats forbid it;

Instead of restoring the Federal Government as a good neighbor to those communities impacted by the public lands, the Democrats give those communities the finger.

What Obama said about elections having consequences, here it is in real life.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I thank Ms. DEGETTE for yielding.

I rise today in very strong support of H.R. 2215, the San Gabriel Mountains Foothills and Rivers Protection Act, which is included in H.R. 2546, and I associate my remarks with those of Ms. CHU, my distinguished colleague.

As the representative of the San Gabriel foothills community, I am very proud of our community members and local organizations that have worked tirelessly on preserving and expanding the mountains for future generations.

The San Gabriel Mountains, foothills, and river corridor attract millions of visitors a year and provide some of the only outdoor options for the open space-poor Los Angeles County.

H.R. 2215 expands the boundaries of the monument and allows the San Gabriel Mountains, foothills, and river corridor to be eligible for Federal funding to help clean, protect, and develop our beloved mountain recreation areas.

The bill will improve recreation opportunities for millions of families and bring much-needed resources to the communities that serve as the gateway to the mountains, while respecting local rights. Water agencies and communities from the area all agree this is a good thing.

As California has continued to be faced with drought, forest fires, and the growing impacts of climate change, it is critical that we support policies such as this that protect our environment.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

□ 1300

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my friend from Idaho for yielding.

The legislation before us today represents the same failed policies that have caused recent fire seasons to be some of the worst on record. Over 1.5 million acres of new wilderness is created by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, a wilderness designation is the most restrictive land classification that can be levied by the Federal Government. Wilderness designations such as these greatly hinder Federal and local agencies' ability to actively manage our forests, which greatly enhances the risk of catastrophic wildfires.

Just yesterday, I hosted a roundtable with stakeholders from across the West representing local governments, State governments, animal conservation groups, and private companies that are developing groundbreaking technologies to help us fight the threat of catastrophic fire. Every participant in the panel spoke to the importance of actively managing our forests.

Wildfire prevention saves money, human lives, and protects vital wildlife habitats. Passage of this bill puts all of that at risk.

This legislation also represents another attempt by the majority to legislate in other Members' districts without their support. I especially want to highlight the provisions in this bill dealing particularly with Colorado.

The vast majority of the 700,000 acres of new wilderness created by this bill in Colorado is located in Mr. TIPTON's district and Mr. LAMBORN's district. Neither of these Members support this legislation.

This is a continuation of legislation previously taken up by this House restricting mining in my district that I did not support and attempts by the other side to restrict mining in northern Minnesota and oil and gas development in ANWR completely against the wishes of local Members of Congress as well as people back home.

Legislation like this before us today flies in the face of what public lands legislation should be. It should be locally driven and benefit those who live closest to those lands.

This legislation does none of that. Instead, it applies a top-down approach to land management, with decrees being levied from Washington, D.C., without the input of local stakeholders.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this disastrous legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Protecting America's Wilderness Act.

This bill includes a number of worthy initiatives to expand and protect our national heritage, and I am very pleased and grateful that the legislation includes the Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act, a bill I have been working on for nearly 20 years.

The Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act would expand the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to include the lands known as the Rim of the Valley. This includes Simi Hills, Santa Susana Mountains, Verdugo Mountains, part of Santa Clarita, San Gabriel Mountain foothills, the Los Angeles River, and Griffith Park, all important green spaces in the greater Los Angeles region, one of the park-poorest regions in the country.

By expanding the national recreation area, the National Park Service will have the authority to make capital improvements, like repairing hiking trails and maintaining facilities for public enjoyment, studying wildlife and its habitats, and participating in cooperative conservation with local landowners. It will help ensure wildlife corridors that allow Los Angelinos to experience lions, bears, and other precious wildlife in their own backyard.

Protecting and embracing our national spaces is very important to me personally. I come from a hiking family. My wife, Eve, and I love to go on hiking trips with our friends or when we can steal away during the summer, evening hikes through Griffith Park. From time to time, I like to run alone in the Verdugos, with a little extra pace at certain points, knowing that one of P-22's mountain lion friends might be watching me from the tall grass.

Last week, I asked my constituents to send some reflections about what the Rim of the Valley means to them, along with their favorite pictures of the natural beauty of our region, and you can see just a sampling of the beautiful vistas that they sent behind me.

I want to say, I think my constituent Donald from Sunland put it best when he said: "I appreciate how the calm beauty of undeveloped nature replenishes my spirits. Everyone, including future generations, should be able to access unspoiled nature."

We owe it to ourselves and our children and grandchildren to safeguard these treasures. The Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act plays an important role in this effort.

I want to thank Chairman GRIJALVA and his staff for their work on this legislation. I want to thank my colleague, DIANA DEGETTE. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2546.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to a completely partisan bill in H.R. 2546, legislation that grows the reach of the Federal Government and strong-arms local stakeholders.

To my colleagues in California and Colorado who are involuntarily affected by this legislation, I stand with you.

Like them, I represent a vast district with significant Federal lands. Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District is the size of West Virginia. It features two national forests, a national park, a wild and scenic river, and a wilderness area.

Like them, I have a colleague from an urban area in my State legislating in my district, as if they know what is best for our constituents and we don't.

About a month ago, a colleague representing part of the Twin Cities area of Minneapolis-Saint Paul introduced a mineral withdrawal, putting over 235,000 acres off-limits. In northern Minnesota, the Range Association of Municipalities and Schools sharply rebuked this legislation, as the bill promises to deprive schools of millions of dollars in potential revenue.

In Colorado, H.R. 2546 is opposed by Mesa, Garfield, and Montezuma Counties because of their concern about the impacts this expansion can have on their rural communities.

What many in Washington, D.C., and Representatives of urban areas fail to recognize is how much this bill affects the daily lives of rural constituencies.

For example, this bill will disallow proper forest management. Why not let our loggers clear the timber that leads to forest fires?

It will disallow recreational activities like mountain biking. Why would we stop activities like that that help grow our local tourism industries?

The National Guard Bureau is concerned about the high-altitude training in this area. Why would we impede the readiness of our military?

Mr. Chairman, the trend of rejecting the input of local Members of Congress and local stakeholders is troubling. Whether it be in California, Colorado, or my great State of Minnesota, all our constituents ask for is to have a seat at the table and their voices heard.

Please oppose this bill and send a message that locals affected by Washington, D.C., legislation need to be heard.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), chairman of the committee.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for the time and for her longstanding

commitment to public land in her State and throughout the Nation.

I also want to thank all of the sponsors from California to Washington who have done tremendous work on the individual titles that make up the package of bills before us today.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2546, Protecting America's Wilderness Act.

Congress passed the Wilderness Act in 1964 in response to concerns about population growth and increasing development. The reason for the act is more pressing now than ever.

Since then, wilderness designations have served as a key tool for protecting pristine places in their natural state for the benefit of current and future generations of Americans.

This package truly embodies the spirit of the Wilderness Act, something that is often dismissed by many of my colleagues across the aisle. Each title was developed through a multiyear collaborative process with diverse and locally driven coalitions that have demonstrated that these places are worthy of protection as wilderness.

They provided abundant recreational opportunities to help support local economies, teach visitors about our Nation's diverse heritage, and allow people to find solitude and peace in nature.

They protect some of the last and best refuges for wildlife in the face of a changing environment and play a vital role in safeguarding the natural systems that our communities rely on.

As climate change increasingly impacts our natural world, designating pristine landscapes as wilderness is one of the most important actions Congress can take in response to the climate crisis.

This bill prioritizes the long-term conservation of large, connected landscapes that provide clean air, clean water, critical wildlife habitat, and intact natural systems that enhance community resiliency to this climate crisis.

It reflects the heart of the Wilderness Act, reminding us of our dependence on healthy, natural systems and our responsibility to ensure a sustainable environment for future generations.

It is no surprise that the Trump administration would oppose these designations, given the single-use mission of the Trump administration, which is extraction and profit being the only option for our public lands, while this legislation before us today represents and recognizes that protection and conservation are public benefits for all Americans.

I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2546 and the package of legislation before us, which will ensure that these wild places are protected for the benefit of current and future generations.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I appreciate having the ability to speak

after Mr. GRIJALVA, my good friend from Arizona, so I can bring some balance to the rhetoric that we are doing because somebody has to realize that the ideas of conservation, recreation, and economic development in the vast territories we have in the West are not mutually exclusive. They never have been. They never need to be.

But the bill we have in front of us today is very unbalanced. It is pretty ideological, and as Yogi Berra used to say: "It's *deja vu* all over again."

This puts 1.5 million acres, as has been said, in new wilderness designations and over 800 miles of wild and scenic rivers, which destroys or shuts down all forest management activity in those particular areas, including things like fuel reduction and wildfire mitigation.

To put this in perspective for some of you, especially those in the East, in the last 10 years, 7.3 million acres of our most restricted public lands have been burned out. That is like burning the entire State of Massachusetts, all of which was set in this kind of restrictive area.

Now, what the majority wants to do, what the Democrats want to do, is add more to that potential problem. It is unbalanced simply because there is not a single Republican who has cosponsored any of these bills in this package, including the two Colorado Republicans who are most directly impacted by this package.

This puts critical military-readiness training at risk. This has concerns for private property that have never been resolved in elements of this package. It doesn't even address the local consensus.

This is a bill that the Senate will not pass, that the President has already said he is going to reject.

Earlier in this session, as we began, we had a lands package that came through. It was a consensus between Democrats and Republicans both here and in the Senate. Many of these bills were not part of that consensus land package, and for justifiable reasons, because they haven't reached that consensus status.

It hasn't happened before, which means—you know, Earl Weaver once came out and got thrown out of a game because he looked at the umpire and said: Are you going to get better, or is this as good as it gets?

We are looking at the other side and saying: Are you going to get better, or is this simply as good as it gets?

What we should be doing is realizing, instead of creating more problem areas, we should be trying to solve the problem of the land we already own. I am specifically talking about H.R. 1225, the Restore Our Parks Act. We have a maintenance backlog in our parks that is huge and a solution to it that actually works. Why are we not bringing that bill to the floor instead of this bill, which is destined to fail?

We all talk a big game about how much we revere our national parks, yet

when we had the opportunity to do something about it with a bill that has 330 sponsors and cosponsors, we have the chance of doing it, we don't.

For some reason, the Democrats don't decide to bring that up on the floor so it can move along. Instead, they bring packages up here that create more wilderness, more problems, and more costs without having solved any of the underlying problems with these packages, which is why they weren't in the consensus bill we had at the beginning of the session in the first place.

We can do better. We need to do better. We are wasting our time with messaging bills that have no future when we have the opportunity to do stuff that works.

I am calling on my friends on the other side: Put that bill on the floor so we can vote for something that solves our problems and saves our parks instead of these simply messaging bills that are dedicated to having special interest groups being able to check off the box that you did something for them. It is about time we did something that works.

□ 1315

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out to the gentleman that when we did the last land package none of these bills had been brought up for a hearing by the then-majority, so the gentleman would not have been too happy to have included them in that package.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues in support of this important lands package which is not a messaging bill. It is a bill that will protect endangered species, improve climate mitigation, and support our Nation's growing outdoor recreation economy. Every component of this bill certainly accomplishes those ends.

But, in particular, the Colorado Wilderness Act Title I provides Federal protections to many of Colorado's most beautiful and treasured lands, and that I can attest to as a Representative for Colorado's Second Congressional District.

I am inspired by my colleague, Congresswoman DEGETTE's dedication and her championing of this cause, having worked on this bill for the better part of the last 20 years.

It is important that we protect these beautiful and treasured public lands for generations to come. We have a strong tradition of protecting public lands in my home State. As the Chair well knows, earlier this year we passed the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act out of the House, which is an important step in that regard.

I think at the end of the day we should be able to agree on the goal of protecting public lands to ensure that they exist for future generations, including for the generation of my

daughter who is 18 months old now—a year-and-a-half-old, I should say—and I look forward to being able to enjoy these incredible public lands with her over the many coming years.

So at the end of the day this bill makes sense. It is worth fighting for. Let's protect public lands, not just in Colorado but across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Protecting America's Wilderness Act.

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

Mr. Chairman, it was alluded to once, but I want to underscore that passage of this would add massive new burdens on Federal agencies. We need to be using those resources to better manage what we have already got as public land and public resources.

As a reminder, we are \$2.3 billion in debt. What that means is the Federal Government is way over its head. We can't afford to manage land, and we can't afford to take care of it.

So guess what?

It doesn't do it. Then we all pay, typically, when things go on fire.

Mr. Chairman, in my State of Idaho, because of all that massive amount of Federal land, we are really more like tenants than we are landlords. But to make an analogy, our landlord can't afford to fix a broken roof. That is what we have got with responsibility on these government agencies unable to take care of these resources.

Mr. Chairman, you have heard testimony from my colleagues that many of the local communities impacted have raised significant concerns ranging from loss of access, recreation, elimination of constructive and wise management, and threats to rural economies. In addition to the concerns and opposition raised by local stakeholders and counties, some of the provisions in the package are opposed by the actual Members who represent the areas affected. It is troubling.

This effort is also funded in part by some special interest groups, and they sometimes will call themselves environmentalists. To those people, I just want to communicate: I live in this area. All too often you don't. We are the real environmentalists because we take care of a fabulous resource.

Public lands decisions should be made with local collaboration and input. This set of bills does not do it. They have real consequences on real people. Sound, proven, and scientific management are critical.

Mr. Chairman, God gave us a fabulous resource here, but he also gave us a brain. We need to use our brain.

Now, I am not naive. I know my colleagues across the aisle have got to vote for this thing. Part of that is that some people's DNA says that wilderness is good and human involvement is bad.

I would just close by saying this: Facts are stubborn things. The first fact is this set of bills is going nowhere.

The second fact is wise management—that is using our mind—is much better than stagnating this resource.

Fact number three is when this stalls—and it will—those of us on this side of the aisle and those of us who live in the West will still be here asking for your cooperation in working with us.

Mr. Chairman, please don't let pride blind you. Work with us on putting some intelligence and some wisdom into managing this resource.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy recommending a veto of this bill package.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2546—PROTECTING AMERICA'S WILDERNESS ACT—REP. DEGETTE, D-CO, AND REP. NEGUSE, D-CO

The Administration opposes H.R. 2546. This bill would impose unnecessary and harmful restrictions on more than 2.5 million acres of land in Colorado, California, and Washington State, including nearly 1.5 million acres in the form of wilderness designations. These restrictions will greatly reduce opportunities for multiple uses on these public lands, limit access to them, and significantly reduce the available productive acreage in working forests, rendering them more prone to catastrophic wildfires.

The Administration has expanded access to America's public lands; increased hunting, fishing, and recreational opportunities nationwide; and enhanced conservation stewardship of our vast natural resources. With regard to the designation of wilderness on public lands, the Administration generally supports congressional action to resolve wilderness designation and Wilderness Study Areas (WSA) release issues, particularly for WSAs that were established more than 30 years ago. Many WSAs were recommended for designation, while others were recommended as not suitable, with suggestions that they be returned to agency management to integrate their other intrinsic values into surrounding land management plans. The Administration recommends addressing these long overdue WSA decisions before undertaking potential designations of new areas that did not meet the criteria established in the 1964 Wilderness Act when inventories were completed many years ago.

The Administration strongly believes that before new or potential wilderness areas or wild and scenic rivers are designated, it is important to first ensure that such designation is the most appropriate land management tool for a given parcel. For this and other reasons, successful conservation proposals that have incorporated this tool over the last decade have been more limited in geographic scope than this bill. It is important to ensure that designating new wilderness areas on public lands does not unnecessarily impede public access, limit outdoor recreational opportunities, or conflict with pre-existing uses. Unfortunately, a number of the proposals for wilderness designations in H.R. 2546 fail to follow this successful model.

While many recreational activities, such as hunting, fishing, and hiking, are compatible with wilderness designation, other activities, such as mountain biking and off-highway vehicle use, are not. Some of the areas proposed for wilderness designation in H.R. 2546 contain popular motorized or mechanized recreation areas. In addition, existing energy development poses inherent challenges for wilderness designations, creating complex management issues pertaining to active mining claims and oil and gas

leases within a designated wilderness area. The designations under this bill could impede future energy and mineral development, including development that is important to the economic and national security of the United States.

The Administration is committed to managing public lands as a good neighbor to the local communities and to the Americans who live and work in close proximity to them. Engaging local stakeholders and considering their on-the-ground expertise are critical steps in making decisions about public lands management, and local communities have concerns that many aspects of H.R. 2546 would produce negative effects for their citizens and their economies.

The Administration is willing to work with Congress to make the necessary improvements to this bill if it is considered further. If H.R. 2546 were presented to the President in its current form, however, his advisors would recommend that he veto it.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY).

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this important public lands bill to the floor.

H.R. 2546 incorporates a bill I helped introduce along with Representative CARBAJAL, the Central Coast Heritage Protection Act.

The Central Coast Heritage Protection Act sets aside more than 40,000 acres in the Los Padres National Forest as wilderness. It also designates the Condor Trail within Los Padres as a National Recreation Trail. Both of these actions have long been priorities of my constituents, and so I am pleased the House is taking action on them today.

We in Ventura County are so fortunate to be surrounded by gorgeous public spaces, including the Los Padres National Forest. Designating these lands as wilderness will strengthen environmental protections in our region and preserve this important part of our natural heritage for future generations to enjoy.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman, again, for bringing this bill forward.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend and colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as someone who was born and raised on the Olympic Peninsula, I know firsthand how special our region is and how our public lands contribute to the fabric of who we are.

In our region we understand that protecting public lands isn't just about saving these unforgettable places for future generations. It also means protecting high quality jobs for the next generation as well.

As someone who worked in economic development professionally for over a decade, I have seen how our natural resources contribute to our economic vitality. Each year millions of people and

families travel to my State and contribute roughly \$22 billion in economic impact and support 200,000 jobs in Washington's outdoor economy. Our national treasures have created opportunities for local entrepreneurs who have started restaurants, guided tour companies, hotels, and other small businesses.

That is why it makes sense to protect these special places, and it is why I am proud the House is considering this comprehensive package which includes my legislation, the Wild Olympics Wilderness and Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. This bill protects some of our environmentally sensitive areas by establishing a new wilderness area to protect the last remaining old-growth stands on the peninsula and designating 19 rivers and tributaries as wild and scenic rivers to protect critical salmon spawning habitat.

This proposal has evolved through extensive public engagement with Tribes, conservation groups, timber communities, business leaders, shellfish growers, and everyone in between to create a bill that works for our local communities.

It is because of that extensive public outreach that this bill is formally now supported by more than 800 community leaders—Republicans, Democrats, business owners, sportsmen, mayors, county commissioners, and Tribal leaders—all of whom agree that this proposal moves our region in the right direction.

In addition to protecting recreational access and supporting our outdoor economy, this bill will also bolster our region's efforts to protect sources of clean drinking water, support critical salmon and steelhead habitat, and protect key waterways that are vital to our shellfish industry.

But just as important as these things are the things this bill will not do.

This proposal will not close, decommission, or otherwise restrict access to any existing Forest Service roads or trailheads.

It will not impact any harvestable timber base in the Olympic National Forest, and I am doing a whole bunch of work to actually increase harvest through other avenues.

This bill will not affect any private property rights, and it will not impact how the Washington Department of Natural Resources manages State-owned land, which is why it has gained the endorsement of the Washington Commissioner of Public Lands.

We know that our region's future depends on building a strong and diversified economy. And after years of collaboration, I think this bill we are considering today represents a clear win-win for the communities I represent.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the senior Senator from Washington, Senator MURRAY, for her partnership on this effort, and I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this important legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Chairman, wilderness is not owned by me, it is not owned by any Member on the other side of the aisle, and it is not owned by any Members of Congress. It is owned by the people. It is owned by the people of this country and future generations of this country. That is why we are the stewards of this wilderness.

These are Federal lands, and I have heard some of my colleagues on the other side in this debate say: Well, some county commissioner doesn't support it; some Member doesn't support it.

It doesn't matter. These Federal lands belong to the public. In fact, last October in Colorado there was a poll done of the areas that are impacted in my portion of the wilderness bill. This poll found that 71 percent of the people in the affected areas—the citizens, the people who use this land for economic development and recreation—believe that these wilderness study areas should be made permanent and that they should be made into wilderness. That is whom I believe.

I want to tell you one more story, Mr. Chairman, and that is the story about in August when I went down to Cortez, Colorado, near three of the wilderness areas in my bill. One of the county commissioners, Mr. Ertel, testified in Congress that he represents that area.

Do you know something?

In Cortez, Colorado, the city council and the mayor support the bill. At a townhall meeting I had, there were 75 people. Sixty-five of them raised their hands when I asked if they supported the bill. That is who supports this bill, that is who this is for, and that is whom we need to think about and listen to as we pass this legislation.

The areas in this bill all have strong wilderness characteristics, and we owe it to our children, to our grandchildren, and to our great-grandchildren to take bold action right now and preserve them.

I just want to take a minute and thank everybody who has been involved with this bill: obviously, the chairman of the committee, Mr. GRIJALVA, his staff, Chris Rackens, Brandon Bragato, Henry Wykowski, Cameron Walkup, and Lily Wang; and my staff who have worked on this bill for over 20 years now, Lisa Cohen, my Chief of Staff, Kaila Hood, Matt Allen, Tom Woodburn, and Marc Rehmann, all of whom have worked their guts out for this, as well as many other staffers past and present.

Finally, I want to thank the citizens who brought this bill to me to begin with and who continue to work their hearts out every day to preserve our wild places; in particular, John Stansfield of Wild Connections who can't be with us today, and Mark Pearson of San Juan Wilderness—who the last time I saw him, he was sitting on a cliff high up in one of my wilderness areas and is now sitting in the gallery watching us pass this historic legislation.

It truly is a labor of love, and I look forward to telling my grandchildren about this historic day.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ESPAILLAT). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–50, shall be considered as adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 2546

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 “Protecting America’s Wilderness Act”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—COLORADO WILDERNESS

Sec. 101. Short title; definition.

Sec. 102. Additions to National Wilderness Preservation System in the State of Colorado.

Sec. 103. Administrative provisions.

Sec. 104. Water.

Sec. 105. Sense of Congress.

TITLE II—NORTHWEST CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS, RECREATION, AND WORKING FORESTS

Sec. 201. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 202. Definitions.

Subtitle A—RESTORATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 211. South Fork Trinity-Mad River Restoration Area.

Sec. 212. Redwood National and State Parks restoration.

Sec. 213. California Public Lands Remediation Partnership.

Sec. 214. Trinity Lake visitor center.

Sec. 215. Del Norte County visitor center.

Sec. 216. Management plans.

Sec. 217. Study; partnerships related to overnight accommodations.

Subtitle B—RECREATION

Sec. 221. Horse Mountain Special Management Area.

Sec. 222. Bigfoot National Recreation Trail.

Sec. 223. Elk Camp Ridge Recreation Trail.

Sec. 224. Trinity Lake Trail.

Sec. 225. Trails study.

Sec. 226. Construction of mountain bicycling routes.

Sec. 227. Partnerships.

Subtitle C—CONSERVATION

Sec. 231. Designation of wilderness.

Sec. 232. Administration of wilderness.

Sec. 233. Designation of potential wilderness.

Sec. 234. Designation of wild and scenic rivers.

Sec. 235. Sanhedrin Special Conservation Management Area.

Subtitle D—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 241. Maps and legal descriptions.

Sec. 242. Updates to land and resource management plans.

Sec. 243. Pacific Gas and Electric Company Utility facilities and rights-of-way.

TITLE III—CENTRAL COAST HERITAGE PROTECTION

Sec. 301. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 302. Definitions.

Sec. 303. Designation of wilderness.

Sec. 304. Designation of the Machesna Mountain Potential Wilderness.

Sec. 305. Administration of wilderness.

Sec. 306. Designation of Wild and Scenic Rivers.

Sec. 307. Designation of the Fox Mountain Potential Wilderness.

Sec. 308. Designation of scenic areas.

Sec. 309. Condor National Scenic Trail.

Sec. 310. Forest service study.

Sec. 311. Nonmotorized recreation opportunities.

Sec. 312. Use by members of Tribes.

TITLE IV—SAN GABRIEL MOUNTAINS FOOTHILLS AND RIVERS PROTECTION

Sec. 401. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 402. Definition of State.

Subtitle A—SAN GABRIEL NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Sec. 411. Purposes.

Sec. 412. Definitions.

Sec. 413. San Gabriel National Recreation Area.

Sec. 414. Management.

Sec. 415. Acquisition of non-Federal land within Recreation Area.

Sec. 416. Water rights; water resource facilities; public roads; utility facilities.

Sec. 417. San Gabriel National Recreation Area Public Advisory Council.

Sec. 418. San Gabriel National Recreation Area Partnership.

Sec. 419. Visitor services and facilities.

Subtitle B—SAN GABRIEL MOUNTAINS

Sec. 421. Definitions.

Sec. 422. National monument boundary modification.

Sec. 423. Designation of Wilderness Areas and Additions.

Sec. 424. Administration of Wilderness Areas and Additions.

Sec. 425. Designation of Wild and Scenic Rivers.

Sec. 426. Water rights.

TITLE V—RIM OF THE VALLEY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION

Sec. 501. Short title.

Sec. 502. Boundary adjustment; land acquisition; administration.

TITLE VI—WILD OLYMPICS WILDERNESS AND WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS

Sec. 601. Short title.

Sec. 602. Designation of olympic national forest wilderness areas.

Sec. 603. Wild and scenic river designations.

Sec. 604. Existing rights and withdrawal.

Sec. 605. Treaty rights.

TITLE VII—PAYGO

Sec. 701. Determination of Budgetary Effects.

TITLE I—COLORADO WILDERNESS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE; DEFINITION.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This title may be cited as the “Colorado Wilderness Act of 2020”.

(b) **SECRETARY DEFINED.**—As used in this title, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, as appropriate.

SEC. 102. ADDITIONS TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM IN THE STATE OF COLORADO.

(a) **ADDITIONS.**—Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–77; 107 Stat. 756; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note) is amended by adding at the end the following paragraphs:

“(23) Certain lands managed by the Colorado River Valley Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 316 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Maroon Bells Addition Proposed Wilderness’,

dated July 20, 2018, which is hereby incorporated in and shall be deemed to be a part of the Maroon Bells-Snowmass Wilderness Area designated by Public Law 88-577.

“(24) Certain lands managed by the Gunnison Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 38,217 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Redcloud & Handies Peak Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 9, 2019, which shall be known as the Redcloud Peak Wilderness.

“(25) Certain lands managed by the Gunnison Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management or located in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests, which comprise approximately 26,734 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Redcloud & Handies Peak Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 9, 2019, which shall be known as the Handies Peak Wilderness.

“(26) Certain lands managed by the Royal Gorge Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 16,481 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Table Mountain & McIntyre Hills Proposed Wilderness’, dated November 7, 2019, which shall be known as the McIntyre Hills Wilderness.

“(27) Certain lands managed by the Colorado River Valley Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 10,282 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Grand Hogback Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 16, 2019, which shall be known as the Grand Hogback Wilderness.

“(28) Certain lands managed by the Grand Junction Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 25,624 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Demaree Canyon Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 9, 2019, which shall be known as the Demaree Canyon Wilderness.

“(29) Certain lands managed by the Grand Junction Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 28,279 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Little Books Cliff Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 9, 2019, which shall be known as the Little Bookcliffs Wilderness.

“(30) Certain lands managed by the Colorado River Valley Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 14,886 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Bull Gulch & Castle Peak Proposed Wilderness’, dated January 29, 2020, which shall be known as the Bull Gulch Wilderness.

“(31) Certain lands managed by the Colorado River Valley Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 12,016 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Bull Gulch & Castle Peak Proposed Wilderness Areas’, dated January 29, 2020, which shall be known as the Castle Peak Wilderness.”

(b) FURTHER ADDITIONS.—The following lands in the State of Colorado administered by the Bureau of Land Management or the United States Forest Service are hereby designated as wilderness and, therefore, as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Certain lands managed by the Colorado River Valley Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management or located in the White River National Forest, which comprise approximately 19,240 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Assignment Ridge Proposed Wilderness’, dated November 12, 2019, which shall be known as the Assignment Ridge Wilderness.

(2) Certain lands managed by the Royal Gorge Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management or located in the Pike and San Isabel National Forests, which comprise approximately 23,116 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Badger Creek Proposed Wilderness’, dated November 7, 2019, which shall be known as the Badger Creek Wilderness.

(3) Certain lands managed by the Royal Gorge Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management or located in the Pike and San Isabel National Forests, which comprise approximately 35,251

acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Beaver Creek Proposed Wilderness’, dated November 7, 2019, which shall be known as the Beaver Creek Wilderness.

(4) Certain lands managed by the Royal Gorge Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management or the Bureau of Reclamation or located in the Pike and San Isabel National Forests, which comprise approximately 32,884 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Grape Creek Proposed Wilderness’, dated November 7, 2019, which shall be known as the Grape Creek Wilderness.

(5) Certain lands managed by the Grand Junction Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 13,351 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘North & South Bangs Canyon Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 9, 2019, which shall be known as the North Bangs Canyon Wilderness.

(6) Certain lands managed by the Grand Junction Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 5,144 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘North & South Bangs Canyon Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 9, 2019, which shall be known as the South Bangs Canyon Wilderness.

(7) Certain lands managed by the Grand Junction Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 26,624 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Unaweep & Palisade Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 9, 2019, which shall be known as the Palisade Wilderness.

(8) Certain lands managed by the Grand Junction Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management or located in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests, which comprise approximately 19,776 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Unaweep & Palisade Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 9, 2019, which shall be known as the Unaweep Wilderness.

(9) Certain lands managed by the Grand Junction Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management and Uncompahgre Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management and in the Manti-LaSal National Forest, which comprise approximately 37,637 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Sewemup Mesa Proposed Wilderness’, dated November 7, 2019, which shall be known as the Sewemup Mesa Wilderness.

(10) Certain lands managed by the Kremmling Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 31 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Platte River Addition Proposed Wilderness’, dated July 20, 2018, and which are hereby incorporated in and shall be deemed to be part of the Platte River Wilderness designated by Public Law 98-550.

(11) Certain lands managed by the Uncompahgre Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 17,587 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Roubideau Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 9, 2019, which shall be known as the Roubideau Wilderness.

(12) Certain lands managed by the Uncompahgre Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management or located in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests, which comprise approximately 12,102 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Norwood Canyon Proposed Wilderness’, dated November 7, 2019, which shall be known as the Norwood Canyon Wilderness.

(13) Certain lands managed by the Tres Rios Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 24,475 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Cross Canyon Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 9, 2019, which shall be known as the Cross Canyon Wilderness.

(14) Certain lands managed by the Tres Rios Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 21,220 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘McKenna Peak Proposed Wilderness’, dated

October 16, 2019, which shall be known as the McKenna Peak Wilderness.

(15) Certain lands managed by the Tres Rios Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 14,270 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Weber-Menefee Mountain Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 9, 2019, which shall be known as the Weber-Menefee Mountain Wilderness.

(16) Certain lands managed by the Uncompahgre and Tres Rios Field Offices of the Bureau of Land Management or the Bureau of Reclamation, which comprise approximately 33,351 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Dolores River Canyon Proposed Wilderness’, dated November 7, 2019, which shall be known as the Dolores River Canyon Wilderness.

(17) Certain lands managed by the Royal Gorge Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management or located in the Pike and San Isabel National Forests, which comprise approximately 17,922 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Browns Canyon Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 9, 2019, which shall be known as the Browns Canyon Wilderness.

(18) Certain lands managed by the San Luis Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 10,527 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘San Luis Hills Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 9, 2019, which shall be known as the San Luis Hills Wilderness.

(19) Certain lands managed by the Royal Gorge Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 23,559 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘Table Mountain & McIntyre Hills Proposed Wilderness’, dated November 7, 2019, which shall be known as the Table Mountain Wilderness.

(c) WEST ELK ADDITION.—Certain lands in the State of Colorado administered by the Gunnison Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, the United States National Park Service, and the Bureau of Reclamation, which comprise approximately 6,695 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled ‘West Elk Addition Proposed Wilderness’, dated October 9, 2019, are hereby designated as wilderness and, therefore, as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System and are hereby incorporated in and shall be deemed to be a part of the West Elk Wilderness designated by Public Law 88-577. The boundary adjacent to Blue Mesa Reservoir shall be 50 feet landward from the water’s edge, and shall change according to the water level.

(d) BLUE MESA RESERVOIR.—If the Bureau of Reclamation determines that lands within the West Elk Wilderness Addition are necessary for future expansion of the Blue Mesa Reservoir, the Secretary shall by publication of a revised boundary description in the Federal Register revise the boundary of the West Elk Wilderness Addition.

(e) MAPS AND DESCRIPTIONS.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of the Act, the Secretary shall file a map and a boundary description of each area designated as wilderness by this section with the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate. Each map and boundary description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map or boundary description. The maps and boundary descriptions shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, and in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, as appropriate.

(f) STATE AND PRIVATE LANDS.—Lands within the exterior boundaries of any wilderness area designated under this section that are owned by a private entity or by the State of Colorado, including lands administered by the Colorado

State Land Board, shall be included within such wilderness area if such lands are acquired by the United States. Such lands may be acquired by the United States only as provided in the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

SEC. 103. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, lands designated as wilderness by this title shall be managed by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) and this title, except that, with respect to any wilderness areas designated by this title, any reference in the Wilderness Act to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **GRAZING.**—Grazing of livestock in wilderness areas designated by this title shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)), as further interpreted by section 108 of Public Law 96-560, and the guidelines set forth in appendix A of House Report 101-405 of the 101st Congress.

(c) **STATE JURISDICTION.**—As provided in section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(7)), nothing in this title shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State of Colorado with respect to wildlife and fish in Colorado.

(d) BUFFER ZONES.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this title creates a protective perimeter or buffer zone around any area designated as wilderness by this title.

(2) **ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE WILDERNESS.**—The fact that an activity or use on land outside the areas designated as wilderness by this title can be seen or heard within the wilderness shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the wilderness.

(e) MILITARY HELICOPTER OVERFLIGHTS AND OPERATIONS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this title restricts or precludes—

(A) low-level overflights of military helicopters over the areas designated as wilderness by this title, including military overflights that can be seen or heard within any wilderness area;

(B) military flight testing and evaluation;

(C) the designation or creation of new units of special use airspace, or the establishment of military flight training routes over any wilderness area; or

(D) helicopter operations at designated landing zones within the potential wilderness areas established by subsection (i)(1).

(2) **AERIAL NAVIGATION TRAINING EXERCISES.**—The Colorado Army National Guard, through the High-Altitude Army National Guard Aviation Training Site, may conduct aerial navigation training maneuver exercises over, and associated operations within, the potential wilderness areas designated by this title—

(A) in a manner and degree consistent with the memorandum of understanding dated August 4, 1987, entered into among the Colorado Army National Guard, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service; or

(B) in a manner consistent with any subsequent memorandum of understanding entered into among the Colorado Army National Guard, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service.

(f) **RUNNING EVENTS.**—The Secretary may continue to authorize competitive running events currently permitted in the Redcloud Peak Wilderness Area and Handies Peak Wilderness Area in a manner compatible with the preservation of such areas as wilderness.

(g) **LAND TRADES.**—If the Secretary trades privately owned land within the perimeter of the Redcloud Peak Wilderness Area or the Handies Peak Wilderness Area in exchange for Federal land, then such Federal land shall be located in Hinsdale County, Colorado.

(h) **RECREATIONAL CLIMBING.**—Nothing in this title prohibits recreational rock climbing activi-

ties in the wilderness areas, such as the placement, use, and maintenance of fixed anchors, including any fixed anchor established before the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(2) subject to any terms and conditions determined to be necessary by the Secretary.

(i) POTENTIAL WILDERNESS DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The following lands are designated as potential wilderness areas:

(A) Certain lands managed by the Colorado River Valley Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 7,376 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled “Pisgah East & West Proposed Wilderness” and dated October 16, 2019, which, upon designation as wilderness under paragraph (2), shall be known as the Pisgah East Wilderness.

(B) Certain lands managed by the Colorado River Valley Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately 6,828 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled “Pisgah East & West Proposed Wilderness” and dated October 16, 2019, which, upon designation as wilderness under paragraph (2), shall be known as the Pisgah West Wilderness.

(C) Certain lands managed by the Colorado River Valley Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management or located in the White River National Forest, which comprise approximately 16,101 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled “Flat Tops Proposed Wilderness Addition”, dated October 9, 2019, and which, upon designation as wilderness under paragraph (2), shall be incorporated in and shall be deemed to be a part of the Flat Tops Wilderness designated by Public Law 94-146.

(2) **DESIGNATION AS WILDERNESS.**—Lands designated as a potential wilderness area by subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1) shall be designated as wilderness on the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register a notice that all nonconforming uses of those lands authorized by subsection (e) in the potential wilderness area that would be in violation of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) have ceased. Such publication in the Federal Register and designation as wilderness shall occur for the potential wilderness area as the nonconforming uses cease in that potential wilderness area and designation as wilderness is not dependent on cessation of nonconforming uses in the other potential wilderness area.

(3) **MANAGEMENT.**—Except for activities provided for under subsection (e), lands designated as a potential wilderness area by paragraph (1) shall be managed by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act as wilderness pending the designation of such lands as wilderness under this subsection.

SEC. 104. WATER.

(a) **EFFECT ON WATER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this title—

(1) affects the use or allocation, in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, of any water, water right, or interest in water;

(2) affects any vested absolute or decreed conditional water right in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, including any water right held by the United States;

(3) affects any interstate water compact in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(4) authorizes or imposes any new reserved Federal water rights; and

(5) shall be considered to be a relinquishment or reduction of any water rights reserved or appropriated by the United States in the State of Colorado on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) MIDSTREAM AREAS.—

(1) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this subsection is to protect for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations—

(A) the unique and nationally important values of areas designated as wilderness by section 102(b) (including the geological, cultural, ar-

chaeological, paleontological, natural, scientific, recreational, environmental, biological, wilderness, wildlife, riparian, historical, educational, and scenic resources of the public land); and

(B) the water resources of area streams, based on seasonally available flows, that are necessary to support aquatic, riparian, and terrestrial species and communities.

(2) WILDERNESS WATER RIGHTS.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall ensure that any water rights within the wilderness designated by section 102(b) required to fulfill the purposes of such wilderness are secured in accordance with subparagraphs (B) through (G).

(B) STATE LAW.—

(i) **PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS.**—Any water rights for which the Secretary pursues adjudication shall be appropriated, adjudicated, changed, and administered in accordance with the procedural requirements and priority system of State law.

(ii) ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RIGHTS.—

(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subclause (II), the purposes and other substantive characteristics of the water rights pursued under this paragraph shall be established in accordance with State law.

(II) **EXCEPTION.**—Notwithstanding subclause (I) and in accordance with this title, the Secretary may appropriate and seek adjudication of water rights to maintain surface water levels and stream flows on and across the wilderness designated by section 102(b) to fulfill the purposes of such wilderness.

(C) **DEADLINE.**—The Secretary shall promptly, but not earlier than January 1, 2021, appropriate the water rights required to fulfill the purposes of the wilderness designated by section 102(b).

(D) **REQUIRED DETERMINATION.**—The Secretary shall not pursue adjudication for any instream flow water rights unless the Secretary makes a determination pursuant to subparagraph (E)(ii) or (F).

(E) COOPERATIVE ENFORCEMENT.—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall not pursue adjudication of any Federal instream flow water rights established under this paragraph if—

(I) the Secretary determines, upon adjudication of the water rights by the Colorado Water Conservation Board, that the Board holds water rights sufficient in priority, amount, and timing to fulfill the purposes of this subsection; and

(II) the Secretary has entered into a perpetual agreement with the Colorado Water Conservation Board to ensure full exercise, protection, and enforcement of the State water rights within the wilderness to reliably fulfill the purposes of this subsection.

(ii) **ADJUDICATION.**—If the Secretary determines that the provisions of clause (i) have not been met, the Secretary shall adjudicate and exercise any Federal water rights required to fulfill the purposes of the wilderness in accordance with this paragraph.

(F) **INSUFFICIENT WATER RIGHTS.**—If the Colorado Water Conservation Board modifies the instream flow water rights obtained under subparagraph (E) to such a degree that the Secretary determines that water rights held by the State are insufficient to fulfill the purposes of this title, the Secretary shall adjudicate and exercise Federal water rights required to fulfill the purposes of this title in accordance with subparagraph (B).

(G) **FAILURE TO COMPLY.**—The Secretary shall promptly act to exercise and enforce the water rights described in subparagraph (E) if the Secretary determines that—

(i) the State is not exercising its water rights consistent with subparagraph (E)(i)(I); or

(ii) the agreement described in subparagraph (E)(i)(II) is not fulfilled or complied with sufficiently to fulfill the purposes of this title.

(3) **WATER RESOURCE FACILITY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning

on the date of enactment of this title, neither the President nor any other officer, employee, or agent of the United States shall fund, assist, authorize, or issue a license or permit for development of any new irrigation and pumping facility, reservoir, water conservation work, aqueduct, canal, ditch, pipeline, well, hydropower project, transmission, other ancillary facility, or other water, diversion, storage, or carriage structure in the wilderness designated by section 102(b).

(c) ACCESS AND OPERATION.—

(1) DEFINITION.—As used in this subsection, the term “water resource facility” means irrigation and pumping facilities, reservoirs, water conservation works, aqueducts, canals, ditches, pipelines, wells, hydropower projects, transmission and other ancillary facilities, and other water diversion, storage, and carriage structures.

(2) ACCESS TO WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.—Subject to the provisions of this subsection, the Secretary shall allow reasonable access to water resource facilities in existence on the date of enactment of this Act within the areas described in sections 102(b) and 102(c), including motorized access where necessary and customarily employed on routes existing as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) ACCESS ROUTES.—Existing access routes within such areas customarily employed as of the date of enactment of this Act may be used, maintained, repaired, and replaced to the extent necessary to maintain their present function, design, and serviceable operation, so long as such activities have no increased adverse impacts on the resources and values of the areas described in sections 102(b) and 102(c) than existed as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) USE OF WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.—Subject to the provisions of this subsection and subsection (a)(4), the Secretary shall allow water resource facilities existing on the date of enactment of this Act within areas described in sections 102(b) and 102(c) to be used, operated, maintained, repaired, and replaced to the extent necessary for the continued exercise, in accordance with Colorado State law, of vested water rights adjudicated for use in connection with such facilities by a court of competent jurisdiction prior to the date of enactment of this Act. The impact of an existing facility on the water resources and values of the area shall not be increased as a result of changes in the adjudicated type of use of such facility as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE.—Water resource facilities, and access routes serving such facilities, existing within the areas described in sections 102(b) and 102(c) on the date of enactment of this Act shall be maintained and repaired when and to the extent necessary to prevent increased adverse impacts on the resources and values of the areas described in sections 102(b) and 102(c).

SEC. 105. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that military aviation training on Federal public lands in Colorado, including the training conducted at the High-Altitude Army National Guard Aviation Training Site, is critical to the national security of the United States and the readiness of the Armed Forces.

TITLE II—NORTHWEST CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS, RECREATION, AND WORKING FORESTS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

This title may be cited as the “Northwest California Wilderness, Recreation, and Working Forests Act”.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means—

(A) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(B) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of California.

Subtitle A—RESTORATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 211. SOUTH FORK TRINITY-MAD RIVER RESTORATION AREA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COLLABORATIVELY DEVELOPED.—The term “collaboratively developed” means projects that are developed and implemented through a collaborative process that—

(A) includes—

(i) appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies; and

(ii) multiple interested persons representing diverse interests; and

(B) is transparent and nonexclusive.

(2) PLANTATION.—The term “plantation” means a forested area that has been artificially established by planting or seeding.

(3) RESTORATION.—The term “restoration” means the process of assisting the recovery of an ecosystem that has been degraded, damaged, or destroyed by establishing the composition, structure, pattern, and ecological processes necessary to facilitate terrestrial and aquatic ecosystem sustainability, resilience, and health under current and future conditions.

(4) RESTORATION AREA.—The term “restoration area” means the South Fork Trinity-Mad River Restoration Area, established by subsection (b).

(5) SHADED FUEL BREAK.—The term “shaded fuel break” means a vegetation treatment that effectively addresses all project-generated slash and that retains: adequate canopy cover to suppress plant regrowth in the forest understory following treatment; the longest lived trees that provide the most shade over the longest period of time; the healthiest and most vigorous trees with the greatest potential for crown-growth in plantations and in natural stands adjacent to plantations; and all mature hardwoods, when practicable.

(6) STEWARDSHIP CONTRACT.—The term “stewardship contract” means an agreement or contract entered into under section 604 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591c).

(7) WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE.—The term “wildland-urban interface” has the meaning given the term by section 101 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6511).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights, there is established the South Fork Trinity-Mad River Restoration Area, comprising approximately 729,089 acres of Federal land administered by the Forest Service and approximately 1,280 acres of Federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, as generally depicted on the map entitled “South Fork Trinity-Mad River Restoration Area—Proposed” and dated July 3, 2018, to be known as the South Fork Trinity-Mad River Restoration Area.

(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the restoration area are to—

(1) establish, restore, and maintain fire-resilient forest structures containing late successional forest structure characterized by large trees and multistoried canopies, as ecologically appropriate;

(2) protect late successional reserves;

(3) enhance the restoration of Federal lands within the restoration area;

(4) reduce the threat posed by wildfires to communities within the restoration area;

(5) protect and restore aquatic habitat and anadromous fisheries;

(6) protect the quality of water within the restoration area; and

(7) allow visitors to enjoy the scenic, recreational, natural, cultural, and wildlife values of the restoration area.

(d) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the restoration area—

(A) in a manner consistent with the purposes described in subsection (c);

(B) in a manner that—

(i) in the case of the Forest Service, prioritizes restoration of the restoration area over other nonemergency vegetation management projects on the portions of the Six Rivers and Shasta-Trinity National Forests in Humboldt and Trinity Counties; and

(ii) in the case of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, establishes with the Forest Service an agreement for cooperation to ensure timely completion of consultation required by section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (15 U.S.C. 1536) on restoration projects within the restoration area and agreement to maintain and exchange information on planning schedules and priorities on a regular basis;

(C) in accordance with—

(i) the laws (including regulations) and rules applicable to the National Forest System for land managed by the Forest Service;

(ii) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) for land managed by the Bureau of Land Management;

(iii) this title; and

(iv) any other applicable law (including regulations); and

(D) in a manner consistent with congressional intent that consultation for restoration projects within the restoration area is completed in a timely and efficient manner.

(2) CONFLICT OF LAWS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The establishment of the restoration area shall not change the management status of any land or water that is designated wilderness or as a wild and scenic river, including lands and waters designated by this title.

(B) RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT.—If there is a conflict between the laws applicable to the areas described in subparagraph (A) and this section, the more restrictive provision shall control.

(3) USES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall only allow uses of the restoration area that the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (c).

(B) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall prioritize restoration activities within the restoration area.

(C) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall limit the Secretary’s ability to plan, approve, or prioritize activities outside of the restoration area.

(4) WILDLAND FIRE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section prohibits the Secretary, in cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies, as appropriate, from conducting wildland fire operations in the restoration area, consistent with the purposes of this section.

(B) PRIORITY.—The Secretary may use prescribed burning and managed wildland fire to the fullest extent practicable to achieve the purposes of this section.

(5) ROAD DECOMMISSIONING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall decommission unneeded National Forest System roads identified for decommissioning and unauthorized roads identified for decommissioning within the restoration area—

(i) subject to appropriations;

(ii) consistent with the analysis required by subparts A and B of part 212 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(iii) in accordance with existing law.

(B) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—In making determinations regarding road decommissioning under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consult with—

(i) appropriate State, Tribal, and local governmental entities; and

(ii) members of the public.

(C) **DEFINITION.**—As used in subparagraph (A), the term “decommission” means—

- (i) to reestablish vegetation on a road; and
- (ii) to restore any natural drainage, watershed function, or other ecological processes that are disrupted or adversely impacted by the road by removing or hydrologically disconnecting the road prism.

(6) **VEGETATION MANAGEMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), the Secretary may conduct vegetation management projects in the restoration area only where necessary to—

- (i) maintain or restore the characteristics of ecosystem composition and structure;
- (ii) reduce wildfire risk to communities by promoting forests that are fire resilient;
- (iii) improve the habitat of threatened, endangered, or sensitive species;
- (iv) protect or improve water quality; or
- (v) enhance the restoration of lands within the restoration area.

(B) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.**—

(i) **SHADED FUEL BREAKS.**—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall prioritize, as practicable, the establishment of a network of shaded fuel breaks within—

(I) the portions of the wildland-urban interface that are within 150 feet from private property contiguous to Federal land;

(II) one hundred and fifty feet from any road that is open to motorized vehicles as of the date of enactment of this Act—

(aa) except that, where topography or other conditions require, the Secretary may establish shaded fuel breaks up to 275 feet from a road so long as the combined total width of the shaded fuel breaks for both sides of the road does not exceed 300 feet; and

(bb) provided that the Secretary shall include vegetation treatments within a minimum of 25 feet of the road where practicable, feasible, and appropriate as part of any shaded fuel break; or

(III) one hundred and fifty feet of any plantation.

(ii) **PLANTATIONS; RIPARIAN RESERVES.**—The Secretary may undertake vegetation management projects—

(I) in areas within the restoration area in which fish and wildlife habitat is significantly compromised as a result of past management practices (including plantations); and

(II) within designated riparian reserves only where necessary to maintain the integrity of fuel breaks and to enhance fire resilience.

(C) **COMPLIANCE.**—The Secretary shall carry out vegetation management projects within the restoration area—

- (i) in accordance with—
- (I) this section; and
- (II) existing law (including regulations);
- (ii) after providing an opportunity for public comment; and
- (iii) subject to appropriations.

(D) **BEST AVAILABLE SCIENCE.**—The Secretary shall use the best available science in planning and implementing vegetation management projects within the restoration area.

(7) **GRAZING.**—

(A) **EXISTING GRAZING.**—The grazing of livestock in the restoration area, where established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue—

- (i) subject to—
- (I) such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary considers necessary; and
- (II) applicable law (including regulations); and
- (ii) in a manner consistent with the purposes described in subsection (c).

(B) **TARGETED NEW GRAZING.**—The Secretary may issue annual targeted grazing permits for the grazing of livestock in the restoration area, where not established before the date of the enactment of this Act, to control noxious weeds, aid in the control of wildfire within the wildland-urban interface, or to provide other ecological benefits subject to—

(i) such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary considers necessary; and

(ii) a manner consistent with the purposes described in subsection (c).

(C) **BEST AVAILABLE SCIENCE.**—The Secretary shall use the best available science when determining whether to issue targeted grazing permits within the restoration area.

(e) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the restoration area is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(f) **USE OF STEWARDSHIP CONTRACTS.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall—

(1) use stewardship contracts to implement this section; and

(2) use revenue derived from such stewardship contracts for restoration and other activities within the restoration area which shall include staff and administrative costs to support timely consultation activities for restoration projects.

(g) **COLLABORATION.**—In developing and implementing restoration projects in the restoration area, the Secretary shall consult with collaborative groups with an interest in the restoration area.

(h) **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.**—A collaboratively developed restoration project within the restoration area may be carried out in accordance with the provisions for hazardous fuel reduction projects set forth in sections 214, 215, and 216 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6514–6516), as applicable.

(i) **MULTIPARTY MONITORING.**—The Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(1) in collaboration with the Secretary of the Interior and interested persons, use a multiparty monitoring, evaluation, and accountability process to assess the positive or negative ecological, social, and economic effects of restoration projects within the restoration area; and

(2) incorporate the monitoring results into the management of the restoration area.

(j) **FUNDING.**—The Secretary shall use all existing authorities to secure as much funding as necessary to fulfill the purposes of the restoration area.

(k) **FOREST RESIDUES UTILIZATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with applicable law, including regulations, and this section, the Secretary may utilize forest residues from restoration projects, including shaded fuel breaks, in the restoration area for research and development of biobased products that result in net carbon sequestration.

(2) **PARTNERSHIPS.**—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary may enter into partnerships with universities, nongovernmental organizations, industry, Tribes, and Federal, State, and local governmental agencies.

SEC. 212. REDWOOD NATIONAL AND STATE PARKS RESTORATION.

(a) **PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to undertake initiatives to restore degraded redwood forest ecosystems in Redwood National and State Parks in partnership with the State of California, local agencies, and nongovernmental organizations.

(b) **COMPLIANCE.**—In carrying out any initiative authorized by subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall comply with all applicable law.

SEC. 213. CALIFORNIA PUBLIC LANDS REMEDIATION PARTNERSHIP.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **PARTNERSHIP.**—The term “partnership” means the California Public Lands Remediation Partnership, established by subsection (b).

(2) **PRIORITY LANDS.**—The term “priority lands” means Federal land within the State

that is determined by the partnership to be a high priority for remediation.

(3) **REMEDIATION.**—The term “remediation” means to facilitate the recovery of lands and waters that have been degraded, damaged, or destroyed by illegal marijuana cultivation or another illegal activity. Remediation includes but is not limited to removal of trash, debris, and other material, and establishing the composition, structure, pattern, and ecological processes necessary to facilitate terrestrial and aquatic ecosystem sustainability, resilience, and health under current and future conditions.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is hereby established a California Public Lands Remediation Partnership.

(c) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the partnership are to—

(1) coordinate the activities of Federal, State, Tribal, and local authorities, and the private sector, in the remediation of priority lands in the State affected by illegal marijuana cultivation or other illegal activities; and

(2) use the resources and expertise of each agency, authority, or entity in implementing remediation activities on priority lands in the State.

(d) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The members of the partnership shall include the following:

(1) The Secretary of Agriculture, or a designee of the Secretary of Agriculture to represent the Forest Service.

(2) The Secretary of the Interior, or a designee of the Secretary of the Interior, to represent the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, and National Park Service.

(3) The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, or a designee of the Director.

(4) The Secretary of the State Natural Resources Agency, or a designee of the Secretary, to represent the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

(5) A designee of the California State Water Resources Control Board.

(6) A designee of the California State Sheriffs’ Association.

(7) One member to represent federally recognized Indian Tribes, to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(8) One member to represent nongovernmental organizations with an interest in Federal land remediation, to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(9) One member to represent local governmental interests, to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(10) A law enforcement official from each of the following:

(A) The Department of the Interior.

(B) The Department of Agriculture.

(11) A scientist to provide expertise and advise on methods needed for remediation efforts, to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(12) A designee of the National Guard Counter Drug Program.

(e) **DUTIES.**—To further the purposes of this section, the partnership shall—

(1) identify priority lands for remediation in the State;

(2) secure resources from Federal and non-Federal sources to apply to remediation of priority lands in the State;

(3) support efforts by Federal, State, Tribal, and local agencies, and nongovernmental organizations in carrying out remediation of priority lands in the State;

(4) support research and education on the impacts of, and solutions to, illegal marijuana cultivation and other illegal activities on priority lands in the State;

(5) involve other Federal, State, Tribal, and local agencies, nongovernmental organizations, and the public in remediation efforts, to the extent practicable; and

(6) take any other administrative or advisory actions as necessary to address remediation of priority lands in the State.

(f) **AUTHORITIES.**—To implement this section, the partnership may, subject to the prior approval of the Secretary of Agriculture—

(1) make grants to the State, political subdivisions of the State, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;

(2) enter into cooperative agreements with, or provide grants or technical assistance to, the State, political subdivisions of the State, nonprofit organizations, Federal agencies, and other interested parties;

(3) hire and compensate staff;

(4) obtain funds or services from any source, including Federal and non-Federal funds, and funds and services provided under any other Federal law or program;

(5) contract for goods or services; and

(6) support activities of partners and any other activities that further the purposes of this section.

(g) **PROCEDURES.**—The partnership shall establish such rules and procedures as it deems necessary or desirable.

(h) **LOCAL HIRING.**—The partnership shall, to the maximum extent practicable and in accordance with existing law, give preference to local entities and persons when carrying out this section.

(i) **SERVICE WITHOUT COMPENSATION.**—Members of the partnership shall serve without pay.

(j) **DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Agriculture shall convene the partnership on a regular basis to carry out this section.

(2) **TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of the Interior may provide technical and financial assistance, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, as determined by the appropriate Secretary, to the partnership or any members of the partnership to carry out this title.

(3) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements with the partnership, any members of the partnership, or other public or private entities to provide technical, financial, or other assistance to carry out this title.

SEC. 214. TRINITY LAKE VISITOR CENTER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, may establish, in cooperation with any other public or private entities that the Secretary may determine to be appropriate, a visitor center in Weaverville, California—

(1) to serve visitors; and

(2) to assist in fulfilling the purposes of the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the visitor center authorized under subsection (a) is designed to interpret the scenic, biological, natural, historical, scientific, paleontological, recreational, ecological, wilderness, and cultural resources of the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area and other nearby Federal lands.

(c) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary of Agriculture may, in a manner consistent with this title, enter into cooperative agreements with the State and any other appropriate institutions and organizations to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 215. DEL NORTE COUNTY VISITOR CENTER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of the Interior, acting jointly or separately, may establish, in cooperation with any other public or private entities that the Secretaries determine to be appropriate, a visitor center in Del Norte County, California—

(1) to serve visitors; and

(2) to assist in fulfilling the purposes of Redwood National and State Parks, the Smith River National Recreation Area, and other nearby Federal lands.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretaries shall ensure that the visitor center authorized under

subsection (a) is designed to interpret the scenic, biological, natural, historical, scientific, paleontological, recreational, ecological, wilderness, and cultural resources of Redwood National and State Parks, the Smith River National Recreation Area, and other nearby Federal lands.

SEC. 216. MANAGEMENT PLANS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In revising the land and resource management plan for the Shasta-Trinity, Six Rivers, Klamath, and Mendocino National Forests, the Secretary shall—

(1) consider the purposes of the South Fork Trinity-Mad River Restoration Area established by section 211; and

(2) include or update the fire management plan for the wilderness areas and wilderness additions established by this title.

(b) **REQUIREMENT.**—In carrying out the revisions required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) develop spatial fire management plans in accordance with—

(A) the Guidance for Implementation of Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy dated February 13, 2009, including any amendments to that guidance; and

(B) other appropriate policies;

(2) ensure that a fire management plan—

(A) considers how prescribed or managed fire can be used to achieve ecological management objectives of wilderness and other natural or primitive areas; and

(B) in the case of a wilderness area expanded by section 231, provides consistent direction regarding fire management to the entire wilderness area, including the addition;

(3) consult with—

(A) appropriate State, Tribal, and local governmental entities; and

(B) members of the public; and

(4) comply with applicable laws (including regulations).

SEC. 217. STUDY; PARTNERSHIPS RELATED TO OVERNIGHT ACCOMMODATIONS.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with interested Federal, State, Tribal, and local entities, and private and nonprofit organizations, shall conduct a study to evaluate the feasibility and suitability of establishing overnight accommodations near Redwood National and State Parks on—

(1) Federal land at the northern boundary or on land within 20 miles of the northern boundary; and

(2) Federal land at the southern boundary or on land within 20 miles of the southern boundary.

(b) **PARTNERSHIPS.**—

(1) **AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED.**—If the study conducted under subsection (a) determines that establishing the described accommodations is suitable and feasible, the Secretary may enter into agreements with qualified private and nonprofit organizations for the development, operation, and maintenance of overnight accommodations.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—Any agreements entered into under paragraph (1) shall clearly define the role and responsibility of the Secretary and the private or nonprofit organization.

(3) **COMPLIANCE.**—The Secretary shall enter agreements under paragraph (1) in accordance with existing law.

(4) **EFFECT.**—Nothing in this subsection—

(A) reduces or diminishes the authority of the Secretary to manage land and resources under the jurisdiction of the Secretary; or

(B) amends or modifies the application of any existing law (including regulations) applicable to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

Subtitle B—RECREATION

SEC. 221. HORSE MOUNTAIN SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Subject to valid existing rights, there is established the Horse Mountain Special Management Area (referred to in this section as the “special management area”) com-

prising approximately 7,399 acres of Federal land administered by the Forest Service in Humboldt County, California, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Horse Mountain Special Management Area—Proposed” and dated April 13, 2017.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purpose of the special management area is to enhance the recreational and scenic values of the special management area while conserving the plants, wildlife, and other natural resource values of the area.

(c) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act and in accordance with paragraph (2), the Secretary shall develop a comprehensive plan for the long-term management of the special management area.

(2) **CONSULTATION.**—In developing the management plan required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

(A) appropriate State, Tribal, and local governmental entities; and

(B) members of the public.

(3) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.**—The management plan required under paragraph (1) shall ensure that recreational use within the special management area does not cause significant adverse impacts on the plants and wildlife of the special management area.

(d) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the special management area—

(A) in furtherance of the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the laws (including regulations) generally applicable to the National Forest System;

(ii) this section; and

(iii) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(2) **RECREATION.**—The Secretary shall continue to authorize, maintain, and enhance the recreational use of the special management area, including hunting, fishing, camping, hiking, hang gliding, sightseeing, nature study, horseback riding, rafting, mountain biking, and motorized recreation on authorized routes, and other recreational activities, so long as such recreational use is consistent with the purposes of the special management area, this section, other applicable law (including regulations), and applicable management plans.

(3) **MOTORIZED VEHICLES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the use of motorized vehicles in the special management area shall be permitted only on roads and trails designated for the use of motorized vehicles.

(B) **USE OF SNOWMOBILES.**—The winter use of snowmobiles shall be allowed in the special management area—

(i) during periods of adequate snow coverage during the winter season; and

(ii) subject to any terms and conditions determined to be necessary by the Secretary.

(4) **NEW TRAILS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may construct new trails for motorized or nonmotorized recreation within the special management area in accordance with—

(i) the laws (including regulations) generally applicable to the National Forest System;

(ii) this section; and

(iii) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(B) **PRIORITY.**—In establishing new trails within the special management area, the Secretary shall—

(i) prioritize the establishment of loops that provide high-quality, diverse recreational experiences; and

(ii) consult with members of the public.

(e) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the special management area is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of appropriation or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing.

SEC. 222. BIGFOOT NATIONAL RECREATION TRAIL.

(a) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a study that describes the feasibility of establishing a non-motorized Bigfoot National Recreation Trail that follows the route described in paragraph (2).

(2) ROUTE.—The trail described in paragraph (1) shall extend from the Ides Cove Trailhead in the Mendocino National Forest to Crescent City, California, by roughly following the route as generally depicted on the map entitled “Bigfoot National Recreation Trail—Proposed” and dated July 25, 2018.

(3) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—In completing the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Agriculture shall consult with—

(A) appropriate Federal, State, Tribal, regional, and local agencies;

(B) private landowners;

(C) nongovernmental organizations; and

(D) members of the public.

(b) DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon a determination that the Bigfoot National Recreation Trail is feasible and meets the requirements for a National Recreation Trail in section 1243 of title 16, United States Code, the Secretary of Agriculture shall designate the Bigfoot National Recreation Trail in accordance with—

(A) the National Trails System Act (Public Law 90-543);

(B) this title; and

(C) other applicable law (including regulations).

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—Upon designation by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Bigfoot National Recreation Trail (referred to in this section as the “trail”) shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with—

(A) other Federal, State, Tribal, regional, and local agencies;

(B) private landowners; and

(C) other interested organizations.

(3) PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—No portions of the trail may be located on non-Federal land without the written consent of the landowner.

(B) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall not acquire for the trail any land or interest in land outside the exterior boundary of any federally managed area without the consent of the owner of the land or interest in the land.

(C) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section—

(i) requires any private property owner to allow public access (including Federal, State, or local government access) to private property; or

(ii) modifies any provision of Federal, State, or local law with respect to public access to or use of private land.

(c) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary of Agriculture may enter into cooperative agreements with State, Tribal, and local government entities and private entities to complete needed trail construction, reconstruction, realignment, maintenance, or education projects related to the Bigfoot National Recreation Trail.

(d) MAP.—

(1) MAP REQUIRED.—Upon designation of the Bigfoot National Recreation Trail, the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare a map of the trail.

(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map referred to in paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

SEC. 223. ELK CAMP RIDGE RECREATION TRAIL.

(a) DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with paragraph (2), the Secretary of Agriculture after an opportunity for public comment, shall designate a trail (which may include a system of trails)—

(A) for use by off-highway vehicles or mountain bicycles, or both; and

(B) to be known as the Elk Camp Ridge Recreation Trail.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In designating the Elk Camp Ridge Recreation Trail (referred to in this section as the “trail”), the Secretary shall only include trails that are—

(A) as of the date of enactment of this Act, authorized for use by off-highway vehicles or mountain bikes, or both; and

(B) located on land that is managed by the Forest Service in Del Norte County.

(3) MAP.—A map that depicts the trail shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(b) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the trail—

(A) in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations);

(B) to ensure the safety of citizens who use the trail; and

(C) in a manner by which to minimize any damage to sensitive habitat or cultural resources.

(2) MONITORING; EVALUATION.—To minimize the impacts of the use of the trail on environmental and cultural resources, the Secretary shall annually assess the effects of the use of off-highway vehicles and mountain bicycles on—

(A) the trail;

(B) land located in proximity to the trail; and

(C) plants, wildlife, and wildlife habitat.

(3) CLOSURE.—The Secretary, in consultation with the State and Del Norte County, and subject to paragraph (4), may temporarily close or permanently reroute a portion of the trail if the Secretary determines that—

(A) the trail is having an adverse impact on—

(i) wildlife habitats;

(ii) natural resources;

(iii) cultural resources; or

(iv) traditional uses;

(B) the trail threatens public safety; or

(C) closure of the trail is necessary—

(i) to repair damage to the trail; or

(ii) to repair resource damage.

(4) REROUTING.—Any portion of the trail that is temporarily closed by the Secretary under paragraph (3) may be permanently rerouted along any road or trail—

(A) that is—

(i) in existence as of the date of the closure of the portion of the trail;

(ii) located on public land; and

(iii) open to motorized or mechanized use; and

(B) if the Secretary determines that rerouting the portion of the trail would not significantly increase or decrease the length of the trail.

(5) NOTICE OF AVAILABLE ROUTES.—The Secretary shall ensure that visitors to the trail have access to adequate notice relating to the availability of trail routes through—

(A) the placement of appropriate signage along the trail; and

(B) the distribution of maps, safety education materials, and other information that the Secretary concerned determines to be appropriate.

(c) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section affects the ownership, management, or other rights relating to any non-Federal land (including any interest in any non-Federal land).

SEC. 224. TRINITY LAKE TRAIL.

(a) TRAIL CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall study the feasibility and public interest of constructing a recreational trail for nonmotorized uses around Trinity Lake.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—

(A) CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZED.—Subject to appropriations, and in accordance with paragraph (3), if the Secretary determines under paragraph (1) that the construction of the trail described in such paragraph is feasible and in the public interest, the Secretary may provide for the construction of the trail.

(B) USE OF VOLUNTEER SERVICES AND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The trail may be constructed under this section through the acceptance of volunteer services and contributions from non-Federal sources to reduce or eliminate the need for Federal expenditures to construct the trail.

(3) COMPLIANCE.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall comply with—

(A) the laws (including regulations) generally applicable to the National Forest System; and

(B) this title.

(b) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section affects the ownership, management, or other rights relating to any non-Federal land (including any interest in any non-Federal land).

SEC. 225. TRAILS STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with subsection (b) and in consultation with interested parties, shall conduct a study to improve motorized and nonmotorized recreation trail opportunities (including mountain bicycling) on land not designated as wilderness within the portions of the Six Rivers, Shasta-Trinity, and Mendocino National Forests located in Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, and Mendocino Counties.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Agriculture shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior regarding opportunities to improve, through increased coordination, recreation trail opportunities on land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior that shares a boundary with the national forest land described in subsection (a).

SEC. 226. CONSTRUCTION OF MOUNTAIN BICYCLING ROUTES.

(a) TRAIL CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall study the feasibility and public interest of constructing recreational trails for mountain bicycling and other nonmotorized uses on the routes as generally depicted in the report entitled “Trail Study for Smith River National Recreation Area Six Rivers National Forest” and dated 2016.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—

(A) CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZED.—Subject to appropriations, and in accordance with paragraph (3), if the Secretary determines under paragraph (1) that the construction of one or more routes described in such paragraph is feasible and in the public interest, the Secretary may provide for the construction of the routes.

(B) MODIFICATIONS.—The Secretary may modify the routes as necessary in the opinion of the Secretary.

(C) USE OF VOLUNTEER SERVICES AND CONTRIBUTIONS.—Routes may be constructed under this section through the acceptance of volunteer services and contributions from non-Federal sources to reduce or eliminate the need for Federal expenditures to construct the route.

(3) COMPLIANCE.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall comply with—

(A) the laws (including regulations) generally applicable to the National Forest System; and

(B) this title.

(b) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section affects the ownership, management, or other rights relating to any non-Federal land (including any interest in any non-Federal land).

SEC. 227. PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with qualified private and nonprofit organizations to undertake the following activities on Federal lands in Mendocino, Humboldt, Trinity, and Del Norte Counties—

- (1) trail and campground maintenance;
- (2) public education, visitor contacts, and outreach; and
- (3) visitor center staffing.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any agreements entered into under subsection (a) shall clearly define the role and responsibility of the Secretary and the private or nonprofit organization.

(c) **COMPLIANCE.**—The Secretary shall enter into agreements under subsection (a) in accordance with existing law.

(d) **EFFECT.**—Nothing in this section—

(1) reduces or diminishes the authority of the Secretary to manage land and resources under the jurisdiction of the Secretary; or

(2) amends or modifies the application of any existing law (including regulations) applicable to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

Subtitle C—CONSERVATION

SEC. 231. DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) **BLACK BUTTE RIVER WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service in the State, comprising approximately 11,117 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Black Butte River Wilderness—Proposed” and dated April 13, 2017, which shall be known as the Black Butte River Wilderness.

(2) **CHANCELULLA WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service in the State, comprising approximately 6,212 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Chancelulla Wilderness Additions—Proposed” and dated July 16, 2018, which is incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the Chancelulla Wilderness, as designated by section 101(a)(4) of the California Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 98 Stat. 1619).

(3) **CHINQUAPIN WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service in the State, comprising approximately 27,258 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Chinquapin Wilderness—Proposed” and dated January 15, 2020, which shall be known as the Chinquapin Wilderness.

(4) **ELKHORN RIDGE WILDERNESS ADDITION.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in the State, comprising approximately 37 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Elkhorn Ridge Wilderness Additions” and dated October 24, 2019, which is incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the Elkhorn Ridge Wilderness, as designated by section 6(d) of Public Law 109–362 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 120 Stat. 2070).

(5) **ENGLISH RIDGE WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in the State, comprising approximately 6,204 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “English Ridge Wilderness—Proposed” and dated March 29, 2019, which shall be known as the English Ridge Wilderness.

(6) **HEADWATERS FOREST WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in the State, comprising approximately 4,360 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Headwaters Forest Wilderness—Proposed” and dated October 15, 2019, which shall be known as the Headwaters Forest Wilderness.

(7) **MAD RIVER BUTTES WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service in the State, comprising approximately 6,002 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Mad River Buttes Wilderness—Proposed” and dated July 25, 2018, which shall be known as the Mad River Buttes Wilderness.

(8) **MOUNT LASSIC WILDERNESS ADDITION.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service in the State, comprising approximately 1,292 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Mount Lassic Wilderness Additions—Proposed” and dated February 23, 2017, which

is incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the Mount Lassic Wilderness, as designated by section 3(6) of Public Law 109–362 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 120 Stat. 2065).

(9) **NORTH FORK EEL WILDERNESS ADDITION.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management in the State, comprising approximately 16,274 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “North Fork Wilderness Additions” and dated January 15, 2020, which is incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the North Fork Eel Wilderness, as designated by section 101(a)(19) of the California Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 98 Stat. 1621).

(10) **PATTISON WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service in the State, comprising approximately 28,595 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Pattison Wilderness—Proposed” and dated July 16, 2018, which shall be known as the Pattison Wilderness.

(11) **SANHEDRIN WILDERNESS ADDITION.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service in the State, comprising approximately 112 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Sanhedrin Wilderness Addition—Proposed” and dated March 29, 2019, which is incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the Sanhedrin Wilderness, as designated by section 3(2) of Public Law 109–362 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 120 Stat. 2065).

(12) **SISKIYOU WILDERNESS ADDITION.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service in the State, comprising approximately 27,747 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Siskiyou Wilderness Additions and Potential Wildernesses—Proposed” and dated July 24, 2018, which is incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the Siskiyou Wilderness, as designated by section 101(a)(30) of the California Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 98 Stat. 1623) (as amended by section 3(5) of Public Law 109–362 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 120 Stat. 2065)).

(13) **SOUTH FORK EEL RIVER WILDERNESS ADDITION.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in the State, comprising approximately 603 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “South Fork Eel River Wilderness Additions—Proposed” and dated October 24, 2019, which is incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the South Fork Eel River Wilderness, as designated by section 3(10) of Public Law 109–362 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 120 Stat. 2066).

(14) **SOUTH FORK TRINITY RIVER WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service in the State, comprising approximately 26,446 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “South Fork Trinity River Wilderness and Potential Wildernesses—Proposed” and dated March 11, 2019, which shall be known as the South Fork Trinity River Wilderness.

(15) **TRINITY ALPS WILDERNESS ADDITION.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service in the State, comprising approximately 60,826 acres, as generally depicted on the maps entitled “Trinity Alps Proposed Wilderness Additions EAST” and “Trinity Alps Proposed Wilderness Additions WEST” and dated January 15, 2020, which is incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the Trinity Alps Wilderness, as designated by section 101(a)(34) of the California Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 98 Stat. 1623) (as amended by section 3(7) of Public Law 109–362 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 120 Stat. 2065)).

(16) **UNDERWOOD WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service in the State, comprising approximately 15,069 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Underwood Wilderness—Proposed” and dated January 15, 2020, which shall be known as the Underwood Wilderness.

(17) **YOLLA BOLLY-MIDDLE EEL WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land

Management in the State, comprising approximately 10,729 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Yolla Bolly Middle Eel Wilderness Additions and Potential Wildernesses—Proposed” and dated June 7, 2018, which is incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the Yolla Bolly-Middle Eel Wilderness, as designated by section 3 of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1132) (as amended by section 3(4) of Public Law 109–362 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 120 Stat. 2065)).

(18) **YUKI WILDERNESS ADDITION.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management in the State, comprising approximately 11,076 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Yuki Wilderness Additions—Proposed” and dated January 15, 2020, which is incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the Yuki Wilderness, as designated by section 3(3) of Public Law 109–362 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 120 Stat. 2065).

(b) **REDESIGNATION OF NORTH FORK WILDERNESS AS NORTH FORK EEL RIVER WILDERNESS.**—Section 101(a)(19) of Public Law 98–425 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 98 Stat. 1621) is amended by striking “North Fork Wilderness” and inserting “North Fork Eel River Wilderness”. Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the North Fork Wilderness shall be deemed to be a reference to the North Fork Eel River Wilderness.

(c) **ELKHORN RIDGE WILDERNESS ADJUSTMENTS.**—The boundary of the Elkhorn Ridge Wilderness established by section 6(d) of Public Law 109–362 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note) is adjusted by deleting approximately 30 acres of Federal land as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Elkhorn Ridge Wilderness Additions” and dated October 24, 2019.

SEC. 232. ADMINISTRATION OF WILDERNESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness areas and wilderness additions established by section 231 shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with this subtitle and the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that—

(1) any reference in the Wilderness Act to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) any reference in that Act to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be considered to be a reference to the Secretary.

(b) **FIRE MANAGEMENT AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may take such measures in a wilderness area or wilderness addition designated by section 231 as are necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases in accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)) and House Report 98–40 of the 98th Congress.

(2) **FUNDING PRIORITIES.**—Nothing in this subtitle limits funding for fire and fuels management in the wilderness areas or wilderness additions designated by this title.

(3) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Consistent with paragraph (1) and other applicable Federal law, to ensure a timely and efficient response to fire emergencies in the wilderness additions designated by this subtitle, the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, establish agency approval procedures (including appropriate delegations of authority to the Forest Supervisor, District Manager, or other agency officials) for responding to fire emergencies; and

(B) enter into agreements with appropriate State or local firefighting agencies.

(c) **GRAZING.**—The grazing of livestock in the wilderness areas and wilderness additions designated by this title, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be administered in accordance with—

(1) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(2)(A) for lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the guidelines set forth in the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 5487 of the 96th Congress (H. Rept. 96-617); or

(B) for lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, the guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (H. Rept. 101-405).

(d) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(7)), nothing in this title affects the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State with respect to fish and wildlife on public land in the State.

(2) MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—In furtherance of the purposes and principles of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Secretary may conduct any management activities that are necessary to maintain or restore fish, wildlife, and plant populations and habitats in the wilderness areas or wilderness additions designated by section 231, if the management activities are—

(A) consistent with relevant wilderness management plans; and

(B) conducted in accordance with—

(i) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(ii) appropriate policies, such as the policies established in Appendix B of House Report 101-405.

(e) BUFFER ZONES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress does not intend for designation of wilderness or wilderness additions by this title to lead to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around each wilderness area or wilderness addition.

(2) ACTIVITIES OR USES UP TO BOUNDARIES.—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from within a wilderness area shall not, of itself, preclude the activities or uses up to the boundary of the wilderness area.

(f) MILITARY ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this subtitle precludes—

(1) low-level overflights of military aircraft over the wilderness areas or wilderness additions designated by section 231;

(2) the designation of new units of special airspace over the wilderness areas or wilderness additions designated by section 231; or

(3) the use or establishment of military flight training routes over the wilderness areas or wilderness additions designated by section 231.

(g) HORSES.—Nothing in this subtitle precludes horseback riding in, or the entry of recreational or commercial saddle or pack stock into, an area designated as a wilderness area or wilderness addition by section 231—

(1) in accordance with section 4(d)(5) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(5)); and

(2) subject to any terms and conditions determined to be necessary by the Secretary.

(h) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness areas and wilderness additions designated by section 231 are withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral materials and geothermal leasing laws.

(i) USE BY MEMBERS OF INDIAN TRIBES.—

(1) ACCESS.—In recognition of the past use of wilderness areas and wilderness additions designated by this title by members of Indian Tribes for traditional cultural and religious purposes, the Secretary shall ensure that Indian Tribes have access to the wilderness areas and wilderness additions designated by section 231 for traditional cultural and religious purposes.

(2) TEMPORARY CLOSURES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary, on request of an Indian Tribe, may temporarily close to the general public one or more specific portions of a wilderness area or wilderness addition to protect the privacy of the members of the Indian Tribe in the conduct of the traditional cultural and religious activities in the wilderness area or wilderness addition.

(B) REQUIREMENT.—Any closure under subparagraph (A) shall be made in such a manner as to affect the smallest practicable area for the minimum period of time necessary for the activity to be carried out.

(3) APPLICABLE LAW.—Access to the wilderness areas and wilderness additions under this subsection shall be in accordance with—

(A) Public Law 95-341 (commonly known as the American Indian Religious Freedom Act) (42 U.S.C. 1996 et seq.); and

(B) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

(j) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.—Any land within the boundary of a wilderness area or wilderness addition designated by section 231 that is acquired by the United States shall—

(1) become part of the wilderness area in which the land is located;

(2) be withdrawn in accordance with subsection (h); and

(3) be managed in accordance with this section, the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), and any other applicable law.

(k) CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA COLLECTION.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may authorize the installation and maintenance of hydrologic, meteorologic, or climatological collection devices in the wilderness areas and wilderness additions designated by section 231 if the Secretary determines that the facilities and access to the facilities are essential to flood warning, flood control, or water reservoir operation activities.

(l) AUTHORIZED EVENTS.—The Secretary may continue to authorize the competitive equestrian event permitted since 2012 in the Chinquapin Wilderness established by section 231 in a manner compatible with the preservation of the area as wilderness.

(m) RECREATIONAL CLIMBING.—Nothing in this title prohibits recreational rock climbing activities in the wilderness areas, such as the placement, use, and maintenance of fixed anchors, including any fixed anchor established before the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(2) subject to any terms and conditions determined to be necessary by the Secretary.

SEC. 233. DESIGNATION OF POTENTIAL WILDERNESS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as potential wilderness areas:

(1) Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 3,797 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Chinquapin Proposed Potential Wilderness” and dated January 15, 2020.

(2) Certain Federal land administered by the National Park Service, comprising approximately 31,000 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Redwood National Park - Potential Wilderness” and dated October 9, 2019.

(3) Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 8,961 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Siskiyou Wilderness Additions and Potential Wildernesses—Proposed” and dated July 24, 2018.

(4) Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 405 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “South Fork Trinity River Wilderness and Potential Wildernesses—Proposed” and dated March 11, 2019.

(5) Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 1,256 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Trinity Alps Proposed Potential Wilderness” and dated January 15, 2020.

(6) Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 4,282 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Yolla Bolly Middle Eel Wilderness Additions and Potential Wildernesses—Proposed” and dated June 7, 2018.

(7) Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 2,909 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Yuki Proposed Potential Wilderness” and dated January 15, 2020.

(b) MANAGEMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (c) and subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall manage the potential wilderness areas designated by subsection (a) (referred to in this section as “potential wilderness areas”) as wilderness until the potential wilderness areas are designated as wilderness under subsection (d).

(c) ECOLOGICAL RESTORATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of ecological restoration (including the elimination of non-native species, removal of illegal, unused, or decommissioned roads, repair of skid tracks, and any other activities necessary to restore the natural ecosystems in a potential wilderness area and consistent with paragraph (2)), the Secretary may use motorized equipment and mechanized transport in a potential wilderness area until the potential wilderness area is designated as wilderness under subsection (d).

(2) LIMITATION.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall use the minimum tool or administrative practice necessary to accomplish ecological restoration with the least amount of adverse impact on wilderness character and resources.

(d) EVENTUAL WILDERNESS DESIGNATION.—The potential wilderness areas shall be designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System on the earlier of—

(1) the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register notice that the conditions in a potential wilderness area that are incompatible with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) have been removed; or

(2) the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act for potential wilderness areas located on lands managed by the Forest Service.

(e) ADMINISTRATION AS WILDERNESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On its designation as wilderness under subsection (d), a potential wilderness area shall be administered in accordance with section 232 and the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

(2) DESIGNATION.—On its designation as wilderness under subsection (d)—

(A) the land described in subsection (a)(1) shall be incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the Chinquapin Wilderness established by section 231(a)(3);

(B) the land described in subsection (a)(3) shall be incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the Siskiyou Wilderness as designated by section 231(a)(30) of the California Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 98 Stat. 1623) (as amended by section 3(5) of Public Law 109-362 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 120 Stat. 2065) and expanded by section 231(a)(12));

(C) the land described in subsection (a)(4) shall be incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the South Fork Trinity River Wilderness established by section 231(a)(14);

(D) the land described in subsection (a)(5) shall be incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the Trinity Alps Wilderness as designated by section 101(a)(34) of the California Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 98 Stat. 1623) (as amended by section 3(7) of Public Law 109-362 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 120 Stat. 2065) and expanded by section 231(a)(15));

(E) the land described in subsection (a)(6) shall be incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the Yolla Bolly-Middle Eel Wilderness as designated by section 3 of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1132) (as amended by section 3(4) of Public Law 109-362 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 120 Stat. 2065) and expanded by section 231(a)(17)); and

(F) the land described in subsection (a)(7) shall be incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the Yuki Wilderness as designated by section 3(3) of Public Law 109-362 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 120 Stat. 2065) and expanded by section 231(a)(18).

(f) **REPORT.**—Within 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 3 years thereafter until the date upon which the potential wilderness is designated wilderness under subsection (d), the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate on the status of ecological restoration within the potential wilderness area and the progress toward the potential wilderness area's eventual wilderness designation under subsection (d).

SEC. 234. DESIGNATION OF WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS.

Section 3(a) of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(231) **SOUTH FORK TRINITY RIVER.**—The following segments from the source tributaries in the Yolla Bolly-Middle Eel Wilderness, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 18.3-mile segment from its multiple source springs in the Cedar Basin of the Yolla Bolly-Middle Eel Wilderness in section 15, T. 27 N., R. 10 W. to .25 miles upstream of the Wild Mad Road, as a wild river.

“(B) The .65-mile segment from .25 miles upstream of Wild Mad Road to the confluence with the unnamed tributary approximately .4 miles downstream of the Wild Mad Road in section 29, T. 28 N., R. 11 W., as a scenic river.

“(C) The 9.8-mile segment from .75 miles downstream of Wild Mad Road to Silver Creek, as a wild river.

“(D) The 5.4-mile segment from Silver Creek confluence to Farley Creek, as a scenic river.

“(E) The 3.6-mile segment from Farley Creek to Cave Creek, as a recreational river.

“(F) The 5.6-mile segment from Cave Creek to the confluence of the unnamed creek upstream of Hidden Valley Ranch in section 5, T. 15, R. 7 E., as a wild river.

“(G) The 2.5-mile segment from unnamed creek confluence upstream of Hidden Valley Ranch to the confluence with the unnamed creek flowing west from Bear Wallow Mountain in section 29, T. 1 N., R. 7 E., as a scenic river.

“(H) The 3.8-mile segment from the unnamed creek confluence in section 29, T. 1 N., R. 7 E. to Plummer Creek, as a wild river.

“(I) The 1.8-mile segment from Plummer Creek to the confluence with the unnamed tributary north of McClellan Place in section 6, T. 1 N., R. 7 E., as a scenic river.

“(J) The 5.4-mile segment from the unnamed tributary confluence in section 6, T. 1 N., R. 7 E. to Hitchcock Creek, as a wild river.

“(K) The 7-mile segment from Eltapom Creek to the Grouse Creek, as a scenic river.

“(L) The 5-mile segment from Grouse Creek to Coon Creek, as a wild river.

“(232) **EAST FORK SOUTH FORK TRINITY RIVER.**—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 8.4-mile segment from its source in the Pettijohn Basin in the Yolla Bolly-Middle Eel Wilderness in section 10, T. 3 S., R. 10 W. to .25 miles upstream of the Wild Mad Road, as a wild river.

“(B) The 3.4-mile segment from .25 miles upstream of the Wild Mad Road to the South Fork Trinity River, as a recreational river.

“(233) **RATTLESNAKE CREEK.**—The 5.9-mile segment from the confluence with the unnamed

tributary in the southeast corner of section 5, T. 1 S., R. 12 W. to the South Fork Trinity River, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a recreational river.

“(234) **BUTTER CREEK.**—The 7-mile segment from .25 miles downstream of the Road 3N08 crossing to the South Fork Trinity River, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a scenic river.

“(235) **HAYFORK CREEK.**—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 3.2-mile segment from Little Creek to Bear Creek, as a recreational river.

“(B) The 13.2-mile segment from Bear Creek to the northern boundary of section 19, T. 3 N., R. 7 E., as a scenic river.

“(236) **OLSEN CREEK.**—The 2.8-mile segment from the confluence of its source tributaries in section 5, T. 3 N., R. 7 E. to the northern boundary of section 24, T. 3 N., R. 6 E., to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a scenic river.

“(237) **RUSCH CREEK.**—The 3.2-mile segment from .25 miles downstream of the 32N11 Road crossing to Hayfork Creek, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a recreational river.

“(238) **ELTAPOM CREEK.**—The 3.4-mile segment from Buckhorn Creek to the South Fork Trinity River, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a wild river.

“(239) **GROUSE CREEK.**—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 3.9-mile segment from Carson Creek to Cow Creek, as a scenic river.

“(B) The 7.4-mile segment from Cow Creek to the South Fork Trinity River, as a recreational river.

“(240) **MADDEN CREEK.**—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 6.8-mile segment from the confluence of Madden Creek and its unnamed tributary in section 18, T. 5 N., R. 5 E. to Fourmile Creek, as a wild river.

“(B) The 1.6-mile segment from Fourmile Creek to the South Fork Trinity River, as a recreational river.

“(241) **CANYON CREEK.**—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior:

“(A) The 6.6-mile segment from the outlet of lower Canyon Creek Lake to Bear Creek upstream of Ripstein, as a wild river.

“(B) The 11.2-mile segment from Bear Creek upstream of Ripstein to the southern boundary of section 25, T. 34 N., R. 11 W., as a recreational river.

“(242) **NORTH FORK TRINITY RIVER.**—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 12-mile segment from the confluence of source tributaries in section 24, T. 8 N., R. 12 W. to the Trinity Alps Wilderness boundary upstream of Hobo Gulch, as a wild river.

“(B) The .5-mile segment from where the river leaves the Trinity Alps Wilderness to where it fully reenters the Trinity Alps Wilderness downstream of Hobo Gulch, as a scenic river.

“(C) The 13.9-mile segment from where the river fully reenters the Trinity Alps Wilderness downstream of Hobo Gulch to the Trinity Alps Wilderness boundary upstream of the County Road 421 crossing, as a wild river.

“(D) The 1.3-mile segment from the Trinity Alps Wilderness boundary upstream of the County Road 421 crossing to the Trinity River, as a recreational river.

“(243) **EAST FORK NORTH FORK TRINITY RIVER.**—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 9.5-mile segment from the river's source north of Mt. Hilton in section 19, T. 36 N., R. 10 W. to the end of Road 35N20 approximately .5 miles downstream of the confluence with the East Branch East Fork North Fork Trinity River, as a wild river.

“(B) The 3.25-mile segment from the end of Road 35N20 to .25 miles upstream of Coleridge, as a scenic river.

“(C) The 4.6-mile segment from .25 miles upstream of Coleridge to the confluence of Fox Gulch, as a recreational river.

“(244) **NEW RIVER.**—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 12.7-mile segment of Virgin Creek from its source spring in section 22, T. 9 N., R. 7 E. to Slide Creek, as a wild river.

“(B) The 2.3-mile segment of the New River where it begins at the confluence of Virgin and Slide Creeks to Barron Creek, as a wild river.

“(245) **MIDDLE EEL RIVER.**—The following segment, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 37.7-mile segment from its source in Frying Pan Meadow to Rose Creek, as a wild river.

“(B) The 1.5-mile segment from Rose Creek to the Black Butte River, as a recreational river.

“(C) The 10.5-mile segment of Balm of Gilead Creek from its source in Hopkins Hollow to the Middle Eel River, as a wild river.

“(D) The 13-mile segment of the North Fork Middle Fork Eel River from the source on Dead Puppy Ridge in section 11, T. 26 N., R. 11 W. to the confluence of the Middle Eel River, as a wild river.

“(246) **NORTH FORK EEL RIVER, CA.**—The 14.3-mile segment from the confluence with Gilman Creek to the Six Rivers National Forest boundary, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a wild river.

“(247) **RED MOUNTAIN CREEK, CA.**—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 5.25-mile segment from its source west of Mike's Rock in section 23, T. 26 N., R. 12 E. to the confluence with Littlefield Creek, as a wild river.

“(B) The 1.6-mile segment from the confluence with Littlefield Creek to the confluence with the unnamed tributary in section 32, T. 26 N., R. 8 E., as a scenic river.

“(C) The 1.25-mile segment from the confluence with the unnamed tributary in section 32, T. 4 S., R. 8 E. to the confluence with the North Fork Eel River, as a wild river.

“(248) **REDWOOD CREEK.**—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior:

“(A) The 6.2-mile segment from the confluence with Lacks Creek to the confluence with Coyote Creek as a scenic river on publication by the Secretary of a notice in the Federal Register that sufficient inholdings within the boundaries of the segments have been acquired in fee title to establish a manageable addition to the system.

“(B) The 19.1-mile segment from the confluence with Coyote Creek in section 2, T. 8 N., R. 2 E. to the Redwood National Park boundary upstream of Orick in section 34, T. 11 N., R. 1 E. as a scenic river.

“(C) The 2.3-mile segment of Emerald Creek (also known as Harry Weir Creek) from its source in section 29, T. 10 N., R. 2 E. to the confluence with Redwood Creek as a scenic river.

“(249) **LACKS CREEK.**—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior:

“(A) The 5.1-mile segment from the confluence with two unnamed tributaries in section 14, T. 7 N., R. 3 E. to Kings Crossing in section 27, T. 8 N., R. 3 E. as a wild river.

“(B) The 2.7-mile segment from Kings Crossing to the confluence with Redwood Creek as a scenic river upon publication by the Secretary of a notice in the Federal Register that sufficient inholdings within the segment have been acquired in fee title or as scenic easements to establish a manageable addition to the system.

“(250) **LOST MAN CREEK.**—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior:

“(A) The 6.4-mile segment of Lost Man Creek from its source in section 5, T. 10 N., R. 2 E. to

.25 miles upstream of the Prairie Creek confluence, as a recreational river.

“(B) The 2.3-mile segment of Larry Damm Creek from its source in section 8, T. 11 N., R. 2 E. to the confluence with Lost Man Creek, as a recreational river.

“(251) LITTLE LOST MAN CREEK.—The 3.6-mile segment of Little Lost Man Creek from its source in section 6, T. 10 N., R. 2 E. to .25 miles upstream of the Lost Man Creek road crossing, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a wild river.

“(252) SOUTH FORK ELK RIVER.—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through a cooperative management agreement with the State of California:

“(A) The 3.6-mile segment of the Little South Fork Elk River from the source in section 21, T. 3 N., R. 1 E. to the confluence with the South Fork Elk River, as a wild river.

“(B) The 2.2-mile segment of the unnamed tributary of the Little South Fork Elk River from its source in section 15, T. 3 N., R. 1 E. to the confluence with the Little South Fork Elk River, as a wild river.

“(C) The 3.6-mile segment of the South Fork Elk River from the confluence of the Little South Fork Elk River to the confluence with Tom Gulch, as a recreational river.

“(253) SALMON CREEK.—The 4.6-mile segment from its source in section 27, T. 3 N., R. 1 E. to the Headwaters Forest Reserve boundary in section 18, T. 3 N., R. 1 E. to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a wild river through a cooperative management agreement with the State of California.

“(254) SOUTH FORK EEL RIVER.—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior:

“(A) The 6.2-mile segment from the confluence with Jack of Hearts Creek to the southern boundary of the South Fork Eel Wilderness in section 8, T. 22 N., R. 16 W., as a recreational river to be administered by the Secretary through a cooperative management agreement with the State of California.

“(B) The 6.1-mile segment from the southern boundary of the South Fork Eel Wilderness to the northern boundary of the South Fork Eel Wilderness in section 29, T. 23 N., R. 16 W., as a wild river.

“(255) ELDER CREEK.—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through a cooperative management agreement with the State of California:

“(A) The 3.6-mile segment from its source north of Signal Peak in section 6, T. 21 N., R. 15 W. to the confluence with the unnamed tributary near the center of section 28, T. 22 N., R. 16 W., as a wild river.

“(B) The 1.3-mile segment from the confluence with the unnamed tributary near the center of section 28, T. 22 N., R. 15 W. to the confluence with the South Fork Eel River, as a recreational river.

“(C) The 2.1-mile segment of Paralyze Canyon from its source south of Signal Peak in section 7, T. 21 N., R. 15 W. to the confluence with Elder Creek, as a wild river.

“(256) CEDAR CREEK.—The following segments to be administered as a wild river by the Secretary of the Interior:

“(A) The 7.7-mile segment from its source in section 22, T. 24 N., R. 16 W. to the southern boundary of the Red Mountain unit of the South Fork Eel Wilderness.

“(B) The 1.9-mile segment of North Fork Cedar Creek from its source in section 28, T. 24 N., R. 16 E. to the confluence with Cedar Creek.

“(257) EAST BRANCH SOUTH FORK EEL RIVER.—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a scenic river on publication by the Secretary of a notice in the Federal Register that sufficient inholdings within the boundaries of the segments have been acquired in fee title or as scenic easements to establish a manageable addition to the system:

“(A) The 2.3-mile segment of Cruso Cabin Creek from the confluence of two unnamed trib-

utaries in section 18, T. 24 N., R. 15 W. to the confluence with Elkhorn Creek.

“(B) The 1.8-mile segment of Elkhorn Creek from the confluence of two unnamed tributaries in section 22, T. 24 N., R. 16 W. to the confluence with Cruso Cabin Creek.

“(C) The 14.2-mile segment of the East Branch South Fork Eel River from the confluence of Cruso Cabin and Elkhorn Creeks to the confluence with Rays Creek.

“(D) The 1.7-mile segment of the unnamed tributary from its source on the north flank of Red Mountain's north ridge in section 2, T. 24 N., R. 17 W. to the confluence with the East Branch South Fork Eel River.

“(E) The 1.3-mile segment of the unnamed tributary from its source on the north flank of Red Mountain's north ridge in section 1, T. 24 N., R. 17 W. to the confluence with the East Branch South Fork Eel River.

“(F) The 1.8-mile segment of Tom Long Creek from the confluence with the unnamed tributary in section 12, T. 5 S., R. 4 E. to the confluence with the East Branch South Fork Eel River.

“(258) MATTOLE RIVER ESTUARY.—The 1.5-mile segment from the confluence of Stansberry Creek to the Pacific Ocean, to be administered as a recreational river by the Secretary of the Interior.

“(259) HONEYDEW CREEK.—The following segments to be administered as a wild river by the Secretary of the Interior:

“(A) The 5.1-mile segment of Honeydew Creek from its source in the southwest corner of section 25, T. 3 S., R. 1 W. to the eastern boundary of the King Range National Conservation Area in section 18, T. 3 S., R. 1 E.

“(B) The 2.8-mile segment of West Fork Honeydew Creek from its source west of North Slide Peak to the confluence with Honeydew Creek.

“(C) The 2.7-mile segment of Upper East Fork Honeydew Creek from its source in section 23, T. 3 S., R. 1 W. to the confluence with Honeydew Creek.

“(260) BEAR CREEK.—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior:

“(A) The 1.9-mile segment of North Fork Bear Creek from the confluence with the unnamed tributary immediately downstream of the Horse Mountain Road crossing to the confluence with the South Fork, as a scenic river.

“(B) The 6.1-mile segment of South Fork Bear Creek from the confluence in section 2, T. 5 S., R. 1 W. with the unnamed tributary flowing from the southwest flank of Queen Peak to the confluence with the North Fork, as a scenic river.

“(C) The 3-mile segment of Bear Creek from the confluence of the North and South Forks to the southern boundary of section 11, T. 4 S., R. 1 E., as a wild river.

“(261) GITCHELL CREEK.—The 3-mile segment of Gitchell Creek from its source near Saddle Mountain to the Pacific Ocean to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a wild river.

“(262) BIG FLAT CREEK.—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a wild river:

“(A) The 4-mile segment of Big Flat Creek from its source near King Peak in section 36, T. 3 S., R. 1 W. to the Pacific Ocean.

“(B) The .8-mile segment of the unnamed tributary from its source in section 35, T. 3 S., R. 1 W. to the confluence with Big Flat Creek.

“(C) The 2.7-mile segment of North Fork Big Flat Creek from the source in section 34, T. 3 S., R. 1 W. to the confluence with Big Flat Creek.

“(263) BIG CREEK.—The following segments to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as wild rivers:

“(A) The 2.7-mile segment of Big Creek from its source in section 26, T. 3 S., R. 1 W. to the Pacific Ocean.

“(B) The 1.9-mile unnamed southern tributary from its source in section 25, T. 3 S., R. 1 W. to the confluence with Big Creek.

“(264) ELK CREEK.—The 11.4-mile segment from its confluence with Lookout Creek to its confluence with Deep Hole Creek, to be jointly administered by the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior, as a wild river.

“(265) EDEN CREEK.—The 2.7-mile segment from the private property boundary in the northwest quarter of section 27, T. 21 N., R. 12 W. to the eastern boundary of section 23, T. 21 N., R. 12 W., to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a wild river.

“(266) DEEP HOLE CREEK.—The 4.3-mile segment from the private property boundary in the southwest quarter of section 13, T. 20 N., R. 12 W. to the confluence with Elk Creek, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a wild river.

“(267) INDIAN CREEK.—The 3.3-mile segment from 300 feet downstream of the jeep trail in section 13, T. 20 N., R. 13 W. to the confluence with the Eel River, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a wild river.

“(268) FISH CREEK.—The 4.2-mile segment from the source at Buckhorn Spring to the confluence with the Eel River, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a wild river.”

SEC. 235. SANHEDRIN SPECIAL CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights, there is established the Sanhedrin Special Conservation Management Area (referred to in this section as the “conservation management area”), comprising approximately 14,177 acres of Federal land administered by the Forest Service in Mendocino County, California, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Sanhedrin Special Conservation Management Area—Proposed” and dated April 12, 2017.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the conservation management area are to—

(1) conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the ecological, scenic, wildlife, recreational, roadless, cultural, historical, natural, educational, and scientific resources of the conservation management area;

(2) protect and restore late-successional forest structure, oak woodlands and grasslands, aquatic habitat, and anadromous fisheries within the conservation management area;

(3) protect and restore the wilderness character of the conservation management area; and

(4) allow visitors to enjoy the scenic, natural, cultural, and wildlife values of the conservation management area.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the conservation management area—

(A) in a manner consistent with the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the laws (including regulations) generally applicable to the National Forest System;

(ii) this section; and

(iii) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(2) USES.—The Secretary shall only allow uses of the conservation management area that the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(d) MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the use of motorized vehicles in the conservation management area shall be permitted only on existing roads, trails, and areas designated for use by such vehicles as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), no new or temporary roads shall be constructed within the conservation management area.

(3) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) or (2) prevents the Secretary from—

(A) rerouting or closing an existing road or trail to protect natural resources from degradation, or to protect public safety, as determined to be appropriate by the Secretary;

(B) designating routes of travel on lands acquired by the Secretary and incorporated into

the conservation management area if the designations are—

(i) consistent with the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(ii) completed, to the maximum extent practicable, within 3 years of the date of acquisition;

(C) constructing a temporary road on which motorized vehicles are permitted as part of a vegetation management project carried out in accordance with subsection (e);

(D) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles for administrative purposes; or

(E) responding to an emergency.

(4) DECOMMISSIONING OF TEMPORARY ROADS.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall decommission any temporary road constructed under paragraph (3)(C) not later than 3 years after the date on which the applicable vegetation management project is completed.

(B) DEFINITION.—As used in subparagraph (A), the term “decommission” means—

(i) to reestablish vegetation on a road; and

(ii) to restore any natural drainage, watershed function, or other ecological processes that are disrupted or adversely impacted by the road by removing or hydrologically disconnecting the road prism.

(e) TIMBER HARVEST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no harvesting of timber shall be allowed within the conservation management area.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary may authorize harvesting of timber in the conservation management area—

(A) if the Secretary determines that the harvesting is necessary to further the purposes of the conservation management area;

(B) in a manner consistent with the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(C) subject to—

(i) such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary determines appropriate; and

(ii) all applicable laws (including regulations).

(f) GRAZING.—The grazing of livestock in the conservation management area, where established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue—

(1) subject to—

(A) such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary considers necessary; and

(B) applicable law (including regulations); and

(2) in a manner consistent with the purposes described in subsection (b).

(g) WILDFIRE, INSECT, AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT.—Consistent with this section, the Secretary may take any measures within the conservation management area that the Secretary determines to be necessary to control fire, insects, and diseases, including the coordination of those activities with a State or local agency.

(h) ACQUISITION AND INCORPORATION OF LAND AND INTERESTS IN LAND.—

(1) ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.—In accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land within or adjacent to the boundaries of the conservation management area by purchase from willing sellers, donation, or exchange.

(2) INCORPORATION.—Any land or interest in land acquired by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) incorporated into, and administered as part of, the conservation management area; and

(B) withdrawn in accordance with subsection (i).

(i) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land located in the conservation management area is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patenting under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

Subtitle D—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 241. MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare maps and legal descriptions of the—

(1) wilderness areas and wilderness additions designated by section 231;

(2) potential wilderness areas designated by section 233;

(3) South Fork Trinity-Mad River Restoration Area;

(4) Horse Mountain Special Management Area; and

(5) Sanhedrin Special Conservation Management Area.

(b) SUBMISSION OF MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—The Secretary shall file the maps and legal descriptions prepared under subsection (a) with—

(1) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(c) FORCE OF LAW.—The maps and legal descriptions prepared under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical and typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The maps and legal descriptions prepared under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and National Park Service.

SEC. 242. UPDATES TO LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.

As soon as practicable, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the Secretary shall incorporate the designations and studies required by this title into updated management plans for units covered by this title.

SEC. 243. PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY UTILITY FACILITIES AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

(a) EFFECT OF ACT.—Nothing in this title—

(1) affects any validly issued right-of-way for the customary operation, maintenance, upgrade, repair, relocation within an existing right-of-way, replacement, or other authorized activity (including the use of any mechanized vehicle, helicopter, and other aerial device) in a right-of-way acquired by or issued, granted, or permitted to Pacific Gas and Electric Company (including any predecessor or successor in interest or assign) that is located on land included in the South Fork Trinity-Mad River Restoration Area, Bigfoot National Recreation Trail, Sanhedrin Special Conservation Management Area, and Horse Mountain Special Management Area; or

(2) prohibits the upgrading or replacement of any—

(A) utility facilities of the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, including those utility facilities known on the date of enactment of this Act within the—

(i) South Fork Trinity-Mad River Restoration Area known as—

(I) Gas Transmission Line 177A or rights-of-way;

(II) Gas Transmission Line DFM 1312-02 or rights-of-way;

(III) Electric Transmission Line Bridgeville-Cottonwood 115 kV or rights-of-way;

(IV) Electric Transmission Line Humboldt-Trinity 60 kV or rights-of-way;

(V) Electric Transmission Line Humboldt-Trinity 115 kV or rights-of-way;

(VI) Electric Transmission Line Maple Creek-Hoopa 60 kV or rights-of-way;

(VII) Electric Distribution Line-Willow Creek 1101 12 kV or rights-of-way;

(VIII) Electric Distribution Line-Willow Creek 1103 12 kV or rights-of-way;

(IX) Electric Distribution Line-Low Gap 1101 12 kV or rights-of-way;

(X) Electric Distribution Line-Fort Seward 1121 12 kV or rights-of-way;

(XI) Forest Glen Border District Regulator Station or rights-of-way;

(XII) Durret District Gas Regulator Station or rights-of-way;

(XIII) Gas Distribution Line 4269C or rights-of-way;

(XIV) Gas Distribution Line 43991 or rights-of-way;

(XV) Gas Distribution Line 4993D or rights-of-way;

(XVI) Sportsman's Club District Gas Regulator Station or rights-of-way;

(XVII) Highway 36 and Zenia District Gas Regulator Station or rights-of-way;

(XVIII) Dinsmore Lodge 2nd Stage Gas Regulator Station or rights-of-way;

(XIX) Electric Distribution Line-Wildwood 1101 12kV or rights-of-way;

(XX) Low Gap Substation;

(XXI) Hyampom Switching Station; or

(XXII) Wildwood Substation;

(ii) Bigfoot National Recreation Trail known as—

(I) Gas Transmission Line 177A or rights-of-way;

(II) Electric Transmission Line Humboldt-Trinity 115 kV or rights-of-way;

(III) Electric Transmission Line Bridgeville-Cottonwood 115 kV or rights-of-way; or

(IV) Electric Transmission Line Humboldt-Trinity 60 kV or rights-of-way;

(iii) Sanhedrin Special Conservation Management Area known as, Electric Distribution Line-Willits 1103 12 kV or rights-of-way; or

(iv) Horse Mountain Special Management Area known as, Electric Distribution Line Willow Creek 1101 12 kV or rights-of-way; or

(B) utility facilities of the Pacific Gas and Electric Company in rights-of-way issued, granted, or permitted by the Secretary adjacent to a utility facility referred to in paragraph (1).

(b) PLANS FOR ACCESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subtitle or the issuance of a new utility facility right-of-way within the South Fork Trinity-Mad River Restoration Area, Bigfoot National Recreation Trail, Sanhedrin Special Conservation Management Area, and Horse Mountain Special Management Area, whichever is later, the Secretary, in consultation with the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, shall publish plans for regular and emergency access by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company to the rights-of-way of the Pacific Gas and Electric Company.

TITLE III—CENTRAL COAST HERITAGE PROTECTION

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

This title may be cited as the “Central Coast Heritage Protection Act”.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SCENIC AREAS.—The term “scenic area” means a scenic area designated by section 308(a).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means—

(A) with respect to land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, the Secretary of the Interior; and

(B) with respect to land managed by the Forest Service, the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of California.

(4) WILDERNESS AREA.—The term “wilderness area” means a wilderness area or wilderness addition designated by section 303(a).

SEC. 303. DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following areas in the State are designated as wilderness areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Certain land in the Bakersfield Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management comprising approximately 35,116 acres, as generally

depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Caliente Mountain Wilderness” and dated November 13, 2019, which shall be known as the “Caliente Mountain Wilderness”.

(2) Certain land in the Bakersfield Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management comprising approximately 13,332 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Soda Lake Wilderness” and dated June 25, 2019, which shall be known as the “Soda Lake Wilderness”.

(3) Certain land in the Bakersfield Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management comprising approximately 12,585 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Temblor Range Wilderness” and dated June 25, 2019, which shall be known as the “Temblor Range Wilderness”.

(4) Certain land in the Los Padres National Forest comprising approximately 23,670 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Chumash Wilderness Area Additions—Proposed” and dated March 29, 2019, which shall be incorporated into and managed as part of the Chumash Wilderness as designated by the Los Padres Condor Range and River Protection Act (Public Law 102-301; 106 Stat. 242).

(5) Certain land in the Los Padres National Forest comprising approximately 54,036 acres, as generally depicted on the maps entitled “Dick Smith Wilderness Area Additions—Proposed Map 1 of 2 (Bear Canyon and Cuyama Peak Units)” and “Dick Smith Wilderness Area Additions—Proposed Map 2 of 2 (Buckhorn and Mono Units)” and dated November 14, 2019, which shall be incorporated into and managed as part of the Dick Smith Wilderness as designated by the California Wilderness Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-425; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note).

(6) Certain land in the Los Padres National Forest and the Bakersfield Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management comprising approximately 7,289 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Garcia Wilderness Area Additions—Proposed” and dated March 29, 2019, which shall be incorporated into and managed as part of the Garcia Wilderness as designated by the Los Padres Condor Range and River Protection Act (Public Law 102-301; 106 Stat. 242).

(7) Certain land in the Los Padres National Forest and the Bakersfield Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management comprising approximately 8,774 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Machesna Mountain Wilderness—Proposed Additions” and dated October 30, 2019, which shall be incorporated into and managed as part of the Machesna Mountain Wilderness as designated by the California Wilderness Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-425; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note).

(8) Certain land in the Los Padres National Forest comprising approximately 30,184 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Matilija Wilderness Area Additions—Proposed” and dated March 29, 2019, which shall be incorporated into and managed as part of the Matilija Wilderness as designated by the Los Padres Condor Range and River Protection Act (Public Law 102-301; 106 Stat. 242).

(9) Certain land in the Los Padres National Forest comprising approximately 23,969 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “San Rafael Wilderness Area Additions—Proposed” and dated March 29, 2019, which shall be incorporated into and managed as part of the San Rafael Wilderness as designated by Public Law 90-271 (82 Stat. 51), the California Wilderness Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-425; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note), and the Los Padres Condor Range and River Protection Act (Public Law 102-301; 106 Stat. 242).

(10) Certain land in the Los Padres National Forest comprising approximately 2,921 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Santa Lucia Wilderness Area Additions—Proposed” and dated March 29, 2019, which shall be incorporated into and managed as part of the Santa Lucia Wilderness as designated by the Endan-

gered American Wilderness Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-237; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note).

(11) Certain land in the Los Padres National Forest comprising approximately 14,313 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Sespe Wilderness Area Additions—Proposed” and dated March 29, 2019, which shall be incorporated into and managed as part of the Sespe Wilderness as designated by the Los Padres Condor Range and River Protection Act (Public Law 102-301; 106 Stat. 242).

(12) Certain land in the Los Padres National Forest comprising approximately 17,870 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Diablo Caliente Wilderness Area—Proposed” and dated March 29, 2019, which shall be known as the “Diablo Caliente Wilderness”.

(b) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file maps and legal descriptions of the wilderness areas with—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—The maps and legal descriptions filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical and typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The maps and legal descriptions filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 304. DESIGNATION OF THE MACHESNA MOUNTAIN POTENTIAL WILDERNESS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain land in the Los Padres National Forest comprising approximately 2,359 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Machesna Mountain Potential Wilderness” and dated March 29, 2019, is designated as the Machesna Mountain Potential Wilderness Area.

(b) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Machesna Mountain Potential Wilderness Area (referred to in this section as the “potential wilderness area”) with—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—The map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical and typographical errors in the map and legal description.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall manage the potential wilderness area in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

(d) TRAIL USE, CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND REALIGNMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with paragraph (2), the Secretary may reconstruct, realign, or reroute the Pine Mountain Trail.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out the reconstruction, realignment, or rerouting under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) comply with all existing laws (including regulations); and

(B) to the maximum extent practicable, use the minimum tool or administrative practice necessary to accomplish the reconstruction, realignment, or rerouting with the least amount of ad-

verse impact on wilderness character and resources.

(3) MOTORIZED VEHICLES AND MACHINERY.—In accordance with paragraph (2), the Secretary may use motorized vehicles and machinery to carry out the trail reconstruction, realignment, or rerouting authorized by this subsection.

(4) MOTORIZED AND MECHANIZED VEHICLES.—The Secretary may permit the use of motorized and mechanized vehicles on the existing Pine Mountain Trail in accordance with existing law (including regulations) and this subsection until such date as the potential wilderness area is designated as wilderness in accordance with subsection (h).

(e) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land in the potential wilderness area is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(f) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with State, Tribal, and local governmental entities and private entities to complete the trail reconstruction, realignment, or rerouting authorized by subsection (d).

(g) BOUNDARIES.—The Secretary shall modify the boundary of the potential wilderness area to exclude any area within 150 feet of the centerline of the new location of any trail that has been reconstructed, realigned, or rerouted under subsection (d).

(h) WILDERNESS DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The potential wilderness area, as modified under subsection (g), shall be designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System on the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register notice that the trail reconstruction, realignment, or rerouting authorized by subsection (d) has been completed; or

(B) the date that is 20 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) ADMINISTRATION OF WILDERNESS.—On designation as wilderness under this section, the potential wilderness area shall be—

(A) incorporated into the Machesna Mountain Wilderness Area, as designated by the California Wilderness Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-425; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note) and expanded by section 303; and

(B) administered in accordance with section 305 and the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

SEC. 305. ADMINISTRATION OF WILDERNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness areas shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with this title and the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that—

(1) any reference in the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) any reference in the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be considered to be a reference to the Secretary that has jurisdiction over the wilderness area.

(b) FIRE MANAGEMENT AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may take any measures in a wilderness area as are necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases in accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)) and House Report 98-40 of the 98th Congress.

(2) FUNDING PRIORITIES.—Nothing in this title limits funding for fire and fuels management in the wilderness areas.

(3) REVISION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL FIRE MANAGEMENT PLANS.—As soon as practicable

after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall amend the local information in the Fire Management Reference System or individual operational plans that apply to the land designated as a wilderness area.

(4) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Consistent with paragraph (1) and other applicable Federal law, to ensure a timely and efficient response to fire emergencies in the wilderness areas, the Secretary shall enter into agreements with appropriate State or local firefighting agencies.

(c) **GRAZING.**—The grazing of livestock in the wilderness areas, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue, subject to any reasonable regulations as the Secretary considers necessary in accordance with—

(1) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4));

(2) the guidelines set forth in Appendix A of House Report 101-405, accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress for land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior;

(3) the guidelines set forth in House Report 96-617, accompanying H.R. 5487 of the 96th Congress for land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(4) all other laws governing livestock grazing on Federal public land.

(d) **FISH AND WILDLIFE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(7)), nothing in this title affects the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State with respect to fish and wildlife on public land in the State.

(2) **MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.**—In furtherance of the purposes and principles of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Secretary may conduct any management activities that are necessary to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and habitats in the wilderness areas, if the management activities are—

(A) consistent with relevant wilderness management plans;

(B) conducted in accordance with appropriate policies, such as the policies established in Appendix B of House Report 101-405; and

(C) in accordance with memoranda of understanding between the Federal agencies and the State Department of Fish and Wildlife.

(e) **BUFFER ZONES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Congress does not intend for the designation of wilderness areas by this title to lead to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around each wilderness area.

(2) **ACTIVITIES OR USES UP TO BOUNDARIES.**—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from within a wilderness area shall not, of itself, preclude the activities or uses up to the boundary of the wilderness area.

(f) **MILITARY ACTIVITIES.**—Nothing in this title precludes—

(1) low-level overflights of military aircraft over the wilderness areas;

(2) the designation of new units of special airspace over the wilderness areas; or

(3) the use or establishment of military flight training routes over wilderness areas.

(g) **HORSES.**—Nothing in this title precludes horseback riding in, or the entry of recreational saddle or pack stock into, a wilderness area—

(1) in accordance with section 4(d)(5) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(5)); and

(2) subject to any terms and conditions determined to be necessary by the Secretary.

(h) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness areas are withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(i) **INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.**—Any land within the boundary of a

wilderness area that is acquired by the United States shall—

(1) become part of the wilderness area in which the land is located; and

(2) be managed in accordance with—

(A) this section;

(B) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(C) any other applicable law.

(j) **CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA COLLECTION.**—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) and subject to terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may authorize the installation and maintenance of hydrologic, meteorologic, or climatological collection devices in the wilderness areas if the Secretary determines that the facilities and access to the facilities are essential to flood warning, flood control, or water reservoir operation activities.

SEC. 306. DESIGNATION OF WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS.

(a) **INDIAN CREEK, MONO CREEK, AND MATILIJIA CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**—Section 3(a) of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(231) **INDIAN CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**—The following segments of Indian Creek in the State of California, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 9.5-mile segment of Indian Creek from its source in sec. 19, T. 7 N., R. 26 W., to the Dick Smith Wilderness boundary, as a wild river.

“(B) The 1-mile segment of Indian Creek from the Dick Smith Wilderness boundary to 0.25 miles downstream of Road 6N24, as a scenic river.

“(C) The 3.9-mile segment of Indian Creek from 0.25 miles downstream of Road 6N24 to the southern boundary of sec. 32, T. 6 N., R. 26 W., as a wild river.

“(232) **MONO CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**—The following segments of Mono Creek in the State of California, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 4.2-mile segment of Mono Creek from its source in sec. 1, T. 7 N., R. 26 W., to 0.25 miles upstream of Don Victor Fire Road in sec. 28, T. 7 N., R. 25 W., as a wild river.

“(B) The 2.1-mile segment of Mono Creek from 0.25 miles upstream of the Don Victor Fire Road in sec. 28, T. 7 N., R. 25 W., to 0.25 miles downstream of Don Victor Fire Road in sec. 34, T. 7 N., R. 25 W., as a recreational river.

“(C) The 14.7-mile segment of Mono Creek from 0.25 miles downstream of Don Victor Fire Road in sec. 34, T. 7 N., R. 25 W., to the Ogilvy Ranch private property boundary in sec. 22, T. 6 N., R. 26 W., as a wild river.

“(D) The 3.5-mile segment of Mono Creek from the Ogilvy Ranch private property boundary to the southern boundary of sec. 33, T. 6 N., R. 26 W., as a recreational river.

“(233) **MATILIJIA CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**—The following segments of Matilija Creek in the State of California, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 7.2-mile segment of the Matilija Creek from its source in sec. 25, T. 6 N., R. 25 W., to the private property boundary in sec. 9, T. 5 N., R. 24 W., as a wild river.

“(B) The 7.25-mile segment of the Upper North Fork Matilija Creek from its source in sec. 36, T. 6 N., R. 24 W., to the Matilija Wilderness boundary, as a wild river.”.

(b) **SESPE CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**—Section 3(a) of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (142) and inserting the following:

“(142) **SESPE CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**—The following segments of Sespe Creek in the State of California, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 2.7-mile segment of Sespe Creek from the private property boundary in sec. 10, T. 6 N., R. 24 W., to the Hartman Ranch private

property boundary in sec. 14, T. 6 N., R. 24 W., as a wild river.

“(B) The 15-mile segment of Sespe Creek from the Hartman Ranch private property boundary in sec. 14, T. 6 N., R. 24 W., to the western boundary of sec. 6, T. 5 N., R. 22 W., as a recreational river.

“(C) The 6.1-mile segment of Sespe Creek from the western boundary of sec. 6, T. 5 N., R. 22 W., to the confluence with Trout Creek, as a scenic river.

“(D) The 28.6-mile segment of Sespe Creek from the confluence with Trout Creek to the southern boundary of sec. 35, T. 5 N., R. 20 W., as a wild river.”.

(c) **SISQUOC RIVER, CALIFORNIA.**—Section 3(a) of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (143) and inserting the following:

“(143) **SISQUOC RIVER, CALIFORNIA.**—The following segments of the Siquoc River and its tributaries in the State of California, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 33-mile segment of the main stem of the Siquoc River extending from its origin downstream to the Los Padres Forest boundary, as a wild river.

“(B) The 4.2-mile segment of the South Fork Siquoc River from its source northeast of San Rafael Mountain in sec. 2, T. 7 N., R. 28 W., to its confluence with the Siquoc River, as a wild river.

“(C) The 10.4-mile segment of Manzanita Creek from its source west of San Rafael Peak in sec. 4, T. 7 N., R. 28 W., to the San Rafael Wilderness boundary upstream of Nira Campground, as a wild river.

“(D) The 0.6-mile segment of Manzanita Creek from the San Rafael Wilderness boundary upstream of the Nira Campground to the San Rafael Wilderness boundary downstream of the confluence of Davy Brown Creek, as a recreational river.

“(E) The 5.8-mile segment of Manzanita Creek from the San Rafael Wilderness boundary downstream of the confluence of Davy Brown Creek to the private property boundary in sec. 1, T. 8 N., R. 30 W., as a wild river.

“(F) The 3.8-mile segment of Manzanita Creek from the private property boundary in sec. 1, T. 8 N., R. 30 W., to the confluence of the Siquoc River, as a recreational river.

“(G) The 3.4-mile segment of Davy Brown Creek from its source west of Ranger Peak in sec. 32, T. 8 N., R. 29 W., to 300 feet upstream of its confluence with Munch Canyon, as a wild river.

“(H) The 1.4-mile segment of Davy Brown Creek from 300 feet upstream of its confluence with Munch Canyon to its confluence with Manzanita Creek, as a recreational river.

“(I) The 2-mile segment of Munch Canyon from its source north of Ranger Peak in sec. 33, T. 8 N., R. 29 W., to 300 feet upstream of its confluence with Sunset Valley Creek, as a wild river.

“(J) The 0.5-mile segment of Munch Canyon from 300 feet upstream of its confluence with Sunset Valley Creek to its confluence with Davy Brown Creek, as a recreational river.

“(K) The 2.6-mile segment of Fish Creek from 500 feet downstream of Sunset Valley Road to its confluence with Manzanita Creek, as a wild river.

“(L) The 1.5-mile segment of East Fork Fish Creek from its source in sec. 26, T. 8 N., R. 29 W., to its confluence with Fish Creek, as a wild river.”.

(d) **PIRU CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**—Section 3(a) of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (199) and inserting the following:

“(199) **PIRU CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**—The following segments of Piru Creek in the State of California, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture:

“(A) The 9.1-mile segment of Piru Creek from its source in sec. 3, T. 6 N., R. 22 W., to the private property boundary in sec. 4, T. 6 N., R. 21 W., as a wild river.

“(B) The 17.2-mile segment of Piru Creek from the private property boundary in sec. 4, T. 6 N., R. 21 W., to 0.25 miles downstream of the Gold Hill Road, as a scenic river.

“(C) The 4.1-mile segment of Piru Creek from 0.25 miles downstream of Gold Hill Road to the confluence with Trail Canyon, as a wild river.

“(D) The 7.25-mile segment of Piru Creek from the confluence with Trail Canyon to the confluence with Buck Creek, as a scenic river.

“(E) The 3-mile segment of Piru Creek from 0.5 miles downstream of Pyramid Dam at the first bridge crossing to the boundary of the Sespe Wilderness, as a recreational river.

“(F) The 13-mile segment of Piru Creek from the boundary of the Sespe Wilderness to the boundary of the Sespe Wilderness, as a wild river.

“(G) The 2.2-mile segment of Piru Creek from the boundary of the Sespe Wilderness to the upper limit of Piru Reservoir, as a recreational river.”.

(e) EFFECT.—The designation of additional miles of Piru Creek under subsection (d) shall not affect valid water rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) MOTORIZED USE OF TRAILS.—Nothing in this section (including the amendments made by this section) affects the motorized use of trails designated by the Forest Service for motorized use that are located adjacent to and crossing upper Piru Creek, if the use is consistent with the protection and enhancement of river values under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.).

SEC. 307. DESIGNATION OF THE FOX MOUNTAIN POTENTIAL WILDERNESS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain land in the Los Padres National Forest comprising approximately 41,082 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Fox Mountain Potential Wilderness Area” and dated November 14, 2019, is designated as the Fox Mountain Potential Wilderness Area.

(b) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the Fox Mountain Potential Wilderness Area (referred to in this section as the “potential wilderness area”) with—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—The map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary of Agriculture may correct any clerical and typographical errors in the map and legal description.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall manage the potential wilderness area in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

(d) TRAIL USE CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND REALIGNMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with paragraph (2), the Secretary of Agriculture may—

(A) construct a new trail for use by hikers, equestrians, and mechanized vehicles that connects the Aliso Park Campground to the Bull Ridge Trail; and

(B) reconstruct or realign—

(i) the Bull Ridge Trail; and

(ii) the Rocky Ridge Trail.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out the construction, reconstruction, or alignment under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) comply with all existing laws (including regulations); and

(B) to the maximum extent practicable, use the minimum tool or administrative practice nec-

essary to accomplish the construction, reconstruction, or alignment with the least amount of adverse impact on wilderness character and resources.

(3) MOTORIZED VEHICLES AND MACHINERY.—In accordance with paragraph (2), the Secretary may use motorized vehicles and machinery to carry out the trail construction, reconstruction, or realignment authorized by this subsection.

(4) MECHANIZED VEHICLES.—The Secretary may permit the use of mechanized vehicles on the existing Bull Ridge Trail and Rocky Ridge Trail in accordance with existing law (including regulations) and this subsection until such date as the potential wilderness area is designated as wilderness in accordance with subsection (h).

(e) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land in the potential wilderness area is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(f) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with State, Tribal, and local governmental entities and private entities to complete the trail construction, reconstruction, and realignment authorized by subsection (d).

(g) BOUNDARIES.—The Secretary shall modify the boundary of the potential wilderness area to exclude any area within 50 feet of the centerline of the new location of any trail that has been constructed, reconstructed, or realigned under subsection (d).

(h) WILDERNESS DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The potential wilderness area, as modified under subsection (g), shall be designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System on the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register notice that the trail construction, reconstruction, or alignment authorized by subsection (d) has been completed; or

(B) the date that is 20 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) ADMINISTRATION OF WILDERNESS.—On designation as wilderness under this section, the potential wilderness area shall be—

(A) incorporated into the San Rafael Wilderness, as designated by Public Law 90–271 (82 Stat. 51), the California Wilderness Act of 1964 (Public Law 98–425; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note), and the Los Padres Condor Range and River Protection Act (Public Law 102–301; 106 Stat. 242), and section 303; and

(B) administered in accordance with section 305 and the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

SEC. 308. DESIGNATION OF SCENIC AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, there are established the following scenic areas:

(1) CONDOR RIDGE SCENIC AREA.—Certain land in the Los Padres National Forest comprising approximately 18,666 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Condor Ridge Scenic Area—Proposed” and dated March 29, 2019, which shall be known as the “Condor Ridge Scenic Area”.

(2) BLACK MOUNTAIN SCENIC AREA.—Certain land in the Los Padres National Forest and the Bakersfield Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management comprising approximately 16,216 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Black Mountain Scenic Area—Proposed” and dated March 29, 2019, which shall be known as the “Black Mountain Scenic Area”.

(b) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and legal descrip-

tion of the Condor Ridge Scenic Area and Black Mountain Scenic Area with—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—The maps and legal descriptions filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary of Agriculture may correct any clerical and typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The maps and legal descriptions filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the scenic areas is to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the ecological, scenic, wildlife, recreational, cultural, historical, natural, educational, and scientific resources of the scenic areas.

(d) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the scenic areas—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the resources of the scenic areas, and in particular the scenic character attributes of the scenic areas; and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) this section;

(ii) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) for land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior;

(iii) any laws (including regulations) relating to the National Forest System, for land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(iv) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(2) USES.—The Secretary shall only allow those uses of the scenic areas that the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (c).

(e) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land in the scenic areas is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(f) PROHIBITED USES.—The following shall be prohibited on the Federal land within the scenic areas:

(1) Permanent roads.

(2) Permanent structures.

(3) Timber harvesting except when necessary for the purposes described in subsection (g).

(4) Transmission lines.

(5) Except as necessary to meet the minimum requirements for the administration of the scenic areas and to protect public health and safety—

(A) the use of motorized vehicles; or

(B) the establishment of temporary roads.

(6) Commercial enterprises, except as necessary for realizing the purposes of the scenic areas.

(g) WILDFIRE, INSECT, AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT.—Consistent with this section, the Secretary may take any measures in the scenic areas that the Secretary determines to be necessary to control fire, insects, and diseases, including, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the coordination of those activities with the State or a local agency.

(h) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—The fact that an otherwise authorized activity or use can be seen or heard within a scenic area shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the scenic area.

SEC. 309. CONDOR NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The contiguous trail established pursuant to this section shall be known

as the “Condor National Scenic Trail” named after the California condor, a critically endangered bird species that lives along the extent of the trail corridor.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purposes of the Condor National Scenic Trail are to—

(1) provide a continual extended hiking corridor that connects the southern and northern portions of the Los Padres National Forest, spanning the entire length of the forest along the coastal mountains of southern and central California; and

(2) provide for the public enjoyment of the nationally significant scenic, historic, natural, and cultural qualities of the Los Padres National Forest.

(c) **AMENDMENT.**—Section 5(a) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(31) **CONDOR NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Condor National Scenic Trail, a trail extending approximately 400 miles from Lake Piru in the southern portion of the Los Padres National Forest to the Bottchers Gap Campground in northern portion of the Los Padres National Forest.

“(B) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The trail shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with—

“(i) other Federal, State, Tribal, regional, and local agencies;

“(ii) private landowners; and

“(iii) other interested organizations.

“(C) **RECREATIONAL USES.**—Notwithstanding section 7(c), the use of motorized vehicles on roads or trails included in the Condor National Scenic Trail on which motorized vehicles are permitted as of the date of enactment of this paragraph may be permitted.

“(D) **PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS.**—

“(i) **PROHIBITION.**—The Secretary shall not acquire for the trail any land or interest in land outside the exterior boundary of any federally managed area without the consent of the owner of land or interest in land.

“(ii) **EFFECT.**—Nothing in this paragraph—

“(I) requires any private property owner to allow public access (including Federal, State, or local government access) to private property; or

“(II) modifies any provision of Federal, State, or local law with respect to public access to or use of private land.

“(E) **REALIGNMENT.**—The Secretary of Agriculture may realign segments of the Condor National Scenic Trail as necessary to fulfill the purposes of the trail.

“(F) **MAP.**—A map generally depicting the trail described in subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.”.

(d) **STUDY.**—

(1) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a study that—

(A) addresses the feasibility of, and alternatives for, connecting the northern and southern portions of the Los Padres National Forest by establishing a trail across the applicable portions of the northern and southern Santa Lucia Mountains of the southern California Coastal Range; and

(B) considers realignment of the trail or construction of new trail segments to avoid existing trail segments that currently allow motorized vehicles.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—In carrying out the study required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(A) conform to the requirements for national scenic trail studies described in section 5(b) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(b));

(B) provide for a continual hiking route through and connecting the southern and northern sections of the Los Padres National Forest;

(C) promote recreational, scenic, wilderness and cultural values;

(D) enhance connectivity with the overall National Forest trail system;

(E) consider new connectors and realignment of existing trails;

(F) emphasize safe and continuous public access, dispersal from high-use areas, and suitable water sources; and

(G) to the extent practicable, provide all-year use.

(3) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.**—In completing the study required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Agriculture shall consult with—

(A) appropriate Federal, State, Tribal, regional, and local agencies;

(B) private landowners;

(C) nongovernmental organizations; and

(D) members of the public.

(4) **SUBMISSION.**—The Secretary of Agriculture shall submit the study required by paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(5) **ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO THE CONDOR NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon completion of the study required by paragraph (1), if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that additional or alternative trail segments are feasible for inclusion in the Condor National Scenic Trail, the Secretary of Agriculture shall include those segments in the Condor National Scenic Trail.

(B) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Additions or alterations to the Condor National Scenic Trail shall be effective on the date the Secretary of Agriculture publishes in the Federal Register notice that the additional or alternative segments are included in the Condor National Scenic Trail.

(C) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—In carrying out this section (including the amendments made by this section), the Secretary of Agriculture may enter into cooperative agreements with State, Tribal, and local government entities and private entities to complete needed trail construction, reconstruction, and realignment projects authorized by this section (including the amendments made by this section).

SEC. 310. FOREST SERVICE STUDY.

Not later than 6 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service) shall study the feasibility of opening a new trail, for vehicles measuring 50 inches or less, connecting Forest Service Highway 95 to the existing off-highway vehicle trail system in the Ballinger Canyon off-highway vehicle area.

SEC. 311. NONMOTORIZED RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES.

Not later than 6 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with interested parties, shall conduct a study to improve nonmotorized recreation trail opportunities (including mountain bicycling) on land not designated as wilderness within the Santa Barbara, Ojai, and Mt. Pinos ranger districts.

SEC. 312. USE BY MEMBERS OF TRIBES.

(a) **ACCESS.**—The Secretary shall ensure that Tribes have access, in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), to the wilderness areas, scenic areas, and potential wilderness areas designated by this title for traditional cultural and religious purposes.

(b) **TEMPORARY CLOSURES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary, on request of a Tribe, may temporarily close to the general public one or more specific portions of a wilderness area, scenic area, or potential wilderness area designated by this title to protect the privacy of the members of the Tribe in the conduct of traditional cultural and religious activities.

(2) **REQUIREMENT.**—Any closure under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) made in such a manner as to affect the smallest practicable area for the minimum pe-

riod of time necessary for the activity to be carried out; and

(B) be consistent with the purpose and intent of Public Law 95-341 (commonly known as the American Indian Religious Freedom Act) (42 U.S.C. 1996) and the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

TITLE IV—SAN GABRIEL MOUNTAINS FOOTHILLS AND RIVERS PROTECTION

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

This title may be cited as the “San Gabriel Mountains Foothills and Rivers Protection Act”.

SEC. 402. DEFINITION OF STATE.

In this title, the term “State” means the State of California.

Subtitle A—SAN GABRIEL NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

SEC. 411. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this subtitle are—

(1) to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the ecological, scenic, wildlife, recreational, cultural, historical, natural, educational, and scientific resources of the Recreation Area;

(2) to provide environmentally responsible, well-managed recreational opportunities within the Recreation Area;

(3) to improve access to and from the Recreation Area;

(4) to provide expanded educational and interpretive services to increase public understanding of, and appreciation for, the natural and cultural resources of the Recreation Area;

(5) to facilitate the cooperative management of the land and resources within the Recreation Area, in collaboration with the State and political subdivisions of the State, historical, business, cultural, civic, recreational, tourism and other nongovernmental organizations, and the public; and

(6) to allow the continued use of the Recreation Area by all individuals, entities, and local government agencies in activities relating to integrated water management, flood protection, water conservation, water quality, water rights, water supply, groundwater recharge and monitoring, wastewater treatment, public roads and bridges, and utilities within or adjacent to the Recreation Area.

SEC. 412. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **ADJUDICATION.**—The term “adjudication” means any final judgment, order, ruling, or decree entered in any judicial proceeding adjudicating or affecting water rights, surface water management, or groundwater management.

(2) **ADVISORY COUNCIL.**—The term “Advisory Council” means the San Gabriel National Recreation Area Public Advisory Council established under section 417(a).

(3) **FEDERAL LANDS.**—The term “Federal lands” means—

(A) public lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; and

(B) lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Chief of Engineers.

(4) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The term “management plan” means the management plan for the Recreation Area required under section 414(d).

(5) **PARTNERSHIP.**—The term “Partnership” means the San Gabriel National Recreation Area Partnership established by section 418(a).

(6) **PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM.**—The term “public water system” has the meaning given the term in 42 U.S.C. 300(f)(4) or in section 116275 of the California Health and Safety Code.

(6) **RECREATION AREA.**—The term “Recreation Area” means the San Gabriel National Recreation Area established by section 413(a).

(7) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(8) **UTILITY FACILITY.**—The term “utility facility” means—

(A) any electric substations, communication facilities, towers, poles, and lines, ground wires, communication circuits, and other structures, and related infrastructure; and

(B) any such facilities associated with a public water system.

(9) **WATER RESOURCE FACILITY.**—The term “water resource facility” means irrigation and pumping facilities, dams and reservoirs, flood control facilities, water conservation works, including debris protection facilities, sediment placement sites, rain gauges and stream gauges, water quality facilities, recycled water facilities, water pumping, conveyance and distribution systems, water storage tanks and reservoirs, and water treatment facilities, aqueducts, canals, ditches, pipelines, wells, hydropower projects, and transmission and other ancillary facilities, groundwater recharge facilities, water conservation, water filtration plants, and other water diversion, conservation, groundwater recharge, storage, and carriage structures.

SEC. 413. SAN GABRIEL NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT; BOUNDARIES.**—Subject to valid existing rights, there is established as a unit of the National Park System in the State the San Gabriel National Recreation Area depicted as the “Proposed San Gabriel National Recreation Area” on the map entitled “San Gabriel National Recreation Area Proposed Boundary,” numbered 503/152,737, and dated July 2019.

(b) **MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and a legal description of the Recreation Area with—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) **FORCE OF LAW.**—The map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical error in the map or legal description.

(3) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(c) **ADMINISTRATION AND JURISDICTION.**—

(1) **PUBLIC LANDS.**—The public lands included in the Recreation Area shall be administered by the Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

(2) **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LAND.**—Although certain Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense are included in the recreation area, nothing in this subtitle transfers administration jurisdiction of such Federal lands from the Secretary of Defense or otherwise affects Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense.

(3) **STATE AND LOCAL JURISDICTION.**—Nothing in this subtitle alters, modifies, or diminishes any right, responsibility, power, authority, jurisdiction, or entitlement of the State, a political subdivision of the State, including, but not limited to courts of competent jurisdiction, regulatory commissions, boards, and departments, or any State or local agency under any applicable Federal, State, or local law (including regulations).

SEC. 414. MANAGEMENT.

(a) **NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall manage the public lands included in the Recreation Area in a manner that protects and enhances the natural resources and values of the public lands, in accordance with—

(1) this subtitle;

(2) section 100101(a), chapter 1003, and sections 100751(a), 100752, 100753 and 102101 of title 54, United States Code (formerly known as the “National Park Service Organic Act”);

(3) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System; and

(4) other applicable law, regulations, adjudications, and orders.

(b) **COOPERATION WITH SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.**—The Secretary shall cooperate with the Secretary of Defense to develop opportunities for the management of the Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense included in the Recreation Area in accordance with the purposes described in section 411, to the maximum extent practicable.

(c) **TREATMENT OF NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this subtitle—

(A) authorizes the Secretary to take any action that would affect the use of any land not owned by the United States within the Recreation Area;

(B) affects the use of, or access to, any non-Federal land within the Recreation Area;

(C) modifies any provision of Federal, State, or local law with respect to public access to, or use of, non-Federal land;

(D) requires any owner of non-Federal land to allow public access (including Federal, State, or local government access) to private property or any other non-Federal land;

(E) alters any duly adopted land use regulation, approved land use plan, or any other regulatory authority of any State or local agency or unit of Tribal government;

(F) creates any liability, or affects any liability under any other law, of any private property owner or other owner of non-Federal land with respect to any person injured on the private property or other non-Federal land;

(G) conveys to the Partnership any land use or other regulatory authority;

(H) shall be construed to cause any Federal, State, or local regulation or permit requirement intended to apply to units of the National Park System to affect the Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense or non-Federal lands within the boundaries of the recreation area; or

(I) requires any local government to participate in any program administered by the Secretary.

(2) **COOPERATION.**—The Secretary is encouraged to work with owners of non-Federal land who have agreed to cooperate with the Secretary to advance the purposes of this subtitle.

(3) **BUFFER ZONES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this subtitle establishes any protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Recreation Area.

(B) **ACTIVITIES OR USES UP TO BOUNDARIES.**—The fact that an activity or use of land can be seen or heard from within the Recreation Area shall not preclude the activity or land use up to the boundary of the Recreation Area.

(4) **FACILITIES.**—Nothing in this subtitle affects the operation, maintenance, modification, construction, destruction, removal, relocation, improvement or expansion of any water resource facility or public water system, or any solid waste, sanitary sewer, water or waste-water treatment, groundwater recharge or conservation, hydroelectric, conveyance distribution system, recycled water facility, or utility facility located within or adjacent to the Recreation Area.

(5) **EXEMPTION.**—Section 100903 of title 54, United States Code, shall not apply to the Puente Hills landfill, materials recovery facility, or intermodal facility.

(d) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **DEADLINE.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Advisory Council shall establish a comprehensive management plan for the Recreation Area that supports the purposes described in section 411.

(2) **USE OF EXISTING PLANS.**—In developing the management plan, to the extent consistent with this section, the Secretary may incorporate any provision of a land use or other plan applicable to the public lands included in the Recreation Area.

(3) **INCORPORATION OF VISITOR SERVICES PLAN.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the

Secretary shall incorporate into the management plan the visitor services plan under section 419(a)(2).

(4) **PARTNERSHIP.**—In developing the management plan, the Secretary shall consider recommendations of the Partnership. To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall incorporate recommendations of the Partnership into the management plan if the Secretary determines that the recommendations are feasible and consistent with the purposes in section 411, this subtitle, and applicable laws (including regulations).

(e) **FISH AND WILDLIFE.**—Nothing in this subtitle affects the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish or wildlife located on public lands in the State.

SEC. 415. ACQUISITION OF NON-FEDERAL LAND WITHIN RECREATION AREA.

(a) **LIMITED ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may acquire non-Federal land within the boundaries of the Recreation Area only through exchange, donation, or purchase from a willing seller.

(2) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.**—As a further condition on the acquisition of land, the Secretary shall make a determination that the land contains important biological, cultural, historic, or recreational values.

(b) **PROHIBITION ON USE OF EMINENT DOMAIN.**—Nothing in this subtitle authorizes the use of eminent domain to acquire land or an interest in land.

(c) **TREATMENT OF ACQUIRED LAND.**—Any land or interest in land acquired by the United States within the boundaries of the Recreation Area shall be—

(1) included in the Recreation Area; and

(2) administered by the Secretary in accordance with—

(A) this subtitle; and

(B) other applicable laws (including regulations).

SEC. 416. WATER RIGHTS; WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES; PUBLIC ROADS; UTILITY FACILITIES.

(a) **NO EFFECT ON WATER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this subtitle or section 422—

(1) shall affect the use or allocation, as in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act, of any water, water right, or interest in water (including potable, recycled, reclaimed, waste, imported, exported, banked, or stored water, surface water, groundwater, and public trust interest);

(2) shall affect any public or private contract in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act for the sale, lease, loan, or transfer of any water (including potable, recycled, reclaimed, waste, imported, exported, banked, or stored water, surface water, and groundwater);

(3) shall be considered to be a relinquishment or reduction of any water rights reserved or appropriated by the United States in the State on or before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(4) authorizes or imposes any new reserved Federal water right or expands water usage pursuant to any existing Federal reserved, riparian or appropriative right;

(5) shall be considered a relinquishment or reduction of any water rights (including potable, recycled, reclaimed, waste, imported, exported, banked, or stored water, surface water, and groundwater) held, reserved, or appropriated by any public entity or other persons or entities, on or before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(6) shall be construed to, or shall interfere or conflict with the exercise of the powers or duties of any watermaster, public agency, public water system, court of competent jurisdiction, or other body or entity responsible for groundwater or surface water management or groundwater replenishment as designated or established pursuant to any adjudication or Federal or State law, including the management of the San Gabriel River watershed and basin, to provide water supply or other environmental benefits;

(7) shall be construed to impede or adversely impact any previously adopted Los Angeles County Drainage Area project, as described in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 30, 1992, including any supplement or addendum to that report, or any maintenance agreement to operate that project;

(8) shall interfere or conflict with any action by a watermaster, water agency, public water system, court of competent jurisdiction, or public agency pursuant to any Federal or State law, water right, or adjudication, including any action relating to water conservation, water quality, surface water diversion or impoundment, groundwater recharge, water treatment, conservation or storage of water, pollution, waste discharge, the pumping of groundwater; the spreading, injection, pumping, storage, or the use of water from local sources, storm water flows, and runoff, or from imported or recycled water, that is undertaken in connection with the management or regulation of the San Gabriel River;

(9) shall interfere with, obstruct, hinder, or delay the exercise of, or access to, any water right by the owner of a public water system or any other individual or entity, including the construction, operation, maintenance, replacement, removal, repair, location, or relocation of any well; pipeline; or water pumping, treatment, diversion, impoundment, or storage facility; or other facility or property necessary or useful to access any water right or operate an public water system;

(10) shall require the initiation or reinitiation of consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service under, or the application of any provision of, the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) relating to any action affecting any water, water right, or water management or water resource facility in the San Gabriel River watershed and basin; or

(11) authorizes any agency or employee of the United States, or any other person, to take any action inconsistent with any of paragraphs (1) through (10).

(b) **WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.**—

(1) **NO EFFECT ON EXISTING WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.**—Nothing in this subtitle or section 422 shall affect—

(A) the use, operation, maintenance, repair, construction, destruction, removal, reconfiguration, expansion, improvement or replacement of a water resource facility or public water system within or adjacent to the Recreation Area or San Gabriel Mountains National Monument; or

(B) access to a water resource facility within or adjacent to the Recreation Area or San Gabriel Mountains National Monument.

(2) **NO EFFECT ON NEW WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.**—Nothing in this subtitle or section 422 shall preclude the establishment of a new water resource facility (including instream sites, routes, and areas) within the Recreation Area or San Gabriel Mountains National Monument if the water resource facility or public water system is necessary to preserve or enhance the health, safety, reliability, quality or accessibility of water supply, or utility services to residents of Los Angeles County.

(3) **FLOOD CONTROL.**—Nothing in this subtitle or section 422 shall be construed to—

(A) impose any new restriction or requirement on flood protection, water conservation, water supply, groundwater recharge, water transfers, or water quality operations and maintenance; or

(B) increase the liability of an agency or public water system carrying out flood protection, water conservation, water supply, groundwater recharge, water transfers, or water quality operations.

(4) **DIVERSION OR USE OF WATER.**—Nothing in this subtitle or section 422 shall authorize or require the use of water or water rights in, or the diversion of water to, the Recreation Area or San Gabriel Mountains National Monument.

(c) **UTILITY FACILITIES AND RIGHTS OF WAY.**—Nothing in this subtitle or section 422 shall—

(1) affect the use, operation, maintenance, repair, construction, destruction, reconfiguration, expansion, inspection, renewal, reconstruction, alteration, addition, relocation, improvement, removal, or replacement of a utility facility or appurtenant right-of-way within or adjacent to the Recreation Area or San Gabriel Mountains National Monument;

(2) affect access to a utility facility or right-of-way within or adjacent to the Recreation Area or San Gabriel Mountains National Monument; or

(3) preclude the establishment of a new utility facility or right-of-way (including instream sites, routes, and areas) within the Recreation Area or San Gabriel Mountains National Monument if such a facility or right-of-way is necessary for public health and safety, electricity supply, or other utility services.

(d) **ROADS; PUBLIC TRANSIT.**—

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **PUBLIC ROAD.**—The term “public road” means any paved road or bridge (including any appurtenant structure and right-of-way) that is—

(i) operated or maintained by a non-Federal entity; and

(ii) (I) open to vehicular use by the public; or (II) used by a public agency or utility for the operation, maintenance, improvement, repair, removal, relocation, construction, destruction or rehabilitation of infrastructure, a utility facility, or a right-of-way.

(B) **PUBLIC TRANSIT.**—The term “public transit” means any transit service (including operations and rights-of-way) that is—

(i) operated or maintained by a non-Federal entity; and

(ii) (I) open to the public; or

(II) used by a public agency or contractor for the operation, maintenance, repair, construction, or rehabilitation of infrastructure, a utility facility, or a right-of-way.

(2) **NO EFFECT ON PUBLIC ROADS OR PUBLIC TRANSIT.**—Nothing in this subtitle or section 422—

(A) authorizes the Secretary to take any action that would affect the operation, maintenance, repair, or rehabilitation of public roads or public transit (including activities necessary to comply with Federal or State safety or public transit standards); or

(B) creates any new liability, or increases any existing liability, of an owner or operator of a public road.

SEC. 417. SAN GABRIEL NATIONAL RECREATION AREA PUBLIC ADVISORY COUNCIL.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish an advisory council, to be known as the “San Gabriel National Recreation Area Public Advisory Council”.

(b) **DUTIES.**—The Advisory Council shall advise the Secretary regarding the development and implementation of the management plan and the visitor services plan.

(c) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—The Advisory Council shall be subject to—

(1) the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.); and

(2) all other applicable laws (including regulations).

(d) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Advisory Council shall consist of 22 members, to be appointed by the Secretary after taking into consideration recommendations of the Partnership, of whom—

(1) 2 shall represent local, regional, or national environmental organizations;

(2) 2 shall represent the interests of outdoor recreation, including off-highway vehicle recreation, within the Recreation Area;

(3) 2 shall represent the interests of community-based organizations, the missions of which include expanding access to the outdoors;

(4) 2 shall represent business interests;

(5) 1 shall represent Indian Tribes within or adjacent to the Recreation Area;

(6) 1 shall represent the interests of homeowners’ associations within the Recreation Area;

(7) 3 shall represent the interests of holders of adjudicated water rights, public water systems, water agencies, wastewater and sewer agencies, recycled water facilities, and water management and replenishment entities;

(8) 1 shall represent energy and mineral development interests;

(9) 1 shall represent owners of Federal grazing permits or other land use permits within the Recreation Area;

(10) 1 shall represent archaeological and historical interests;

(11) 1 shall represent the interests of environmental educators;

(12) 1 shall represent cultural history interests;

(13) 1 shall represent environmental justice interests;

(14) 1 shall represent electrical utility interests; and

(15) 2 shall represent the affected public at large.

(e) **TERMS.**—

(1) **STAGGERED TERMS.**—A member of the Advisory Council shall be appointed for a term of 3 years, except that, of the members first appointed, 7 of the members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year and 7 of the members shall be appointed for a term of 2 years.

(2) **REAPPOINTMENT.**—A member may be reappointed to serve on the Advisory Council on the expiration of the term of service of the member.

(3) **VACANCY.**—A vacancy on the Advisory Council shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(f) **QUORUM.**—A quorum shall be ten members of the advisory council. The operations of the advisory council shall not be impaired by the fact that a member has not yet been appointed as long as a quorum has been attained.

(g) **CHAIRPERSON; PROCEDURES.**—The Advisory Council shall elect a chairperson and establish such rules and procedures as the advisory council considers necessary or desirable.

(h) **SERVICE WITHOUT COMPENSATION.**—Members of the Advisory Council shall serve without pay.

(i) **TERMINATION.**—The Advisory Council shall cease to exist—

(1) on the date that is 5 years after the date on which the management plan is adopted by the Secretary; or

(2) on such later date as the Secretary considers to be appropriate.

SEC. 418. SAN GABRIEL NATIONAL RECREATION AREA PARTNERSHIP.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a Partnership, to be known as the “San Gabriel National Recreation Area Partnership”.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the Partnership are to—

(1) coordinate the activities of Federal, State, Tribal, and local authorities and the private sector in advancing the purposes of this subtitle; and

(2) use the resources and expertise of each agency in improving management and recreational opportunities within the Recreation Area.

(c) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Partnership shall include the following:

(1) The Secretary (or a designee) to represent the National Park Service.

(2) The Secretary of Defense (or a designee) to represent the Corps of Engineers.

(3) The Secretary of Agriculture (or a designee) to represent the Forest Service.

(4) The Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency of the State (or a designee) to represent—

(A) the California Department of Parks and Recreation; and

(B) the Rivers and Mountains Conservancy.

(5) 1 designee of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

(6) 1 designee of the Puente Hills Habitat Preservation Authority.

(7) 4 designees of the San Gabriel Council of Governments, of whom 1 shall be selected from a local land conservancy.

(8) 1 designee of the San Gabriel Valley Ecomomic Partnership.

(9) 1 designee of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District.

(10) 1 designee of the San Gabriel Valley Water Association.

(11) 1 designee of the Central Basin Water Association.

(12) 1 designee of the Main San Gabriel Basin Watermaster.

(13) 1 designee of a public utility company, to be appointed by the Secretary.

(14) 1 designee of the Watershed Conservation Authority.

(15) 1 designee of the Advisory Council for the period during which the Advisory Council remains in effect.

(16) 1 designee of San Gabriel Mountains National Monument Community Collaborative.

(d) DUTIES.—To advance the purposes described in section 411, the Partnership shall—

(1) make recommendations to the Secretary regarding the development and implementation of the management plan;

(2) review and comment on the visitor services plan under section 419(a)(2), and facilitate the implementation of that plan;

(3) assist units of local government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in advancing the purposes of the Recreation Area by—

(A) carrying out programs and projects that recognize, protect, and enhance important resource values within the Recreation Area;

(B) establishing and maintaining interpretive exhibits and programs within the Recreation Area;

(C) developing recreational and educational opportunities in the Recreation Area in accordance with the purposes of this subtitle;

(D) increasing public awareness of, and appreciation for, natural, historic, scenic, and cultural resources of the Recreation Area;

(E) ensuring that signs identifying points of public access and sites of interest are posted throughout the Recreation Area;

(F) promoting a wide range of partnerships among governments, organizations, and individuals to advance the purposes of the Recreation Area; and

(G) ensuring that management of the Recreation Area takes into consideration—

(i) local ordinances and land-use plans; and

(ii) adjacent residents and property owners;

(4) make recommendations to the Secretary regarding the appointment of members to the Advisory Council; and

(5) carry out any other actions necessary to achieve the purposes of this subtitle.

(e) AUTHORITIES.—Subject to approval by the Secretary, for the purposes of preparing and implementing the management plan, the Partnership may use Federal funds made available under this section—

(1) to make grants to the State, political subdivisions of the State, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;

(2) to enter into cooperative agreements with, or provide grants or technical assistance to, the State, political subdivisions of the State, nonprofit organizations, Federal agencies, and other interested parties;

(3) to hire and compensate staff;

(4) to obtain funds or services from any source, including funds and services provided under any other Federal law or program;

(5) to contract for goods or services; and

(6) to support activities of partners and any other activities that—

(A) advance the purposes of the Recreation Area; and

(B) are in accordance with the management plan.

(f) TERMS OF OFFICE; REAPPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—

(1) TERMS.—A member of the Partnership shall be appointed for a term of 3 years.

(2) REAPPOINTMENT.—A member may be reappointed to serve on the Partnership on the expiration of the term of service of the member.

(3) VACANCY.—A vacancy on the Partnership shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(g) QUORUM.—A quorum shall be eleven members of the Partnership. The operations of the Partnership shall not be impaired by the fact that a member has not yet been appointed as long as a quorum has been attained.

(h) CHAIRPERSON; PROCEDURES.—The Partnership shall elect a chairperson and establish such rules and procedures as it deems necessary or desirable.

(i) SERVICE WITHOUT COMPENSATION.—A member of the Partnership shall serve without compensation.

(j) DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convene the Partnership on a regular basis to carry out this subtitle.

(2) TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide to the Partnership or any member of the Partnership, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, such technical and financial assistance as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to carry out this subtitle.

(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the Partnership, a member of the Partnership, or any other public or private entity to provide technical, financial, or other assistance to carry out this subtitle.

(4) CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES ON NON-FEDERAL LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to facilitate the administration of the Recreation Area, the Secretary is authorized, subject to valid existing rights, to construct administrative or visitor use facilities on land owned by a non-profit organization, local agency, or other public entity in accordance with this title and applicable law (including regulations).

(B) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—A facility under this paragraph may only be developed—

(i) with the consent of the owner of the non-Federal land; and

(ii) in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and local laws (including regulations) and plans.

(5) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall give priority to actions that—

(A) conserve the significant natural, historic, cultural, and scenic resources of the Recreation Area; and

(B) provide educational, interpretive, and recreational opportunities consistent with the purposes of the Recreation Area.

(k) COMMITTEES.—The Partnership shall establish—

(1) a Water Technical Advisory Committee to advise the Secretary regarding water-related issues relating to the Recreation Area; and

(2) a Public Safety Advisory Committee to advise the Secretary regarding public safety issues relating to the Recreation Area.

SEC. 419. VISITOR SERVICES AND FACILITIES.

(a) VISITOR SERVICES.—

(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subsection is to facilitate the development of an integrated visitor services plan to improve visitor experiences in the Recreation Area through expanded recreational opportunities and increased interpretation, education, resource protection, and enforcement.

(2) VISITOR SERVICES PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop and carry out an integrated visitor services plan for the Recreation Area in accordance with this paragraph.

(B) CONTENTS.—The visitor services plan shall—

(i) assess current and anticipated future visitation to the Recreation Area, including recreation destinations;

(ii) consider the demand for various types of recreation (including hiking, picnicking, horseback riding, and the use of motorized and mechanized vehicles), as permissible and appropriate;

(iii) evaluate the impacts of recreation on natural and cultural resources, water rights and water resource facilities, public roads, adjacent residents and property owners, and utilities within the Recreation Area, as well as the effectiveness of current enforcement and efforts;

(iv) assess the current level of interpretive and educational services and facilities;

(v) include recommendations to—

(I) expand opportunities for high-demand recreational activities, in accordance with the purposes described in section 411;

(II) better manage Recreation Area resources and improve the experience of Recreation Area visitors through expanded interpretive and educational services and facilities, and improved enforcement; and

(III) better manage Recreation Area resources to reduce negative impacts on the environment, ecology, and integrated water management activities in the Recreation Area;

(vi) in coordination and consultation with affected owners of non-Federal land, assess options to incorporate recreational opportunities on non-Federal land into the Recreation Area—

(I) in manner consistent with the purposes and uses of the non-Federal land; and

(II) with the consent of the non-Federal landowner;

(vii) assess opportunities to provide recreational opportunities that connect with adjacent National Forest System land; and

(viii) be developed and carried out in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and local laws and ordinances.

(C) CONSULTATION.—In developing the visitor services plan, the Secretary shall—

(i) consult with—

(I) the Partnership;

(II) the Advisory Council;

(III) appropriate State and local agencies; and

(IV) interested nongovernmental organizations; and

(ii) involve members of the public.

(b) VISITOR USE FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may construct visitor use facilities in the Recreation Area.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each facility under paragraph (1) shall be developed in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and local—

(A) laws (including regulations); and

(B) plans.

(c) DONATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may accept and use donated funds, property, in-kind contributions, and services to carry out this subtitle.

(2) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary may not use the authority provided by paragraph (1) to accept non-Federal land that has been acquired after the date of the enactment of this Act through the use of eminent domain.

(d) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—In carrying out this subtitle, the Secretary may make grants to, or enter into cooperative agreements with, units of State, Tribal, and local governments and private entities to conduct research, develop scientific analyses, and carry out any other initiative relating to the management of, and visitation to, the Recreation Area.

Subtitle B—SAN GABRIEL MOUNTAINS

SEC. 421. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) WILDERNESS AREA OR ADDITION.—The term “wilderness area or addition” means any wilderness area or wilderness addition designated by section 423(a).

SEC. 422. NATIONAL MONUMENT BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The San Gabriel Mountains National Monument established by Presidential Proclamation 9194 (54 U.S.C. 320301 note) (referred to in this section as the “Monument”) is modified to include the approximately 109,167 acres of additional National Forest System land depicted as the “Proposed San Gabriel Mountains National Monument Expansion” on the map entitled “Proposed San Gabriel Mountains National Monument Expansion” and dated June 26, 2019.

(b) *ADMINISTRATION.*—The Secretary shall administer the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument, including the lands added by subsection (a), in accordance with—

(1) Presidential Proclamation 9194, as issued on October 10, 2014 (54 U.S.C. 320301 note);

(2) the laws generally applicable to the Monument; and

(3) this title.

(c) *MANAGEMENT PLAN.*—Within 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall consult with State and local governments and the interested public to update the existing San Gabriel Mountains National Monument Plan to provide management direction and protection for the lands added to the Monument by subsection (a).

SEC. 423. DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS AND ADDITIONS.

(a) *DESIGNATION.*—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following parcels of National Forest System land in the State are designated as wilderness and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) *CONDOR PEAK WILDERNESS.*—Certain Federal land in the Angeles National Forest, comprising approximately 8,207 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Condor Peak Wilderness—Proposed” and dated June 6, 2019, which shall be known as the “Condor Peak Wilderness”.

(2) *SAN GABRIEL WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.*—Certain Federal land in the Angeles National Forest, comprising approximately 2,032 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “San Gabriel Wilderness Additions” and dated June 6, 2019, which is incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the San Gabriel Wilderness designated by Public Law 90–318 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 82 Stat. 131).

(3) *SHEEP MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.*—Certain Federal land in the Angeles National Forest, comprising approximately 13,726 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Sheep Mountain Wilderness Additions” and dated June 6, 2019, which is incorporated in, and considered to be a part of, the Sheep Mountain Wilderness designated by section 101(a)(29) of the California Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 98 Stat. 1623; Public Law 98–425).

(4) *YERBA BUENA WILDERNESS.*—Certain Federal land in the Angeles National Forest, comprising approximately 6,694 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Yerba Buena Wilderness—Proposed” and dated June 6, 2019, which shall be known as the “Yerba Buena Wilderness”.

(b) *MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and a legal description of the wilderness areas and additions with—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) *FORCE OF LAW.*—The map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this subtitle, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical error in the map or legal description.

(3) *PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.*—The map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on

file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

SEC. 424. ADMINISTRATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS AND ADDITIONS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness areas and additions shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with this section and the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that any reference in that Act to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) *FIRE MANAGEMENT AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary may take such measures in a wilderness area or addition designated in section 423 as are necessary for the control of fire, insects, or diseases in accordance with—

(A) section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)); and

(B) House Report 98–40 of the 98th Congress.

(2) *FUNDING PRIORITIES.*—Nothing in this subtitle limits funding for fire or fuels management in a wilderness area or addition.

(3) *REVISION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL FIRE MANAGEMENT PLANS.*—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall amend, as applicable, any local fire management plan that applies to a wilderness area or addition designated in section 423.

(4) *ADMINISTRATION.*—In accordance with paragraph (1) and any other applicable Federal law, to ensure a timely and efficient response to a fire emergency in a wilderness area or addition, the Secretary shall—

(A) not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, establish agency approval procedures (including appropriate delegations of authority to the Forest Supervisor, District Manager, or other agency officials) for responding to fire emergencies; and

(B) enter into agreements with appropriate State or local firefighting agencies.

(c) *GRAZING.*—The grazing of livestock in a wilderness area or addition, if established before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be administered in accordance with—

(1) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(2) the guidelines contained in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (H. Rept. 101–405).

(d) *FISH AND WILDLIFE.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—In accordance with section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(7)), nothing in this subtitle affects the jurisdiction or responsibility of the State with respect to fish or wildlife on public land in the State.

(2) *MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—In furtherance of the purposes and principles of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Secretary may conduct any management activity that are necessary to maintain or restore fish or wildlife populations or habitats in the wilderness areas and wilderness additions designated in section 423, if the management activities are—

(i) consistent with relevant wilderness management plans; and

(ii) conducted in accordance with appropriate policies, such as the policies established in Appendix B of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (H. Rept. 101–405).

(B) *INCLUSIONS.*—A management activity under subparagraph (A) may include the occasional and temporary use of motorized vehicles, if the use, as determined by the Secretary, would promote healthy, viable, and more naturally distributed wildlife populations that would enhance wilderness values while causing the minimum impact necessary to accomplish those tasks.

(C) *EXISTING ACTIVITIES.*—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)) and appropriate policies (such as the policies established in Appendix B of House Report 101–405), the State may use aircraft (including helicopters) in a wilderness area or addition to survey, capture, transplant, monitor, or provide water for a wildlife population, including bighorn sheep.

(e) *BUFFER ZONES.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Congress does not intend for the designation of wilderness areas or wilderness additions by section 423 to lead to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around each wilderness area or wilderness addition.

(2) *ACTIVITIES OR USES UP TO BOUNDARIES.*—The fact that a nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from within a wilderness area or wilderness addition designated by section 423 shall not, of itself, preclude the activities or uses up to the boundary of the wilderness area or addition.

(f) *MILITARY ACTIVITIES.*—Nothing in this title precludes—

(1) low-level overflights of military aircraft over the wilderness areas or wilderness additions designated by section 423;

(2) the designation of new units of special airspace over the wilderness areas or wilderness additions designated by section 423; or

(3) the use or establishment of military flight training routes over wilderness areas or wilderness additions designated by section 423.

(g) *HORSES.*—Nothing in this subtitle precludes horseback riding in, or the entry of recreational or commercial saddle or pack stock into, an area designated as a wilderness area or wilderness addition by section 423—

(1) in accordance with section 4(d)(5) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(5)); and

(2) subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(h) *LAW ENFORCEMENT.*—Nothing in this subtitle precludes any law enforcement or drug interdiction effort within the wilderness areas or wilderness additions designated by section 423 in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

(i) *WITHDRAWAL.*—Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness areas and additions designated by section 423 are withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral materials and geothermal leasing laws.

(j) *INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.*—Any land within the boundary of a wilderness area or addition that is acquired by the United States shall—

(1) become part of the wilderness area or addition in which the land is located; and

(2) be managed in accordance with this section, the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), and any other applicable laws (including regulations).

(k) *CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA COLLECTION.*—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may authorize the installation and maintenance of hydrologic, meteorologic, or climatological collection devices in a wilderness area or addition if the Secretary determines that the facilities and access to the facilities is essential to a flood warning, flood control, or water reservoir operation activity.

(l) *AUTHORIZED EVENTS.*—The Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the Angeles Crest 100 competitive running event to continue in substantially the same manner and degree in which this event was operated and permitted in 2015 within additions to the Sheep Mountain Wilderness in section 423 of this title and the Pleasant

View Ridge Wilderness Area designated by section 1802 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009, provided that the event is authorized and conducted in a manner compatible with the preservation of the areas as wilderness.

SEC. 425. DESIGNATION OF WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—Section 3(a) of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“() **EAST FORK SAN GABRIEL RIVER, CALIFORNIA.**—The following segments of the East Fork San Gabriel River, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

“(A) The 10-mile segment from the confluence of the Prairie Fork and Vincent Gulch to 100 yards upstream of the Heaton Flats trailhead and day use area, as a wild river.

“(B) The 2.7-mile segment from 100 yards upstream of the Heaton Flats trailhead and day use area to 100 yards upstream of the confluence with Williams Canyon, as a recreational river.

“() **NORTH FORK SAN GABRIEL RIVER, CALIFORNIA.**—The 4.3-mile segment of the North Fork San Gabriel River from the confluence with Cloudburst Canyon to 0.25 miles upstream of the confluence with the West Fork San Gabriel River, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a recreational river.

“() **WEST FORK SAN GABRIEL RIVER, CALIFORNIA.**—The following segments of the West Fork San Gabriel River, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

“(A) The 6.7-mile segment from 0.25 miles downstream of its source near Red Box Gap in sec. 14, T. 2 N., R. 12 W., to the confluence with the unnamed tributary 0.25 miles downstream of the power lines in sec. 22, T. 2 N., R. 11 W., as a recreational river.

“(B) The 1.6-mile segment of the West Fork from 0.25 miles downstream of the powerlines in sec. 22, T. 2 N., R. 11 W., to the confluence with Bobcat Canyon, as a wild river.

“() **LITTLE ROCK CREEK, CALIFORNIA.**—The following segments of Little Rock Creek and tributaries, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

“(A) The 10.3-mile segment from its source on Mt. Williamson in sec. 6, T. 3 N., R. 9 W., to 100 yards upstream of the confluence with the South Fork Little Rock Creek, as a wild river.

“(B) The 6.6-mile segment from 100 yards upstream of the confluence with the South Fork Little Rock Creek to the confluence with Santiago Canyon, as a recreational river.

“(C) The 1-mile segment of Cooper Canyon Creek from 0.25 miles downstream of Highway 2 to 100 yards downstream of Cooper Canyon Campground, as a scenic river.

“(D) The 1.3-mile segment of Cooper Canyon Creek from 100 yards downstream of Cooper Canyon Campground to the confluence with Little Rock Creek, as a wild river.

“(E) The 1-mile segment of Buckhorn Creek from 100 yards downstream of the Buckhorn Campground to its confluence with Cooper Canyon Creek, as a wild river.”.

(b) WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES; AND WATER USE.

(1) **WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.**—

(A) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “water resource facility” means irrigation and pumping facilities, dams and reservoirs, flood control facilities, water conservation works and facilities, including debris protection facilities, sediment placement sites, rain gauges and stream gauges, water quality facilities, recycled water facilities and water pumping, conveyance distribution systems, water storage tanks and reservoirs, and water treatment facilities, aqueducts, canals, ditches, pipelines, wells, hydro-power projects, and transmission and other ancillary facilities, groundwater recharge facilities, water conservation, water filtration plants, and other water diversion, conservation,

groundwater recharge, storage, and carriage structures.

(B) **NO EFFECT ON EXISTING WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.**—Nothing in this section shall alter, modify, or affect—

(i) the use, operation, maintenance, repair, construction, destruction, reconfiguration, expansion, relocation or replacement of a water resource facility downstream of a wild and scenic river segment designated by this section, provided that the physical structures of such facilities or reservoirs shall not be located within the river areas designated in this section; or

(ii) access to a water resource facility downstream of a wild and scenic river segment designated by this section.

(C) **NO EFFECT ON NEW WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.**—Nothing in this section shall preclude the establishment of a new water resource facilities (including instream sites, routes, and areas) downstream of a wild and scenic river segment.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—Any new reservation of water or new use of water pursuant to existing water rights held by the United States to advance the purposes of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.) shall be for nonconsumptive instream use only within the segments designated by this section.

(3) **EXISTING LAW.**—Nothing in this section affects the implementation of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SEC. 426. WATER RIGHTS.

(a) **STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this title, and no action to implement this title—

(1) shall constitute an express or implied reservation of any water or water right, or authorizing an expansion of water use pursuant to existing water rights held by the United States, with respect to the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument, the land designated as a wilderness area or wilderness addition by section 423 or land adjacent to the wild and scenic river segments designated by the amendment made by section 425;

(2) shall affect, alter, modify, or condition any water rights in the State in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act, including any water rights held by the United States;

(3) shall be construed as establishing a precedent with regard to any future wilderness or wild and scenic river designations;

(4) shall affect, alter, or modify the interpretation of, or any designation, decision, adjudication or action made pursuant to, any other Act; or

(5) shall be construed as limiting, altering, modifying, or amending any of the interstate compacts or equitable apportionment decrees that apportions water among or between the State and any other State.

(b) **STATE WATER LAW.**—The Secretary shall comply with applicable procedural and substantive requirements of the law of the State in order to obtain and hold any water rights not in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument, wilderness areas and wilderness additions designated by section 423, and the wild and scenic rivers designated by amendment made by section 425.

TITLE V—RIM OF THE VALLEY CORRIDOR PRESERVATION

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act”.

SEC. 502. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT; LAND ACQUISITION; ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**—Section 507(c)(1) of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460kk(c)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “, which shall” and inserting “ and generally depicted as ‘Rim of the Valley Unit Proposed Addition’ on the map entitled ‘Rim of the Valley Unit—Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area’, numbered 638/147,723, and dated September 2018. Both maps shall”.

(b) **RIM OF THE VALLEY UNIT.**—Section 507 of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460kk) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(u) **RIM OF THE VALLEY UNIT.**—(1) Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall update the general management plan for the recreation area to reflect the boundaries designated on the map referred to in subsection (c)(1) as the ‘Rim of the Valley Unit’ (hereafter in the subsection referred to as the ‘Rim of the Valley Unit’). Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall administer the Rim of the Valley Unit, and any land or interest in land acquired by the United States and located within the boundaries of the Rim of the Valley Unit, as part of the recreation area in accordance with the provisions of this section and applicable laws and regulations.

“(2) The Secretary may acquire non-Federal land within the boundaries of the Rim of the Valley Unit only through exchange, donation, or purchase from a willing seller. Nothing in this subsection authorizes the use of eminent domain to acquire land or interests in land.

“(3) Nothing in this subsection or the application of the management plan for the Rim of the Valley Unit shall be construed to—

“(A) modify any provision of Federal, State, or local law with respect to public access to or use of non-Federal land;

“(B) create any liability, or affect any liability under any other law, of any private property owner or other owner of non-Federal land with respect to any person injured on private property or other non-Federal land;

“(C) affect the ownership, management, or other rights relating to any non-Federal land (including any interest in any non-Federal land);

“(D) require any local government to participate in any program administered by the Secretary;

“(E) alter, modify, or diminish any right, responsibility, power, authority, jurisdiction, or entitlement of the State, any political subdivision of the State, or any State or local agency under existing Federal, State, and local law (including regulations);

“(F) require the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones, and the fact that certain activities or land can be seen or heard from within the Rim of the Valley Unit shall not, of itself, preclude the activities or land uses up to the boundary of the Rim of the Valley Unit;

“(G) require or promote use of, or encourage trespass on, lands, facilities, and rights-of-way owned by non-Federal entities, including water resource facilities and public utilities, without the written consent of the owner;

“(H) affect the operation, maintenance, modification, construction, or expansion of any water resource facility or utility facility located within or adjacent to the Rim of the Valley Unit;

“(I) terminate the fee title to lands or customary operation, maintenance, repair, and replacement activities on or under such lands granted to public agencies that are authorized pursuant to Federal or State statute;

“(J) interfere with, obstruct, hinder, or delay the exercise of any right to, or access to any water resource facility or other facility or property necessary or useful to access any water right to operate any public water or utility system;

“(K) require initiation or reinitiation of consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service under, or the application of provisions of, the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), or division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code, concerning any action or activity affecting water, water rights or water management or water resource facilities within the Rim of the Valley Unit; or

“(L) limit the Secretary’s ability to update applicable fire management plans, which may consider fuels management strategies including managed natural fire, prescribed fires, non-fire mechanical hazardous fuel reduction activities, or post-fire remediation of damage to natural and cultural resources.

“(4) The activities of a utility facility or water resource facility shall take into consideration ways to reasonably avoid or reduce the impact on the resources of the Rim of the Valley Unit.

“(5) For the purpose of paragraph (4)—

“(A) the term ‘utility facility’ means electric substations, communication facilities, towers, poles, and lines, ground wires, communications circuits, and other structures, and related infrastructure; and

“(B) the term ‘water resource facility’ means irrigation and pumping facilities; dams and reservoirs; flood control facilities; water conservation works, including debris protection facilities, sediment placement sites, rain gauges, and stream gauges; water quality, recycled water, and pumping facilities; conveyance distribution systems; water treatment facilities; aqueducts; canals; ditches; pipelines; wells; hydropower projects; transmission facilities; and other ancillary facilities, groundwater recharge facilities, water conservation, water filtration plants, and other water diversion, conservation, groundwater recharge, storage, and carriage structures.”.

TITLE VI—WILD OLYMPICS WILDERNESS AND WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Wild Olympics Wilderness and Wild and Scenic Rivers Act”.

SEC. 602. DESIGNATION OF OLYMPIC NATIONAL FOREST WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In furtherance of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following Federal land in the Olympic National Forest in the State of Washington comprising approximately 126,554 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Wild Olympics Wilderness and Wild and Scenic Rivers Act” and dated April 8, 2019 (referred to in this section as the “map”), is designated as wilderness and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) **LOST CREEK WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 7,159 acres, as generally depicted on the map, which shall be known as the “Lost Creek Wilderness”.

(2) **RUGGED RIDGE WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 5,956 acres, as generally depicted on the map, which shall be known as the “Rugged Ridge Wilderness”.

(3) **ALCKEE CREEK WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 1,787 acres, as generally depicted on the map, which shall be known as the “Alckee Creek Wilderness”.

(4) **GATES OF THE ELWHA WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 5,669 acres, as generally depicted on the map, which shall be known as the “Gates of the Elwha Wilderness”.

(5) **BUCKHORN WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 21,965 acres, as generally depicted on the map, is incorporated in, and shall be managed as part of, the “Buckhorn Wilderness”, as designated by section 3 of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 98-339).

(6) **GREEN MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 4,790 acres, as generally depicted on the map, which shall be known as the “Green Mountain Wilderness”.

(7) **THE BROTHERS WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.**—Certain land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 8,625 acres, as generally depicted on the map, is incorporated in,

and shall be managed as part of, the “The Brothers Wilderness”, as designated by section 3 of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 98-339).

(8) **MOUNT SKOKOMISH WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.**—Certain land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 8,933 acres, as generally depicted on the map, is incorporated in, and shall be managed as part of, the “Mount Skokomish Wilderness”, as designated by section 3 of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 98-339).

(9) **WONDER MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.**—Certain land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 26,517 acres, as generally depicted on the map, is incorporated in, and shall be managed as part of, the “Wonder Mountain Wilderness”, as designated by section 3 of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 98-339).

(10) **MOONLIGHT DOME WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 9,117 acres, as generally depicted on the map, which shall be known as the “Moonlight Dome Wilderness”.

(11) **SOUTH QUINULT RIDGE WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 10,887 acres, as generally depicted on the map, which shall be known as the “South Quinault Ridge Wilderness”.

(12) **COLONEL BOB WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 353 acres, as generally depicted on the map, is incorporated in, and shall be managed as part of, the “Colonel Bob Wilderness”, as designated by section 3 of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 98-339).

(13) **SAM’S RIVER WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 13,418 acres, as generally depicted on the map, which shall be known as the “Sam’s River Wilderness”.

(14) **CANOE CREEK WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 1,378 acres, as generally depicted on the map, which shall be known as the “Canoe Creek Wilderness”.

(b) **ADMINISTRATION.**—

(1) **MANAGEMENT.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the land designated as wilderness by subsection (a) shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”), in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that any reference in that Act to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **MAP AND DESCRIPTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and a legal description of the land designated as wilderness by subsection (a) with—

(i) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(B) **EFFECT.**—Each map and legal description filed under subparagraph (A) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct minor errors in the map and legal description.

(C) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Each map and legal description filed under subparagraph (A) shall be filed and made available for public inspection in the appropriate office of the Forest Service.

(c) **POTENTIAL WILDERNESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain Federal land managed by the Forest Service, comprising approximately 5,346 acres as identified as “Potential Wilderness” on the map, is designated as potential wilderness.

(2) **DESIGNATION AS WILDERNESS.**—On the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register notice that any nonconforming uses in the potential wilderness designated by paragraph (1) have terminated, the potential wilderness shall be—

(A) designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System; and

(B) incorporated into the adjacent wilderness area.

(d) **ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **NO PROTECTIVE PERIMETERS OR BUFFER ZONES.**—The designations in this section shall not create a protective perimeter or buffer zone around any wilderness area.

(2) **NONCONFORMING USES PERMITTED OUTSIDE OF BOUNDARIES OF WILDERNESS AREAS.**—Any activity or use outside of the boundary of any wilderness area designated under this section shall be permitted even if the activity or use would be seen or heard within the boundary of the wilderness area.

(e) **FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.**—The Secretary may take such measures as are necessary to control fire, insects, and diseases, in the wilderness areas designated by this section, in accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)) and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 603. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3(a) of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(231) **ELWHA RIVER, WASHINGTON.**—The approximately 29.0-mile segment of the Elwha River and tributaries from the source to Cat Creek, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a wild river.

“(232) **DUNGENESS RIVER, WASHINGTON.**—The segment of the Dungeness River from the headwaters to the State of Washington Department of Natural Resources land in T. 29 N., R. 4 W., sec. 12, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, except that portions of the river within the boundaries of Olympic National Park shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, including the following segments of the mainstem and major tributary the Gray Wolf River, in the following classes:

“(A) The approximately 5.8-mile segment of the Dungeness River from the headwaters to the 2870 Bridge, as a wild river.

“(B) The approximately 2.1-mile segment of the Dungeness River from the 2870 Bridge to Silver Creek, as a scenic river.

“(C) The approximately 2.7-mile segment of the Dungeness River from Silver Creek to Sleepy Hollow Creek, as a wild river.

“(D) The approximately 6.3-mile segment of the Dungeness River from Sleepy Hollow Creek to the Olympic National Forest boundary, as a scenic river.

“(E) The approximately 1.9-mile segment of the Dungeness River from the National Forest boundary to the State of Washington Department of Natural Resources land in T. 29 N., R. 4 W., sec. 12, as a recreational river.

“(F) The approximately 16.1-mile segment of the Gray Wolf River from the headwaters to the 2870 Bridge, as a wild river.

“(G) The approximately 1.1-mile segment of the Gray Wolf River from the 2870 Bridge to the confluence with the Dungeness River, as a scenic river.

“(233) **BIG QUILCENE RIVER, WASHINGTON.**—The segment of the Big Quilcene River from the headwaters to the City of Port Townsend water intake facility, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, in the following classes:

“(A) The approximately 4.4-mile segment from the headwaters to the Buckhorn Wilderness boundary, as a wild river.

“(B) The approximately 5.3-mile segment from the Buckhorn Wilderness boundary to the City of Port Townsend water intake facility, as a scenic river.

“(C) Section 7(a), with respect to the licensing of dams, water conduits, reservoirs, powerhouses, transmission lines, or other project works, shall apply to the approximately 5-mile segment from the City of Port Townsend water intake facility to the Olympic National Forest boundary.

“(234) DOSEWALLIPS RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The segment of the Dosewallips River from the headwaters to the private land in T. 26 N., R. 3 W., sec. 15, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, except that portions of the river within the boundaries of Olympic National Park shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in the following classes:

“(A) The approximately 12.9-mile segment from the headwaters to Station Creek, as a wild river.

“(B) The approximately 6.8-mile segment from Station Creek to the private land in T. 26 N., R. 3 W., sec. 15, as a scenic river.

“(235) DUCKABUSH RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The segment of the Duckabush River from the headwaters to the private land in T. 25 N., R. 3 W., sec. 1, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, except that portions of the river within the boundaries of Olympic National Park shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in the following classes:

“(A) The approximately 19.0-mile segment from the headwaters to the Brothers Wilderness boundary, as a wild river.

“(B) The approximately 1.9-mile segment from the Brothers Wilderness boundary to the private land in T. 25 N., R. 3 W., sec. 1, as a scenic river.

“(236) HAMMA HAMMA RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The segment of the Hamma Hamma River from the headwaters to the eastern edge of the NW1/4 sec. 21, T. 24 N., R. 3 W., to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, in the following classes:

“(A) The approximately 3.1-mile segment from the headwaters to the Mt. Skokomish Wilderness boundary, as a wild river.

“(B) The approximately 5.8-mile segment from the Mt. Skokomish Wilderness boundary to Lena Creek, as a scenic river.

“(C) The approximately 6.8-mile segment from Lena Creek to the eastern edge of the NW1/4 sec. 21, T. 24 N., R. 3 W., as a recreational river.

“(237) SOUTH FORK SKOKOMISH RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The segment of the South Fork Skokomish River from the headwaters to the Olympic National Forest boundary to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, in the following classes:

“(A) The approximately 6.7-mile segment from the headwaters to Church Creek, as a wild river.

“(B) The approximately 8.3-mile segment from Church Creek to LeBar Creek, as a scenic river.

“(C) The approximately 4.0-mile segment from LeBar Creek to upper end of gorge in the NW1/4 sec. 22, T. 22 N., R. 5 W., as a recreational river.

“(D) The approximately 6.0-mile segment from the upper end of the gorge to the Olympic National Forest boundary, as a scenic river.

“(238) MIDDLE FORK SATSOP RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The approximately 7.9-mile segment of the Middle Fork Satsop River from the headwaters to the Olympic National Forest boundary, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, as a scenic river.

“(239) WEST FORK SATSOP RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The approximately 8.2-mile segment of the West Fork Satsop River from the headwaters to the Olympic National Forest boundary, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, as a scenic river.

“(240) WYNOOCHEE RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The segment of the Wynoochee River from the headwaters to the head of Wynoochee Reservoir to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, except that portions of the river within the boundaries of Olympic National Park shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in the following classes:

“(A) The approximately 2.5-mile segment from the headwaters to the boundary of the Wonder Mountain Wilderness, as a wild river.

“(B) The approximately 7.4-mile segment from the boundary of the Wonder Mountain Wilderness to the head of Wynoochee Reservoir, as a recreational river.

“(241) EAST FORK HUMPTULIPS RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The segment of the East Fork Humptulips River from the headwaters to the Olympic National Forest boundary to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, in the following classes:

“(A) The approximately 7.4-mile segment from the headwaters to the Moonlight Dome Wilderness boundary, as a wild river.

“(B) The approximately 10.3-mile segment from the Moonlight Dome Wilderness boundary to the Olympic National Forest boundary, as a scenic river.

“(242) WEST FORK HUMPTULIPS RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The approximately 21.4-mile segment of the West Fork Humptulips River from the headwaters to the Olympic National Forest boundary, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, as a scenic river.

“(243) QUINULT RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The segment of the Quinault River from the headwaters to private land in T. 24 N., R. 8 W., sec. 33, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in the following classes:

“(A) The approximately 16.5-mile segment from the headwaters to Graves Creek, as a wild river.

“(B) The approximately 6.7-mile segment from Graves Creek to Cannings Creek, as a scenic river.

“(C) The approximately 1.0-mile segment from Cannings Creek to private land in T. 24 N., R. 8 W., sec. 33, as a recreational river.

“(244) QUEETS RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The segment of the Queets River from the headwaters to the Olympic National Park boundary to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, except that portions of the river outside the boundaries of Olympic National Park shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, including the following segments of the mainstem and certain tributaries in the following classes:

“(A) The approximately 28.6-mile segment of the Queets River from the headwaters to the confluence with Sams River, as a wild river.

“(B) The approximately 16.0-mile segment of the Queets River from the confluence with Sams River to the Olympic National Park boundary, as a scenic river.

“(C) The approximately 15.7-mile segment of the Sams River from the headwaters to the confluence with the Queets River, as a scenic river.

“(D) The approximately 17.7-mile segment of Matheny Creek from the headwaters to the confluence with the Queets River, as a scenic river.

“(245) HOH RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The segment of the Hoh River and the major tributary South Fork Hoh from the headwaters to Olympic National Park boundary, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in the following classes:

“(A) The approximately 20.7-mile segment of the Hoh River from the headwaters to Jackson Creek, as a wild river.

“(B) The approximately 6.0-mile segment of the Hoh River from Jackson Creek to the Olympic National Park boundary, as a scenic river.

“(C) The approximately 13.8-mile segment of the South Fork Hoh River from the headwaters to the Olympic National Park boundary, as a wild river.

“(D) The approximately 4.6-mile segment of the South Fork Hoh River from the Olympic National Park boundary to the Washington State Department of Natural Resources boundary in T. 27 N., R. 10 W., sec. 29, as a recreational river.

“(246) BOGACHIEL RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The approximately 25.6-mile segment of the Bogachiel River from the source to the Olympic National Park boundary, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, as a wild river.

“(247) SOUTH FORK CALAWAH RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The segment of the South Fork Calawah River and the major tributary Sitkum River from the headwaters to Hyas Creek to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, except those portions of the river within the boundaries of Olympic National Park shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, including the following segments in the following classes:

“(A) The approximately 15.7-mile segment of the South Fork Calawah River from the headwaters to the Sitkum River, as a wild river.

“(B) The approximately 0.9-mile segment of the South Fork Calawah River from the Sitkum River to Hyas Creek, as a scenic river.

“(C) The approximately 1.6-mile segment of the Sitkum River from the headwaters to the Rugged Ridge Wilderness boundary, as a wild river.

“(D) The approximately 11.9-mile segment of the Sitkum River from the Rugged Ridge Wilderness boundary to the confluence with the South Fork Calawah, as a scenic river.

“(248) SOL DUC RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The segment of the Sol Duc River from the headwaters to the Olympic National Park boundary to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, including the following segments of the mainstem and certain tributaries in the following classes:

“(A) The approximately 7.0-mile segment of the Sol Duc River from the headwaters to the end of Sol Duc Hot Springs Road, as a wild river.

“(B) The approximately 10.8-mile segment of the Sol Duc River from the end of Sol Duc Hot Springs Road to the Olympic National Park boundary, as a scenic river.

“(C) The approximately 14.2-mile segment of the North Fork Sol Duc River from the headwaters to the Olympic Hot Springs Road bridge, as a wild river.

“(D) The approximately 0.2-mile segment of the North Fork Sol Duc River from the Olympic Hot Springs Road bridge to the confluence with the Sol Duc River, as a scenic river.

“(E) The approximately 8.0-mile segment of the South Fork Sol Duc River from the headwaters to the confluence with the Sol Duc River, as a scenic river.

“(249) LYRE RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The approximately 0.2-mile segment of the Lyre River from Lake Crescent to the Olympic National Park boundary, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a scenic river.”.

(b) EFFECT.—The amendment made by subsection (a) does not affect valid existing water rights.

SEC. 604. EXISTING RIGHTS AND WITHDRAWAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 12(b) of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1283(b)), nothing in this title or the amendment made by section 603(a) affects or abrogates existing rights, privileges, or contracts held by private parties, nor does this title in any way modify or direct the management, acquisition, or disposition of lands managed by the Washington Department of Natural Resources on behalf of the State of Washington.

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land within the boundaries of the river segments designated by this title and the amendment made by section 603(a) is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

SEC. 605. TREATY RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title alters, modifies, diminishes, or extinguishes the reserved treaty rights of any Indian tribe with hunting, fishing, gathering, and cultural or religious rights in the

Olympic National Forest as protected by a treaty.

TITLE VII—PAYGO

SEC. 701. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 116-395. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1330

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. DEGETTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 116-395.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, lines 18 and 19, strike "'Cross Canyon Proposed Wilderness', dated October 9, 2019" and insert "'Papoose & Cross Canyon Proposed Wilderness', and dated January 29, 2020".

Page 12, after line 13, insert the following:
(20) Certain lands managed by the Tres Rios Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management or located in the San Juan National Forest, which comprise approximately 10,844 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled "North & South Ponderosa Gorge Proposed Wilderness", and dated January 31, 2020, which shall be known as the North Ponderosa Gorge Wilderness.

(21) Certain lands managed by the Tres Rios Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management or located in the San Juan National Forest, which comprise approximately 12,393 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled "North & South Ponderosa Gorge Proposed Wilderness", and dated January 31, 2020 which shall be known as the South Ponderosa Gorge Wilderness.

(22) Certain lands managed by the Little Snake Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management which comprise approximately 33,168 acres, as generally depicted on a map titled "Diamond Breaks Proposed Wilderness", and dated January 31, 2020 which shall be known as the Diamond Breaks Wilderness.

(23) Certain lands managed by the Tres Rios Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management which comprises approximately 4,782 acres, as generally depicted on the map titled "Papoose & Cross Canyon Proposed Wilderness", and dated January 29, 2020 which shall be known as the Papoose Canyon Wilderness.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, the amendment I offer today adds four additional unique wilderness areas to the State of Colorado, totaling more than 60,000 acres to our bill, the Protecting America's Wilderness Act.

The addition of these areas stems from extensive conversations I had with local stakeholders, Tribes, and outdoor recreation groups.

The first one is Diamond Breaks, a wilderness study area in northwest Colorado that is attached to our State's beloved Dinosaur National Monument. This area was recommended for wilderness designation by the Bureau of Land Management under George H.W. Bush. It is a favorite among the many rafters, kayakers, and canoers who visit the national monument every year, and preserving it has been a priority for many conservation groups in my State.

Protecting this land will help provide economic security for an area of the State that depends heavily on our outdoor recreation economy.

The amendment also further protects Papoose Canyon, another wilderness study area in southwest Colorado, near Cross Canyon, which is the area I mentioned that I visited last August.

Papoose Canyon has been a wilderness study area since 1980. It lies within the Canyon of the Ancients National Monument and, with an estimated 100 ancestral Puebloan sites per square mile, has significant cultural value. By officially designating this area as federally protected wilderness, we will permanently preserve this sacred land for generations to come.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this amendment protects north and south Ponderosa Gorge, which is often referred to as the Southwest Secret of Colorado. According to the Bureau of Land Management, nearly 13,000 visitors come to this region every month during its peak season. It is a favorite among those looking to launch their non-motorized boats on the Dolores River or backpack into the Chemehuevi Mountains. Protecting this land has also been a priority for conservationists in Colorado for decades.

While each of these areas that would be protected under this amendment is unique, they are some of the most incredible wilderness that our State has to offer. Countless Coloradans, when they found that this bill was coming forward, came and asked me to include these three unique areas in the legislation.

Mr. Chair, I hope my colleagues will honor their request and accept this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I do rise in opposition to the amendment before us.

Apparently, the bill that is before us today didn't include enough wilderness in my district. As we see in this amendment, we are now trying to be able to add more.

The amendment adds an additional 60,000 acres of wilderness in Colorado. One proposed addition that is particularly concerning, because it has local opposition, is the Papoose Canyon. Montezuma and Dolores Counties oppose the wilderness designation of Papoose Canyon.

The wilderness study area falls within the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument, which I have worked to preserve. The land already has strict Federal protections so wilderness designation is not necessary.

Mr. Chairman, again, the BLM has studied these lands and found them to be unsuitable for wilderness. Montezuma and Dolores Counties have requested the Papoose Canyon Wilderness Study Area be released because the canyon is surrounded by private land, which has created challenges when it comes to wildfire prevention.

Papoose Canyon Wilderness was not originally in my colleague's bill. Instead of consulting the counties that would be impacted by the addition and considering their objections, we are here debating a last-minute amendment.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I would encourage my colleagues who believe that local voices must be a part of any land management decision to vote "no."

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

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

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from a coalition of groups—the San Juan Citizens Alliance, the Sierra Club, the Sheep Mountain Alliance, the Conservatives for Responsible Stewardship, and the Western Colorado Alliance—urging me to include these areas in the bill.

FEBRUARY 4, 2020.

Hon. DIANA DEGETTE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. DEGETTE: Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Colorado Wilderness Act, HR 2546. We appreciate your relentless leadership in pursuit of protecting Colorado's BLM wild lands.

It's worth recalling that your original proposal first introduced in 1999 encompassed 49 areas and almost 1.4 million acres, and was the result of field work completed by conservationists over the prior 20 years. The Colorado Wilderness Act has evolved over time, and most recently includes about 30 areas with a little over 600,000 acres.

There are several areas we wanted to highlight as HR 2546 moves towards consideration by the House of Representatives. One area consistently included in every version of the bill since 1999 is Snaggletooth, an area that encompasses the spectacular ponderosa gorge of the Dolores River Canyon. Snaggletooth was removed from the bill during consideration by the House Natural Resources Committee, but we believe that with some modest boundary adjustments and clarifications about nearby rights-of-way corridors that Snaggletooth can be reincorporated into the legislation. It is without

doubt one of the BLM's crown jewels in Colorado.

Papoose Canyon is one of three wilderness study areas in Canyons of the Ancients National Monument. It was included in the Colorado Wilderness Act through 2007, but then inexplicably omitted from subsequent bills. Papoose is adjacent to Cross Canyon, and provides added protection for some of the richest cultural resource concentrations in the Southwest. Like Cross Canyon, it is outside the McElmo Dome carbon dioxide reserves and is unlikely to provide any conflict with energy minerals. We encourage your inclusion of Papoose Canyon WSA in the Colorado Wilderness Act as the other WSAs in Canyons of the Ancients National Monument are already in the bill.

While we might hope that National Monument designation provided a level of conservation certainty, in the past few years we have observed that an Administration hostile to the Antiquities Act could well pursue actions to undermine or eliminate the National Monument status of Canyons of the Ancients. Wilderness designation is a congressional action that cannot be overturned at the whim of the executive branch and is the tried and true approach to guaranteeing the wildlands resources, wildlife habitat, and undisturbed cultural resources of Papoose Canyon will be preserved into the future.

In 2009, you deferred to an effort by BLM to undertake re-evaluation of wilderness candidate areas in northwest Colorado, including a number of areas surrounding Dinosaur National Monument that BLM had long recognized for their wilderness values, and removed those areas from the Colorado Wilderness Act. Unfortunately, once BLM's unsuccessful wilderness re-inventory concluded, these areas from northwest Colorado that had previously been included within every version of the Colorado Wilderness Act from 1999 through 2007 were not reincorporated into the legislation. We encourage you to revisit the status of these areas and consider adding them back into the Colorado Wilderness Act. These include one of the largest Wilderness Study Areas in Colorado, Diamond Breaks, which is bounded both by Dinosaur National Monument and Browns Park National Wildlife Refuge. Additional wilderness quality lands surround Dinosaur National Monument, and include the stunning Yampa River gorge through Cross Mountain, sandstone canyons across the southern approaches to the Monument, and extraordinary wildlife habitat on Cold Spring Mountain.

Diamond Breaks straddles the Colorado-Utah border. For many years, America's Red Rock Wilderness legislation has been pending that includes the Utah portion of Diamond Breaks. Most recently, America's Red Rock Wilderness Act was reintroduced with 16 cosponsors in the Senate, S. 3056, that once again includes wilderness designation for the Utah portion of Diamond Breaks. In 2017, a companion House bill was introduced, HR 2044, cosponsored by 123 members of the House and similarly included wilderness designation for Diamond Breaks in Utah. Pairing Colorado legislation that completes designation for the Colorado portion of Diamond Breaks makes obvious sense.

We are hopeful the Colorado Wilderness Act, HR 2546 will be favorably approved by the House. We look forward to working with your office and Senate colleagues to further refine the Colorado Wilderness Act and see it successfully enacted into law.

Respectfully yours,

MARK PEARSON,
Executive Director,
San Juan Citizens
Alliance.

JIM ALEXEE,

Colorado Chapter Director,
Sierra Club.

LEXI TUDDENHAM,
Executive Director,
Sheep Mountain Alliance.

STEVE BONOWSKI,
Colorado-based Board member,
Conservatives for Responsible Stewardship.

EMILY HORNBACK,
Executive Director,
Western Colorado Alliance.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, these areas have all been protected for years. Two of them have already been wilderness study areas, and as I mentioned, they are in the area of the State where there is widespread public support and where they also are great economic drivers. They are appropriately contained in this bill.

As I said, when these groups found out that this bill was moving along, they urged me to include these really important historical and recreational areas in the bill.

Mr. Chair, one last thing: I forgot to thank Steve Bonowski, who is with Conservatives for Responsible Stewardship. He has been a real partner with us throughout, making the conservative argument of why we need to protect wilderness.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, I do appreciate the comments. Here is the reality: In the Canyon of the Ancients in the area that I am speaking to, these are already protected lands. The BLM, when we are talking about a wilderness study area, has stated that these do not qualify as wilderness.

When we look at our county commissioners, they are going to be the ones in our remote rural areas who are going to be responsible for dealing with the potential of wildfire, which is something that all Coloradans ought to be well concerned about.

Without their support, with recognition that this land is protected, and with the BLM stating that this does not qualify as a wilderness area, I would encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 116-395.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 234, after line 21, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent provisions accordingly):

TITLE VII—COUNTY APPROVAL OF WILDERNESS DESIGNATIONS

SEC. 701. COUNTY APPROVAL.

No wilderness designation under this Act shall be effective in any county until the county formally approves such designation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government owns just seven-tenths of 1 percent of the State of New York. It owns 1.1 percent of the State of Illinois. It owns just 1.8 percent of the entire State of Texas. In fact, the Federal Government only owns one-fourth of Washington, D.C.

But then go farther west, and you will see the problem. The Federal Government owns and controls 62 percent of the State of Alaska, two-thirds of Utah, and four-fifths of the State of Nevada. It owns nearly half of my home State of California. In one county in my district, Alpine County, the Federal Government owns 96 percent.

People from the East have no idea what that means. That is all lands that is off the local tax rolls. That is all land that carries increasingly severe restrictions on public use and access, which means it is generating very little economic activity for those regions. Often, Federal ownership means the Federal land-use policies are in direct contravention to the wishes of the local communities that are entangled with it.

Now, when we Republicans held the majority, one of our Federal lands objectives was to restore the Federal Government as a good neighbor to those communities directly impacted by the Federal lands. The bill before us does exactly the opposite. This bill adds 1½ million acres of Federal land to wilderness restrictions, meaning you can't even bring a stroller on these lands.

This land grab is strongly opposed by the local communities it would directly affect. The Mesa County commission and Garfield County, Colorado, oppose this bill because of concerns it will further restrict public access and increase the risk of fire. The Congressmen representing those areas opposes the legislation.

Mr. Chair, 80 percent of Del Norte County in California is already owned by the State and Federal Governments,

and their board of supervisors is protesting the further restriction of public access to these lands, noting that these lands don't even meet wilderness criteria.

Trinity County has also formally opposed the bill, yet we are plowing ahead anyway. The Monrovia City Council protests the enormous economic burdens this bill would place on their city. So, too, the Grays Harbor County Commission and the city councils of Aberdeen and Cosmopolis in Washington State beg us not to impose these restrictions on their communities, and I could go on.

Representing the Sierra Nevada of California, I can tell you there are no more fierce or knowledgeable guardians of our forests than the people who live among them. My amendment simply restores the good neighbor policy the Republicans practiced for many years. It simply provides that wilderness restrictions cannot be imposed until the county on which the land is located approves of them.

Mr. Chair, I would ask my Democratic colleagues to show a little humility and a little mercy in exercising their power by listening to the people most affected by their decisions and adopt this amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, I am so glad the author of this amendment has asked us to listen to the people who this affects because we have.

That is why we found out that 71 percent of the people in the affected areas, the citizens, support this legislation.

That is why when I went to Cortez, Colorado, and had a townhall and there were 75 people there, 65 of them said they were in support of the wilderness areas.

We shouldn't allow one or two local elected officials, or even Members of Congress, to have veto power over preservation of Federal lands for future generations.

If this amendment were adopted and the bill enacted, local governments would be able to indefinitely delay a Federal land designation approved by the House, the Senate, and signed into law by the President.

Wilderness designation, which is the highest level of protection that we bestow, is solely at the discretion of Congress and has been so since the original Wilderness Act. It is intended to provide permanent protection for exceptional landscapes, and it is a key tool for preserving undisturbed lands.

So what are we going to do? Are we going to be at the whim of local elections to decide who should support it? And who decides? Why do the county commissioners get veto power? What about the mayors and city councils?

While the Montezuma County commissioners may oppose the designation

of the wilderness study areas, the Cortez City Council and the mayor support it.

That is why we have to hear what the people have to say. No individual elected official, from a commissioner to a Member of Congress, should have the ability to unilaterally veto these things.

All the areas included in all the titles of this bill are the result of multiyear collaborative efforts between bill sponsors and stakeholders on the ground.

We have to remember that these lands are publicly owned. They are not privately owned. They belong to every American and future generations.

Frankly, I think that, as Members of Congress, we have the responsibility to listen to our constituents and to listen to the people of the United States, and the people of the United States want to preserve the very few special remaining wild places that we have.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would simply ask the gentlewoman, if it is true that local people affected by this bill actually support it, then what does she have to fear from getting their approval? Her opposition to this amendment puts the lie to her claim that the local people support it and tells us she doesn't believe her own rhetoric.

Gifford Pinchot, the father of the U.S. Forest Service, propounded maxims for good behavior by foresters. He said, among other things:

A public official is there to serve the public and not run them.

Public support of acts affecting public rights is absolutely required.

It is more trouble to consult the public than to ignore them, but that is what you were hired to do.

Get rid of an attitude of personal arrogance or pride of attainment of superior knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, this bill turns these maxims upside down.

□ 1345

It says to local residents: We know what's best for you and your communities; your opinions are unimportant to us, your wishes are irrelevant, and your voices are unheard. We're in charge and we'll damn well do as we please.

I ask my Democratic colleagues to step back and consider how you would react to a government that takes such an attitude as that.

My amendment simply asks the people and trusts the people. If we are still a government of, by, and for the people, that is the least we can do.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 116-395.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 234, after line 21, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent provisions accordingly):

TITLE VII—PRESERVING WILDERNESS CHARACTER AND WILD AND SCENIC RIVER CHARACTER

SEC. 701. PRESERVING WILDERNESS AND WILD AND SCENIC RIVER CHARACTER.

(a) WILDERNESS.—The Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, may exempt from any wilderness designated under this Act any area determined by that Secretary not to meet the definition of wilderness under the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

(b) WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS.—The Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, may exempt from any wild and scenic river designated by an amendment in this Act any area determined by that Secretary not to meet the qualifications for a wild, scenic, or recreational river under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, when the Wilderness Act was adopted in 1964, it designated about 9 million acres; that is a little larger than the State of Maryland. Over the years, that has ballooned to 111 million acres, a land area the size of California. This bill adds 1½ million acres more. That is the size of Delaware and half of Rhode Island combined.

The restrictions in the wilderness areas are severe. You can't bring a bicycle on these lands. You can't drive to a campsite.

The Wilderness Act provides for wilderness designation only for those lands that are—and listen to this carefully—"an area where the Earth and community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain" and "an area of underdeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions."

Well, much of the land in this bill doesn't begin to meet these criteria. The Department of the Interior, and the local communities directly affected by this bill, are warning us that this

new Federal land grab includes acreage on which there are buildings and roads, grazing and off-road vehicle trails, bicycle trails, communication towers, small businesses, mines and oil wells.

Moreover, motorized and mechanized firefighting and fire suppression equipment is currently allowed on these lands but would be severely restricted if the land is designated as wilderness. All you can use in a wilderness area, without special permission, is a hand-saw, a shovel, and an axe to fight a fire.

To include such acreage under the Wilderness Act makes a mockery of its original intent and poses a direct threat to the tourism, livelihoods, jobs, safety, and quality of life of the communities adjacent to them.

Abraham Lincoln once told of the farmer who said: "I ain't greedy for land. All I want is what's next to mine." That appears to be the new motto of the Democrats, and it is having a devastating impact on our mountain and rural communities.

The amendment I offer simply provides that the relevant Department Secretary, either Agriculture or Interior, can exempt those lands contained in this bill that do not meet the legal requirements of the Wilderness Act or the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, restoring the original intent of these laws.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, this amendment, just like the prior amendment, is another attempt to cede congressional responsibility.

I can assure the gentleman that every piece of land in this bill that is designated as wilderness is, in fact, wilderness. The gentleman is right; in the statutory definition of wilderness there is no mechanized or motorized equipment. There is no mining or drilling. I will say, for firefighting, you don't just have to use shovels; you can use other things.

But, be that as it may, wilderness should be reserved for those very few special areas that are untrammelled by man, just like the Wilderness Act says.

I will also guarantee, Mr. Chair, that every acre that is designated wilderness has been gone over by the sponsors, by the citizens, by the activists, and it qualifies as wilderness.

In the Colorado Wilderness Act, two-thirds of the areas have been managed as wilderness because they are wilderness study areas, and they have been managed as wilderness for over 30 years; so these areas are wilderness.

Why, then, would I object to this amendment? Because what it does is it cedes Congress' powers to the executive branch. And, frankly, with this administration, that is the last thing I think we should do in deciding what wilderness is.

If this amendment were adopted and the bill was enacted, Secretary Bernhardt would be unilaterally empowered to veto designations of wilderness enacted by Congress and signed by the President.

This amendment would give unprecedented and problematic power to the Secretary to override Congress, based on no criteria, other than what they wanted to do.

Now, if my colleagues had questions about if these areas are worthy of designation, they only have to look at the bill reports, where we extensively documented the outstanding values of the public lands and rivers included in this bill.

Now, I would just challenge the gentleman to tell me which of the wilderness designations in this legislation do not meet wilderness criteria, because it is for Congress to make that decision, not the executive branch. And we need to retain our Article I power every day and in every way.

For that reason, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, once again, I would ask the gentlewoman that if what she says is true, that the lands in this bill meet the legal requirements, she has nothing to fear from my amendment. Only where the land does not meet legal requirements can a Secretary exempt it.

One of the objectives we had set when we were in the majority was to restore public access to the public lands. These lands are set aside for the use, enjoyment, and recreation of the American people for all time. And that includes a wide range of activities, most of which are prohibited under wilderness or wild and scenic rivers designation. Such severe restrictions on public access should be used very carefully and sparingly.

My amendment simply says: That the lands affected by this bill must meet the legal definitions contained in the Wilderness Act and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. It doesn't modify those acts; it affirms them.

The despots of Great Britain early on set aside a third of the countryside as the "King's royal forests," the private preserves of the royal court and their hangers-on. Commoners were severely restricted from these lands under draconian penalties. They were so resented by the British people that no fewer than five clauses in the Magna Carta were devoted to redressing these grievances.

The American public lands were supposed to be exactly the opposite of the King's forests. These are lands set aside for the common enjoyment of the American people in all the many and varied outdoor activities and pursuits that they cherish.

By ignoring the legal definitions of the Wilderness and Wild and Scenic Rivers Acts and scooping up and putting off-limits to most activities vast tracts of land held by and for the pub-

lic, the Democrats make a mockery of these laws and undermine public support for them.

We have heard a lot recently that no one is above the law. Well, that includes Congress. This amendment assures that the lands affected by this bill meet the criteria of the original laws that they invoke.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I do agree that wilderness is reserved for those very special few areas that are left that truly are wild.

I challenged the gentleman to tell me which area, which acre in this bill does not meet the Wilderness Act criteria, and he did not do so. And that is because every acre of wilderness that my cosponsors and I have designated meets that criteria. It has been vetted, and it is one of those very few pristine areas that we should protect.

By the way, in Colorado, even if this bill is adopted, still, only less than 10 percent of our land will be wilderness and as it should be, because wilderness should be protected as a wild area.

I will say, though, that is not what this amendment does. What this amendment does is it cedes determination of what is wilderness from the Congress, which should be determining this, to the administration, another erosion of an Article I power. That is why I oppose this amendment, and I urge a "no" vote.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 116-395.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following:

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS **SEC. 801. PROMOTING HEALTH AND WELLNESS FOR VETERANS AND SERVICEMEMBERS.**

The Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are encouraged to ensure servicemember and veteran access to public lands designed by this Act for the purposes of outdoor recreation and to participate in outdoor-related volunteer and wellness programs.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the gentleman

from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

I thank Chairman GRIJALVA and Congresswoman DEGETTE for their hard work on this bill.

Our public lands are iconic features of the American landscape. It is our duty to preserve and protect these treasured lands, and to be responsible stewards so that future generations can enjoy them as much as we do today.

The Protecting America's Wilderness Act recognizes the irreplaceable value of public lands in our lives by safeguarding public lands and waters across Colorado, California, and Washington.

But the value of these lands goes far beyond their vast ecological diversity. They offer our veterans a unique opportunity to heal after they return home from the frontlines.

My amendment strengthens this bill by promoting the health and wellness of our veterans and servicemembers through access to lands protected within this bill, outdoor recreation, and participation in volunteer programs.

The great American outdoors is uniquely positioned to provide therapeutic benefits to our veterans and brave men and women in service. As they transition from service, or a uniform, to civilian life, public lands have been shown to help them reconnect, recover, and heal.

We make a sacred promise to every veteran, and it is our duty to serve them as they have served us and ensure that they can actively benefit from all that our landscapes have to offer. By doing so, we honor not only the importance of these lands, but also those who continue to serve this country today.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. FULCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER), the minority manager.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a comment. We haven't been shy so far today over here on criticizing where we see issues. I just wanted to communicate with the gentleman that, in this case, I also want to point out the positive things.

I support the gentleman's amendment, and I commend him for bringing that forward.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say thank you to the gentleman and all the Members of Congress who, not only during the course of this bill and the amendments and the debate but as a tradition, in a bipartisan manner are supporting our men and women in uniform, those who

have worn the uniform, and our veterans and their families.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1400

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 116-395.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following:

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 801. FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture under section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), in accordance with existing laws (including regulations).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an amendment today to H.R. 2546, Protecting America's Wilderness Act.

As we know, this bill would provide permanent protections for approximately 1.3 million acres of Federal land, including in California, and 1,200 miles of rivers. Not only will it provide vital protections for some of our most precious natural resources, but it will also improve outdoor recreational opportunities for underserved communities.

Now, my amendment ensures that, as we work to protect, conserve, and enjoy Federal public lands, we also prioritize the safety of our communities. This amendment gives the authority to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture to ensure that they are able to manage for fire, insects, and disease in wilderness areas, particularly during times of crisis.

In California, we are, unfortunately, no stranger to the threat of wildfires; and with climate change, wildfire seasons are becoming wildfire years.

Now, wildfires do not stop at property lines, so neither should our Federal efforts to fight wildfires and better manage our forestland. As we work to fight the effects of climate change and the impacts on our forests, we must also take every action that we can to protect the families and the homes in these vulnerable communities.

In putting forward new and critical protections on land—from the redwoods to the Los Padres National Forest, to the San Gabriel Mountains—we

must ensure our Federal land managers have the flexibility that they need to take the reasonable and necessary actions to preemptively address fire, insects, and disease threats to this land.

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

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CUELLAR). Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chairman, as stated, this amendment allows the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to manage for fire, insects, or disease the wilderness areas designated by this act. Again, I am not opposed to that, but I just want to point out in real life what really happens.

Many wilderness areas are overgrown and suffer from insect infestations. We have already talked about that. That contributes significantly to uncontrollable wildfires that really don't respect manmade boundaries very well.

In wilderness areas, the reality is that fires are allowed to continue, and they are only suppressed once they leave that wilderness boundary. That is a particular bummer for wildlife. We haven't talked about what happens in those situations, that wildlife is often decimated by this type of activity.

The other thing I just want to point out is that mechanized fire mitigation tools are banned in wilderness areas for anybody, including the Department of the Interior, Department of Agriculture, or the Forest Service. That is another thing that is bothersome about all of this is that, when we make these designations, we throw out the commonsense ability to use appropriate tools when there are problems.

Again, we are in support of this amendment, but it will do nothing to improve the conditions in these wilderness areas.

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL), my good friend from the southern coast of California.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. PANETTA for offering this important amendment which further clarifies that nothing in this bill would hinder any fuels management or fire suppression activities on our public lands.

I represent the central coast of California, and we have seen our share of wildfires. I believe that, if we can take preventative measures to address any wildfire risks, we should.

As a former county supervisor for Santa Barbara County, I have experienced firsthand the obstacles and challenges of balancing red tape and coordinating amongst stakeholders. As a supervisor, I helped implement the first community wildfire protection plan in Santa Barbara County.

I support Representative PANETTA's amendment because it reaffirms that this legislation would not interfere with any firefighting or fuels management activities. The underlying bill we are debating here today would not do that. Specifically, section 305(b) of my bill explicitly addresses these concerns.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment as well.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chair, I want to thank my good friend and neighbor to the south, Representative CARBAJAL, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has the only time remaining. The gentleman from Idaho has yielded back his time.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 116-395.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 234, after line 21, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent provisions accordingly):

TITLE VII—PROTECTION FROM HIGH RISK OF WILDFIRE

SEC. 701. PROTECTION FROM HIGH RISK OF WILDFIRE.

The Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, may exempt from any wilderness designated under this Act any area determined by that Secretary to be at high risk for wildfire.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense amendment that will help ensure that the lands designated as wilderness in this package are not areas that are at high risk for catastrophic wildfire.

One of the clear flaws of the package before us is the apparent arbitrary process that was taken in determining the areas to designate as wilderness. At the July 10 hearing that included the bills in today's package, the BLM and Forest Service conveyed findings that a significant number of the proposed wilderness additions are not suitable to be added to the wilderness system.

It is critically important that wilderness designations are carefully applied due to their highly restrictive limitations and to make sure to take into account existing uses of the land that can be limited, including wildfire risk.

The amount of public lands at high risk for catastrophic wildfire is truly sobering. Just last year, the chief of the Forest Service warned that a billion acres of land across America are at risk of catastrophic wildfire.

This is especially true in the three States addressed in the legislation before us, all three of which rank in the top 10, nationally, for severe threat of wildfire: California, number 1; Colorado, number 3; and Washington, number 6.

Mr. Chairman, I filed a bill today to plant a trillion trees. We can use forests to help mitigate atmospheric carbon. When we lock these forests away in wilderness areas, we are taking that off the table and actually adding to climate change by putting forests at risk of catastrophic wildfires that emit carbon.

This is a commonsense amendment. We don't need to be putting these areas into wilderness areas and taking them off the table to use in fighting the mitigation of carbon. This amendment will make sure that we are not unwisely designating areas that have been identified at high risk of catastrophic wildfire.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

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

Unlike the Panetta amendment that we just debated, the Westerman amendment contains no action or management prescription to address wildfire risk on our public lands. Instead, the amendment is another attempt by my colleagues to override Congress' constitutional responsibility to make law and, instead, give political appointees overly broad and unilateral authority to essentially veto an act of Congress.

This amendment contains the false narrative that wilderness is a "no management" designation and that any protective designation will inherently increase wildfire risk.

That, in fact, is not true, and it is the opposite: Wilderness areas are some of our most resilient natural landscapes.

Wilderness areas are usually far away from homes and other developed areas. They don't contain power lines or roads, which are major causes of human-caused ignitions, as we saw with the recent California fires. And if a fire does start in a wilderness area, these landscapes are best equipped to endure those periodic disturbances, which can achieve important management objectives and enhance habitat and ecosystem functions.

Mr. Chair, here we have got a photo provided to me by my colleague, Mr. CARBAJAL, which illustrates this point. It is the Machesna Wilderness Area that is included in this bill. If you look at the area for a moment, you can see this is not an area that is appropriate for logging, but you can also see some charred wood from a recent fire. But overall, look at how this area has regrown and the beautiful flowers that bloomed after the fire. This is what a resilient landscape looks like, and it is what we are protecting in this bill.

Furthermore, we have said this over and over and over, and I can't stress it enough, there is nothing that prevents suppression of an active wildfire in a wilderness area. And the Wilderness Act allows management activities if they are necessary to address fire, insects, and diseases, which is referenced in no uncertain terms by Mr. PANETTA's amendment.

Wildfire, like climate change, is an issue that always should be on our minds and inherent in our policies, but this red herring narrative that wilderness designation inherently increases wildfire is just simply not played out.

I encourage my colleagues not to give in to these false assumptions and oppose this amendment. I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to look at the science. I urge my colleagues to look at the law, look at what wilderness area means. It means untrampled by man. It means man has a hands-off approach to it.

Wilderness areas can be resilient to fire if they are designated appropriately, but when we have the experts at the BLM and the Forest Service saying these lands are not suitable for wilderness areas, when these areas are close to roads, when they are close to homes and property, we are treading on dangerous ground here. We are not applying the science. We are not applying the opinions of the experts. We are just saying we want to randomly call something wilderness area and think that, randomly, our approach is going to be suppression.

If our idea of management is suppression, we are losing ground. We should be doing things to prevent fire. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. And if our plan is we are just going to roll the dice but we can put the fire out when these wilderness areas catch on fire, I think we are sending the wrong message and we are making bad policy.

So, again, I encourage my colleagues to vote for this amendment that is common sense and that will do good in the long run.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, just to reiterate, the way it works right now with existing wilderness areas is that

the region that is managing that wilderness area can decide, obviously, taking into account that it is a wilderness area.

If it is a remote area, as we just saw in this photo, where burning would benefit the ecosystem, then they are allowed to burn, as they are in other areas of Federal land; but, if the regional director in the management plan has a wilderness that is near an urban interface and it looks like homes and lives may be put at risk, they are allowed, under the Wilderness Act, to take that action.

That is what I have been trying to tell my colleagues for years now. I think that the Panetta amendment makes that clear. I think that it allows us the power that we have in designating wilderness.

Again, we shouldn't offload our power to the executive branch or any other branch of government. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, if we are allowing management in an area, then, by definition, it shouldn't be a wilderness area. If our plan is to put the fire out when it starts and it could possibly do damage to property or life, that is not a very good plan.

We shouldn't be putting areas into wilderness that is close to wildland-urban interfaces, that is close to where people live, and taking management completely off the table.

I have wilderness areas in my district and in my State, and they are managed as wilderness areas, which means they are not managed at all.

Again, this is common sense. Listen to the experts. If this area is not suitable to be in a wilderness area, we shouldn't be designating it a wilderness area.

I encourage my colleagues to vote for this amendment. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY Mr. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 116-395.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 17, strike line 17 and all that follows through page 19, line 20.

Strike section 233.

Strike section 304.

Strike section 307.

Page 220, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 221, line 2.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, this strikes all the potential wilderness designations proposed in this package, which is a very vague and ambiguous designation that gives broad discretion to the relevant land management agencies to designate these areas as wilderness at a later time.

As I previously mentioned during debate on the last amendment, one of the clear flaws of the package before us is the apparent arbitrary process that was taken in determining the areas to designate as wilderness. This shortcoming, unfortunately, extends to the potential wilderness designations in the bill as well.

Official testimony from the land management agencies raised concerns about many of these suspect designations not possessing appropriate wilderness characteristics.

For example, in the Washington portion of this package, many of the 5,000 acres set to become potential wilderness are largely near roads and include large amounts of previously harvested stands of timber.

These are clearly roads that the proponents of this bill want to close. However, this is the wrong way to do that. Locking up vast swaths of land is a bad way to manage Federal land.

And I reiterate, if we want to do something about atmospheric carbon and use our forest as a tool, locking them up where we can't touch them is not the way to do that. We should be investing in sustainable, proactive measures that balance both resource stewardship and local input.

This amendment will remove some of the ambiguity from this package and will allow local communities to continue to benefit from lands and roads in these areas.

Mr. Chair, it is for those reasons I again urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, plain and simple, this amendment would remove all the potential wilderness from this bill, which totals over 130,000 acres.

My colleagues are using this amendment to claim that the wilderness areas in this bill don't meet the definition or intent of the wilderness designation.

Guess what? That is exactly why they are designated as "potential wil-

derness." These are areas that are, for all intents and purposes, wilderness, but for a small nonconforming use. Since the quotation marks on the amendment description seem to show some lack of understanding about this designation, I would like to explain it for the RECORD.

A potential wilderness designation typically means that an area has wilderness characteristics, but it recognizes that there is a nonconforming use or activity that would otherwise be prohibited by a standard wilderness designation, which is exactly what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle keep trying to argue. They keep trying to say: "Well, you know, you can't have motorized activities. You can't have this and that in wilderness," and they are right. But that is why some of these areas are potential wilderness.

Some examples of potential wilderness allowances that would be impacted by this amendment include allowing redwood forest restoration, allowing trail reconstruction using heavy equipment, and allowing the high-altitude helicopter operations in Colorado to continue in potential wilderness, because those uses are not appropriate in wilderness but these areas have strong wilderness characteristics, but for that one activity.

Potential wilderness designations simply say this: manage the area for the wilderness quality characteristics but continue to allow the specific use or activity. Then when that nonconforming use is removed, the area will then revert to wilderness because mostly that is what it is.

Potential wilderness provides exactly the type of management flexibility that my colleagues claim is needed for certain areas, but they want to strike all of these designations from the bill. Frankly, it seems a little backward to me.

For some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, I know it can be hard to see these areas for anything other than their extractive potential, but I see it from the other side of the coin. These areas are strong wilderness areas; they just have a small nonconforming use that eventually will be removed, restoring these areas to wilderness. That is why these areas are called potential wilderness.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, there are a couple of things that I would like to point out here.

First off, I am having a hard time understanding the logic. I appreciate the gentlewoman trying to explain what these potential wilderness areas are, but in the debate on the last amendment, the gentlewoman pointed out that we shouldn't be ceding any power to the executive branch, which designating something a potential wilderness area would cede all that power to the executive branch to determine if that could be a wilderness area in the future.

There is a process to designate a wilderness area. It is called a wilderness study area. We have done that all across the country. I have seen it done in my State, and there are certain criteria that you have to meet when you are in a wilderness study area to be designated wilderness.

Congress can change the law if they want to. They can violate the Wilderness Protection Act that was put in place, but that is not a wise thing to do.

For instance, there is an area in my State that is in a wilderness study area that has beautiful trees on it, but those trees are loblolly pine trees. They are nonnative to that site. So you could put that into a wilderness area, but by definition, you can't have nonnative tree species on that site.

Those are the kinds of things that the agencies look for when they go through a wilderness study program and when they propose to designate areas as wilderness. Just haphazardly doing it, putting it in areas where it shouldn't be, and designating potential wilderness is leaving the science out it, and it is making it all about politics.

Mr. Chair, again, I encourage my colleagues to be rational and to vote for this simple amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close if the gentleman is ready. I think I have the right to close. Mr. Chair, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, again, I encourage the adoption of this commonsense amendment; that we let the science rule; that we keep land available, our precious land and our precious resources to use in this fight to remove atmospheric carbon, to make the world a better place, and for environmental stewardship for the future.

That is why I offered this amendment and why I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, the 131,702 acres of potential wilderness in this bill, they are in many of the sections of this legislation, and they all have strong wilderness characteristics but for one nonconforming use, which will be eventually gone, in which case it is imperative that we manage these areas as wilderness.

Mr. Chair, that is why I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no." I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Arkansas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 116-395.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following:

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 801. MILITARY ACTIVITIES.

Nothing in this Act precludes—

- (1) low-level overflights of military aircraft over wilderness areas;
- (2) the designation of new units of special airspace over wilderness areas; or
- (3) the establishment of military flight training routes over wilderness areas.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment, which would make crystal clear that our men and women in uniform can continue to use the areas affected by this bill to conduct the training that they need to keep us safe.

The underlying bill would designate over a million acres of federally owned land as new or potential wilderness, safeguarding these important natural resources for Americans to enjoy for generations.

But these lands not only provide us with our outdoor recreation opportunities; they also serve as an important training ground for our Armed Forces as they prepare to defend our country overseas.

My bipartisan, commonsense amendment would ensure that our military aviators can continue to fly training missions and traverse the more than 1.3 million acres of wilderness designated by this act.

Now, this is critical because some areas affected by this bill are currently used by servicemembers at the High-Altitude Army National Guard Aviation Training Site, which is represented by my colleague, Congressman TIPTON, who joined me in offering this amendment.

This facility is the only place military helicopter pilots can learn the advanced power management skills needed to safely operate thousands of feet above sea level.

Given the mountainous regions our troops presently operate in overseas, both in Iraq and Afghanistan, it is critically important that these training operations continue uninterrupted.

Our public lands management agencies have a long history of working with our military leaders. When it comes to protecting our public lands, this amendment shows that conserva-

tion and national security can go hand in hand.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting our amendment, ensuring that our servicemembers can continue to utilize America's diverse natural resources to prepare to fight and win in any environment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for putting forward this amendment.

I do rise in opposition, though I am not opposed, ultimately, to the amendment. I am glad to join my colleague from South Carolina as a cosponsor, ultimately, of this amendment to be able to ensure that military overflights can continue over areas that will be designated wilderness under the Protecting America's Wilderness Act.

As my good friend from South Carolina is aware, my district is home to the High-Altitude Army National Guard Aviation Training Site or HAATS, where our men and women in uniform learn how to fly rotary-wing aircraft safely in high-altitude environments.

Mr. Chair, five wilderness or potential wilderness areas are to be established within the HAATS training area under the Protecting America's Wilderness Act. It is essential that when the time comes for aviation training to take place for the readiness of our Armed Forces that it is not interfering with the current and future wilderness proposals being debated and introduced in Congress.

Although the gentleman's amendment doesn't deal with the issue of landing zones, I do believe it is an important protection and a promising step forward. I would urge all of my colleagues to be able to support this amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, in closing, I want to thank my friend from Colorado, Mr. TIPTON, for joining me in offering this bipartisan amendment. Mr. Chair, I also want to thank Chairman GRIJALVA and my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee for their work on this important legislation.

I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting this amendment, which will make clear that our military can continue to utilize the airspace above these newly designated wilderness areas.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

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

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

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

□ 1430

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 116-395.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, strike lines 15 through 20.

Page 11, strike lines 3 through 9.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter and a resolution from the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners and a letter from the Montezuma County Board of County Commissioners in opposition to the legislation that we have on the floor today.

MESA COUNTY, COLORADO,
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Grand Junction, CO, June 24, 2019.

Re Colorado Wilderness Act of 2019, H.R. 2546.

Hon. DIANA DEGETTE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR Ms. DEGETTE: As the Board of County Commissioners ("Board") for Mesa County, Colorado, we are submitting this letter to voice our opposition to the Colorado Wilderness Act of 2019, H.R. 2546.

Mesa County has a well-established history of supporting sensible, multiple use of public lands and resources. The Board finds the proposed Wilderness designations of more 140,000 acres within Mesa County unacceptable and in direct conflict of the Mesa County Resolution adopted in opposition of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 2015, H.R. 3336 (enclosed). The areas proposed for Wilderness in Mesa County include:

1. South Shale Ridge & Little Book Cliffs Proposed Wilderness—29,045 acres (proposed "Little Bookcliffs Wilderness")
2. South Shale Ridge & Little Book Cliffs Proposed Wilderness—27,517 acres (proposed "South Shale Ridge Wilderness")
3. Bangs Canyon Proposed Wilderness—20,996 acres (proposed "Bangs Canyon Wilderness")
4. Unawep & Palisade Proposed Wilderness—27,150 acres (proposed "Palisade Wilderness")
5. Unawep & Palisade Proposed Wilderness—20,420 acres (proposed "Unawep Wilderness")
6. Sewemup Mesa Proposed Wilderness—15,208 acres (proposed "Sewemup Mesa Wilderness")

As the most restrictive designation in land management, the Board believes Wilderness

designations are often punitive in nature for many public land users whose impact is negligible. In addition to ending multiple use of public lands, Wilderness designations:

1. eliminate the opportunity to manage forest level concerns with the flexibility necessary for ever-changing conditions;
2. remove the ability to properly address the tremendous buildup of natural fuels due to unprecedented beetle kill thus compounding the potential and severity of wildfires;
3. abolish future uses that enhance the social and economic futures of area residents and businesses;
4. place undue burden on adjacent property owners, lessees and other non-recreation forest users who face potential loss of income due to restricted travel;
5. discriminate against citizens unable to walk or ride horseback, including those with disabilities and the elderly.

As a County comprised of 72% public lands, the Board believes the management of these public lands should be decided with area resource management plans developed in cooperation with federal, state and local governments as well as the multitude of user groups and area citizens, not by a process where those most affected have no voice. Given the above concerns and those in the attached Resolution, Mesa County cannot support this proposed legislation. Furthermore, we encourage the Colorado Congressional delegation to introduce legislation to release all Wilderness Study Areas from their perpetual existence as de facto Wilderness.

Please do not hesitate to contact the Mesa County Commissioners should you wish to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

ROSE PUGLIESE,
Chair, Board of County Commissioners.
SCOTT MCINNIS,
Commissioner.
JOHN JUSTMAN,
Commissioner.

RESOLUTION # _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF MESA COUNTY, COLORADO OPPOSING THE COLORADO WILDERNESS ACT OF 2015 (H.R. 3336) AND CALLING ON CONGRESS TO RELEASE ALL WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS IN COLORADO

Whereas, the Colorado Wilderness Act of 2015 (H.R. 3336) (the "Wilderness Act") has been introduced into Congress as the latest annual attempt to create Wilderness Areas without the participation or endorsement of the communities in which the areas are located; and

Whereas, Mesa County has formally declared its position on previous Wilderness proposals throughout the past years, (see Exhibit A—MCA 2001-17, MCM 2008-049, MCM 2009-175); and

Whereas, the Wilderness Act has been introduced by a Congressional Representative who does not reside in or represent the congressional districts that would be most impacted by this proposed legislation; and

Whereas, motorized and mechanized recreation are prohibited within Wilderness Areas; and

Whereas, motorized and mechanized recreation are areas of important and steady economic growth throughout Colorado and specifically in Mesa County; and

Whereas, the Wilderness Act will close off approximately 715,000 acres across the state to all mechanized use, such as mountain bikes, chainsaws, ATV's, snowmobiles, and motorcycles; and

Whereas, Colorado will face a potential firestorm with the tremendous buildup of

natural fuels due to unprecedented beetle kill and the inability to lower fuel loads by mechanized thinning under Wilderness designation; and

Whereas, the Wilderness Act would place undue hardship on anyone who cannot walk or ride horseback to enjoy these areas of Colorado, such as the physically disabled or elderly, and would seem to violate the spirit of the Americans with Disabilities Act, if not the letter of the law; and

Whereas, Wilderness designation would place undue hardship on livestock growers to maintain fences and water sources within the Wilderness Areas; and

Whereas, once designated a Wilderness Area, an act of Congress is needed to take the area out of Wilderness; and

Whereas, the numerous "Wilderness Study Areas" identified within the Wilderness Act have been inventoried as such over the past several decades, are mandated to be managed as de facto Wilderness Areas, and can only be released from this designation by an act of Congress; and

Whereas, Mesa County has acted in good faith through various memoranda of understanding and as a cooperating agency as a partner in land use planning with the Bureau of Land Management, the U. S. Forest Service and other agencies regarding the long-term protection and management of special areas worthy of unique management; and

Whereas, Mesa County intends to continue to coordinate cooperatively with the Bureau of Land Management, the U. S. Forest Service and other agencies on land management issues.

Now, therefore the Board of County Commissioners of Mesa County, Colorado finds that:

1. The Colorado Wilderness Act of 2015 (HB 3336) is not in the best interest of the citizens of Mesa County and the State of Colorado, and it would cause undue economic hardship on the surrounding communities.

2. Congress should release all Wilderness Study Areas (WSA) in Mesa County from such designation to allow for true multiple use those lands that are unduly restricted from appropriate use as WSAs.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved that the Board of County Commissioners of Mesa County, Colorado:

1. stands opposed to the Colorado Wilderness Act of 2015 (HB 3336) in its current form; and

2. calls upon the Colorado Congressional delegation to introduce legislation to release all Wilderness Study Areas within Mesa County from such designation.

Passed and Adopted this 21st day of September 2015.

Board of County Commissioners of Mesa County: Rose Pugliese, Chair.

MONTEZUMA COUNTY,
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Cortez, CO, May 28, 2019.

Re Colorado Wilderness Act of 2019.

Hon. DIANA DEGETTE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSSWOMAN: Respectfully, we are writing you as a County Commission to let you know that Montezuma County objects to the Colorado Wilderness Act of 2019. We have been consistently opposed since the Act was first proposed.

We ask you to permanently withdraw those portions of Montezuma County that are included in the bill as per the BLM and our recommendations. These areas include; Weber Mountain, Menefee Mountain, Cross Canyon, Cahone Canyon and Squaw and Pa-poose Canyons.

Since the early 1990's, Montezuma County has collaborated with federal land managers

in effort to develop public land management strategies that provide reasonable and responsible protection for our natural resources and wild lands. This collaboration has built an effective working relationship with federal land managers that allows us better protect natural resources while also ensuring the public have access to their public lands.

We believe we already have a good strategy in place for the protection of the WSAs being proposed for wilderness that maintains or improves their current characteristics for future generations while providing better access for the public to enjoy those lands in a responsible and appropriate manner.

Congresswoman,

We have seven major areas of concern with regard to the proposed Wilderness designations in Southwest Colorado that we feel have not been addressed with us and you need to be aware of:

1. Compatibility; the potential Wilderness Area designation has some compatibility problems with the surrounding private lands, their maintenance, and public access.
2. Best Protection of Resources; The proposed wilderness designations present a threat to landscapes that have been well protected under the current management.
3. The proposed legislation will create management difficulties for both federal land managers and for surrounding private landowners and threatens public health, safety and wellbeing.
4. The proposed legislation undermines the integrity of the BLM Land and Resource Management Planning process.
5. Proposed wilderness designations can trigger intense and protracted disputes over downstream water rights.
6. Economics. Wilderness Areas are not always good for a local economy. Often Wilderness leads to rural gentrification and disrupts local cultures and traditions.
7. The proposed legislation is a breach of the local-federal cooperation that we have all worked so hard to cultivate in Southwest Colorado.

Conclusions and Recommendations.

Montezuma County objects to the proposed Wilderness designation of;

1. Weber Mountain
2. Menefee Mountain
3. Cross Canyon
4. Cahone Canyon
5. Squaw and Papoose Canyon

We request that these five WSAs be dropped from your Bill. And we further request your support in Congressional delisting of those five WSAs.

We also would request your support in working with the BLM to re-designate those WSAs as Special Recreational Management Areas (SRMAs) and provide input in developing a customized protection plan for each SRMA that analyzes and mitigates the specific threats to the resources without throwing away recreational opportunities that may be perfectly suitable, and compatible with protection of resources.

We can't speak for the rest of the Western Slope, but in Montezuma County, we ask that our efforts to work with the federal land management agencies be respected. Any needed land protection measures should be developed through an open collaborative process in conjunction with mandated land and resource management planning and NEPA processes.

We do not feel that Wilderness Designation has been propose through a collaborative and transparent process at all. Please contact us at your earliest convenience. We look forward to working with you to craft specific protections that meet the public expectations, respects our culture and traditions, and truly protect resources.

Sincerely yours,

THE MONTEZUMA COUNTY

BOARD OF
COMMISSIONERS, KEENAN
G. ERTEL, LARRY DON
SUCKLA, JIM CANDELARIA.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, the majority of the land in Title I of the underlying bill would be converted into wilderness and it is in my district.

While I am never pleased when another Member of the House tries to tell my constituents what is best for them, I get especially frustrated when they ignore the opinions of elected officials in the communities in which they are seeking to make land management designations.

For instance, I might think that designating wilderness between Denver and Boulder would cut down on the challenges the State is facing with population growth might be something to consider, yet I have refrained from introducing such a proposal.

The underlying bill seeks to convert several wilderness study areas in the Third Congressional District into wilderness. The two that I focused on in this amendment are in Montezuma County.

During the hearing on the underlying bill, Montezuma County Commissioner Keenan Ertel testified in opposition to the proposed wilderness additions in the county. In a letter he sent to me and to the bill's sponsor, the board of county commissioners wrote:

We have been consistently opposed since the act was first proposed. We ask you to permanently withdraw those portions of Montezuma County that are included in the bill as per the BLM and our recommendations.

Since the early 1990's, Montezuma County has collaborated with Federal land managers in an effort to develop public land management strategies that provide reasonable and responsible protection for our natural resources and wild lands. This collaboration has built an effective working relationship with Federal land managers that allows us to better protect natural resources while also ensuring the public have access to their public lands.

We believe we already have a good strategy in place for the protection of the WSAs being proposed for wilderness that maintains or improves their current characteristics for future generations while providing better access for the public to enjoy those lands in a responsible and appropriate manner.

In the letter, the commissioners mention the BLM's recommendation. This is because the BLM studied the lands that my colleague is proposing to be added to wilderness and determined that they are not suitable. In fact, one of the parcels has a D8 bulldozer sitting on the land. This doesn't meet the standard of untrammelled by man.

Aside from the fact that the BLM has determined that these lands are not suitable for wilderness, the current WSA designation has created management challenges for the county when it comes to noxious weeds, wildfire prevention and mitigation, and managing the challenges of the Federal-private checkerboard that we see throughout the West.

It is for all of these reasons, but especially because of the local opposition,

that I urged my colleagues to remove the land in Montezuma County from the bill during the legislative process.

Additionally, my colleague's amendment to the underlying bill added additional land to Montezuma and Dolores Counties for wilderness designation. I will note that the counties are also opposed to these lands being added as indicated in their opposition letter.

While this amendment focuses on land in Montezuma County, I also want to say that the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners has written to me and the bill's sponsor about its opposition to the bill and the proposed wilderness additions in its county. There seems to be a common theme here.

I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment. But given the lack of local support this bill has in western Colorado, this amendment is not enough to fix the flaws of the bill.

Therefore, I will encourage my colleagues who believe that local input is important in land management decisions to oppose the underlying bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing but great affection and respect for my friend from the Third Congressional District, and I have worked with him and his predecessors as I have developed this bill over the last 20-plus years, but I respectfully have to strongly disagree with him over his proposal to remove these two areas from the legislation.

As a matter of fact, as I mentioned earlier in general debate, I actually went to these two areas over the August recess and I visited these areas. I invited Mr. TIPTON to come, but he was unavailable. When we were in the Cross Canyon area, we rode in on horses because there are no trails. It is completely inaccessible. There we saw ancestral pueblos. We saw petroglyphs with our own eyes.

When we went to the Weber-Menefee area to the area overlooking it, we saw really clearly how this area was wild and needed protection. And, by the way, the areas with the noxious weeds were several miles away, not even close to the wilderness area.

I do understand these concerns, but I believe these two areas are a case study for who you should listen to when you decide what wilderness should be.

As I said in general debate, when Commissioner Ertel came to testify before Congress, he rightly said that I had never been to these two areas. So, last August I went there, and I toured the areas. I had a town hall meeting in Cortez, which is the town that is right in between these two areas. We had over 70 people who showed up at this

town hall meeting, and I presented what the bill was. Several other people asked questions, presented opposing views.

At the end I just had a gut feeling that there was support there, so I took an impromptu survey, and I asked the people in that room, "How many of you, knowing what you know, would support designation of Cross Canyon and Weber-Menefee as wilderness?" Sixty-five people raised their hands. Then I asked, "How many of you would oppose it?" Four people raised their hands. When I asked, "How many are neutral," four people raised their hands.

It seems to me we shouldn't be having local county commissioners have veto power either over the citizens in those areas or over the U.S. Congress in determining wilderness. And by the way, the local mayor of Cortez and the town council have all voted to support designation of these areas—both of which have been wilderness study areas for over 30 years—permanently.

That is why we need to keep these areas in our bill. That is why they need to be designated as wilderness because they are wild and pristine.

And that is why I humbly and respectfully ask for a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful that my colleague, who I also have a lot of respect for, did come down to Montezuma County.

I hope while the gentlewoman was there, she had the opportunity to spend a little money, buy a few presents to take back and help an area that is often left out and forgotten in Colorado.

What the gentlewoman spoke to is important. She mentioned that the city council and the mayor were supportive. That is great. But they aren't responsible for the county lands, which the county commissioners are responsible for. It was within the confines of the city limits. Does that diminish their right to be able to have an opinion? It does not.

What is not being addressed is these are already protected lands. There isn't a person in the State of Colorado or in the country that can go on any of those lands and try to develop them, to put in a road, to put in a tower for transmission. That would have to go through a planning process, a comment process, if anything were to happen.

Those local comments, the impacts that our county commissioners are seeing, those who are responsible for the land should not be ignored, should be listened to, and I would encourage the adoption of my amendment.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman should be assured we spent quite a little bit of money in your town.

I just want to say what the gentleman said points to exactly what I

am saying. He says that the Cortez town council and mayor are not managing the county lands. Well, guess what, the county commissioners aren't managing the Federal lands. These are Federal lands. These are wilderness study areas, and they have been wilderness study areas for almost 30 years. The residents, the local residents, they are the ones that should care. They are the ones using these areas and they want them to be preserved.

Mr. Chairman, I refer again, on the Western Slope in the areas referenced in this bill, New Bridge Strategy did a poll last October of 2019, and they found that in those areas, 71 percent of Coloradans support wilderness protections for those already managed as such, like these two areas. And 63 percent supported expanding wilderness protections across the State. These are the people who matter. These are the people who care.

Also, we have a list of 80 different groups, most of them on the Western Slope, and we have a list of 179 business owners and community leaders, most of them on the Western Slope, who support this legislation. The reason is because the local governments and the county governments are benefiting from the visits that they have to these areas.

In Cortez, one of the biggest employers is Osprey. Almost everybody has an Osprey backpack or something in their home. They are selling their goods to the people who are using these areas.

That is why I oppose this amendment. That is why we need to pass this bill, and we need to protect these areas that are already wilderness study areas and have been for 30 years, for the future generations to come.

I include in the RECORD the list of business owners and the conservation and recreation groups, as well as the survey from New Bridge Strategy.

CONSERVATION AND RECREATION GROUPS IN SUPPORT OF TITLE I: COLORADO WILDERNESS ACT OF 2020 (DEGETTE—H.R. 2546) (80)

1. Access Fund
2. Aiken Audubon Society
3. American Alpine Club
4. American Hiking Society
5. American Whitewater
6. Ancient Forest Rescue
7. Animas Riverkeeper
8. Arkansas Valley Audubon Society
9. Audobon Society Denver
10. Audubon Rockies
11. Audubon Society of Greater Denver
12. Backcountry Hunters and Anglers
13. Backcountry Skiers Alliance
14. Biodiversity Legal Foundation
15. Big Agnes
16. Black Canyon Audubon Society
17. Blue River Anglers
18. Boulder County Audubon Soc.
19. Center for Environmental Citizenship
20. Central Colorado Wilderness Coalition
21. Clean Water Advocacy Center
22. Colorado Mountain Club
23. Colorado Native Plant Society
24. Colorado Wild/Rocky Mountain Wild
25. Colorado Wildlife Federation
26. Colorado Wolf and Wildlife Center
27. Community Alliance of the Yampa Valley
28. Conservation Alliance

29. Conservation Colorado/League of Conservation Voters

30. Conservatives for Responsible Stewardship

31. CoPIRG

32. CU Environmental Center

33. Defenders of Wildlife

34. Earthjustice Legal Defense Fund

35. Endangered Species Coalition

36. Environment Colorado/Environment America

37. Friends of Browns Canyon

38. Friends of The Yampa

39. Frying Pan Anglers

40. Grand Valley Audubon Society

41. Grand Valley Citizen's Alliance

42. Great Old Broads for Wilderness

43. High Country Citizen's Alliance

44. Land & Water Fund of the Rockies

45. La Sportiva

46. Mesa County Wilderness Coalition

47. National Parks Conservation Association

48. National Wildlife Federation

49. Natural Resources Defense Council

50. Osprey

51. Outdoor Alliance

52. Outdoor Industry Association

53. Patagonia

54. Protect Our Winters

55. Quiet Use Coalition

56. Ridgway-Ouray Community Council

57. Roaring Fork Anglers

58. Roaring Fork Audubon

59. Rocky Mountain Canoe Club

60. Rocky Mountain Field Institute

61. Rocky Mountain Recreation Initiative

62. San Juan Citizen's Alliance

63. San Luis Valley Ecosystem Council

64. Sopris Greens

65. Sheep Mountain Alliance

66. Sierra Club Rocky Mountain/Sierra Club

67. Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project

68. Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance

69. Trout Unlimited

70. Uncompahgre Valley Association

71. Western Colorado Alliance for Community Action formerly Western Colorado Congress

72. Western Environmental Law Center

73. Western Resource Advocates

74. Western Slope Environmental Resource Council

75. Wild Connections

76. Wilderness Education Institute

77. Wilderness Land Trust

78. Wilderness Workshop

79. Wildlands Restoration Volunteers

80. Winter Wildlands Alliance

BUSINESSES IN SUPPORT OF TITLE I: COLORADO WILDERNESS ACT OF 2020 (DEGETTE—H.R. 2546) (187)

1. Friends Fields Inc
2. Hart's Skating and Dancewear
3. House of Seasons
4. Mr. Mike's Repair
5. Hill's Aspen Gallery of Photography
6. Hotel Lenado
7. UTE Mountaineer
8. Bristlecone Mountain Sports
9. Taylor Creek Fly Shops
10. Ames Burgess Ranch LLC
11. Boulder Mountain Repair
12. Little Mountain
13. Montgomery Partnership Architecture
14. Mountain Sports
15. Target Earth International
16. The Cup Espresso Café
17. Neptune Mountaineering
18. Big City Blues
19. Loom and Weave Inc
20. Mountain Angler
21. Rasta Pasta
22. The Adventure Rafting Company
23. Great Big Color Inc
24. MasterPrint

25. The Trailhead
26. Echo Canyon River Exp. Inc.
27. Mother Nature's Health Food Store
28. Alpine Angling and Adventure Travel
29. Sopris Surfers
30. Centennial Canoe Outfitters Inc.
31. Boulder Running Company
32. Cripple Creek District Museum
33. Criterium Bicycles
34. Gordon Anderson Photography
35. Mountain Chalet
36. Pikes Peak Mountain Bike
37. The E-Quest Corporation
38. Canyon Sports LLC
39. Jake's Rio Grande Outfitting Service
40. Butte Bagels Inc
41. Bill Myers, P.C.
42. C.W. Action
43. Colorado Outdoor Recreational Adventures
44. Confluence Kayaks LLC
45. Golden West Co. LLC
46. Patagonia (Denver)
47. Arapahoe Caf  /Pub
48. Pug Ryan's (brewery)
49. Dolores River Brewery
50. A Shared Blanket
51. AAM's Mild to Wild Rafting
52. Animas Trading Co
53. Animon City Rock LLC
54. Aquarius Adventures
55. Backcountry Experience
56. Branson Reynolds Photography
57. Carver Brewing Co
58. Carver Brewing Company
59. Colorado Mtn. Expeditions
60. Concrete Ski Shop
61. Couldberries
62. Dancing Willows Herbs Inc.
63. Duranglers Inc.
64. Durango Kid
65. Durango Shirt Co.
66. Ecos Consulting
67. Flexible Flyers Rafting
68. Gardenswartz Sporting Goods
69. Gunnar Conrad Photography
70. Hummingbirds Herbals
71. Main Avenue Marketplace
72. Maria's Bookshop
73. Nature's Oasis
74. Norton Painting Inc.
75. P. River Outfitters
76. Performance Video
77. Pineneedle Mountaineering
78. POPOLI—Design for People
79. Precious Earth
80. Reruns
81. Rhea Environmental Consulting
82. Ski Barn Inc.
83. The Boarding Haus
84. The Light Store Inc
85. Urban Homestead
86. Yoga Durango
87. Mountain Misen LTD
88. In the Groove Inc.
89. The Snow Leopard
90. Rock Solid Adventures
91. DeJaVu Coffeehouse
92. Hammocks in the Square
93. Hearne's Fine Goods
94. New Belgium Brewing Co.
95. Poudre River Kayaks
96. Rocky Mountain Home Collection
97. Trails End Hardscapes Inc.
98. COPY COPY
99. Pioneer Sports
100. Summit Canyon Mountaineering
101. Architecture Works
102. Mounainsmith
103. The Bent Gate Inc.
104. Timberline Llamas Inc.
105. Greeley Monument Works
106. Marbled Artworks by Marie Palowoda
107. Margies Java Joint & The Book Stop
108. Mellow Yellow
109. Paws Animal Clinic
110. All Sports Replay
111. Black Diamond Exp. & Tenderfoot Rafting
112. Mountain Mamas
113. The Book Worm
114. Cannibal Outdoors
115. Hall Realty, Mountaineer Inc.
116. Lake City Properties Inc.
117. Rosemary Knight CPA
118. The Pueblo House
119. Zen Home Construction Inc.
120. Donut Hut
121. Sisters' Espresso
122. Backcountry Escape LLC
123. Grandpa's Pawn and Gun
124. The Dickens House Bed & Breakfast
125. Red Canyon Art Co.
126. Deer Hill Expeditions
127. Blue Planet Earthscapes
128. The Cliff House @Pikes Peak
129. Black Cat Books
130. Mountain Wind and Sun
131. Natural Gems by the Corner Goldsmith
132. The Hemp Store
133. Backstreet Bagel & Deli
134. Devinny Jewelers
135. Cimarron Creek
136. Montrose Chiropractic
137. Ross Reels
138. Scott Fly Rods
139. The Soul Garden
140. Valley Books & Coffee
141. Streamside Bed & Breakfast
142. Outwest Guides
143. Reed Designs LLC
144. Vistas and Vineyards B&B
145. Earth Write
146. The John Deaux Art Gallery
147. Redstone Inn
148. Adobe Inn
149. Cimarron Books & Coffeehouse
150. CO Kids Clothing Co.
151. Ridgway Office Supply & Services
152. Firehouse Sculpture & Gallery
153. Ridgway Outdoor Experience
154. Ridgway Rentals
155. San Juan Stone Company LLC
156. Unicas Southwest
157. White House Salon
158. Willowcreek Floral
159. Light Hawk
160. Lifestream Water Systems
161. Silver Mountain Harvest LTD
162. Simpler Way Book Co.
163. Renegade LLC
164. Alpine Art & Glasswork
165. Backcountry Provisions
166. Backdoor Sports Ltd.
167. Bamboo Market
168. Epilogue Book Company
169. Little Moon Essentials
170. Mad Dog Sports
171. Mail Boxes, Etc.
172. Matt & Bryan's Outdoor Shop
173. Mountain High Technology
174. One Stop Ski Shop Ltd
175. Orange Peel Bicycle Service US
176. Spring Sips
177. Straightline Outdoor Sports
178. Use It Again Sports
179. Vino
180. Ivar Eidsmo Builder Inc.
181. Telluride Outside
182. Tomboy Soup
183. Vectra Bank Colorado
184. Arkansas Valley Adventure
185. Civilized Designs from the Wild West
186. EcoFlight
187. Lupitar Bizzare Bazaar
9. Steve Montgomery
10. Daniel Howley
11. Nicole Holt
12. Wendy Ball
13. Gary Neptune
14. Andrea Gessner
15. Jeremy Feldman
16. Jackson Streit
17. Noble Wolf Schlicht
18. Sean McLaughlin
19. Meena Keuer
20. Michael & Star Betz
21. Travis Holton
22. Sherleen Westfield
23. Matt Sampson
24. Nancy Brown
25. Main Turner
26. Nina Thompson
27. Claire Carren
28. Vicki Stroud
29. Jamie Black
30. Frank Lilly
31. Mark Wimberly
32. Weston & Mary Mauz
33. Judy McDonald/Mary Ward
34. Joe Wright
35. Daniel Delano
36. Bob Wade
37. Susan & Don Edmonds
38. Tim Heng
39. Martha A. Burgess
40. Jeff Dysart
41. Dale Ahrens
42. Duane Daniels
43. David Jake Powell
44. Mark Youngguist
45. D. Frank
46. Alex Mickel
47. Cathy Wakeman
48. Anne Batt-Ostlund
49. Valyda May
50. Kirk Singer
51. Branson Reynolds
52. Barbara Wynne
53. Zachary Lawrence
54. Pete Turner
55. Cheryl Hobby
56. Debra Reuben
57. Tom Knopick
58. Barbara Haas
59. Kristin Kuhn
60. Chris Calwell
61. Robin Fritch & Steven Saltsman
62. Brian Hessling
63. Gunnar Conrad
64. Melanie Rose
65. Andrea Brenell
66. Peter Schertz
67. Jeff & Sherri Watson
68. Dylan Norton
69. Tom Kleema
70. Kent Ford
71. Cindy Schroeder
72. Christine Conner
73. Kim Pardini
74. Laura Fickard
75. Barry Rhea
76. Jurgen Umbhau
77. John Agnew
78. Crissy Schneider
79. Tracy Campbell
80. "Katie Walsh
81. Michele Lawrence
82. Sherly McGourty"
83. Steve Davis
84. Andrew Smith
85. Greg Osgood
86. Marianne Tarr
87. Marcia Duncan
88. Jack & Leslie Nichols
89. Phil & Carolyn Virden
90. William & Ruthanna Hall
91. Rosemary Knight
92. Christi Hall
93. Ken Bodine
94. Douglas & Beverly Caplin
95. Pete Freer
96. David Devinny

BUSINESS OWNERS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS
IN SUPPORT OF TITLE I: COLORADO WILDER-
NESS ACT OF 2020 (DEGETTE—H.R. 2546) (179)

1. Bill Myers
2. Carmi McLean
3. Jonathan Kahn
4. Errol Cerovski
5. Dave Richardson
6. Claudia Goodman
7. Karen Gordan
8. Dan Groenwald

97. Bob Burk
 98. John T. Unger
 99. David S. Heller
 100. Junimz Britsch
 101. Jim Riddell
 102. Charlie Peterson
 103. Gary Hubbell
 104. Lorna Reed
 105. Iris Meachum
 106. Riadeaux
 107. Deborah Strom
 108. Joyce Bucknam
 109. Priscilla Peters
 110. Ellen Hunter
 111. Gale Ingram
 112. Joni McCullough
 113. Albert Adams
 114. Patsy Young
 115. Cindy Feirn
 116. Deborah Lombardo
 117. Judi S.
 118. Paula Brown
 119. Michelle G.
 120. Maryelleu & Brandon Hubley
 121. John Marshall
 122. Betsy Fields
 123. Vickie Rosenzweig
 124. David Pepin
 125. Peter Van de Carr
 126. Anne Halloran
 127. Erica Focelle
 128. Laura Lamun
 129. John Seymour
 130. Al Callahan
 131. Matt Taff, Bryan Ayer
 132. Marty Rosenzweig
 133. John M Kole
 134. Brock S. Webster
 135. Stephanie Reineke
 136. Brett Lee
 137. Fred Garrison
 138. Michael Kirlum & Lisa Lesyshen
 139. Ivar Eidsmo
 140. John Duncan
 141. Jessica News Co.
 142. Timothy J. Cannon
 143. Debbie Dacton & Michael McBride
 144. Maria Palowoda
 145. Deanna Shepard
 146. Jodie Callen
 147. David Shoemaker
 148. Shonda Lehtola
 149. Rod Brandenburg
 150. Kim Khake
 151. Dick & Jan Scar
 152. David Burch
 153. Marjorie F. Oldfield
 154. Cody Hill
 155. Jan MacKell
 156. Nic Ponsor
 157. Gordon Anderson
 158. Dan Foster
 159. Howard Hallman Jr.
 160. George Watson
 161. Becky Elder
 162. Craig A. Hartman
 163. Natalie Johnson
 164. Laura Bell
 165. Stephen A. Smith
 166. Dennis & Kathleen Claveau
 167. Mike Kunkel
 168. Duke Brad Ford
 169. Julia Gumpster & Marty Genereux
 170. Drew Shaw
 171. Richard & Carol Wolfe
 172. Laurie Hurd
 173. Margy Dalpes
 174. Karin Dukehart
 175. Carol Boyd
 176. Michael Cady
 177. Joe Doyle
 178. Kristine Dirla
 179. Kristi Floyd

NEW BRIDGE STRATEGY.

To: Interested Parties

From: Lori Weigel & Kathryn Hahne/New Bridge Strategy

Date: October 21, 2019

Re: Support for Colorado Wilderness Act in Survey of Western Slope Voters

New Bridge Strategy recently completed a survey of voters throughout western Colo-

rado—an area largely consisting of the Third Congressional District—to determine their views on a range of conservation issues, particularly increasing wilderness designations on some lands in the West. The study found strong support for the Colorado Wilderness Act to increase wilderness primarily in desert and canyon areas in their region. They also want to keep Wilderness Study Areas intact, rather than removing that designation on some public lands. This support may be grounded in the fact that voters view public lands as beneficial for the economy. They also anticipate outdoor recreation becoming increasingly important in the region. This is not surprising given that most voters in this region say that they engage in outdoor recreation activities and/or sportsmen activities.

Specifically, the survey found that . . .

More than three-in-five Western Slope voters support “dedicating additional, existing public lands as wilderness areas here in Colorado.” Fully 63 percent support dedicating more land as wilderness in Colorado after hearing a brief explanation of what this would entail. Respondents were told that “Just over fifty years ago Congress passed the Wilderness Act, which protected the Maroon Bells and the San Juan Mountains here in Colorado. These areas are designated as wilderness in order to keep that land conserved in its natural state. Wilderness lands can be used for hiking, camping, livestock grazing, horseback riding, wildlife watching, hunting and fishing. However, mining, oil and gas development, logging, and the use of motorized or off-road vehicles and mountain bikes are not allowed on wilderness lands.” Again, after hearing this neutral explanation, there is solid support of 63 percent, and fully 42 percent “strongly” support it. Only 35 percent register opposition to this proposal. Support for increasing the amount of wilderness in Colorado is evident throughout the entire district as well.

Support for extending wilderness protections has appeal among virtually all sub-groups, including a majority of hunters (55 percent) and anglers (62 percent), and surprisingly, off-road vehicle users (55 percent support, 43 percent oppose). More than two-thirds of every other type of outdoor recreation enthusiast expressed support, including 80 percent of mountain bikers, 75 percent of bird/wildlife watchers, and 73 percent of hikers). A majority across party lines also express support, with near universal support among Democrats (94 percent), and nearly three-in-five Republicans (59 percent) and unaffiliated voters (59 percent) registering support for additional wilderness areas in Colorado.

In addition, once voters know that “just five percent of Colorado lands are currently dedicated as wilderness areas,” support for dedicating additional public lands as wilderness increases to fully 69 percent.

Likewise, there is significant support for adding wilderness protections to public lands in desert and canyons regions of the state. Fully 68 percent express support for a proposal that would “designate as wilderness lands areas that include some desert canyons and mesas, such as lands near Mesa Verde National Park, and natural areas along the Arkansas and Dolores Rivers. These amount to less than 10 percent of the public lands in southern and western Colorado.” Two-in-five (40 percent) strongly support the proposal, while 29 percent oppose it. This proposal engenders majority support across party lines (92 percent of Democrats, 62 percent of unaffiliated voters and 54 percent of Republicans), and with virtually every sub-group examined. It has solid support throughout the district, including in Mesa County (66 percent support).

Voters in this region also reject calls to eliminate protections for Wilderness Study Areas. Western Colorado voters prefer that Congress keep existing public lands in Wilderness Study Areas, rather than removing that designation to those lands by a nearly three to one margin, as the next graph illustrates.

Majorities of all key voter sub-groups prefer that Congress keep the status quo. This includes more than three-in-five Republican and unaffiliated voters in the region (61 percent say to keep the areas as they are, while 34 percent would change their status) and virtually all Democrats (97 percent keep as is). The desire to retain Wilderness Study Areas is evident throughout the region, including in Mesa County (70 percent).

Support for these public lands proposals may be grounded in the fact that voters make a connection between their economy and the outdoors. The overwhelming majority of voters in western Colorado say they presence of public lands in Colorado helps our economy (84 percent) rather than hurts it (6 percent) or has little impact on the economy (8 percent). Majorities of every single sub-group hold the perception that public lands help the economy.

Similarly, the survey demonstrates that voters in this region view the “outdoor economy” as being “very important” to their economic future. Fully 68 percent characterize the outdoor economy which in the survey we defined as “people who come to hunt, fish, camp, hike, see wildlife, as well as those who manufacture and sell equipment for those activities” as being very important to “the economic future of western Colorado.” Another one-in-four (25 percent) say it is “somewhat important,” and a mere 7 percent do not see it as important. Both Democrats (76 percent) and Republicans (70 percent) view the outdoor economy as very important to the economic future of western Colorado.

The vast majority of western Coloradans engage in outdoor recreation themselves. When asked about their own ties to the outdoors, the vast majority of voters here are participating in many activities. Many identify as either a hunter (39%) or an angler (52 percent). More than nine-in-ten say that they regularly participate in some other form of outdoor recreation, with a range of activities identified:

64% Hiking or trail running, 64% Camping, 51% Bird watching and viewing wildlife, 30% Kayaking, canoeing or boating, 36% Riding an off-road vehicle or snowmobile, 36% Snow shoeing, skiing or boarding, 22% Mountain biking.

In fact, a majority say that they regularly participate in three or more of these activities (56 percent).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 116-395.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

After section 105, insert the following:

SEC. 106. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STUDY ON IMPACTS THAT THE EXPANSION OF WILDERNESS DESIGNATIONS IN THE WESTERN UNITED STATES WOULD HAVE ON THE READINESS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO AVIATION TRAINING.

(a) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on the impacts that the expansion of wilderness designations in the Western United States would have on the readiness of the Armed Forces of the United States with respect to aviation training.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the study required under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, military aviation and training is critical to the national security interests of the United States and the readiness of our Armed Forces.

My district is home to one of the installations that conducts military aviation training missions for our men and women in uniform, the High Altitude Army National Guard Aviation Training Site, or HAATS, located in Gypsum, Colorado.

It is both an honor and a privilege to be able to represent the lone U.S. Department of Defense schoolhouse where rotary-wing aviators in our Nation's Armed Forces and our foreign allies learn how to be able to safely fly rotary-wing aircraft in mountainous high-altitude environments. The life-saving training that is required by our servicemen and women at HAATS is vital to our national security and our readiness.

Mr. Chairman, Title I of the Protecting America's Wilderness Act would establish five wilderness or potential wilderness areas within the HAATS training area.

During this Congress, numerous pieces of legislation designating wilderness continue to be introduced without taking into consideration the potential effects that these designations would have on readiness. Proactively, Congress should work to be able to ensure current and future wilderness proposals do not interfere with readiness of our Armed Forces when it comes to aviation training.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study, which would examine the impacts of the expansion of wilderness designations in the western United States and what they would have on the readiness of our Armed

Forces with respect to aviation training.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, there has been a lot of debate for a long time about how this bill might or might not impact military training in Colorado, and I myself have been concerned about this for some years. We have been looking at this for over 10 years, ever since we found out about the high-altitude training by the National Guard.

We have provisions in the underlying bill and, of course, we have accepted an amendment from Mr. CUNNINGHAM that would clearly say nothing in this bill will interfere with the HAATS activities. As a matter of fact, we removed several areas from the original bill that we found out had helicopter landing pads in them and we called them potential wilderness, because, frankly, I don't think that landing a helicopter in an area is an approved wilderness use, and I have said that all along.

So, therefore, we want to make sure that the National Guard can continue to do its landing in these areas as long as it deems that it is necessary to do so. We have written the underlying bill that way. Mr. CUNNINGHAM's amendment clarifies it. And, frankly, if this amendment will help to clarify the situation even more, I would be happy to go along with that because I do not intend, and I don't think any of the other bill sponsors intend, to interfere with our national defense.

People might be surprised to find out the findings of the study once it comes out, because the Pentagon often supports the protective buffer that wilderness offers for aviation training. Also, this bill is supported by a number of veterans and other military organizations.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter dated February 11, 2020, from the Vet Voice Foundation that shows support for this legislation and, in particular, support for the wilderness in this legislation.

VET VOICE FOUNDATION,
February 11, 2020.

Subject: Vet Voice Foundation Support for H.R. 2546—Protecting America's Wilderness Act.

Hon. DIANA DEGETTE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DEGETTE: I am Paul Eaton, Major General (Ret.), U.S. Army, who served more than 30 years in the United States Army, including combat and post-combat assignments in Iraq, Bosnia and Somalia, and Senior Advisor for the Vet Voice

Foundation (VVF). The VVF serves as a platform for veterans to influence policy outcomes and has over 500,000 members with over 34,000 living in California and Colorado. We write to express our support for H.R. 2546—Protecting America's Wilderness Act.

Our support for H.R. 2546 is based on our intent to protect our public lands. Those who serve our country fought to preserve American freedoms and lifestyles. Almost nothing better encapsulates these ideals than the wild spaces and ecologically rich lands that have changed little since our country's founding, thanks to the laws that protect them.

Through our work, we know veterans return from war and turn to the outdoors to find relief from the trauma and stresses of war and reintegration. For many veterans who've returned from locations marked by desperation and violent conflict, nature and wildlife can be a critical source of strength and healing. The Protecting America's Wilderness Act would ensure veterans and future generations have access to the great outdoors.

We also recognize that the Protecting America's Wilderness Act would provide permanent protections for landscapes in Colorado, California, and Washington by designating over 1.3 million acres of federal land as new, expanded or potential wilderness and safeguarding more than 1,200 miles of river as components of the National Wild and Scenic River System. These bills are the product of years of input by a wide variety of stakeholders and will boost local economies, recreation opportunities, and protect wildlife and their habitats.

In order to protect and defend our public lands, we strongly support H.R. 2546—Protecting America's Wilderness Act.

Thank you for your continued support of our public lands and consideration of Vet Voice Foundation's views. If we can be of assistance on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully,

PAUL EATON,
Major General (Ret.), U.S. Army,
Senior Advisor, Vet Voice Foundation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, I urge support for Mr. TIPTON's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of Ms. DEGETTE of Colorado, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 116-395.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk made in order by the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 223, line 9, strike "as a recreational river" and insert "to be administered as a recreational river through a cooperative management agreement between the State of Washington and the Secretary of Agriculture as provided in section 10(e) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1281(e))".

Page 226, lines 6 and 7, strike "as a recreational river" and insert "to be administered as a recreational river through a cooperative management agreement between the

State of Washington and the Secretary of Agriculture as provided in section 10(e) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1281(e))”.

Page 230, lines 7 and 8, strike “as a scenic river” and insert “to be administered as a scenic river through a cooperative management agreement between the State of Washington and the Secretary of Agriculture as provided in section 10(e) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1281(e))”.

Page 231, lines 5 and 6, strike “as a recreational river” and insert “to be administered as a recreational river through a cooperative management agreement between the State of Washington and the Secretary of Agriculture as provided in section 10(e) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1281(e))”.

On page 233, after line 20, insert the following:

(C) UPDATES TO LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, with respect to the designations made under subsection (a) on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, incorporate such designations into updated management plans for units of the National Forest System in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations).

(2) EXCEPTION.—The date specified in paragraph (1) shall be 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act if the Secretary of Agriculture—

(A) is unable to meet the requirement under such paragraph by the date specified in such paragraph; and

(B) not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, includes in the Department of Agriculture annual budget submission to Congress a request for additional sums as may be necessary to meet the requirement of such paragraph.

(3) COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—Updated management plans under paragraph (1) or (2) satisfy the requirements under section 3(d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(d)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chair, I am proud to offer this amendment to make two key improvements to title VI of this bill, which designates 19 Wild and Scenic Rivers on the Olympic Peninsula of Washington State.

First, this amendment will further protect the interests of Washington State’s Department of Natural Resources to manage State-owned lands adjacent to new Wild and Scenic River designations.

Building on the savings clause already included in the base text, which explicitly protects DNR’s management authority, this amendment would further require the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into cooperative agreements with DNR to manage the four new Wild and Scenic Rivers that abut DNR lands.

This important change will ensure that DNR not only retains the authority to manage State-owned lands, but also has a clear voice in how the Forest

Service manages their surrounding Federal lands that fall within the adjacent Wild and Scenic River corridor.

This small but important change has led our State Commissioner of Public Lands, Hilary Franz, to give her strong support to this bill.

Second, this amendment directs the Secretary of Agriculture to complete the 19 comprehensive river management plans through the long-overdue process of updating the forest management plan for the Olympic National Forest, sets a maximum 5-year timeline for updating the forest plan, and allows the Secretary to request additional funds to complete the forest plan update if needed.

This provision will ensure that this critical forest plan update, which was last revised nearly three decades ago, does not take a backseat to the development of these comprehensive river management plans. It also ensures that the Secretary will have sufficient resources to complete the update in a timely manner.

This amendment was developed through direct consultation with local stakeholders and will ultimately strengthen title VI of this bill.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have had an opportunity to visit this beautiful part of the world that my colleague from Washington represents, and I know that he has the best interests of those beautiful forests and beautiful natural areas at heart, and it is because of this and because of this commonsense amendment that I can rise in support of it.

Although I do not believe it goes far enough to address some of the legitimate concerns raised by local stakeholders, it is a great step in the right direction.

Instead of simply removing proposed wild and scenic designations from State trust lands that are managed by the Washington Department of Natural Resources to generate revenue for schools, counties, and other beneficiaries, the amendment directs the Secretary of Agriculture to work with the DNR to develop these cooperative management agreements to guide the management of those rivers.

Now, overlaying DNR trust lands with wild and scenic designations subjects these trust lands to additional process, and I believe it will make it more difficult for DNR to propose timber harvest in these areas that could potentially cost school funding and other benefits.

The savings language added in this amendment can only clarify what is re-

quired under Federal law. Nothing in the savings language alleviates DNR from potential added burdens under Washington State’s Environmental Protection Act, potential litigation based on the wild and scenic overlays and adjacent wilderness, or precludes potential State litigation based on the new designations.

This amendment also appears to recognize the tremendous burden this legislation will put on the Olympic National Forest.

Under the Wild and Scenic Act, the Olympic will be required to prepare comprehensive river management plans for 19 new Wild and Scenic Rivers across 464 miles of river, all of that within 3 years.

The amendment seeks to give the forest the potential for a 2-year extension, but the reality is the staff of this forest will be spending the next several years doing paperwork instead of proposing projects to restore forest, to replace culverts, or increase timber harvest, all things that have broad support. All the while, the Olympic National Forest is still living under a forest plan that hasn’t been revised since 1994, when the Clinton Northwest Forest Plan was adopted.

Most of the rivers proposed for the wild and scenic designation were not found to be suitable by the Forest Service. Currently, in the State of Washington, there are 197 miles of Wild and Scenic River. This legislation would more than quintuple the miles of Wild and Scenic River in Washington.

So, Mr. Chair, while I wish this amendment went further, I congratulate my colleague and encourage him to continue working with stakeholders, and I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment which does make the underlying bill better.

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chair, first of all, I thank the gentleman for his support for this amendment.

Again, it makes two changes that I think strengthen the legislation: to ensure that there is not an impact on State DNR harvest; and, hopefully, to see the Forest Service move forward with an update to the forest management plan, which is a long time coming, a long-overdue process to move forward. That is why we are putting forward this amendment; it is why it strengthens the legislation.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of adopting my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. SCHRIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 116-395.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 234, after line 21, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent provisions accordingly):

TITLE VII—STUDY ON FLOOD RISK MITIGATION

SEC. 701. STUDY ON FLOOD RISK MITIGATION.

The Comptroller General shall conduct a study to determine the contributions of wilderness designations under this Act to protections to flood risk mitigation in residential areas.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, first, I would like to applaud the work of my colleagues, Representative KILMER and Representative DEGETTE, for all the hard work they have done on this underlying, very important bill. It is a great bill for Washington, and I will be supporting it. Protecting wilderness areas is so important to maintain Washington's beautiful environment for future generations.

My amendment to the bill is very simple. It requires the Government Accountability Office to study how preserving wilderness lands can help reduce flood risks in residential areas.

The area in this photo is practically in my backyard. Over the past week, Washington State has experienced severe winter storms. The Governor of Washington State recently issued an emergency proclamation for 25 counties due to flooding and winter weather. Three of those counties, Kittitas, King, and Pierce, are located in the Eighth Congressional District, my congressional district.

In my district, these storms largely took the form of excessive rain and flooding. They caused landslides on a highway that cut off access to the Greenwater community and Crystal Mountain, Washington's largest ski area, which was closed for 4 days in a very busy, typical weekend period.

In Issaquah, here, down the road from one of my district offices, the Eastside Fire Department evacuated apartment buildings that were in proximity to a creek that had breached its banks and had water rushing through the parking lot and under the building.

In Fall City, a town that has two roads in and out, there is a slow-moving landslide underneath one of those roads, and the road has started to separate. Residents have been encouraged to evacuate so they are not at risk of being isolated in this town.

As we continue to confront climate change, we need to holistically consider our approaches to wilderness and public lands. Preservation of our public lands is just one tool at our disposal to

help mitigate the impacts of flooding. We need to let nature do what nature does best: soak up water and prevent land from moving and turning into a landslide or mudslide during a flooding event.

Climate change science shows that our region will experience heavier, more intense rainfall and increased rain-on-snow events that will increase the risk of flooding.

Comprehensive watershed level planning, from the headwaters in wild and public lands all the way down to our towns and cities, is critical if we are going to address the myriad challenges facing so many of our communities, from flooding to salmon habitat restoration, to expanding recreation and outdoor access.

As we think on a watershed scale, wilderness areas in the Eighth Congressional District and across the State help protect the headwaters of our watersheds.

A little further downhill, we have collaborative groups working on active management to improve forest health; and in the lower watersheds, we have local governments, Tribes, and other stakeholders working on integrative approaches to reduce flood risks in our communities.

As our climate changes, we are going to see a marked increase in these 100-year events. Whether that is rainstorms, snowstorms, or wildfires, it can all be better managed with a thoughtful approach toward land use planning, management, and protection.

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

□ 1500

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Acting Chair. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

It is a simple study. We don't know what the cost is, but I want to use that comment to correct myself previously. I said that the Federal Government is \$2.3 trillion in debt. I was off by a decimal there. It is over \$23 trillion.

Wilderness areas are supposed to be "untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain."

It is true that wildfires in wilderness areas definitely increase flood risk, and perhaps that points out an underlying flaw in the underlying bill, of course, and that is that there are wilderness areas too close to where residences are.

But, again, the study is okay. The amendment is okay. I think it does identify one of the 992 flaws in this underlying bill, which is that wilderness is too close to residential areas.

And that 992, Mr. Chairman, is an estimate.

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

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the support of my colleague. He is absolutely right that wildfires do increase the risk of landslides and flooding later down the line. We forget about that part, what happens when the rain hits that previously scorched earth.

I am thrilled to present this amendment to have a study to protect our city urban areas in times of flood, and I appreciate the support of my colleague.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SCHRIER) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUELLAR, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2546) to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

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 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1531

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CASTEN of Illinois) at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

COLORADO WILDERNESS ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 844 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2546.

Will the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) kindly take the chair.

□ 1532

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2546) to designate certain lands in the

State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes, with Mr. COURTNEY (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 116-395 offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 116-395 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. DEGETTE of Colorado.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. PANETTA of California.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. WESTERMAN of Arkansas.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. WESTERMAN of Arkansas.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. CUNNINGHAM of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. TIPTON of Colorado.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. DEGETTE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 189, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

AYES—229

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

Fitzpatrick	Loeb sack	Rush
Fletcher	Lofgren	Ryan
Foster	Lowenthal	Sablan
Frankel	Lowey	San Nicolas
Fudge	Luján	Sánchez
Gallego	Luria	Sarbanes
Garamendi	Lynch	Scanlon
Garcia (IL)	Malinowski	Schakowsky
Garcia (TX)	Maloney,	Schiff
Golden	Carolyn B.	Schneider
Gomez	Maloney, Sean	Schrader
Gonzalez (TX)	Matsui	Schrier
Gottheimer	McBath	Scott (VA)
Green, Al (TX)	McCollum	Scott, David
Grijalva	McEachin	Serrano
Haaland	McGovern	Sewell (AL)
Harder (CA)	McNerney	Shalala
Hastings	Meeks	Sherman
Hayes	Meng	Sherrill
Heck	Moore	Sires
Higgins (NY)	Moulton	Slotkin
Himes	Mucarsel-Powell	Smith (WA)
Horn, Kendra S.	Murphy (FL)	Soto
Horsford	Nadler	Spanberger
Houlihan	Napolitano	Speier
Hoyer	Neal	Stanton
Huffman	Neguse	Stevens
Jackson Lee	Norcross	Suozi
Jayapal	Norton	Swalwell (CA)
Jeffries	O'Halleran	Takano
Johnson (GA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Thompson (CA)
Johnson (TX)	Omar	Thompson (MS)
Kaptur	Pallone	Titus
Keating	Panetta	Tlaib
Kelly (IL)	Pappas	Tonko
Kennedy	Pascarell	Torres (CA)
Khanna	Perlmutter	Torres Small
Kildee	Peters	(NM)
Kilmer	Peterson	Trahan
Kim	Phillips	Trone
Kind	Pingree	Underwood
Krishnamoorthi	Plaskett	Van Drew
Kuster (NH)	Pocan	Vargas
Lamb	Porter	Veasey
Langevin	Pressley	Vela
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Larson (CT)	Quigley	Visclosky
Lawrence	Raskin	Wasserman
Lawson (FL)	Rice (NY)	Schultz
Lee (CA)	Richmond	Waters
Lee (NV)	Rose (NY)	Watson Coleman
Levin (CA)	Rouda	Wexton
Levin (MI)	Roybal-Allard	Wild
Lieu, Ted	Ruiz	Wilson (FL)
Lipinski	Ruppersberger	Yarmuth

NOES—189

Abraham	Davidson (OH)	Hudson
Aderholt	Davis, Rodney	Huizenga
Allen	DesJarlais	Hurd (TX)
Amash	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (LA)
Amodei	Duncan	Johnson (OH)
Armstrong	Dunn	Johnson (SD)
Arrington	Emmer	Jordan
Babin	Estes	Joyce (OH)
Bacon	Ferguson	Joyce (PA)
Baird	Fleischmann	Katko
Balderson	Flores	Keller
Banks	Fortenberry	Kelly (MS)
Barr	Foxx (NC)	Kelly (PA)
Bergman	Fulcher	King (IA)
Biggs	Gaetz	King (NY)
Bishop (NC)	Gallagher	Kustoff (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Gianforte	LaMalfa
Bost	Gibbs	Lamborn
Brady	Gohmert	Latta
Brooks (AL)	Gonzalez (OH)	Lesko
Brooks (IN)	González-Colón	Long
Buchanan	(PR)	Loudermilk
Buck	Gooden	Lucas
Bucshon	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Budd	Granger	Marchant
Burchett	Graves (LA)	Marshall
Burgess	Graves (MO)	Massie
Calvert	Green (TN)	Mast
Carter (GA)	Griffith	McAdams
Carter (TX)	Grothman	McCarthy
Chabot	Guest	McCauley
Cheney	Guthrie	McClintock
Cline	Hagedorn	McHenry
Cloud	Harris	McKinley
Cole	Hartzler	Meadows
Collins (GA)	Hern, Kevin	Meuser
Comer	Herrera Beutler	Miller
Conaway	Hice (GA)	Mitchell
Cook	Higgins (LA)	Moolenaar
Crawford	Hill (AR)	Mooney (WV)
Crenshaw	Holding	Murphy (NC)
Curtis	Hollingsworth	Newhouse

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

NOT VOTING—17

Adams	Kirkpatrick	Radewagen
Billirakis	LaHood	Walker
Byrne	Lewis	Webster (FL)
Gabbard	Morelle	Welch
Graves (GA)	Mullin	Wright
Kinzing	Payne	

□ 1601

Messrs. BACON, GONZALEZ of Ohio, GROTHMAN, and Mrs. HARTZLER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. CLARKE of New York changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 239, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

AYES—181

Abraham	Budd	Emmer
Aderholt	Burchett	Estes
Allen	Burgess	Ferguson
Amodei	Calvert	Fleischmann
Armstrong	Carter (GA)	Flores
Arrington	Carter (TX)	Foxx (NC)
Babin	Chabot	Fulcher
Bacon	Cheney	Gaetz
Baird	Cline	Gallagher
Balderson	Cloud	Gianforte
Banks	Cole	Gibbs
Barr	Collins (GA)	Gohmert
Bergman	Comer	Gonzalez (OH)
Biggs	Conaway	González-Colón
Billirakis	Cook	(PR)
Bishop (NC)	Crawford	Gooden
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Gosar
Bost	Curtis	Granger
Brady	Davidson (OH)	Graves (MO)
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Green (TN)
Brooks (IN)	DesJarlais	Griffith
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Grothman
Buck	Duncan	Guest
Bucshon	Dunn	Guthrie

Hagedorn	McCaul	Sensenbrenner	Rooney (FL)	Shalala	Torres Small	Higgins (LA)	Meadows	Simpson
Harris	McClintock	Shimkus	Rose (NY)	Sherman	(NM)	Hill (AR)	Meuser	Smith (MO)
Hartzler	McHenry	Simpson	Rouda	Sherrill	Trahan	Holding	Miller	Smith (NE)
Hern, Kevin	McKinley	Smith (MO)	Roybal-Allard	Sires	Trone	Hollingsworth	Mitchell	Smucker
Herrera Beutler	Meadows	Smith (NE)	Ruiz	Slotkin	Underwood	Hudson	Moolenaar	Spano
Hice (GA)	Meuser	Smucker	Ruppersberger	Smith (NJ)	Upton	Huizenga	Mooney (WV)	Stauber
Higgins (LA)	Miller	Spano	Rush	Smith (WA)	Van Drew	Hurd (TX)	Murphy (NC)	Steil
Hill (AR)	Mitchell	Stauber	Ryan	Soto	Vargas	Johnson (LA)	Newhouse	Steube
Holding	Moolenaar	Steil	Sablan	Spanberger	Veasey	Johnson (OH)	Norman	Stewart
Hollingsworth	Mooney (WV)	Steupe	San Nicolas	Speier	Vela	Johnson (SD)	Nunes	Stivers
Hudson	Murphy (NC)	Stewart	Sánchez	Stanton	Velázquez	Jordan	Olson	Taylor
Huizenga	Newhouse	Stivers	Sarbanes	Stefanik	Visclosky	Joyce (OH)	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)
Hurd (TX)	Norman	Taylor	Scanlon	Stevens	Wasserman	Joyce (PA)	Palmer	Thornberry
Johnson (LA)	Nunes	Thompson (PA)	Schakowsky	Suozi	Schultz	Keller	Pence	Timmons
Johnson (OH)	Olson	Thornberry	Schiff	Swalwell (CA)	Waters	Kelly (MS)	Perry	Tipton
Johnson (SD)	Palazzo	Timmons	Schneider	Takano	Watson Coleman	Kelly (PA)	Posey	Turner
Jordan	Palmer	Tipton	Schrader	Thompson (CA)	Wexton	King (IA)	Ratcliffe	Van Drew
Joyce (OH)	Pence	Turner	Schrier	Thompson (MS)	Wild	King (NY)	Reed	Wagner
Joyce (PA)	Perry	Wagner	Scott (VA)	Titus	Wilson (FL)	Kustoff (TN)	Reschenthaler	Walberg
Keller	Posey	Walberg	Scott, David	Tlaib	Yarmuth	LaMalfa	Rice (SC)	Walden
Kelly (MS)	Ratcliffe	Walden	Serrano	Tonko		Lamborn	Riggleman	Walorski
Kelly (PA)	Reed	Walorski	Sewell (AL)	Torres (CA)		Latta	Roby	Waltz
King (IA)	Reschenthaler	Waltz				Lesko	Rodgers (WA)	Watkins
King (NY)	Rice (SC)	Watkins	Adams	Kinzinger	Payne	Long	Roe, David P.	Weber (TX)
Kustoff (TN)	Riggleman	Weber (TX)	Byrne	Kirkpatrick	Radewagen	Loudermilk	Rogers (AL)	Webster (FL)
LaMalfa	Roby	Webster (FL)	Gabbard	LaHood	Walker	Lucas	Rogers (KY)	Wenstrup
Lamborn	Roe, David P.	Wenstrup	Graves (GA)	Lewis	Welch	Luetkemeyer	Rose, John W.	Westerman
Latta	Rogers (AL)	Westerman	Graves (LA)	Mullin	Wright	Marshall	Rouzer	Williams
Lesko	Rogers (KY)	Williams				Massie	Roy	Wilson (SC)
Long	Rose, John W.	Wittman				Mast	Rutherford	Wittman
Loudermilk	Rouzer	Womack				McCarthy	Scalise	Womack
Lucas	Roy	Woodall				McCaul	Schweikert	Woodall
Luetkemeyer	Rutherford	Yoho				McClintock	Scott, Austin	Yoho
Marshall	Scalise	Young				McHenry	Sensenbrenner	Young
Massie	Schweikert	Zeldin				McKinley	Shimkus	Zeldin
Mast	Scott, Austin							
McCarthy								

NOT VOTING—15

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

□ 1608

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 236, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

AYES—182

Aguilar	Dingell	Lawson (FL)	Abraham	Burgess	Foxx (NC)	Aguilar	Doyle, Michael	Levin (MI)
Allred	Doggett	Lee (CA)	Aderholt	Calvert	Fulcher	Allred	F.	Lieu, Ted
Amash	Lee (NV)	Lee (NV)	Allen	Carter (GA)	Gaetz	Engel	Engel	Lipinski
Axne	Levin (CA)	Levin (CA)	Amash	Carter (TX)	Gallagher	Escobar	Escobar	Loeb sack
Barragán	Levin (MI)	Lieu, Ted	Amodei	Chabot	Gianforte	Eshoo	Eshoo	Lofgren
Bass	Lieu, Ted	Lipinski	Armstrong	Cheney	Gibbs	Españillat	Españillat	Lowenthal
Beatty	Lipinski	Loeb sack	Arrington	Cline	Gohmert	Evans	Evans	Lowe y
Bera	Loeb sack	Lofgren	Babin	Cloud	Gonzalez (OH)	Finkenauer	Finkenauer	Luján
Beyer	Lofgren	Lowenthal	Bacon	Cole	González-Colón	Fitzpatrick	Fitzpatrick	Luria
Bishop (GA)	Lowenthal	Luján	Baird	Collins (GA)	(PR)	Fletcher	Fletcher	Lynch
Blumenauer	Luján	Luria	Balderson	Comer	Gooden	Fortenberry	Fortenberry	Malinowski
Blunt Rochester	Lynch	Malinowski	Banks	Conaway	Gosar	Foster	Foster	Maloney,
Bonamici	Maloney,	Carolyn B.	Barr	Cook	Granger	Frankel	Frankel	Carolyn B.
Boyle, Brendan	Maloney, Sean	Marchant	Bergman	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)	Fudge	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
F.	Marchant	Matsui	Biggs	Curtis	Graves (MO)	Gallego	Gallego	Marchant
Brindisi	Matsui	McAdams	Bilirakis	Davidson (OH)	Green (TN)	Garamendi	Garamendi	Matsui
Brown (MD)	McAdams	McBath	Bishop (NC)	David, Rodney	Griffith	Garcia (IL)	Garcia (IL)	McAdams
Brownley (CA)	McBath	McCollum	Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Grothman	Garcia (TX)	Garcia (TX)	McBath
Bustos	McCollum	McEachin	Bost	Diaz-Balart	Guest	Golden	Golden	McCollum
Bustos	McEachin	McGovern	Brady	Duncan	Guthrie	Gomez	Gomez	McEachin
Butterfield	McGovern	McNerney	Brooks (AL)	Dunn	Hagedorn	Gonzalez (TX)	Gonzalez (TX)	McGovern
Carbajal	McNerney	Meeks	Brooks (NC)	Emmer	Harris	Gottheimer	Gottheimer	McNerney
Cárdenas	Meeks	Meng	Buchanan	Estes	Hartzler	Green, Al (TX)	Green, Al (TX)	Meeks
Carson (IN)	Meng	Moore	Buck	Ferguson	Hern, Kevin	Grijalva	Grijalva	Meng
Cartwright	Moore	Morelle	Budd	Fleischmann	Herrera Beutler	Haaland	Haaland	Moore
Case	Morelle	Moulton	Burchett	Flores	Hice (GA)	Harder (CA)	Harder (CA)	Morelle
Case	Moulton	Mucarsel-Powell				Hastings	Hastings	Moulton
Casten (IL)	Mucarsel-Powell	Murphy (FL)				Hayes	Hayes	Mucarsel-Powell
Castor (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Nadler				Heck	Heck	Murphy (FL)
Castro (TX)	Nadler	Napolitano				Higgins (NY)	Higgins (NY)	Nadler
Chu, Judy	Napolitano	Neal				Himes	Himes	Napolitano
Cicilline	Neal	Neguse				Horn, Kendra S.	Horn, Kendra S.	Neal
Cisneros	Neguse	Norcross				Horsford	Horsford	Neguse
Clark (MA)	Norcross	Norton				Houlahan	Houlahan	Norcross
Clarke (NY)	Norton	O'Halleran				Hoyer	Hoyer	Norton
Clay	O'Halleran	Ocasio-Cortez				Huffman	Huffman	O'Halleran
Cleaver	Ocasio-Cortez	Omar				Cohen	Jackson Lee	Ocasio-Cortez
Clyburn	Omar	Pallone				Connolly	Jayapal	Omar
Cohen	Pallone	Panetta				Cooper	Jeffries	Pallone
Connolly	Panetta	Pappas				Correa	Johnson (GA)	Panetta
Cooper	Pappas	Pascarell				Costa	Johnson (TX)	Pappas
Correa	Pascarell	Perlmutter				Courtney	Kaptur	Pascarell
Costa	Perlmutter	Peters				Cox (CA)	Katko	Perlmutter
Courtney	Peters	Peterson				Craig	Keating	Peters
Cox (CA)	Peterson	Phillips				Crist	Kelly (IL)	Peterson
Craig	Phillips	Pingree				Crow	Kennedy	Phillips
Crist	Pingree	Plaskett				Cuellar	Khanna	Pingree
Crow	Plaskett	Pocan				Cunningham	Kildee	Plaskett
Cuellar	Pocan	Porter				Davids (KS)	Kilmer	Pocan
Cunningham	Porter	Pressley				Davis (CA)	Kim	Porter
Davids (KS)	Pressley	Price (NC)				Davis, Danny K.	Kind	Pressley
Davis (CA)	Price (NC)	Quigley				Dean	Krishnamoorthi	Price (NC)
Davis, Danny K.	Quigley	Raskin				DeFazio	Kuster (NH)	Quigley
Dean	Raskin	Rice (NY)				DeGette	Lamb	Raskin
DeFazio	Rice (NY)	Richmond				DeLauro	Langevin	Rice (NY)
DeGette	Richmond	Rooney (FL)				DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
DeLauro	Rooney (FL)	Rose (NY)				Demings	Larson (CT)	Rooney (FL)
DelBene	Rose (NY)	Rouda				DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Rose (NY)
Delgado	Rouda	Ruiz				Deutch	Lawson (FL)	Rouda
Demings	Ruiz	Ruppersberger				Dingell	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
DeSaulnier	Ruppersberger					Doggett	Lee (NV)	Ruiz
Deutch							Levin (CA)	

NOES—236

Aguilar	Doyle, Michael	Levin (MI)
Allred	F.	Lieu, Ted
Axne	Engel	Lipinski
Barragán	Escobar	Loeb sack
Bass	Eshoo	Lofgren
Beatty	Españillat	Lowenthal
Bera	Evans	Lowe y
Beyer	Finkenauer	Luján
Bishop (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Luria
Blumenauer	Fletcher	Lynch
Blunt Rochester	Fortenberry	Malinowski
Bonamici	Foster	Maloney,
Boyle, Brendan	Frankel	Carolyn B.
F.	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Brindisi	Gallego	Marchant
Brown (MD)	Garamendi	Matsui
Brownley (CA)	Garcia (IL)	McAdams
Bustos	Garcia (TX)	McBath
Butterfield	Golden	McCollum
Carbajal	Gomez	McEachin
Cárdenas	Gonzalez (TX)	McGovern
Carson (IN)	Gottheimer	McNerney
Cartwright	Green, Al (TX)	Meeks
Case	Grijalva	Meng
Casten (IL)	Haaland	Moore
Castor (FL)	Harder (CA)	Morelle
Castro (TX)	Hastings	Moulton
Chu, Judy	Hayes	Mucarsel-Powell
Cicilline	Heck	Murphy (FL)
Cisneros	Higgins (NY)	Nadler
Clark (MA)	Himes	Napolitano
Clarke (NY)	Horn, Kendra S.	Neal
Clay	Horsford	Neguse
Cleaver	Houlahan	Norcross
Clyburn	Hoyer	Norton
Cohen	Huffman	O'Halleran
Connolly	Jackson Lee	Ocasio-Cortez
Cooper	Jayapal	Omar
Correa	Jeffries	Pallone
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Panetta
Courtney	Johnson (TX)	Pappas
Cox (CA)	Kaptur	Pascarell
Craig	Katko	Perlmutter
Crist	Keating	Peters
Crow	Kelly (IL)	Peterson
Cuellar	Kennedy	Phillips
Cunningham	Khanna	Pingree
Davids (KS)	Kildee	Plaskett
Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Pocan
Davis, Danny K.	Kim	Porter
Dean	Kind	Pressley
DeFazio	Krishnamoorthi	Price (NC)
DeGette	Kuster (NH)	Quigley
DeLauro	Lamb	Raskin
DelBene	Langevin	Rice (NY)
Delgado	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
Demings	Larson (CT)	Rooney (FL)
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Rose (NY)
Deutch	Lawson (FL)	Rouda
Dingell	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Doggett	Lee (NV)	Ruiz
	Levin (CA)	Ruppersberger

Ryan	Slotkin	Torres Small
Sablan	Smith (NJ)	(NM)
San Nicolas	Smith (WA)	Trahan
Sánchez	Soto	Trone
Sarbanes	Spanberger	Underwood
Scanlon	Speier	Upton
Schakowsky	Stanton	Vargas
Schiff	Stefanik	Veasey
Schneider	Stevens	Vela
Schrader	Suozzi	Velázquez
Schrier	Swalwell (CA)	Visclosky
Scott (VA)	Takano	Wasserman
Scott, David	Thompson (CA)	Schultz
Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Waters
Sewell (AL)	Titus	Watson Coleman
Shalala	Tlaib	Wexton
Sherman	Tonko	Wild
Sherrill	Torres (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Sires		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Adams	Kinzing	Radewagen
Bucshon	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Byrne	LaHood	Walker
Crawford	Lewis	Welch
Gabbard	Mullin	Wright
Graves (GA)	Payne	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1612

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained and missed a vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 62.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 406, noes 12, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

AYES—406

Abraham	Bonamici	Castor (FL)
Aderholt	Bost	Castro (TX)
Aguilar	Boyle, Brendan	Chabot
Allen	F.	Cheney
Allred	Brindisi	Chu, Judy
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Cicilline
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Cisneros
Armstrong	Brown (MD)	Clark (MA)
Arrington	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Axne	Buchanan	Clay
Babin	Buck	Cleaver
Bacon	Bucshon	Cline
Baird	Burchett	Cloud
Balderson	Burgess	Clyburn
Barr	Bustos	Cohen
Barragán	Butterfield	Cole
Bass	Calvert	Collins (GA)
Beatty	Carbajal	Comer
Bera	Cárdenas	Conaway
Bergman	Carson (IN)	Connolly
Beyer	Carter (GA)	Cook
Bilirakis	Carter (TX)	Cooper
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Correa
Blumenauer	Case	Costa
Blunt Rochester	Casten (IL)	Courtney

Cox (CA)	Hurd (TX)	Olson	Torres (CA)	Wagner	Wexton
Craig	Jackson Lee	Omar	Torres Small	Walberg	Wild
Crawford	Jayapal	Palazzo	(NM)	Walden	Williams
Crenshaw	Jeffries	Pallone	Trahan	Walorski	Wilson (FL)
Crist	Johnson (GA)	Palmer	Trone	Waltz	Wilson (SC)
Crow	Johnson (LA)	Panetta	Turner	Wasserman	Wittman
Cuellar	Johnson (OH)	Pappas	Underwood	Schultz	Womack
Cunningham	Johnson (SD)	Pascrell	Upton	Waters	Woodall
Curtis	Johnson (TX)	Pence	Van Drew	Watkins	Yarmuth
David (KS)	Jordan	Perlmutter	Vargas	Watson Coleman	Yoho
Davidson (OH)	Joyce (OH)	Perry	Veasey	Weber (TX)	Young
Davis (CA)	Joyce (PA)	Peters	Vela	Webster (FL)	Zeldin
Davis, Danny K.	Kaptur	Peterson	Velázquez	Wenstrup	
Davis, Rodney	Katko	Phillips	Visclosky	Westerman	
Dean	Keating	Pingree			
DeFazio	Keller	Plaskett			
DeGette	Kelly (IL)	Pocan			
DeLauro	Kelly (MS)	Porter			
DeBene	Kelly (PA)	Posey			
Delgado	Kennedy	Pressley			
Demings	Khanna	Price (NC)			
DeSaulnier	Kildee	Quigley			
DesJarlais	Kilmer	Raskin			
Deutch	Kim	Ratcliffe			
Diaz-Balart	Kind	Reed			
Dingell	King (IA)	Reschenthaler			
Doggett	King (NY)	Rice (NY)			
Doyle, Michael	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (SC)			
F.	Kuster (NH)	Richmond			
Duncan	Kustoff (TN)	Riggleman			
Dunn	LaMalfa	Roby			
Engel	Lamb	Rodgers (WA)			
Escobar	Lamborn	Roe, David P.			
Eshoo	Langevin	Rogers (AL)			
Espallat	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)			
Estes	Larson (CT)	Rooney (FL)			
Evans	Latta	Rose (NY)			
Ferguson	Lawrence	Rose, John W.			
Finkenauer	Lawson (FL)	Rouda			
Fitzpatrick	Lee (CA)	Rouzer			
Fleischmann	Lee (NV)	Ruiz			
Fletcher	Lesko	Ruppersberger			
Flores	Levin (CA)	Rush			
Fortenberry	Levin (MI)	Rutherford			
Foster	Lieu, Ted	Ryan			
Foxx (NC)	Lipinski	Sablan			
Frankel	Loeb sack	San Nicolas			
Fudge	Lofgren	Sánchez			
Fulcher	Long	Sarbanes			
Gaetz	Loudermilk	Scalise			
Gallagher	Lowenthal	Scanlon			
Gallego	Lowe	Schakowsky			
Garamendi	Lucas	Schiff			
García (IL)	Luetkemeyer	Schneider			
García (TX)	Luján	Schrader			
Gibbs	Luria	Schrier			
Gohmert	Lynch	Schweikert			
Golden	Malinowski	Scott (VA)			
Gomez	Maloney,	Scott, Austin			
Gonzalez (OH)	Carolyn B.	Scott, David			
González-Colón	Maloney, Sean	Sensenbrenner			
(PR)	Marshall	Serrano			
Gooden	Mast	Sewell (AL)			
Gosar	Matsui	Shalala			
Gottheimer	McAdams	Sherrill			
Granger	McBath	Shimkus			
Graves (LA)	McCarthy	Simpson			
Graves (MO)	McCauley	Sires			
Green (TN)	McClintock	Slotkin			
Green, Al (TX)	McCollum	Smith (MO)			
Griffith	McEachin	Smith (NE)			
Grijalva	McGovern	Smith (NJ)			
Grothman	McHenry	Smith (WA)			
Guest	McKinley	Smucker			
Guthrie	McNerney	Soto			
Haaland	Meadows	Spanberger			
Hagedorn	Meeks	Spano			
Harder (CA)	Meng	Speier			
Harris	Meuser	Stanton			
Hartzler	Miller	Staubert			
Hastings	Mitchell	Stefanik			
Hayes	Mooleenaar	Steil			
Heck	Moore	Steube			
Hern, Kevin	Morille	Stevens			
Herrera Beutler	Moulton	Stewart			
Hice (GA)	Mucarsel-Powell	Stivers			
Higgins (LA)	Murphy (FL)	Suozzi			
Higgins (NY)	Murphy (NC)	Swalwell (CA)			
Hill (AR)	Nadler	Takano			
Himes	Napolitano	Taylor			
Holding	Neal	Thompson (CA)			
Hollingsworth	Neguse	Thompson (MS)			
Horn, Kendra S.	Newhouse	Thompson (PA)			
Horsford	Norcross	Thornberry			
Houlahan	Norman	Timmons			
Hoyer	Norton	Tipton			
Hudson	Nunes	Titus			
Huffman	O'Halleran	Tlaib			
Huizenga	Ocasio-Cortez	Tonko			

Torres (CA)	Wagner	Wexton
Torres Small	Walberg	Wild
(NM)	Walden	Williams
Trahan	Walorski	Wilson (FL)
Trone	Waltz	Wilson (SC)
Turner	Wasserman	Wittman
Underwood	Schultz	Womack
Upton	Waters	Woodall
Van Drew	Watkins	Yarmuth
Vargas	Watson Coleman	Yoho
Veasey	Weber (TX)	Young
Vela	Webster (FL)	Zeldin
Velázquez	Wenstrup	
Visclosky	Westerman	

NOES—12

Banks	Brady	Marchant
Biggs	Budd	Massie
Bishop (NC)	Emmer	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (UT)	Gianforte	Roy

NOT VOTING—17

Adams	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Byrne	LaHood	Sherman
Gabbard	Lewis	Walker
Gonzalez (TX)	Mullin	Welch
Graves (GA)	Payne	Wright
Kinzing	Radewagen	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1616

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 63.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, regarding the Panetta Amendment, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 63.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 228, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

AYES—193

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

Gianforte	Lesko	Roy	Omar	Sánchez	Thompson (CA)	Gosar	Luetkemeyer	Rutherford
Gibbs	Long	Rutherford	Pallone	Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)	Granger	Marchant	Scalise
Gohmert	Loudermilk	Scalise	Panetta	Scanlon	Titus	Marshall	Marchall	Schweikert
Gonzalez (OH)	Lucas	Schweikert	Pappas	Schakowsky	Tlaib	Graves (LA)	Massie	Scott, Austin
González-Colón	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin	Pascarell	Schiff	Tonko	Graves (MO)	Mast	Sensenbrenner
(PR)	Marchant	Sensenbrenner	Perlmutter	Schneider	Torres (CA)	Griffith	McCarthy	Shimkus
Gooden	Marshall	Shimkus	Peters	Schrader	Torres Small	Grothman	McCaul	Simpson
Gosar	Massie	Simpson	Phillips	Schrier	(NM)	Guest	McClintock	Smith (MO)
Granger	Mast	Smith (MO)	Pingree	Scott (VA)	Trahan	Guthrie	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Graves (LA)	McCarthy	Smith (NE)	Plaskett	Scott, David	Trone	Hagedorn	McKinley	Smucker
Graves (MO)	McCaul	Smith (NJ)	Pocan	Serrano	Underwood	Harris	Meadows	Spano
Green (TN)	McClintock	Smucker	Porter	Sewell (AL)	Van Drew	Hartzler	Meuser	Staubert
Griffith	McHenry	Spano	Pressley	Shalala	Vargas	Hern, Kevin	Miller	Steil
Grothman	McKinley	Stauber	Price (NC)	Sherman	Veasey	Herrera Beutler	Mitchell	Steube
Guest	Meadows	Stefanik	Quigley	Serrill	Vela	Hice (GA)	Moolenaar	Stewart
Guthrie	Meuser	Steil	Raskin	Sires	Velázquez	Higgins (LA)	Mooney (WV)	Stivers
Hagedorn	Miller	Steube	Rice (NY)	Slotkin	Visclosky	Hill (AR)	Murphy (NC)	Taylor
Harris	Mitchell	Stewart	Richmond	Smith (WA)	Wasserman	Holding	Newhouse	Thompson (PA)
Hartzler	Moolenaar	Stivers	Rouda	Soto	Schultz	Hollingsworth	Norman	Thornberry
Hern, Kevin	Mooney (WV)	Taylor	Roybal-Allard	Spanberger	Waters	Hudson	Nunes	Timmons
Herrera Beutler	Murphy (NC)	Thompson (PA)	Ruiz	Speier	Watson Coleman	Huizenga	Olson	Tipton
Hice (GA)	Newhouse	Thornberry	Ruppersberger	Stanton	Wexton	Hurd (TX)	Palazzo	Turner
Higgins (LA)	Norman	Timmons	Rush	Stevens	Wild	Johnson (LA)	Palmer	Upton
Hill (AR)	Nunes	Tipton	Ryan	Suozzi	Wilson (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Pence	Wagner
Holding	Olson	Turner	Sablan	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth	Johnson (SD)	Perry	Walberg
Hollingsworth	Palazzo	Upton	San Nicolas	Takano	Jordan	Posay	Walden	Walden
Horn, Kendra S.	Palmer	Wagner			Joyce (OH)	Ratcliffe	Walorski	Walorski
Hudson	Pence	Walberg			Joyce (PA)	Reed	Waltz	Waltz
Huizenga	Perry	Walden	Adams	Kirkpatrick	Keller	Reschenthaler	Watkins	Watkins
Hurd (TX)	Peterson	Walorski	Byrne	LaHood	Kelly (MS)	Rice (SC)	Weber (TX)	Weber (TX)
Johnson (LA)	Posay	Waltz	Gabbard	Lewis	Kelly (PA)	Riggleman	Webster (FL)	Webster (FL)
Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe	Watkins	Graves (GA)	Mullin	King (IA)	Roby	Wenstrup	Wenstrup
Johnson (SD)	Reed	Weber (TX)	Kinzing	Payne	King (NY)	Rodgers (WA)	Westerman	Westerman
Jordan	Reschenthaler	Webster (FL)			Kustoff (TN)	Roe, David P.	Williams	Williams
Joyce (OH)	Rice (SC)	Wenstrup			LaMalfa	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)	Wilson (SC)
Joyce (PA)	Riggleman	Westerman			Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	Wittman	Wittman
Keller	Roby	Williams			Latta	Rooney (FL)	Womack	Womack
Kelly (MS)	Rodgers (WA)	Wilson (SC)			Lesko	Rose (NY)	Woodall	Woodall
Kelly (PA)	Roe, David P.	Wittman			Long	Rose, John W.	Yoho	Yoho
King (IA)	Rogers (AL)	Womack			Loudermilk	Rouzer	Young	Young
King (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Woodall			Lucas	Roy	Zeldin	Zeldin
Kustoff (TN)	Rooney (FL)	Yoho						
LaMalfa	Rose (NY)	Young						
Lamborn	Rose, John W.	Zeldin						
Latta	Rouzer							

NOES—228

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

NOT VOTING—14

Adams
Byrne
Gabbard
Graves (GA)
Kinzing

Kirkpatrick
LaHood
Lewis
Mullin
Payne

Radewagen
Walker
Welch
Wright

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

□ 1620

Mr. TURNER changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 233, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

AYES—188

Abraham	Buchanan	DesJarlais
Aderholt	Buck	Diaz-Balart
Allen	Bucshon	Duncan
Amash	Burchett	Dunn
Armstrong	Burgess	Emmer
Arrington	Estes	Estes
Babin	Carter (GA)	Ferguson
Bacon	Carter (TX)	Fleischmann
Baird	Chabot	Flores
Balderson	Cheney	Fortenberry
Banks	Cline	Foxx (NC)
Barr	Cloud	Fulcher
Bergman	Cole	Gaetz
Biggs	Collins (GA)	Gallagher
Billrakis	Comer	Gianforte
Bishop (NC)	Conaway	Gibbs
Bishop (UT)	Cook	Gohmert
Bost	Crawford	Golden
Brady	Crenshaw	Gonzalez (OH)
Brooks (AL)	Curtis	González-Colón
Brooks (IN)	Davidson (OH)	(PR)
	Davis, Rodney	Gooden

NOES—233

Aguilar	Delgado	Kuster (NH)
Allred	Demings	Lamb
Axne	DeSaulnier	Langevin
Barragán	Larsen (WA)	Langevin
Bass	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Beatty	Doggett	Lawrence
Bera	Doyle, Michael	Lawson (FL)
Beyer	F.	Lee (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Engel	Lee (NV)
Blumenauer	Escobar	Levin (CA)
Blunt Rochester	Eshoo	Levin (MI)
Bonamici	Españillat	Lieu, Ted
Boyle, Brendan	Evans	Lipinski
F.	Finkenauer	Loeb sack
Brindisi	Fitzpatrick	Lofgren
Brown (MD)	Fletcher	Lowenthal
Brownley (CA)	Foster	Lowe
Budd	Frankel	Luján
Bustos	Fudge	Luria
Butterfield	Gallego	Lynch
Carbajal	Garamendi	Malinowski
Cárdenas	Garcia (IL)	Maloney
Carson (IN)	Garcia (TX)	Carolyn B.
Cartwright	Gomez	Maloney, Sean
Case	Gonzalez (TX)	Matsui
Casten (IL)	Gottheimer	McAdams
Castor (FL)	Green, Al (TX)	McBath
Castro (TX)	Grijalva	McCollum
Chu, Judy	Haaland	McEachin
Cicilline	Harder (CA)	McGovern
Cisneros	Hastings	McNerney
Clark (MA)	Hayes	Meeks
Clarke (NY)	Heck	Meng
Clay	Higgins (NY)	Moore
Cleaver	Himes	Morelle
Clyburn	Horn, Kendra S.	Moulton
Cohen	Horsford	Mucarsel-Powell
Connolly	Houlahan	Murphy (FL)
Cooper	Hoyer	Nadler
Correa	Huffman	Napolitano
Costa	Jackson Lee	Neal
Courtney	Jayapal	Neguse
Cox (CA)	Jeffries	Norcross
Craig	Johnson (GA)	Norton
Crist	Johnson (TX)	O'Halleran
Crow	Kaptur	Ocasio-Cortez
Cuellar	Katko	Omar
Cunningham	Keating	Pallone
Davids (KS)	Kelly (IL)	Panetta
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Pappas
Davis, Danny K.	Khanna	Pascarell
Dean	Khan	Perlmutter
DeFazio	Kind	Peters
DeGette	Kind	Peterson
	Krishnamoorthi	Phillips
		Pingree

Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

Blumenauer

NOT VOTING—15

Adams	Kinzingner	Payne
Byrne	Kirkpatrick	Radewagen
DeFazio	LaHood	Walker
Gabbard	Lewis	Welch
Graves (GA)	Mullin	Wright

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1628

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 234, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

AYES—183

Gianforte
Gibbs
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón
(PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
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
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)

Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kustoff (TN)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Rouzer
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)

Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker

Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—234

Aguilar
Allred
Amash
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)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.

Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeback
Lofgren
Lowenthal

Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider

Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier

Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood

Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Adams
Byrne
Gabbard
Gohmert
Graves (GA)
Kinzinger

Kirkpatrick
LaHood
Lewis
Marchant
Mast
Morelle

Mullin
Payne
Radewagen
Walker
Welch
Wright

□ 1633

Ms. PRESSLEY changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CLAY). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) having assumed the chair, Mr. CLAY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2546) to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 844, reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Yes, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McClintock moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2546 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 234, after line 21, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent provisions accordingly):

TITLE VII—PROTECTING LIFE, PROPERTY, AND THE ENVIRONMENT FROM WILDFIRE

SEC. 701. PROTECTING LIFE, PROPERTY, AND THE ENVIRONMENT FROM WILDFIRE.

In addition to any other authority provided in this Act, mechanical wildfire mitigation shall be allowed in wilderness areas designated under this Act to protect life, property, or the environment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the question presented in this amendment comes down to this: Are we willing to protect our wilderness areas from catastrophic wildfire or are we content to stand by and watch them burn?

The Wilderness Act of 1964 designates lands, “for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness.”

Now, that is important because nothing impairs the future use and enjoyment of our wilderness areas more than catastrophic fire.

Our pledge in the Wilderness Act is to, “provide for the protection of these areas.” To provide for the protection of these areas.

Look at America’s wilderness areas today, it is heartbreaking. We have utterly failed to protect them from the scourge of wildfire that is now consuming them.

An untended forest is no different than an untended garden. It will grow and grow until it chokes itself to death, and as it becomes morbidly overgrown, it falls victim to disease, pestilence, drought, and ultimately catastrophic wildfire that incinerates everything in its path.

Once a forest is cremated, scrub brush takes over, and the forest won’t regrow for a century or more, denying multiple generations of Americans the use and enjoyment that the Wilderness Act promises. And then the process of destruction will begin again.

Why? Because we have made it all but impossible for forest managers to protect these habitats by removing excess timber before it can choke off the forest. Without special permitting, land managers are restricted to hand-saws and axes, which consigns our wilderness forests to a policy of benign neglect even as they die before our eyes and await the inevitable wildfire.

And even when the conflagration is ravaging the forest, permission to use mechanized equipment to fight the fires in wilderness areas is often difficult and time consuming. Today’s Panetta amendment does nothing to change this dangerous situation.

The 2019 Decker fire in Colorado began in the Sangre de Cristo wilderness where benign neglect had already decimated the forest. Eighty percent of the trees had already perished in the overcrowded conditions that made them vulnerable to pestilence and

drought. And when the fire came, firefighters were held back due to the wilderness designation until the fire literally exploded. The same tale is told over and over again throughout our national lands.

There are currently 111 million acres of Federal land designated as wilderness. That is about the size of California. This bill would add 1.5 million more. That is the size of Delaware and half of Rhode Island combined, much of it in areas where the Federal land managers are warning us that it is not suitable for wilderness designation and it is opposed by local governments because of the proximity to towns, homes, and property.

My amendment simply allows for mechanized wildfire mitigation; that is, something more than handsaws and axes for the express and sole purpose of protecting life, property, or the environment in these newly created wilderness areas under this bill.

This isn't a new policy. There are 29 instances where similar active management activities are already written into specific wilderness designations. This amendment would be the 30th time we have done so.

When Republicans were in the majority, we set three objectives for our Federal lands: To restore public access to them; to restore good management to them; and to restore the Federal Government as a good neighbor to the communities directly impacted by them.

This bill reverses those objectives set by House Republicans. Instead of restoring public access to public lands, the Democrats would restrict it. Instead of restoring good management to the public lands, the Democrats interfere with it. And instead of restoring the Federal Government as a good neighbor to those communities impacted by the public lands, the Democrats give those communities the finger.

But mark these words: If these wilderness restrictions are imposed on acreage near people's homes, it is only a matter of time until the forest succumbs to neglect and the inevitable cycle of overcrowding, death, and fire. In the aftermath, people will have the right to ask why their elected representatives refused to protect them, their families, their homes and their forests when they had the chance to do so today to allow our Nation's foresters to do their jobs and care for this precious resource.

At this moment my Democratic colleagues, remember, only you can prevent forest fires.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit may sound innoc-

uous, but it truly is a wolf in sheep's clothing, and let me tell you why.

Our local agencies already have the ability to fight fires if they need to in wilderness areas. There is no provision in the Wilderness Act that says they can only use axes or nonmechanical items, none.

They keep saying this all day, and I don't know why. It is simply not true.

What this amendment would do is it would give some amorphous entity the ability to use mechanical means whenever they thought necessary, potentially usurping the right of local governments.

And also, as the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) pointed out, the local areas, the management teams, already had the ability to fight fires how they wanted. And what is more, in the underlying bill, we say that.

But just to make clear, just about everybody in this Chamber just voted for the Panetta amendment, which underscores that we can fight fires in wilderness.

But let's talk about what this bill really is about. Let's talk about it, because it is so important for our children and our grandchildren, the future generations.

Today, we have a bipartisan ability to preserve these special wild areas. It is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to preserve 1.4 million acres of wilderness across the West for our generations to come.

It will stimulate the economies of our States; it will encourage recreation; it will encourage conservation; and it will take us a long way to our goal of preserving 30 percent of public lands by 2030 to start slowing down the changing of our climate.

P.S., if we slow down the climate change, we slow down the forest fires, and everybody in this Chamber knows that.

Look at the charts that we have of the areas in this bill. I want to show everybody these gorgeous areas:

This first chart, one of the 35 areas in my Colorado Wilderness Act, the Dolores Canyon River;

The second chart, the Middle Fork Eel Wild and Scenic River in Mr. HUFFMAN's Northwest California Wilderness, Recreation, and Working Forest Act;

The third chart, Dry Lakes Ridge in Mr. CARBAJAL's Central Coast Heritage Protection Act.

And, by the way, Mr. Speaker, you can see here where they had a fire, and you can see here what happened when that area remediated itself from the fire: beautiful wildflowers.

The San Gabriel National Recreation Area waterways in Ms. CHU's act, you can see the beautiful areas that are protected there.

The Rim of the Valley in Mr. SCHIFF's Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act. These were sent to him by his constituents, who love these areas.

And the Skokomish River in Mr. KILMER's Wild Olympics Wilderness and Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Folks, this is what we are talking about. This is the legacy we are leaving our children.

The Wilderness Act of 1964 says:

Wilderness should be preserved as an area where the Earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain.

That is what we are talking about today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this motion to recommit and vote "yes" on this important groundbreaking bill.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 199, nays 215, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—199

Abraham	Davidson (OH)	Johnson (SD)
Aderholt	Davis, Rodney	Jordan
Allen	DesJarlais	Joyce (OH)
Amash	Diaz-Balart	Joyce (PA)
Amodei	Duncan	Katko
Armstrong	Dunn	Keller
Arrington	Emmer	Kelly (MS)
Babin	Estes	Kelly (PA)
Bacon	Ferguson	King (IA)
Baird	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Balderson	Fleischmann	Kustoff (TN)
Banks	Flores	LaMalfa
Barr	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Bergman	Fox (NC)	Latta
Biggs	Fulcher	Lesko
Bilirakis	Gaetz	Long
Bishop (NC)	Gallagher	Loudermilk
Bishop (UT)	Gibbs	Lucas
Bost	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Brady	Gonzalez (OH)	Marshall
Brindisi	Gooden	Massie
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	McAdams
Brooks (IN)	Granger	McCarthy
Buchanan	Graves (LA)	McCaul
Buck	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Bucshon	Green (TN)	McHenry
Budd	Griffith	McKinley
Burchett	Grothman	Meadows
Burgess	Guest	Meuser
Calvert	Guthrie	Miller
Carter (GA)	Hagedorn	Mitchell
Carter (TX)	Harder (CA)	Moolenaar
Chabot	Harris	Mooney (WV)
Cheney	Hartzler	Murphy (NC)
Cisneros	Hern, Kevin	Newhouse
Cline	Herrera Beutler	Norman
Cloud	Hice (GA)	Nunes
Cole	Higgins (LA)	Olson
Collins (GA)	Hill (AR)	Palazzo
Comer	Holding	Palmer
Conaway	Hollingsworth	Pence
Cook	Hudson	Perry
Crawford	Huizenga	Porter
Crenshaw	Hurd (TX)	Posey
Cunningham	Johnson (LA)	Ratcliffe
Curtis	Johnson (OH)	Reed

Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggelman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner

Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Stell
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton

Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

Adams
Byrne
Gabbard
Graves (GA)
Kinzinger

NOT VOTING—15
Kirkpatrick
LaHood
Lewis
Marchant
Mast

Mullin
Payne
Walker
Welch
Wright

Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)

Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew

Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1653

So the motion to recommit was re-jected.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 183, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—231

NAYS—215

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

Gianforte
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

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)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kim
Kilmer
Kind
Crown
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar

Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Portenberry
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halloran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Perlmutter
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)

Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halloran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Perlmutter
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)

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

NAYS—183

Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
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
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kustoff (TN)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman

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

NOT VOTING—15

Adams
Byrne
Gabbard
Graves (GA)
Kinzinger

Kirkpatrick
LaHood
Lewis
Marchant
Mast

□ 1659

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: yea on rollcall No. 60; nay on rollcall No. 61; nay on

rollcall No. 62; yea on rollcall No. 63; nay on rollcall No. 64; nay on rollcall No. 65; yea on rollcall No. 66; nay on rollcall No. 67; nay on rollcall No. 68; and yea on rollcall No. 69.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING ERA RESOLUTION

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

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of the resolution to remove the arbitrary deadline for ratification of the equal rights amendment, which is designed to end the legal distinctions between men and women.

Madam Speaker, signed in 1776, the Declaration of Independence states: "All men are created equal." Really? Following the birth of our Nation, it took women 144 years to secure the right to vote and even longer for women of color. It took 187 years to be promised equal pay, 197 years to get reproductive rights, and 198 years to get a credit card or buy a home.

Yet, Madam Speaker, the women in this country are still fighting for equality. Madam Speaker, we are tired of waiting.

RECOGNIZING FIFTH CORPS AT FORT KNOX

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Fort Knox.

Yesterday, the U.S. Army selected Fort Knox as a new corps headquarters called V Corps. V Corps will bring over 600 soldiers and their families to Kentucky.

I like to say that Fort Knox has the assets and the attitude for this new corps. The assets are the training grounds, housing, schools, and other resources that V Corps will be able to use when they arrive in the fall. The attitude is that of Fort Knox and the surrounding communities.

Kentucky is a great place to be a soldier, and I know that the Commonwealth will welcome these soldiers and their families with open arms.

I want to thank Senate Leader MCCONNELL for his steadfast leadership in helping Fort Knox get selected for the new V Corps. I look forward to continuing to work with Fort Knox, the Department of Defense, and the U.S. Army.

PENN STATE IS IMPORTANT NATIONAL RESOURCE

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, last month, I toured Penn State University Park campus located in Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District.

During that time, I had the opportunity to speak with students, staff, and faculty about ongoing projects and why they are proud to be part of an internationally sought-after education program.

Penn State University was founded as a land grant university, meaning its mission is to serve the public, especially the people of Pennsylvania.

After my tour of the campus and seeing their impressive research facilities, I can say with confidence that Penn State remains focused on that original mission. Whether it is helping the agriculture community with ag extensions or working on important defense-related research for the Federal Government, Penn State is an important State and national resource.

I look forward to continuing to work with Penn State in carrying out its public mission and remaining a premier national institution.

ALLOW TREASURY TO WAIVE VOTING AUTHORITY

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to a bill that I will be introducing this week.

My legislation allows the Secretary of the Treasury to waive voting authority for the international financial institutions on a case-by-case basis.

The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund receive U.S. funding and are subject to legislative oversight, which often dictates by a mandate what projects and policies they can endorse.

For example, when the World Bank takes a vote to approve a lending project, the United States may have to abstain or vote against it due to the parameters put forward by a mandate from Congress. Even further, Congress keeps adding to the mandates and has never tried to streamline them, resulting in mandates that are antiquated and can actually conflict with one another.

As a result, the Financial Services Committee has increasingly come to a bipartisan consensus that new mandates should have waiver authority and sunset clauses.

This legislation would allow the Treasury Secretary to waive a mandate and be able to properly vote on a financing, subject to a written report as to why to Congress. This means more flexibility to pursue our national inter-

ests, but also strong accountability to Congress.

COME TOGETHER TO SERVE THE PEOPLE

(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, I rise today to honor the birthday of the great Abraham Lincoln, an attorney, a Congressman, and the 16th President of the United States.

In this day and age, let us honor President Lincoln by remembering his words: "A house divided against itself cannot stand."

While these words rang true 3 years before the Civil War, they are just as true today, Madam Speaker. As we move past the cloud of impeachment, let us come together and remember why we are here in this Chamber: to serve the American people. That is why we are here.

Let today be the day that we come together and serve the people of our great Nation in a way that would make Abraham Lincoln proud.

RAISING AWARENESS OF AMERICAN HEART MONTH

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to American Heart Month, a topic that is extremely important yet also personal to me.

Almost 10 years ago, I was diagnosed with severe three-vessel coronary artery disease, and I have since had 13 stents placed in my heart. So while this is deeply personal to share, I also recognize the unique position that I have been given to raise awareness about cardiovascular health.

Half of all Americans have at least one key risk factor: high blood pressure, high cholesterol, or history of smoking. By changing our diets, avoiding nicotine products, and exercising, roughly 83 percent of premature deaths from heart disease can be avoided.

Along with annual checkups and prescribed medicines, I urge all to remain alert to the symptoms of heart problems, including shortness of breath, heart palpitations, or numbness in the arms.

Heart disease is currently the world's leading cause of death, claiming 17.9 million lives annually, yet it doesn't have to be.

With modern medicine, and by the grace of God, I am here today. So I urge everyone to take control of their heart health before it is too late.

CONTROL OUR BORDERS

(Mr. GUEST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the New Way Forward Act, which would completely eliminate our Nation's ability to control our borders and determine who enters our country.

It would cripple the efforts of our law enforcement officers to remove dangerous criminals from our streets, and it would undermine the sacrifice that the men and women of law enforcement make every day.

Additionally, the New Way Forward Act would encourage and open new pathways for convicted criminals to enter and remain in the United States. Meanwhile, conservative policies like building the wall and supporting law enforcement agencies reduced the number of apprehensions by almost 75 percent since May and led to the seizure of more than 50,000 pounds of drugs across our southwest border.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the New Way Forward Act.

RECOGNIZING EGG HARBOR TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL MOCK TRIAL TEAM

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize the Egg Harbor Township High School's mock trial team from south Jersey.

Egg Harbor Township High School unseated reigning Atlantic County trial champion Mainland Regional in the county final.

Led by coaches Michael Martirone, Trevor Zompa, and Dara Quattrone, the Egg Harbor mock trial team won for the first time in 9 years.

Students take on roles of prosecutors, defense attorneys, witnesses, and jurors before New Jersey judges and attorneys at the New Jersey Law Center. Egg Harbor's team will now compete in the semifinals, with the final competition being in March.

I am going to mention all of their names: Raza Abbas, Tyler Weller, Madeline Coyle, Annette Diaz, Michael Donchey, Gabriela Garcia, Malini Gulati, Tasmiah Haque, Megan Herbin, Jason Hill, David Lee, Matthew Levine, Nicholas Seppy, Ethan Saul, Carina Sharra, Danielle Sharra, Evan Shuttleworth, Isabella Spena, and finally Skyler Szilagyi.

Congratulations, and good luck. We look forward to big things from all of you. We are so unbelievably proud of you.

□ 1715

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

(Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, in 1970 in this very Chamber the first African American woman elected to Congress, Shirley Chisholm, said:

There is an unspoken assumption that women are different. Artificial distinctions between persons must be wiped out of the law.

Congresswoman Chisholm was calling for the passage of the equal rights amendment. Fifty years later and a century after securing the right to vote, I stand before you, Madam Speaker, with the same call to action.

I stand before you as a Member of the 116th Congress with the greatest proportion of women Members in our history and a female Speaker, but yet as a woman, my rights remain unprotected in the Constitution.

The majority of Americans are women, but yet our Constitution does not fully and explicitly include our mothers, daughters, grandmothers, aunts, and neighbors.

Our Constitution is not just a founding document. It is a foundational document to equality under the law. It is time to reflect the truths that have become self-evident, that all people are created equal. It is time to pass the equal rights amendment.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the importance of investing in our Nation's infrastructure. And, in particular, to fix our broken and aging water delivery systems, not only in California but throughout the country.

In California's San Joaquin Valley, the availability of a clean and reliable water supply is absolutely essential for the foundation of our economy. Farmers need water to feed the world, and life becomes obviously very difficult if residents don't have a clean drinking water supply.

The waterways that carry our water were built decades ago in California and throughout the country.

Last week, I introduced legislation to fix two pieces of critical water infrastructure, the Delta-Mendota Canal and the California Aqueduct, that were built decades ago.

The Conveyance Capacity Correction Act will provide \$400 million to fund these needed projects. This legislation is just one of the many tools we have that can fix the water system that we have; one of the water tools in our water toolbox.

We need to invest in our water infrastructure now for the future sustainability of our State and the livelihood of our residents.

Food is a national security item.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CRAIG). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, when Donald Trump was running for President, he promised that he would balance the budget, eliminate the national debt, and protect programs that support American families.

He continues to promise to balance the budget, but his latest math is based on fantasy. The President's budget cuts the programs that Americans rely on and those that Americans have invested in in order to fund more tax cuts for the wealthy, a bigger defense budget, and an ineffective border wall.

If it isn't clear yet, the President failed to be truthful. He is putting special interests above the health and safety of hardworking American families.

Our national debt is bigger than ever, and taxpayer dollars have been wasted paying for tax cuts that benefit the rich and powerful.

Here is the stone-cold truth: President Trump is reneging on his promise to protect older Americans and those with disabilities. His proposed budget cuts billions from Social Security and Medicare. These drastic cuts and his failure to keep his word will devastate millions of Americans.

Social Security has lifted millions of older Americans out of poverty, but the President doesn't think it is necessary to continue supporting our most vulnerable older Americans.

The President would also slash the budget for the Administration for Community Living. Americans need this agency to support those who are aging and those who have disabilities, as well as their caregivers, so that they can age in place and live their best life every day of their lives. I have heard countless times from Orange County residents that they want the choice to grow older in their homes in our beautiful community that they have spent much of their lives in. The President's budget takes these choices away.

Right now, our country is struggling to keep up with our global competitors. And apparently right now the President thinks this is a good time to gut funding for medical research and innovation.

The President wants to cut investments in medical research at the National Institutes of Health that provide the pipeline for new cures and that spur innovation.

The President wants to cut funding for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Health Resources and Services Administration, and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. These agencies ensure that there are qualified health professionals who can move new medical discoveries into healthcare and public-health delivery, support Americans while they are awaiting new

cures, and prevent them from getting sick in the first place.

The President also wants to cut funding for the Food and Drug Administration and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Americans need the Food and Drug Administration to approve new, safe, and effective treatments and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality to provide evidence on what treatments work best, for whom, and in what circumstances.

If you follow the President's budget proposals over his years in office, Madam Speaker, you know that this is a pattern that just keeps repeating, because the President doesn't care about securing healthcare for older Americans, for children, or for everyday Americans, he doesn't care about ensuring that older Americans have a secure and comfortable retirement. He doesn't care that millions of Americans depend on these programs to survive.

The cuts as proposed are untenable for America's health and are a radical change from how we funded these programs in decades past.

It is my responsibility as a Representative to provide Federal funding in 2021 that aligns with our core values as a nation and that supports the American people, and I promise to put Orange County families first. Unlike the President, I will never break this longstanding promise to my constituents.

The President's budget shows willful ignorance of the climate crisis that is threatening our country's natural resources, our communities' health, and our global prosperity. He proposes cuts to environmental protection programs that would only further exacerbate the worst effects of the climate change. Countries around the world are experiencing their warmest winters in history. Antarctica saw temperatures of 65 degrees for the first time in history.

We have watched Australia and the rain forests burn. We have watched our home State of California burn. We have seen communities devastated by hurricanes and other adverse weather caused by climate change. The President's proposed budget would slash the budget for the Environmental Protection Agency by 26 percent and cut in half funding for energy research and development. This would gut critical programs like the Land & Water Conservation Fund and tax credits for electric vehicles by millions of dollars each.

People are dying, entire species are on the verge of extinction, and communities have been destroyed; but the President wants to devastate bipartisan programs established to protect our natural resources, our communities, and our planet.

Who is this budget for?

Who are these proposals for?

The oil industry, special interests, and the few in this world who gain more from harming our planet than from supporting it. This budget is not for Californians, and it is not for Orange County families.

As a mother of three, I fear for the world my children will grow up in, and I cannot stand by and let this President destroy programs that would protect it.

On the topic of our children's future, I am disgusted by the President's decision to cut funding for public education while providing yet another tax break for the wealthy and largest corporations. The President's proposal is an outright attack on our public schools which are a real point of pride in the 45th Congressional District.

To make matters worse, the budget would make higher education less affordable and less accessible than it already is for too many students. The budget makes a \$170 billion cut to student loan programs over the next 10 years.

What does this mean for our college students?

Increased costs for new students because subsidized student loans would be eliminated, difficulty getting jobs on campus because of cuts to funding for Federal workstudy, and difficulty repaying loans because of the elimination of the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program. This program is based on a simple premise that dedicating yourself to making this country better by responding to emergencies, by educating our students, and by providing care for the sick is an honorable and deeply needed service.

These are just some of the many professions performed by those who pursue a career in the public sector. By eliminating the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program, the President breaks our promise to our first responders, our teachers, and our nurses. These borrowers have tirelessly committed themselves to improving our communities, and we must keep our commitment to them.

Despite being in the middle of a historic affordable housing crisis which we feel acutely in Orange County, President Trump wants to make dramatic cuts to the housing and community development programs that serve those in need. The proposal slashes funding for the Department of Housing and Urban Development by 15 percent. That is \$8.6 billion. That money is coming out of essential housing assistance programs that lift up our communities. In a State like California where the affordable housing crisis hits especially hard, these cuts will hurt thousands of families who rely on them to make ends meet.

In California, a minimum wage worker would have to work 116 hours a week to afford a two-bedroom apartment or have the good fortune to find a job that pays \$35 an hour. But in my district of Orange County, make that \$39 per hour, or \$80,000 per year. The median cost for a single-family home in Orange County is over \$800,000.

Do we want to live in a country where only millionaires can afford shelter?

Until we address the severe lack of affordable housing in America, we will

need programs like community block grants and the HOME Investment Partnerships Program to help families. Those funds support affordable housing for low- and moderate-income families, and the President's budget completely eliminates them. His proposal would, quite literally, leave families out in the cold. Taking a chunk out of HUD's budget when home and rental prices are hitting new highs across the country is irresponsible and, frankly, cruel.

President Trump says he is for our business owners, but he clearly means mega corporations—Big Oil, Big Pharma, and Wall Street banks—because his budget eliminates funding for the Economic Development Administration's grant program, and it cuts the Small Business Administration by 11 percent. This budget would harm U.S. innovation and growth and hurt small business owners who are the backbone of our economy.

President Trump also wants to cut our foreign aid budget by over 20 percent. That money is about keeping Americans safe and keeping us out of never-ending wars. Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, raised similar concerns earlier this week: "The more we cut the international affairs budget, the higher the risk for longer and deadlier military operations."

The President's budget puts Americans and our military at risk, rather than funding foreign aid that keeps us safe and secure.

We have a responsibility as elected officials to be good stewards of working Americans' hard-earned dollars, and that means funding programs to get families the help that they need, programs that invest in our children, and priorities that keep us safe. Giveaways to special interests and wasted dollars on proposals not grounded in evidence are slaps in the face of our hard-working taxpayers.

If this budget is a reflection of the President's values and of his goals and vision for our country, then I am afraid of what policies may come out of this White House next.

I constantly seek opportunities to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I look for chances to work with this President as well. But I cannot and I will not support gutting the programs that serve our families and our communities.

It is Congress' responsibility to make sure that we spend taxpayer dollars wisely on programs that support economic growth rather than things that line the pockets of special interests and hurt our future.

Congress was given the power of the purse as part of a system of checks and balances on the President's power, and it is our responsibility on both sides of the aisle to fight for a real budget grounded in our values and a budget that works for the families and the American people that we represent.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAI).

□ 1730

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER), my incredible colleague who co-chairs the Special Order within the Congressional Progressive Caucus. I do appreciate her continued leadership in fighting for families all across the country.

One of the things that we need to realize is this is a destructive and irrational budget by the current administration, and we want to wonder why.

This is a reflection—very much so—of the values within this administration. It is also showing that we are going to leave working-class folks and anyone who needs access to food, healthcare, housing, clean air, and relief from flooding behind.

And we wonder: Why did this come about? Well, like folks in my district would say: Let's go back and figure out who is part of the administration.

Right now, under the current Trump administration, a coal lobbyist runs the EPA; a pharmaceutical executive runs Health and Human Services; an oil lobbyist runs the Department of the Interior; another lobbyist runs DOD, the Department of Defense; a Verizon lawyer runs the Federal Communications Commission; a Goldman Sachs executive runs Treasury; a private equity kingpin runs Commerce; a billionaire Amway heiress runs the Department of Education.

So what you have here is a reflection of those values, those folks who are completely disconnected from the American people. These folks are millionaires—some may be even billionaires—who do not understand the day-to-day challenges that our folks are facing.

Madam Speaker, I represent the third poorest congressional district in the 13 District Strong, where we have, in some areas, chronic poverty, but also lack of access to food. We also face that we are frontline communities of what doing nothing looks like on climate change. We also house the worst ZIP Code in the State of Michigan—48217.

Madam Speaker, look at the budget itself. Just gloss over it. You are talking about \$1.4 trillion in tax giveaways—\$1.7 billion in cuts just in the Army Corps of Engineers, where two of my communities right now are literally facing flooding of homes that they need the Army Corps of Engineers to be able to address, from communities in Dearborn Heights and all along the east side of Detroit.

Madam Speaker, we have \$920 billion in Medicaid cuts, healthcare to our most vulnerable, many of them, again, family members and those who have to take care of our children.

Madam Speaker, a 26 percent cut to the EPA. We, right now, in the city of Detroit and throughout Wayne County, we don't even meet sulfur dioxide standards, right now, under the Clean Air Act. We suffer every single day. In one of my ZIP Codes, we have three

times higher asthma hospitalization among adults.

We need to push back on these cuts that, again, reflect on who is running this administration versus a reflection of the American people and their needs.

It directly eliminates affordable housing programs within HUD. Not only is the food assistance being cut, the \$181 billion in food assistance, they are going and proceeding on to create a culture that says that working folks, working-class residents, our most vulnerable, seniors, the vulnerable communities—like our mothers and others who are taking care of their families—have to be left behind while we give cuts to the wealthy and to corporations.

And so it is really critically important the American people wake up and understand who is running our government right now, because, right now, our government is not about people. This budget is a reflection of those values that are going to be people versus profit, and this budget is very clear: Our people are not coming first. And, from a community, again, that is a frontline community that always gets left behind—if it is not around education funding, environmental funding to housing funding to food assistance, we are, again, the frontline communities of what doing nothing looks like.

Madam Speaker, this budget is wrong for our country. It is destructive, and it is something that we need to be able to push back together on in a bipartisan way.

I thank my colleague, again, for this opportunity to express and be a voice for many of my residents back home in 13 District Strong.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for the good work that she does on behalf of her constituents, and I appreciate the opportunity to make comments that are important investments that we should be making in our infrastructure for all Americans.

The President, when he ran for office, talked about his willingness to invest in America's infrastructure. Sadly, we have seen little follow-through on behalf of the administration to do just that.

America was built over decades and generations on Americans willing to invest in our infrastructure. Clearly, today, we are living off the investments our parents and grandparents made a generation or two ago.

In California, but throughout the country, that includes fixing our aging water systems, our transportation systems, and investing in our school sites. In my home in the San Joaquin Valley, the development of water over the last 100 years has allowed deserts to bloom.

A reliable water supply is a foundation for any economy. Farmers need water to feed the world. We say, "where water flows, food grows," and

life becomes increasingly difficult when we have literally hundreds and thousands of Californians and elsewhere around the country in which communities that are small, that are not incorporated, cannot meet or comply with clean drinking water standards either by the State or by the Federal Government. That is just wrong.

The richest country in the world, and yet we have communities that don't meet clean drinking water standards?

We know that many of these water systems were built decades ago. California now has doubled its population. We need to invest.

Madam Speaker, this last week, I introduced legislation for critical water infrastructure in parts of my district, the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, the Delta-Mendota Canal that has lost 15 to 20 percent of its capacity.

The California Aqueduct that not only brings water from the north to the San Joaquin Valley but to Los Angeles as a critical supply of those water needs for Los Angelenos, these canals supply water to tens of millions of people, and also to the Santa Clara Valley Water, the home of what? Silicon Valley.

The legislation that I introduced, the Conveyance Capacity Correction Act, will provide \$400 million to fund these needed repairs. This is just one piece of legislation to address the many tools in our water toolbox in California's aging water system, but we need to invest now in our water infrastructure.

We also need to invest now in our transportation system. The roads that were built in California and the highways, the inner city and transit systems and our air transportation have really, post-World War II, been the reason why California has become the Golden State. And we, again, are living off those investments our parents made. We need to make the same kinds of investments.

When the President talks about \$1 trillion of investment across America, that is wonderful, and our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has sought where those needs should be felt. But to do that, you have to put up real money to match local, State dollars with Federal money.

We haven't really provided any new Federal sources of funding since the 1990s; and it is absolutely essential if we are going to have this sort of 21st century system of transportation that is intermodal, that is interconnected, that will be provided for people for work, for pleasure, and for a host of purposes to get from point A to point B, to ensure that they can do it safely, in a way that makes the quality of life absolutely better.

So those are the challenges we face. We are working to put an infrastructure package together that will fund our roads and highways, our transit systems, our inner-city rail systems that include high-speed rail.

We are building high-speed rail in California, and I have introduced legislation that will provide money for fast

trains throughout the country, as well as in California. We are under construction now.

But that is one part of an overall connected system that makes sure that our air transportation, that our inner-city transportation and our roads and highways are connected as we see in Europe and in other parts of the world. That is the challenge.

Madam Speaker, I think, if we can come together in a bipartisan fashion as we have done traditionally, we can overcome these challenges and invest in ways that do what? Provide good-paying jobs; because when you invest in the infrastructure—whether it is our water, our transportation, our schools—we are investing in Americans, and those create the good-paying jobs that raise all boats for working people. And, really, that is what we are talking about here when we talk about investing: investing for working people, for all Americans.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Orange County for all of her good work.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, the administration's Muslim ban has ripped families apart. Orange County families have endured this Muslim ban for 3 long years; yet, the President has doubled down, making it so much worse.

Make no mistake, this policy is based on hate. It is based upon dividing us with fear.

President Trump showed hostility to Muslims during his campaign. He called for a "total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States."

Just 7 days into office, the President signed the first version of the Muslim ban. This was never about national security. It was about anti-Muslim hate and discrimination.

The families in my community, as well as families across the United States, are suffering. Families in my district are being torn apart by the ban. It is separating husbands from wives, mothers from children, and adults from their dying parents.

Let me be clear: No individual or family should be discriminated against based on their religious beliefs. It is why I backed the Freedom of Religion Act, which would prohibit religious discrimination in our immigration system and protect Americans of all faiths—not just Muslim Americans.

I am proud that so many Americans have stood together to protest the administration's Muslim ban, to push back and to vote in Representatives like me who will fight discrimination.

Today, because the American people made their voices heard, the House of Representatives began the process to repeal this shameful ban. I am proud to be a backer of that legislation, the NO BAN Act, and I will always support and celebrate the vibrant Muslim community in Orange County.

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

THE TALE OF TWO CITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) for yielding the balance of the hour, of her time, to me.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 40 minutes remaining.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to sound the alarm among the shrinking Black population in cities across the U.S. According to a recent study by the University of Illinois at Chicago, the city of Chicago lost 350,000 Black residents between 1980 and 2016.

Madam Speaker, this is what I call "Black exodus"—not exodus, but "Black exodus." This intense "Black exodus" is a result of decades of disinvestment and disenfranchisement. Sadly, the city of Chicago that so many African Americans looked to as a beacon of hope during the great migration has often failed to invest in its Black population.

The economic, cultural, and political impact of Chicago's Black community on our Nation has been immense: Louis Armstrong's groundbreaking jazz emanated from Chicago, Thomas Dorsey's gospel rose up from Chicago, and Muddy Waters' blues all came about in Chicago.

□ 1745

Since 1945, until recently, the iconic *Ebony* Magazine, along with its sister magazine, *JET* magazine, chronicled Black civic and social life in Chicago and across the Nation.

The first African American President of the United States began his political career on Chicago's South Side.

The story of Black Chicago is one of power and perseverance, often in the face of extreme resistance and resounding prejudice.

The UIC study stated that a lack of well-paying jobs and affordable housing are two main factors that have driven the decline in Chicago's Black population. The alarming statistics presented in this study are proof that the consequences of the predatory and prejudiced practices from the past are still present with us and still being felt at this very hour.

Madam Speaker, the practice of redlining was invented, first occurred, in Chicago.

Last September, I highlighted a study from Duke University that stated that redlining, the practice of restricting the availability of conventional mortgage loans in certain neighborhoods based on their racial makeup, stole up to \$4 billion from Chicago's Black community during the 1950s and 1960s. Chicago's Black community was ripped off up to \$4 billion because of redlining in the 1950s and 1960s.

Now, some of the neighborhoods that African Americans were initially systematically forced into are, all of a sudden, quickly developing, which threatens to push out families who have lived there for generations.

Redlining is being followed by the gentrifying that is occurring in Chicago.

Despite the creation, Madam Speaker, of 65,000 new jobs in downtown Chicago between 2010 and 2015, Chicago's predominantly Black communities saw a net reduction of 1,500 jobs. While 65,000 jobs in the downtown area increased, 1,500 jobs in Chicago were decreased from the Black community.

Compounding, Madam Speaker, this reduction is the fact that over 700,000 jobs are located within 30 minutes of Chicago's downtown, in the predominantly White North Side of Chicago, but just 60,000 jobs are located within 30 minutes of the South Side of Chicago.

Chicago is a tale of two cities. It always was and currently remains the tale of two cities: the wealthy, affluent, upper-middle-class North Side, and the poor, devastated communities on the South and the West Sides, both within 30 minutes of Chicago's downtown area.

Many Black Chicagoans who reside on the South Side are thus deprived of the opportunity to earn a living in or near the community that they reside in.

Madam Speaker, these startling trends are certainly not confined or restricted just to Chicago or even to the Midwest. In fact, Madam Speaker, we can look right here in our Nation's Capital, the city of Washington, D.C., for our next example.

A recent Georgetown University study found that African Americans accounted for over 70 percent of the District's population in 1970. By the year 2015, African Americans were just 48.3 percent of the District's population, from 70 percent to less than 50 percent in just a few years.

Georgetown's findings were strikingly similar to the findings at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Soaring housing prices and a diminished job market for those who were without a bachelor's degree pushed longtime residents out of our Nation's Capital, and they pushed out longtime residents in Chicago as well.

Madam Speaker, we don't look just at Chicago or our Nation's Capital. Let's look south to see the same troubling trend.

Austin, Texas, Madam Speaker, is a modern-day boomtown whose population grew by 20 percent between 2000 and 2010, a boomtown in Austin, Texas. During this same period, its African American population fell by over 5 percent.

A 2014 survey from the University of Texas at Austin found that 26 percent of African Americans who moved out and left Austin did so because the city had gotten too expensive.

Gentrification has forced many long-term residents of color to leave their neighborhoods due to increased housing costs.

It is essential that this Congress ensures that neighborhood development does not force out those families who have often called these very same neighborhoods home for many past generations.

Madam Speaker, that is why I am so proud to have joined with Congressman HANK JOHNSON in introducing H.R. 4999, the Opportunity Zone Fairness and Inclusion Act. This bill seeks to mitigate the inequities that are often brought on by rapid neighborhood development.

The opportunity zone program was intended to incentivize investment in underserved communities. Currently, Madam Speaker, this same investment program, this same opportunity zone program, lacks mechanisms to ensure that the residents of these neighborhoods benefit from this increased investment.

By mandating that opportunity zone funds establish investment and advisory boards that include members of targeted communities, H.R. 4999 would ensure greater local involvement in opportunity zone projects.

H.R. 4999 would also establish requirements for small and minority business involvement in those very same critical opportunity zone funds. I encourage all of my colleagues in this Congress to join me in supporting H.R. 4999.

Madam Speaker, going forward, we must develop policies with an eye on rectifying the prejudices and the injustices of the past. That means bringing affordable housing, stable and well-paying jobs, and vibrant and robust businesses to communities that have been denied these opportunities for far too long, including my beloved hometown, the city of Chicago.

Merely pushing development without a firm focus on equity would only perpetuate the discriminatory policies of the past.

In partnership with State and local governments, this Congress and future Congresses can help preserve and strengthen the vibrant, pioneering, and groundbreaking Black communities in places like Chicago, Illinois, and, more broadly, in urban areas throughout our great Nation.

Madam Speaker, this Congress can do nothing more or nothing less than help American citizens regain a footing in their communities, in their neighborhoods, by ensuring that fair housing is available, affordable housing is available, economic viability and vitality with increased businesses are available, and that jobs are created in these communities.

Let us turn this page to a more productive and progressive future and close the book on the precedential and bad disinvesting past.

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

□ 1800

E-VERIFY IS THE SOLUTION TO ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I want to talk about immigration, more importantly, a guest worker program for agriculture that will solve this dilemma.

The reason we have an immigration issue in this country is because this body has failed to act in the last 30 years. It is something that the American population shouldn't have to go through and the immigrants shouldn't have to go through because there are simple solutions out there. But, unfortunately, in this body, politics gets played and prevents that from happening.

E-Verify is the solution to illegal immigration. E-Verify stands for an electronic verification system that verifies one's legal identification.

The ID number most commonly used for employment is a person's Social Security number. This ID number is used at an employee's place of employment, and the employer uses this number to validate the identification number of the employee.

There are some major concerns and shortfalls with relying on a Social Security number for identification, as we will explain below.

Using a Social Security number sets the system up for fraud and does nothing to verify the legal status of an individual.

Other numbers can be used for identification purposes for employment, but there does not yet exist a universally accepted ID number or an adequate program for a non-U.S. citizen to use or to enroll into a national E-Verify system.

The problem with using a Social Security number is often they are used by multiple persons fraudulently at the same time and do not provide positive identification of the person using that specific number.

For instance, in my discussions with DHS E-Verify personnel, the people who run that program say they can verify a Social Security number as legitimate within seconds. This is something that is free to the employer. So they can run a Social Security number and verify it within seconds, but they cannot verify if the person using that number is, in fact, the actual person that the unique Social Security number was assigned to.

DHS has said that, in many instances, a Social Security number will be verified as real, yet it will show up in 10 different locations around the country at the same time. Therefore, all E-Verify is doing is verifying a legitimate Social Security number, not whether an individual is permitted to

work here legally or if that person is the legitimate holder of that Social Security number.

Another issue with using a Social Security number for non-U.S. citizens is that somehow it denotes citizenship, and so people think, if they have a Social Security number, that the person using it is a U.S. citizen.

A Social Security number, in what we are promoting and advocating for, should be reserved for and used only by U.S. citizens. All others should receive a different form of identification.

There is a solution. What I propose is to create a standardized E-Verify system used universally around the country so all employers can verify the legal status and identity of an employee. This protects the employer from hiring illegal individuals, as well as providing the migrant employee legal documentation, identification, and permission to be in the country to work.

The solution is a guest worker identification card. This card can be referred to as the GWIC. The GWIC will have a unique 15-digit identification number issued to each unique individual. The GWIC, or guest worker identification card, will also have a photo of the individual on the front and a smart chip embedded in it.

The smart chip will have embedded within it biosecurity information belonging to that cardholder. The recommended biosecurity information would be facial recognition, fingerprints, retinal scans, possibly blood type and DNA. Other things that have been proposed are personal questions only the cardholder would know, and they could customize their individual, unique card to have this information included in the encrypted technology.

This information would only be available to DHS or government agencies. An employer could not get into this because they would be locked out of that information.

The current sectors being proposed in the U.S. Congress to be able to use this program are agriculture, hospitality, and construction. These designations would be at the end of the unique 15-digit identification card.

So, for instance, there would be the 15-digit number, and at the end of that would be the initials AG for agriculture, HP for hospitality, or CS for construction.

The way this program is set up would allow a person to apply, prior to coming into the United States, to work in a specific sector. For example, if the person applies to the agricultural sector, they don't come into the country until there is a job.

So, at the beginning of the process, they are what we would call an applicant. When the person applies and goes through the process and gets accepted into the guest worker program for agriculture, that individual also agrees that they will work only in the agriculture sector. Or if they want to work construction, they are agreeing to work only in the construction sector.

Therefore, they get accepted into a program based on a need for that job, and they get issued a GWIC card, a guest worker identification card, that the individual's personal information is embedded in. The GWIC card, again, would have a unique 15-digit number with the initials AG for agriculture. This worker has agreed only to work in the agriculture sector.

So, when the agriculture producer enters the individual's number into a GWIC reading machine, into the E-Verify system, it is promptly verified by the Department of Homeland Security as an approved worker in the agriculture sector. This would also apply for the construction industry and also for the hospitality industry. The producer and the worker have the assurance that they are in compliance with the law.

If a producer or worker hires or works outside of the permitted sector according to the GWIC designation, they are doing so fraudulently and subject to fines and being blocked from the E-Verify system in the future for a period of time. This will limit the producer's availability for labor and also prevent that worker from employment opportunities in the United States.

This proposed solution has already been created in legislation for the agriculture sector. It is called the Agriculture Guest Worker Program. This legislation has been created in a bipartisan fashion in the House and shared with both parties in the Senate. It has also been shared with the White House and with the USDA. It will solve the incentive that we have for the individuals willing to come to the United States illegally to find work.

Most of the individuals who come here are looking to work in the less-skilled fields that exist in the agriculture, hospitality, and construction fields. They will not be able to work legally without the proper permit as designated by the guest worker identification card, nor will employers be able to hire individuals without the proper guest worker identification permit.

In my home State of Florida, Governor DeSantis is pushing to have mandatory E-Verify implemented soon. I commend him for this initiative. In fact, I had a phone call with him today.

However, legislators in the State body are objecting to this program. Even members in his own party are resisting this requirement. Oftentimes, this is what creates the inaction known too well in Washington, D.C., and also at the State level. Therefore, nothing gets solved. This resistance comes from not having a sensible working program for people to apply to the E-Verify system and also having the identification that a worker can get, and so what happens is a stagnation of ideas for things moving forward.

What we are proposing is this program that people can apply to work. Say, if they want to work in the agriculture sector, they can apply before they come into the country. It stops

that need for people having to cross the desert to get into this country illegally because now they can do that before they come into the country.

They come into the country when a job is available. They are already automatically enrolled into the E-Verify system, so our producers in the agriculture sector have a readily predictable, legal workforce that is there that they can pull from and they can verify and be in compliance with the law.

Like I said, what is needed is a workable guest worker program that allows for the worker to enter the E-Verify system prior to entering into the United States as well as allowing workers into the country to enter this program.

Right now in this country, we have between 12 to 15 million people who are in this country illegally. Some of them came legally on a work visa, but then they just kind of drifted off and stayed in this country and did not leave when they were supposed to.

With this program that we are proposing with this legislation, workers could enter into this program and they could become legally accepted into the United States. It is not a pathway to citizenship, but it doesn't prevent somebody from applying for citizenship.

This agriculture guest worker program is incorporating the guest worker identification number in the E-Verify system as I propose. It is a workable solution for our producers that want to be compliant with a workable E-Verify system and have access to a reliable, predictable, and legal labor pool. This program also gives the migrant worker who desires the opportunity to work in this country a legal way to accomplish that.

In the agriculture sector, which I know very well, as we went around the State of Florida and we talked to the migrant workers, they say they can come and work 5 months in this country and make the equivalent of 5 years of income in their country.

And I had one of my producers say, if we don't fix our labor issue in America, we are either going to import our labor or we are going to import our food. If we get to a situation in America where we are importing our food, it is a national security risk.

This is something that Congress can come together and fix. It shouldn't be a partisan issue. This is a solution to a problem that is good for America; and if a solution is good for America, everybody benefits from it.

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

HONORING JOSEPHINE M. HOWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Josephine M. Howard.

As part of her life journey, Josephine M. Howard has been achieving goals, setting high standards, teaching, learning, positively impacting lives, and been passionately committed to helping, mentoring, and inspiring the lives of children, adults, and the elderly.

She desired to become a teacher like her mother, Crizell, who, in the 1950s, mentored and tutored her five sisters and neighborhood children.

In the 1960s, Josephine graduated from Douglass High School with high honors and Florida College cum laude, with a BS degree in elementary education, and she subsequently began her career in teaching.

Josephine loved teaching but wanted to have a greater impact on more lives by empowering them with knowledge; therefore, she went back to college and earned her master of education degree magna cum laude at the University of Central Florida, as well as her educational specialist degree summa cum laude at Nova Southeastern University.

Josephine is a servant leader; a lifetime member of the NAACP; has served as a member of the Horizon Housing Board; treasurer, former CEO of Howard's Apparel; former chaplain of the NC100BW; board of trustees, Heart of Florida Hospital; Head Start Policy Council; and Who's Who Among Professional Women.

□ 1815

She continues to serve as the first vice president deaconess at the New Beulah Missionary Baptist Church, where she has been a Sunday school teacher for 34 years and has implemented the Mana Food Pantry.

Her community service and leadership dedication have earned her numerous recognitions, honors, and media coverage. She received the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Lifetime Achievement Award, Teacher of the Year, and Distinguished Volunteer Service Award.

Josephine is married to her husband, Phillip, of 52 years. They have two children, Jonita and Phillip II; three grandchildren, Philip and twins Phillip III and Kennedy.

For that, we honor you, Ms. Josephine Howard.

RECOGNIZING REVEREND CLIFTON E. DOLLISON

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Reverend Clifton E. Dollison.

Reverend Clifton E. Dollison has served the First Missionary Baptist Church of Winter Haven, Florida, for 28 years. As the longest serving pastor in the church's rich 138-year history, his visionary leadership has resulted in the largest building program expansion the church has experienced.

Reverend Dollison has a passion for community service and a fearless commitment to confront justice issues in Polk County. That dedication finds expression in his roles as past co-chair and current board member for the Polk Ecumenical Action Council for Empowerment, otherwise known as

PEACE, of Polk County, a grassroots social justice organization for positive change, and the Direct Action and Research Training Center, DART, comprised of PEACE and 20 other affiliated nonprofit, congregation-based organizations located across the Nation. DART's mission is to build the power of organized people to do justice.

Reverend Dollison's commitment to social justice, community engagement, and spiritual leadership is further demonstrated through his varied service positions. He served as past president and current vice president of the NAACP-Winter Haven Branch; senior chaplain of the Winter Haven Police Department; president of the Interdenominational Ministerial Association of Polk County, Inc.; chairman of the Pastoral Development Conference for the Progressive Missionary and Educational Baptist State Convention of Florida, Inc.; president of the Interfaith Ministerial Alliance of Winter Haven; past second vice moderator, First South Florida Missionary Baptist District Association; and as president and past educational dean of the FSF Congress Number Three.

Reverend Dollison, a native Hoosier, graduated from Indiana State University and is a member of the Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity. He has been married for 38 years to his lovely wife, Valerie Bush Dollison, a native of Bartow, Florida. They have three adult children, three grandchildren, and eagerly await the arrival of a fourth grandchild.

For that, Reverend Dollison, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING MICHAEL D. SMITH

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I would like to recognize Michael D. Smith.

Michael D. Smith, Sr., is employed as a captain and paramedic for the Polk County Fire Rescue, where he has served the citizens of Polk County for the past 10 years.

Captain Smith is responsible for supervising a fire company crew in all aspects of fire, technical rescue, and emergency medical rescue. Michael also serves as a licensed funeral director with Epps Memorial Funeral Home in Lake Wales, Florida, where he assists families during their time of bereavement.

He is a graduate of Frostproof High School, Bethune-Cookman University, St. Petersburg College, and South Florida State College.

Michael is the son of Lieutenant Dave and Faye Smith. He is married to Carmencita. He is the father of Michael, Jr., Preston, Trinity, Christopher, and Joshua.

Captain Smith is actively involved in the community, where he passionately participates in the annual Willie Bush Toy Drive. He enthusiastically coaches and mentors youth for the Lake Wales Little League football team.

Captain Smith shares his time with the Polk County community by volunteering at the Candlelight Christian

Academy. He is an active member of Allen Temple AME Church, where he serves as the president of Usher Board Number 1.

He is also a member of the Lake Wales branch of the NAACP; a Bethune-Cookman alumni; a member of the Polk County Professional Firefighters Local 3531; Lakeland Alumni Chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi, Inc.; Boaz Lodge 212 in Daytona Beach, Florida; St. Paul Lodge 77 in Lake Wales, Florida; Florida Morticians Association; Independent Funeral Directors of Florida; and the National Funeral Directors and Morticians Association.

Captain Smith has been a trailblazer for African Americans in the Polk County firefighter department.

For that, Captain Smith, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING EDDY JEAN RIVERS

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Eddy Jean Rivers.

Eddy Jean Rivers is a community leader who started her work life at McCrory's in downtown Lake Wales as the first African American employed in a downtown business and the first African American to be employed by a banking industry in the area.

She obtained her degree in early childhood education and worked for Janie Howard Wilson Elementary for 16 years. Passionate about education, Rivers continues her teaching with Family Literacy Academy in Lake Wales.

She has served as a member of the Roosevelt Alumni Association, PTO of the Janie Howard Wilson Elementary, MAD DADS Association, Drug Awareness Council of Lake Wales, Red Cross Association, Lake Wales Business and Profession Women's Club, Lake Wales MLK Committee, and Lake Wales Recreation Committee. She also served as an active board member of the Lake Wales NAACP since 1956.

She has received awards for Sunday School Teacher of the Year and the Music Ministry Award from the First Institutional Baptist Church, an award from the Lakeland Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority for outstanding service, and the Lake Wales NAACP Community Leader Award.

For that, Ms. Eddy Jean Rivers, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING JOANNE COBBS

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Joanne Cobbs.

Ms. Joanne Cobbs is a native of Williamsburg, Virginia. She is the proud mother of three sons, Troy, Al, and Wayne Johnson.

She relocated to Florida in 1983 when her husband, Master Sergeant Robert Cobbs, was reassigned to Patrick Air Force Base in Cocoa Beach, Florida.

After her husband's retirement from the U.S. Army in 1985, the family remained in Florida. The family moved to Orlando, Florida, in Orange County in 1992.

During the time Joanne has lived in Florida, she has worked in several posi-

tions in private industry and worked at Northlake Park Elementary School as a substitute teacher. She has also worked for the U.S. Army and the U.S. Air Force.

Joanne's last position was at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, otherwise known as NASA, where she was in the Human Resources Directorate at the Kennedy Space Center in Florida, where she retired as a personnel management specialist.

She received her bachelor's degree from the University of Central Florida, where she majored in psychology.

Joanne's volunteer service includes past and current work with the Hispanic Caucus of Orange County; the Orange County Black Caucus; the American Cancer Society; the central Florida breast cancer foundation; Organizing for America, the Obama campaign; the Hillary Clinton campaign; and the Charlie Crist campaign. She provided support for candidates running for office in her house district and other districts within the county.

She currently serves on the Orange County Democratic Executive Committee as a precinct committeewoman for Precinct 544. Joanne is a member of the Democratic Women's Club of Florida, the East Orange Democratic Women's Club, and the Progressives of East Orange.

For that, Ms. Joanne Cobbs, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING MARK CANTY

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Mark Canty.

Undersheriff Mark Canty has deep roots in Orange County. He grew up in Pine Hills, and after graduating from Northwestern University in 1994, he came home to Orlando, where working in a residential group home for the Urban League made him realize that a career in law enforcement was his calling.

He was driven by a desire to make a bigger impact in the community and beyond, by making connections with young people before they were in trouble. That led him to the Orlando Police Department, where, over his 22-year career, he rose through the ranks and was appointed deputy chief in 2017.

Throughout his career, Canty's devotion to improving community and police relations in his hometown has been his driving ideal. Canty's hallmark is leadership by example.

That leadership was in the spotlight most in June 2016 when a deranged gunman killed 49 people and injured scores more in an act of terror and hate at the Pulse nightclub. As commander of the Orlando Police Department's SWAT team, Canty directed team members while they rescued survivors and helped to ensure no more innocent people were killed.

Over the years, Canty's community involvement strides have been just as important as those he made in crime-fighting. In March 2019, Sheriff John W.

Mina, appointed Canty as the Undersheriff of Orange County Sheriff's Office. The Office of Undersheriff provides direct managerial oversight of the Operational Services Bureau, Administrative Services Bureau, Fiscal Management Section, CFIJ-Criminal Intelligence Section, Legal Services, and Strategic Communications.

Undersheriff Canty has the vision, skill, and desire to further the excellence of this nationally accredited law enforcement agency.

For that, Undersheriff Mark Canty, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING RICHARD DELOACH

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Richard DeLoach.

Richard DeLoach is a passionate, dedicated, and determined leader who has been serving our youth football coach leagues for over 35 years.

DeLoach is a pastor at a church in Leesburg. He is married to Diane and is a father of nine children.

After playing semipro ball for a season, he decided he wanted to coach. He is a founding member of the Mid-Florida Youth Football Conference and an inaugural member of the Mid-Florida Youth Football and Cheerleaders Hall of Fame of 2018. He started the Mid-Florida Youth Football League in 1984 with four teams and now has 356 players and cheerleaders involved in the program.

He is a compassionate and committed coach, a team player who led his team to 14 league super bowls and won 11 of them. He works well with kids of all ages, loves sports, and has a passion for competition.

DeLoach has always helped any child who desires to participate in youth sports attain that goal, regardless of their ability to play. He uses sports to teach about and instill in youth work ethics and integrity.

His work ethic stems from his father teaching him and his three brothers how to mow yards and clear lakes every day after school.

He has made positive impacts on so many young people and is credited with the success of several Polk County football players now playing in the NFL.

He is the president of the Lake Wales Youth Football Association, a member of the Lake Wales Recreation Advisory Committee, and owner of the Polk County War Eagles.

Due to his commitment and leadership to youth and community, the Lake Wales mayor proclaimed June 4, 2019, as Richard DeLoach Day.

For that, Coach DeLoach, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING LEWAYNE JOHNSON

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Chief Warrant Officer LeWayne Johnson.

Chief Warrant Officer Robert LeWayne Johnson, also of the United States Army Reserve, joined the Air Force as a navigational aids equipment

specialist in August 1983 with an initial duty assignment at the Pope Air Force Base in North Carolina.

□ 1830

In 1987, Mr. Johnson joined the U.S. Army Reserve. In 1988 Mr. Johnson reclassified to a legal specialist and was assigned to the 86th United States Army Reserve Command in Forest Park, Illinois. Chief Johnson also served as a court reporter in several units which included a deployment in Saudi Arabia with the 21st Support Command.

Mr. Johnson applied for a warrant officer appointment because he wanted to use his knowledge and skills to assist commanders in maintaining unit readiness. Mr. Johnson also wanted to mentor, counsel, and assist soldiers.

During a 33-year career of exceptionally meritorious service, Mr. Johnson distinguished himself in positions of increasing responsibility with the United States, with the U.S. Army Reserve and with the U.S. Air Force, as well. Significant positions of leadership include: Senior legal administrative officer, a G-7 level; United States Army Reserve Legal Command; legal administrative officer, 174th Legal Operations Department; administrative officer, 9th LSO; senior court reporter/amnesty recorder, 22nd Support Command in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia; legal specialist for the 21st Headquarters Company at TAACOM; legal specialist, headquarters 7th Judge Advocate General Detachment at Fort Sheridan, Illinois; and also served as a navigational aids electronic specialist, United States Air Force for Pope Air Force Base.

Chief Johnson has earned a doctorate from Walden University in public policy and administration and a juris doctorate degree from Barry University, and an LLM in international taxation from Saint Thomas University. Additionally, Chief Johnson has completed the warrant officer senior education program at Fort Rucker, Alabama.

And for that, Chief Warrant Officer Robert LeWayne Johnson, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING RONALD MCCRIMON

Mr. SOTO. In honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Ronald McCrimon.

Ronald McCrimon is a lifelong resident of Osceola County, Florida. Ronald is the son of Mrs. Louise McCrimon and the late Mr. David McCrimon. He is married to Doravia L. McCrimon and has three daughters, Desheria, Ronnetta, and Chantel. Ronald is the proud grandfather of Eris and Aiden. As a member of the family of God, Jesus Christ is his Lord and savior. Ronald is a man of deep faith.

Mr. McCrimon was educated in the school system of Osceola County. He was a member of the football, wrestling, and track teams and lettered in each. Ronald was a member of the Osceola class of 1981. After graduating from high school, Ronald attended Jacksonville State University in Jack-

sonville, Alabama, under a football scholarship. There Ronald obtained a bachelor's in marketing and a minor in criminal justice.

Mr. McCrimon served in the Army Reserve from 1986 to 1994 in the 174th Judge Advocate General Detachment unit as a legal specialist.

Upon completion of college, Mr. McCrimon became a dispatcher with the St. Cloud Police Department. In 1989, Mr. McCrimon enrolled in the police academy and became employed by the Osceola County Sheriff's Office. This was the beginning of a 28-year career with the agency.

During his tenure with the agency, he served as a patrol deputy, two tours as a member of the Osceola County investigation bureau, a sniper on the SWAT team, and a captain over court administration in the Osceola County Courthouse. In 2017, he retired from the agency.

Mr. McCrimon served as an instructor of TECO Police Academy for 15 years and is a part-time instructor at Valencia College.

Mr. McCrimon was an honoree at the Martin Luther King banquet for Osceola County. Ronald served as a local board member for Habitat for Humanity and a member of the Community Development Block Grant Program.

And for that, Mr. Ronald McCrimon, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING DOROTHY SCOTT WILSON

Mr. SOTO. In honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Dorothy Scott Wilson.

Dorothy Scott Wilson is of Lake Wales, Florida. Dorothy has been a community leader for years. Dorothy earned her bachelor's degree from Florida A&M University and maintains her Rattler Pride to this day as a member of the Florida A&M board of directors in Polk County. Dorothy has worked at the Florida State Department of Revenue for over 35 years and now serves the community through her work at Scott's Medical Transportation and Advocacy, a local provider of medical services for students with special needs.

Dorothy Scott Wilson has served on the board of directors of several organizations, including the Polk County chapter of the Florida A&M University, the Dr. Joseph A. Wiltshire Scholarship Foundation, the Unity in the Community organization, the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Scholarship Fund of Lake Wales organization, the Lincoln Ave. Redevelopment Council, the Ray Jones, Jr. Wellness Project, 2019, and she has also served as the development director for the Lake Wales Hospital and is a member of the NAACP.

And for that, Ms. Dorothy Scott Wilson, we honor you.

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

CONGRESS MUST DEAL WITH OUTSTANDING IMMIGRATION ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, today I would like to address one more time what I think is the most important issue facing the country, because it deals so much with the country's future and who will be living in the country 10, 20, or 30 years down the road: And that is immigration.

To a large extent we haven't addressed this issue as we should have, I think, in part, because we are spending a great deal of time on impeachment, and that kind of sucked the air out of other critical issues facing the country. I think even conservative media, be it talk radio or other media, have not dealt with what is going on with immigration, have not pointed out the progress that President Trump has made, but also have not highlighted the things that have to be done if we are going to assure in the future the people living in this country are people who are going to make a positive contribution to the Nation.

President Trump on his own, through a variety of efforts, has reduced the number of people who are coming in this country from over 140,000 people processed last May—a time in which at least 90,000 people were placed in the United States somewhere—to well under 50,000 with under 1,000 people in January being placed in the United States. Dropping from over 90,000 to under 1,000 is the type of progress you rarely see anywhere in government.

First of all, I thank President Trump for the things he has done. We now have the Mexican military patrolling the southern border, so it is not just our border patrol minding things.

Even more significantly, the Mexican Government has agreed to hold people who are seeking asylum. Prior to this, people seeking asylum—and anybody can seek asylum—were placed with a social services agency in the United States, frequently Catholic Social Services, placed somewhere in the United States pending a hearing and frequently never showing up for that hearing. Now they are held in Mexico, which is a big benefit and also will discourage people from coming here unnecessarily. And I think the vast majority of people that were seeking asylum in the past were not even really subject to any fear or any possible danger in their home country.

Just as significantly, President Trump has reached agreements with Central American countries to hold people down there who are seeking asylum from further down south. It should go without saying that if I leave Venezuela because I feel a threat to myself, I would probably stay in a country relatively near Venezuela. If I am going all the way to the United States and having passed through five or six other countries, my primary goal is probably to improve my economic condition, not just escape danger in my homeland. President Trump's efforts with Central American countries to hold more people are also bearing fruit.

However, we also have to talk about what has to be done in the future and what should be done by Congress, commonsense things—now, I am one of those Congressmen using the phrase “commonsense,” it is kind of over-used—but commonsense things I think the vast majority of Americans would agree with.

First of all, the Flores settlement right now requires having to release families after being held for 20 days. That obviously should be extended, and it creates a very difficult situation for the United States Government.

Secondly, President Trump is trying to crack down on people getting welfare payments if they are coming here as immigrants. Obviously, we have no problem taking care of Americans who are going through a tough time, but we take immigrants here—given that we have a trillion-dollar debt—who can take care of themselves. It would be a big mistake, both cost wise and as far as the future of people who are coming here, to allow people to come here if they will be taking advantage of our generous welfare system.

In particular, we have to do something with what some people want: Free medical care for people coming here as immigrants. I have been down to the border several times, and it is something that frustrates the Border Patrol.

So, many Americans right now have large deductibles and have to hesitate before they go to the doctor or hesitate before they have a procedure done. That is not true of people who come here illegally. And the Border Patrol believes that right now some people are coming to the country primarily for the free medical care that is being offered. That is something we have to get rid of.

President Trump continues to build the wall as quickly as he can, given the way government operates. I am glad that President Trump was able to find money in the Defense Department to help along the wall.

I want to point out that every Border Patrol agent that I have talked to, and I must have talked to dozens, believe the wall is a good idea. I realize there are people who haven't gone to the border or dealt with the experts down there, but unless you secure that southern border, you have a tremendous problem. And part of that problem, by the way, is the danger people trying to come here face.

Somebody is going to control that southern border; it is either going to be the United States or the Mexican drug cartels. If the Mexican drug cartels continue to control the border, it means that some people are going to wind up dehydrating in the desert, it means some people are going to wind up drowning in the Rio Grande, and it means the people who come here are frequently going to be subject to the whims of the Mexican cartels. Sometimes that means sexual assault. Sometimes it means their relatives

back home are going to be threatened. But we want to be the ones controlling the border and who comes across. Again, if we don't determine it, the Mexican drug cartels determine it.

I have to point out that we believe that over 1,000 gang members were caught last year. Among certain drugs, over 90 percent, of course according to the DEA, have gotten into this country by going through the southern border. We really can't say we are serious about addressing the opioid crisis until we do something at the southern border.

The next thing we should be addressing is sanctuary cities. Sanctuary cities are an invitation for people to break American law. It is hard to say we have a serious immigration system when, on the other hand, we have individual, local government people, in essence, saying come here, we will not enforce our law.

Another huge problem with sanctuary cities is it makes it difficult to deport the criminals. Obviously, we don't want the next generation of Americans to be criminal in nature, and the only way to deal with that, I believe, is to get rid of the sanctuary cities. Last year, 68,000 people died of various drug overdoses in this country.

The next thing that should be done is we should be doing something about birthright citizenship. When I was down at the border, it was very apparent there were women coming here, and not a few, who were 7 or 8 months pregnant. In other words, they are coming here, not because we handpick them, they are coming here because they realize that their children become citizens, and largely, if their children become citizens—and we are not for breaking up families—the parents will be able to stay here, too.

The United States is only one of two of the 45 wealthiest countries in the world which allows birthright citizenship. It is obviously something that we ought to get rid of, and this is another thing that Congress ought to do.

In the upcoming budget bill, having talked to the Border Patrol and having talked to ICE, it would be a good idea to get more dogs on the border, not just to detect things coming into the country but to detect cash going out of the country.

□ 1845

Dogs today can do something about that, can detect cash. It would do a lot, I think, to stop the drug cartels from using our border.

In any event, these are some of the suggestions that I hope Congress takes up.

I think it is such an important decision, because we know that very frequently when somebody comes to this country, they are not leaving.

If we are picking good people—and under President Trump in the last few years, the number of people sworn in legally has gone up. We are now over 650,000. So nobody says President

Trump is anti-immigrant. We are getting more people here legally.

But we have got to prevent people from coming here illegally. By continuing to do this, we will continue to create a situation in which the future of America will look more bleak because the type of people coming here are not the type of people who are handpicked.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for yesterday and today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 13, 2020, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3789. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2019 Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Parts A and B Supplemental Report to Congress, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 300ff-13(e); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title XXVI, Sec. 2603(e) (as amended by Public Law 109-415, Sec. 104(e)); (120 Stat. 2776) and 42 U.S.C. 300ff-29a(d); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title XXVI, Sec. 2620(d) (as amended by Public Law 109-415, Sec. 205(2)); (120 Stat. 2798); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3790. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a Declaration of a Public Health Emergency that has a significant potential to affect national security or the health and security of the United States citizens living abroad and the involve a novel (new) coronavirus (nCoV) first detected in Wuhan City, Hubei Province, China in 2019 (20219-nCoV); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3791. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Asphalt Processing and Asphalt Roofing Manufacturing Residual Risk and Technology Review [EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0662; FRL-10005-06-OAR] (RIN: AT206-AT34) received February 7, 2020, 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.

3792. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3793. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to India, Transmittal No. 19-55, pursuant to section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3794. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to Turkey, Transmittal No. 20-02, pursuant to section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3795. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3796. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting two notifications of a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3797. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting the Corps' FY 2019 Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress covering the period April 1, 2019 through, September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3798. A letter from the Chairman and Members, Capitol Police Board, transmitting the Board's 2019 Year in Review which provides a synopsis of the Board's many short- and long-term initiatives and highlights the achievements of the Board, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1901 note; Public Law 108-7, Sec. 1014(d)(1); (117 Stat. 361); to the Committee on House Administration.

3799. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the 2018 and 2019 Delayed-Notice Search Warrant Report, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3103a(d)(2); Public Law 90-351, Sec. 1401(a) (added by Public Law 109-177, Sec. 114(c)); (120 Stat. 211); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3800. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Department of State 2020 Civil Monetary Penalties Inflationary Adjustment [Public Notice: 10992] (RIN: 1400-AF00) received February 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3801. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — The Navigable Waters Protection Rule: Definition of "Waters of the United States" [EPA-HQ-OW-2018-0149; FRL-10004-88-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF75) received February 7, 2020, 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.

3802. A letter from the National Adjunct, Chief Executive Officer, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the reports and proceedings of the 2019 National Convention of the Disabled American Veterans, held in Orlando, Florida, August 3-6, 2019, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1332; and 36 U.S.C. 50308; and 36 U.S.C. 10101 (H. Doc. No. 116-98); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

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. OCASIO-CORTEZ (for herself and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 5857. A bill to ban the practice of hydraulic fracturing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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 Mrs. LURIA (for herself and Mr. KINZINGER):

H.R. 5858. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to seek to enter into an agreement with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to study and report on the incidence of cancer diagnosis and mortality among pilots in the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BARR, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. BACON, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 5859. A bill to establish forest management, reforestation, and utilization practices which lead to the sequestration of greenhouse gases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Natural Resources, and 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 Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 5860. A bill to expand the advanced technology vehicles manufacturing incentive program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 5861. A bill to address the impact of climate change on agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, Oversight and Reform, and House Administration, 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. BUCK (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BUDD, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 5862. A bill to restrict certain Federal grants for States that grant driver licenses to illegal immigrants and fail to share information about criminal aliens with the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. COLE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. CLINE, Mr. SPANO, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr.

DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. DUNCAN);

H.R. 5863. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow married couples to apply the student loan interest deduction limitation separately to each spouse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 5864. A bill to establish and support the research, development, and demonstration of advanced carbon capture and utilization technologies at the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 5865. A bill to advance technologies for carbon capture, utilization, and storage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, and 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. CASTEN of Illinois (for himself, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 5866. A bill to require lost or stolen firearms to be reported to law enforcement authorities within 48 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CISNEROS (for himself and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 5867. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish or update certain clinical practice guidelines of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and 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 Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 5868. A bill to amend the Act of August 18, 1941 (commonly known as the Flood Control Act of 1941), to allow a non-Federal sponsor to carry out certain work, to provide for reimbursement of costs to complete such work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 5869. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide business with a tax credit for investing in work-based learning for workers with low skill levels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVIN of California (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 5870. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the time during which members of the Armed Forces serve on active duty for training qualifies for educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MALINOWSKI (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. SIRE):

H.R. 5871. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to make certain natural infrastructure projects eligible for surface transportation block grant funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. BARR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr.

POSEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. MARSHALL):

H.R. 5872. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a separation oath for members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 5873. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the Bicentennial of Harriet Tubman's birth; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BEYER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 5874. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to amend regulations concerning the day-night average sound level, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 5875. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that a member of the Armed Forces and the spouse of that member shall have the same rights regarding the receipt of firearms at the location of any duty station of the member; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORCROSS (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BACON, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COOK, Mr. KIM, Mr. CROW, and Mr. DELGADO):

H.R. 5876. A bill to provide a work opportunity tax credit for military spouses and to provide for flexible spending arrangements for childcare services for military families; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 5877. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to establish a program to provide disadvantaged youth in developing countries with opportunities to receive education and employment skills, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 5878. A bill to promote the adoption of a binding Global Migration Agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. OMAR:

H.R. 5879. A bill to impose certain limits relating to the national emergency authorities of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Rules, 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. OMAR:

H.R. 5880. A bill to provide for the imposition of sanctions with respect to foreign countries that are in violation of international human rights law or international humanitarian law, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 5881. A bill to establish the Office of Territorial Exporting in the Export-Import Bank of the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CROW, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BERA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 5882. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option under the Medicaid program to pay for covered outpatient drugs through risk-sharing value-based agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 5883. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an increased credit for carbon oxide sequestration for direct air capture facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. BAIRD):

H. Res. 849. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Engineers Week; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 850. A resolution expressing disapproval of the Trump administration's removal of United States Army Lieutenant Colonel Alexander Vindman from the National Security Council; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Res. 851. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of February 2020 as "National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POSTER:

H. Res. 852. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the first Saturday of every January as "National FIRST Robotics Day"; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MCEACHIN (for himself, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Ms. WEXTON):

H. Res. 853. A resolution recognizing the maternal health crisis in the United States and the importance of reducing mortality and morbidity among all women, and honoring mothers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. OMAR:

H. Res. 854. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should become a state party to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. OMAR:

H. Res. 855. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should ratify the Rome Statute and join the International Criminal Court; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. SPEIER (for herself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 856. A resolution opposing kleptocracy around the world and supporting efforts to develop an effective, independent International Anti-Corruption Court; 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. OCASIO-CORTEZ:

H.R. 5857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. LURIA:

H.R. 5858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 5859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 5860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 5861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 5862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 5863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, "This Congress shall have 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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 5864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution

Article 1, Section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 5865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

Section 8—Powers of Congress. 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. CASTEN of Illinois:

H.R. 5866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3

By Mr. CISNEROS:

H.R. 5867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 5868.

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. HORSFORD:

H.R. 5869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LEVIN of California:

H.R. 5870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MALINOWSKI:

H.R. 5871.

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. MAST:

H.R. 5872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Regulation of the land and naval Forces Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 5873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 5874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution. [Page H10170]

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina:

H.R. 5875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 5876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 5877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section I

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 5878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 5879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 5880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 5881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution, Congress's authority to make all rules and regulations respecting the Territories and possessions.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress's authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, Congress's authority to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 5882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section I; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 5883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 218: Mr. SPANO and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 219: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 303: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 451: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 619: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 692: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 767: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 906: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 955: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 991: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1049: Mr. GARCIA of Illinois and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1050: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1108: Mrs. LESKO, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1140: Mr. COOPER and Mr. MCADAMS.

H.R. 1156: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. BURCHETT.

H.R. 1243: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

- H.R. 1272: Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 1349: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1374: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 1432: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1464: Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 1468: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1586: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 1629: Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 1656: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1695: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 1730: Mr. WALTZ, Mrs. LURIA, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1733: Mr. PETERSON, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1749: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 1754: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Mr. BUCK.
H.R. 1766: Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1769: Mr. UPTON and Mr. HAGEDORN.
H.R. 1878: Mr. CROW.
H.R. 2117: Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 2166: Mr. CISNEROS and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2192: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2201: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
H.R. 2218: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 2225: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 2311: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 2337: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2344: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 2350: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. COX of California, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. GALLEG0.
H.R. 2381: Mr. STEIL.
H.R. 2420: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. HAGEDORN.
H.R. 2468: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2478: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2491: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2616: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 2693: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2694: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2731: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2777: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2867: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2874: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2896: Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 2953: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 2986: Mr. MCADAMS.
H.R. 3077: Mr. SOTO and Ms. PRESSLEY.
H.R. 3107: Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. MEUSER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 3120: Mr. KEATING and Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3131: Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 3219: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 3250: Mr. HURD of Texas.
H.R. 3399: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 3583: Mr. BURCHETT.
H.R. 3623: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 3632: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. STEWART, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
H.R. 3654: Mr. HUIZENGA and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 3681: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 3794: Mr. MCADAMS.
H.R. 3801: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 3815: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3929: Ms. WATERS, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3968: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 3980: Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 4009: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 4010: Mr. CONNOLLY and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4020: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 4050: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4138: Mr. MEEKS and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 4172: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 4230: Mr. MCADAMS.
H.R. 4306: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 4309: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4361: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 4438: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. RUPPERS-BERGER.
H.R. 4468: Mr. BERGMAN and Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 4526: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4552: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.R. 4567: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 4674: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 4679: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 4681: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 4708: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 4709: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 4782: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 4836: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 4907: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 4926: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 5002: Mr. HAGEDORN.
H.R. 5043: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5050: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 5053: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 5119: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 5129: Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 5153: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 5169: Mr. ROSE of New York.
H.R. 5175: Mr. HURD of Texas and Mr. RATCLIFFE.
H.R. 5212: Mr. GOODEN.
H.R. 5231: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 5234: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 5248: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 5284: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 5296: Mr. BRINDISI.
H.R. 5297: Mr. YOUNG and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5343: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 5376: Mr. LAMB and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5434: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 5491: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 5514: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 5544: Mr. KATKO and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 5549: Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. VELA, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BASS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 5552: Ms. STEVENS, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 5554: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 5602: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 5605: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 5610: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 5628: Mrs. DEMINGS and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 5630: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5636: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 5642: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 5675: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 5689: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 5708: Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 5711: Mr. CORREA, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BERA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GOMEZ, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 5734: Mr. NADLER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. PRESSLEY.
H.R. 5763: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 5765: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 5767: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 5770: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 5775: Mr. SIRES and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 5793: Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 5806: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 5812: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H.R. 5813: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 5814: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 5826: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 5845: Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 5847: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. J. Res. 22: Mr. TIPTON.
H. J. Res. 50: Mr. POSEY.
H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. SPANO.
H. Con. Res. 88: Mr. POCAN.
H. Res. 23: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H. Res. 255: Mr. LUJÁN.
H. Res. 325: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 374: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GALLEG0, and Mr. WALTZ.
H. Res. 395: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. STANTON.
H. Res. 443: Mr. DELGADO.
H. Res. 540: Mr. ROUDA.
H. Res. 701: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H. Res. 723: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H. Res. 734: Mr. GAETZ.
H. Res. 735: Mr. DEFazio.
H. Res. 745: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H. Res. 803: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SOTO, Mr. YOHO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. SIRES.
H. Res. 806: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mrs. HAYES.
H. Res. 845: Mr. HILL of Arkansas.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2020

No. 29

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, who sustains our universe by Your boundless power, preserve our Senators with Your goodness, and rule them with Your justice. Lord, we cast ourselves entirely upon Your faithfulness, for You are the source of every blessing.

Stabilize our lawmakers in the midst of the contradictions of reality. Grant that they will be able to make sense out of life's complexities. Lord, help our legislators know the constancy of Your presence and the certainty of Your judgment as You guide them with Your higher wisdom.

We pray in Your generous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PARKLAND SHOOTING ANNIVERSARY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, this Friday marks the 2-year anniversary of the shooting at the school in Parkland, FL, where 17 innocent lives were lost at the hands of evil. We will never forget that tragic moment and day.

I am dedicated to keeping weapons from dangerous people. That is why I have introduced the EAGLES Act over the past 2 years. This bipartisan, bicameral bill reauthorizes and expands the leading center in threat assessment and prevention. This bill is a tribute to the victims and the families.

Also, the Justice Department still hasn't provided to Congress its report on the shooting. I hope the Department of Justice will get off the stick. It owes it to the families to get this report done.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

FORT KNOX

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday, the U.S. Army and the Commonwealth of Kentucky both received some really great news.

Secretary of the Army Ryan McCarthy and Army Chief of Staff GEN James McConville announced that Fort Knox will be the headquarters for the new Army Corps. They stopped by my office last night to discuss the good news.

The new Fifth Corps will support U.S. forces and operations in Europe, helping fulfill requirements of the national defense strategy. It is expected to bring more than 600 additional soldiers to Fort Knox.

Along with Congressman BRETT GUTHRIE and Senator PAUL, I had urged

Army leadership to select Fort Knox for this new corps headquarters, and, obviously, we think they made a great choice.

Now Fifth Corps will join the eight commands already stationed there, including the Army's Human Resources, Recruiting, and Cadet Commands. I have worked for years to help ensure that Fort Knox receives the national attention that it deserves.

It is really great to see the Army agrees that its high-quality facilities are perfect for this new headquarters. The extraordinary work of the Knox Regional Development Alliance has made it a wonderful place both to live and to work—both for servicemembers and for their families.

Last year I was proud to host Defense Secretary Mark Esper in Kentucky to meet with members of the Fort Knox community. I am certainly grateful to him, Secretary McCarthy, and General McConville for recognizing our potential.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, today, the Senate will consider a War Powers Resolution offered by the junior Senator from Virginia. Our colleague's resolution is deeply flawed on a number of levels.

As I explained yesterday, it is too blunt and too broad. It is also an abuse of the War Powers Act, which was designed to strike a balance between the President's constitutional war powers and Congress's own war powers and oversight responsibilities.

Some of us believe the War Powers Act went too far in undermining the separation of powers and infringing upon the authorities of the Commander in Chief. But apart from that debate, everyone should acknowledge that it was designed to stop Vietnams—the deployment of thousands of troops into sustained combat without congressional authorization, not the one-off

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S999

uses of limited force that Presidents have carried out literally for centuries.

Until recently, most in this body recognized the need for Presidents to have flexibility with respect to the threat of military force. They saw the deterrent effect and diplomatic utility of keeping our options open.

During President Obama's tenure, Democrats said frequently that when it comes to Iran, we should never take the military option off the table. But now they seek to use this privileged resolution to do precisely that.

The collateral institutional damage of this action would fall on our military. Its ability to operate quickly and adaptively to emerging threats would be jeopardized.

Colleagues, if you want to take the truly significant step of preemptively taking options off the table for defending our troops, if you really want to remove troops from Syria or Iraq altogether, why don't you just be honest about it and make your case? Find 60 votes to pass legislation. Find 67 votes to override a Presidential veto. Don't use a blunt and imprecise War Powers Resolution to end-run around the constitutional structures that make this a difficult proposition by design.

There is no ongoing, protracted combat with respect to Iran. Our troops are not mired in unending hostilities. The War Powers Act aims to impose a 60-day clock on combat operations. The strike that killed Soleimani took maybe 60 seconds. Let me say that again. The strike took about 60 seconds.

Clearly, this is the wrong tool for this subject.

We have just come through an impeachment trial because House Democrats rushed to use this serious tool as a political weapon of first resort rather than patiently conducting more normal oversight using the more normal tools that Congresses of both parties typically use. No patience for ordinary oversight—just rush to grab the bluntest tool available to make a political statement against the President. Well, this war powers debate bears an eerie resemblance to that pattern.

To listen to some of the advocates of Senator Kaine's resolution, you would think that sweeping resolutions like this were the only means available to Senators to express any discomfort with White House foreign policy. Of course that isn't so.

If Senators' priority is genuine oversight, there are countless tools in their toolbox. They can hold hearings. They can engage the administration directly. They can ask questions and raise issues they feel were not sufficiently addressed in interagency deliberations.

Instead, like impeachment, this War Powers Resolution cuts short that interplay between the branches. It short-circuits the thoughtful deliberation and debate. It is a dangerously overbroad resolution that should not pass Congress and is certain to be ve-

toed if it does. If my colleagues want to make a real difference, this is not the way to go.

The amendments my Republican colleagues and I have filed expose the shortcomings and unintended risks of this approach.

Senator Kaine has drafted a rule of construction that tries to provide an exception allowing U.S. troops to defend themselves against an attack if it is "imminent." My amendment exposes the absurdity of this by simply removing the word "imminent."

How imminent, exactly, is imminent enough? When do our men and women in uniform get to defend themselves? I would like to know. Should our servicemembers need to sit on intelligence until an attack is a week away? A day away? An hour away? Until they see the whites of the enemy's eyes?

And who makes the determination about imminence? Five hundred thirty-five Members of Congress? The President? A Pentagon lawyer? A battlefield commander? Some young private?

This resolution imposes a new constraint on the military without answering any of those questions.

If we have intelligence warning that an enemy is planning to attack our forces, can we not disrupt the plot until the attack is almost underway?

Senators Cotton, Rounds, and Sullivan have also filed amendments. They propose sensible additions to give our troops and their commanders more confidence we aren't trying to tie their hands against precisely the threat they might face if Iran were again to become emboldened enough to attack us—oh, and to make sure we can defend our diplomats and Embassies, too, if they were to face renewed threats.

So clearly this resolution is not ready for prime time. I believe it is just an effort to broadcast a political message, but even that message can be harmful to our troops and to our national security.

So what message will the Senate send to American servicemembers? Should they doubt whether their own leaders are authorized to defend them? What message should we send to our regional allies and partners? Can they count on continued solidarity from the United States? What would it say to real great-power competitors like Russia and China if we cannot even remain united in the face of a lesser challenge, such as Iran?

Let's send the right message with our vote. Let's defeat this misguided resolution.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 3275

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3275) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joshua M. Kindred, of Alaska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, last week the Senate concluded the impeachment proceeding. I heard one of my colleagues say it is the most serious thing that the U.S. Senate has the constitutional authority to do. That argument can be made, but I would disagree.

I think the most serious thing we are assigned under the Constitution is the declaration of war because, you see, it isn't just a matter of the political fate of any individual; it is the matter of the lives of many good people in America who serve in our Armed Forces, who may be in danger if we decide to go to war. Even under the best circumstances, a quick and effective war can lead to the deaths of brave and innocent Americans who are simply serving their country. That is why the comments made by the majority leader this morning need to be responded to.

His suggestion that Senator Kaine's War Powers Resolution is a mistake, I think, really ignores the obvious. It has been 18 years—almost 18 years—since Congress and the Senate had an active debate about the United States engaging in war. I remember that debate in 2002 very well because it was a debate that consumed the attention of the Senate, the House, and the Nation over whether we would invade Iraq and whether we would invade Afghanistan.

Most of us remember the argument made by the Bush administration for the invasion of Iraq. We were told there were weapons of mass destruction in that country that could threaten the

neighbors of Iraq, our allies, and even the United States. Over and over again we heard that phrase, “weapons of mass destruction,” “weapons of mass destruction.”

I was serving on the Senate Intelligence Committee at that time. I remember the classified testimony behind closed doors. I had serious doubts in my mind as to whether they had established that weapons of mass destruction actually existed and whether authorizing a war meant we would just use that as a device to force Iraq into better conduct or we would actually invade their country.

As a consequence, I joined 22 other Senators in voting against the invasion of Iraq, which we voted on the floor of the Senate in 2002. Twenty-two Democrats and one Republican all voted against that invasion of Iraq. Obviously, we did not prevail. A majority gave that authority to President George W. Bush, and the invasion was underway. I can still remember it.

I can remember the unfolding events as our troops arrived, made their impact on that nation, and eventually took control of Iraq.

Then the search was on for the weapons of mass destruction, which led to our invasion of Iraq. The search continued for days and weeks and months without any evidence of weapons of mass destruction. It was a farce. It was a fraud on the American public. Almost 5,000 Americans lost their lives because of our invasion of Iraq, but the premise, the pretense that led to that invasion was misleading information from the administration. But at least I will say this: There was a debate. There was a vote on the floor of the Senate. Did anyone at that time believe, 18 years ago, that we were voting for a war in Iraq that would continue for 18 years?

On the invasion of Afghanistan, the argument was made to convince me and virtually every Member of Congress that the parties responsible for the tragedy and terror of 9/11 were somehow camped in Afghanistan, and we needed to go after ISIS and all those responsible for that 9/11 invasion of the United States. I voted for that, but I have to say as well, there wasn't a single Senator or Member of the House who really believed that 18 years later, we would still be at war in Afghanistan. Yet we are.

The President is now talking about removing more troops from Afghanistan. We will see. We have heard these promises before, but perhaps it will lead to such a decision by the administration.

The point I am getting to is, the Kaine War Powers Resolution—I see Senator Kaine has come to the floor—really addresses the most fundamental question of our constitutional authority and responsibility to declare war. As Senator Kaine says in this resolution, which I am happy to cosponsor, Congress has the sole power to declare war under article I, section 8, clause 11, of the U.S. Constitution.

When I heard Senator McConnell come to the floor this morning and argue against the Senate stepping forward and asserting its constitutional authority, I wondered, how does he explain in the Commonwealth of Kentucky that we are still engaged in a war 18 years after there was any vote for an authorization for use of military force in Iraq and Afghanistan?

The larger question Senator Kaine and I tried to raise in this resolution is, What does this mean in terms of our future relationship with Iran and their neighbor, Iraq? We know we have had a rocky and contentious relationship with that country. We know they have engaged in acts of terrorism that cost American lives. There has been tension between our countries for decades. We know that full well.

President Obama tried to at least bring some sanity to the relationship by limiting the ability of the Iranians to develop nuclear weapons. He felt, I felt, and most Americans felt that was a step in the right direction, to take the nuclear weapons out of the hands of Iraq so that even if they are engaged in conduct we find reprehensible, it would not reach that horrible level of a nuclear confrontation.

I thought the President was right. I supported President Obama's efforts to develop this inspection mechanism where international inspectors would come into Iran and see if they were developing weapons and report to the world.

We engaged countries around the world to join us in this effort to stop the development of nuclear weapons in Iran. It was an incredible coalition that included Russia and China and the European nations that joined with us to impose this limitation of nuclear weapons in Iran. I thought it was a move in the right direction to have this kind of international support.

Yet, when President Trump took office, sadly, he kept his promise to eliminate that nuclear control agreement between the United States, Iran, and the other parties. By eliminating it, he basically gave permission to the Iranians to continue development of nuclear weapons. Yet he warned the Iranians that if they did, there would be a price to pay.

This is the very reason why this resolution by Senator Kaine is relevant and why we need to consider what the next step will be, because if we are going to stop the Iranians from developing nuclear weapons—and I pray they will not—how are we going to do it and how much force will we use in response? Will it be authorized by the Constitution and by Congress?

I listened to Senator McConnell this morning, and he has basically said to do nothing. Do nothing. Don't assert the constitutional authority of the Congress under the Constitution when it comes to any declaration of war against Iran or any future military endeavors. He described this as a one-off situation, a one-off use of force that we

have currently seen in the targeting of General Soleimani. Perhaps it was, but we don't know the answer to that. When it happened a few weeks ago, there was real uncertainty about what would follow, and I suppose that uncertainty is still here to this day.

This morning, the majority leader said that he thought the impeachment effort that came to the Senate over the last week would not have occurred if we had been patient, and he said this is another example of impatience where we are setting up this constitutional responsibility of the administration.

Well, I disagree with him on two counts. If Senator McConnell is counseling patience, patience in an impeachment trial would certainly have involved evidence, documents, and witnesses. Yet he was impatient to get it over with without any evidence coming before the Senate.

I also would say that patience is a good virtue when it comes to most of life's experiences, and it certainly is if there is a prospect of war.

What Senator Kaine is doing is asserting the authority of Congress to step up and be party to discussions about whether we move beyond the current situation to one that involves troops or any type of invasion of territory in Iran.

I see Senator Kaine is on the floor, and I will defer to him in a moment, but I will tell you this before I sit down: As long as I have been a Member of the House and Senate, I have felt that Congress has a responsibility under the Constitution to declare war. It is a responsibility that most Members of Congress talk about a lot but, frankly, don't want to face. They don't want to be on the record for or against war for fear they will guess wrong in terms of certain foreign policy decisions.

Regardless, I think the Framers of our Constitution understood full well that if we are going to ask American families to potentially sacrifice the lives of their sons and daughters in combat, in a war, they should have a voice in the decision on going to war. That is what this article in the Constitution provides—a voice for the U.S. public that comes through the Congress as to whether we are going to engage in a war. Otherwise, we find ourselves in a situation like today, 18 years after an authorization of use of military force—and part of it under false pretenses—continuing a military effort that was never truly authorized.

I support Senator Kaine's effort. I am glad it is a bipartisan resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LOEFFLER).

The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I rise briefly to thank my colleague. I am actually scheduled to talk on this topic later this afternoon, but I wanted to come and hear Senator Durbin today. I appreciate his effort. He has been a

powerful advocate of this principle that we don't stand in contradiction of this President or any President when we stand for the proposition that Congress should do its job under article I of the Constitution, and I applaud my colleague for his strong support.

I will take the floor later today to talk about the bipartisan resolution he has just described.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, we are likely to postpone a vote this week that had been scheduled on a Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval relative to Education Secretary Betsy DeVos's new borrower defense rule. I would like to explain the background behind this procedure. Although it is likely it will be postponed until after our 1-week President's Day recess, I still think Members should reflect on the importance of this measure.

In 1992 Congress added a provision to the Higher Education Act that allowed student borrowers who were defrauded by their schools to have their Federal student loans discharged. Here is what it boiled down to: The Federal Government recognizes the accreditation of colleges and universities. With that recognition, those colleges and universities can offer Federal loans to the students who attend. So there is a partnership that begins this process and this relationship, and the partnership is a seal of approval by the Federal Government in the authorization of Federal loans.

What we found was that some of the institutions that were given permission to authorize Federal student loans for those attending their institutions, in fact, were lying to their students. So the students were in a situation where they incurred a debt in student loans for promises made by a college or university that turned out to be false.

We said that under the law, that is not fair to the student and the student's family. Those students can be discharged from federal student debt if, in fact, that college or university defrauded them.

What would be a typical fraud? To invite students to enroll in your college with the promise that the courses they take in that college would be transferrable, that the credits are transferrable to another school, and then it turns out to be a lie; the promise that if you complete a certain number of courses in the school, you will have satisfied the requirements for licensure for nursing, for example, and that turns out to be a lie; or the possibility that you would finish the courses of this school and get a job in a certain field.

Great promises were made to the students, and it turns out they were lies. In those circumstances, students—many of whom are young and facing the first serious financial decision of their lives—were misled and defrauded. We said that under the law, those students should have an opportunity to discharge their student loan.

It is bad enough they were lied to, bad enough they wasted their time, and bad enough they had a college experience that didn't make life better for them, but to be saddled with debt because that school lied to them and defrauded them is unacceptable. The process for having their loans discharged is called borrower defense.

Under President Obama, we found that many schools—almost exclusively for-profit universities such as Corinthian, ITT, and others—lied to students about what their experience would be if they went there. So the students, saddled with debt, having been lied to, went to the Department of Education to have that debt discharged. There was some success in that, but then came the new President.

President Trump, with his Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos, took a much different view and has ignored the claims of these students for discharge of their student loans. They started stacking up, and nearly 230,000 students from across the United States who were looking for this borrower defense relief from their student loans, after having been lied to and defrauded by these colleges and universities, just found no response whatsoever from the Trump administration and from Education Secretary DeVos. As a consequence, they asked Members of Congress to intervene, and we tried but with no success.

Then Secretary DeVos took this decisive step in changing the rules for future students. Do you know what she said? She said to these students: In the future, if you want relief from student debt from being defrauded, prove your case. Lawyer-up. Get your lawyer, and let's have a hearing.

Well, understand that these students—young and in debt to start with—are not likely to turn around and hire a lawyer to prove Corinthian, in its catalogues and representations to students, for example, misrepresented the education they were offering.

Under the previous administration, that could be established in evidence, and all the students affected by it could use that evidence. Under the DeVos administration, it is an individual burden of proof to qualify for borrower defense. So that will leave many students with no recourse. As a consequence, they will be stuck with the debt for a worthless education or one that didn't meet as promised.

More than 223,000 claims are pending before the Department. Many of them have been waiting for years. The claims come from every State in the Union—large, small, red, blue and purple—and they are not going to stop.

These claims have led to this CRA, this Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval.

I doubt that we are going to be taking it up this week, so I am going to withhold making a presentation on this until we return after the President's Day recess. But I want to make one last point. We are not just bringing this up on behalf of students; we are bringing this matter before the Senate on behalf of veterans. Student veterans.

The American Legion of the United States has stepped up and said to us that veterans have been defrauded just like the students we are talking about on the floor of the Senate.

If you believe in these veterans and these military families who are stuck with student loan debt because of lies from colleges and universities, I urge my colleagues to think twice and join us in this effort to stop the DeVos rules and give our veterans a fighting chance not to be burdened with this unfair debt.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in voting to acquit President Trump of an abuse of power and obstruction of Congress, Senate Republicans sought to justify their vote by claiming that the President had "learned his lesson." The implication was that the ordeal of impeachment and its permanent stain on his reputation that can never be erased would chasten President Trump's future behavior—a toddler scolded into compliance.

The explanation, frankly, looked like an excuse. It was unconvincing the moment it was uttered. No serious person believes President Trump has learned any lesson. He doesn't learn any lessons. He does just what he wants and what suits his ego at the moment. Observers of the President would question whether he is even capable of learning a lesson, and, unsurprisingly, the flimsy rationalization by some Senate Republicans, desperate to have an excuse because they were so afraid of doing the right thing, was disproven within a matter of days.

President Trump was acquitted by Senate Republicans last Wednesday. On Friday, he began dismissing members of his administration who testified in the impeachment inquiry, including the patriot, LTC Alexander Vindman and Ambassador Gordon Sondland, a clear and obvious act of retaliation—very simply, that is all it was—against witnesses who told the truth under oath.

President Trump hates the truth, time and time again, because he knows he lies, and when other people tell the truth, he hates it, so he fired them. The President even fired the brother of Lieutenant Colonel Vindman for the crime of being related to someone the President wanted out. How vindictive,

how petty, how nasty, and yet there are rumors now that the President might dismiss the inspector general of the intelligence community, the official who received the whistleblower report. These are patriots all. President Trump can't stand patriots because they stand for country, not for what he wants.

Yesterday, once again and typically, the White House reportedly decided to withdraw the nomination of Elaine McCusker, who was in line to serve as the Pentagon Comptroller and Chief Financial Officer. Why did he dismiss her—a longtime serving, very capable woman? Because over the summer, Ms. McCusker advised—merely advised—members of the administration about the legal ramifications of denying assistance to Ukraine. Her crime, in the eyes of President Trump and his so many acolytes—henchmen—in the administration, was attempting to follow the law. How dare she try to follow the law. How dare she even voice this is what the law is in this kind of administration.

Of course, yesterday, after career prosecutors recommended that Roger Stone be sentenced to 7 to 9 years in Federal prison for witness tampering and lying abjectly to Congress, the President tweeted that his former confidant was being treated extremely unfair. It appears the Attorney General of the United States and other political appointees of the Justice Department intervened to countermand the sentencing recommendation. As a result, in an unprecedented but brave, courageous, and patriotic move, four career prosecutors working on the Roger Stone case—all four of them—withdrew from the case or resigned from the Justice Department.

When asked about the clear impropriety of intervening in a Federal case, the President said he has an “absolute right” to order the Justice Department to do whatever he wants. This morning, the President congratulated the Attorney General, amazingly enough, for taking charge of the case.

The President ran against the swamp in Washington, a place where the game is rigged by the powerful to benefit them personally. I ask my fellow Americans: What is more swampy, what is more fetid, and what is more stinking than the most powerful person in the country literally changing the rules to benefit a crony guilty of breaking the law?

As a result, I have formally requested that the inspector general of the Justice Department investigate this matter immediately. This morning, I call on Judiciary Committee Chairman GRAHAM to convene an emergency hearing of the Judiciary Committee to do the same—to conduct oversight and hold hearings. That is the job of the Judiciary Committee, no matter who is President and whether the President is from your party or not. Something egregious like this demands that the inspector general investigate and de-

mands that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee hold a hearing now.

The President is claiming that rigging the rules is perfectly legitimate. He claims an absolute right to order the Justice Department to do anything he wants. The President has, as his Attorney General, an enabler—and that is a kind word—who actually supports this view. Does anyone think it is out of the question that President Trump might order the FBI to investigate Hillary Clinton, Joe Biden, or anyone else without any evidence to support such an arbitrary violation of individual rights? Oh, I know, some far-right conspiratorial writer, who has no credibility, who just makes things up, writes it, FOX News puts it on, Sean Hannity or someone talks about it, and then the President says “investigate.” That is third-world behavior, not American behavior. That kind of behavior defiles that great flag that is standing above us. This is not ordinary stuff. I have never seen it before with any President—Democratic, Republican, liberal or conservative.

Does any serious person believe the President's abuse would be limited to the Justice Department? Does any serious person think that Trump might not order the Justice Department to treat his friends, associates, and family members differently than it treats ordinary citizens and that Attorney General Barr would just carry out these orders?

Of course, none of this is out of the question. The President asserted his absolute right to do whatever he wants yesterday. We are witnessing a crisis in the rule of law in America, unlike one we have ever seen before. It is a crisis of President Trump's making, but it was enabled and emboldened by every Senate Republican who was too afraid to stand up to him and say the simple word “no” when the vast majority of them knew that was the right thing to do.

Republicans thought the President would learn his lesson. It turned out that the lesson he learned was not that he went too far and not that he needed to rein it in. The lesson the President learned was that the Republican Party will not hold him accountable, no matter how egregious his behavior—not now, not ever.

Senate Republicans voted to excuse President Trump's abuses of power. They voted to abdicate the constitutional authority of Congress to check on an overreaching Executive. Senate Republicans now own this crisis, and they are responsible for every new abuse of power President Trump commits. John Adams famously described our grand Republic that he helped create as a government of laws, not of men. Our Founding Fathers' foremost concern, of course, was to escape the tyranny of a government of men—more specifically, a King. That is why the Founders created a republic in America. That is why the patriots died for the freedom we are now blessed with.

Yet, after almost 2½ centuries of experience in self-government as a republic, we are, once again, faced with a very serious and looming question: Do we want a government of laws or of men? Do we want to be governed by the laws of the United States or by the whims of one man?

I don't think my Republican colleagues fully appreciated what they were unleashing when they voted in the impeachment trial to excuse the President's conduct—although, maybe they did. They were just afraid, fearful, shaking in their boots because Trump might take vengeance out on them as he did on Senators Flake and Corker. They voted to acquit the President after he used his immense power to pressure a foreign leader to announce an investigation to smear a rival.

What we have seen in the hours and days since that fateful acquittal vote last Wednesday is so disturbing. In a parade of horrors, this is one of the most horrible things President Trump has done. In a parade of horrors, this is one of the most feeble and servile actions of Republicans, just no one saying a peep about it. We are seeing the behavior of a man who has contempt for the rule of law beginning to try out the new unrestrained power conferred on him by 52, 53—well, 52 Republican Senators, 1 brave one.

Left to his own devices, President Trump would turn America into a banana republic with a dictator who can do whatever he wants, and the Justice Department is the President's personal law firm, not a defender of the rule of law. It is a sad day in America—a sad day.

The Founding Fathers created something brand new, a republic, because they were afraid of monarchy. The Senate Republicans aided and abetted President Trump to get much closer to that monarchy than we have been in a long time. Senate Republicans have created something very close to a monarchy, if they can keep it.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Madam President, now, on war powers, later today, the Senate will begin debate on Senator Kaine's War Powers Resolution, preventing President Trump from unilaterally escalating military action against Iran.

The Constitution is clear, Congress alone has the power to declare wars. The President has no authority to enter the United States into another endless conflict in the Middle East, but I fear that the strike against Iranian Major General Soleimani last month may bumble us into one.

With this bipartisan resolution, the Senate can assert its constitutional authority and send a clear bipartisan message to the President that he cannot sidestep Congress when it comes to matters of war and peace. It was immediately clear that the strike against General Soleimani was carried out with insufficient transparency, without proper notification of Congress, and without a clear plan for what comes next.

Last month has only magnified these problems. President Trump initially claimed that no one was hurt after Iran retaliated against forces on January 8. Now the Pentagon says over 100 military personnel suffered a traumatic brain injury. Why has it taken so long for us to learn that American troops were hurt in the attack? Who ordered the withholding of that information? Was it President Trump? It sure wouldn't be surprising. And who in the military—the military, which is a bulwark, one of the few, particularly when General Mattis was the Secretary—who in the military let that happen? Just as importantly, what is the President's strategy for keeping our troops safe in the coming weeks?

The administration has deliberately refused to be transparent with Congress about the aftermath of the Iranian strike. I fear that by keeping Congress in the dark, President Trump is, once again, hoping to short-circuit our checks and balances and escape scrutiny. That is why Senator KAINE's War Powers Resolution is a matter of urgent necessity. I commend Senator KAINE on the job he has done and urge my colleagues of both parties to vote in favor of this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the confirmation vote on the Kindred nomination begin following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF JOSHUA M. KINDRED

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I rise today in support of the vote that the Senate is going to take on here in a few minutes on Joshua Kindred to be Alaska's next Federal district court judge, and I commend this body, particularly Leader MCCONNELL, for prioritizing putting good, solid, young Federal judges in seats in districts and circuit courts all across the country—188 so far since the Trump administration took office, and now it is Alaska's turn.

That Federal judge seat that we are looking at filling here in a couple of minutes has been empty for almost 4 years, and in our State, in the great State of Alaska, we don't have too many opportunities for Federal judges. For example, Alaska only has 1 active judge on the entire Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals out of 29 active judges. So this is an important vote, certainly, for my State.

I want to talk a little bit about Josh Kindred. I have known Josh since he was a young assistant district attorney for the State of Alaska when I was attorney general. We talked about how we were going to work together to make Alaska's judicial process more efficient and more effective for Alaskans during his confirmation process. I certainly was impressed then, but I was impressed when I first met Josh many

years ago and continue to be impressed with his fierce commitment to upholding the law, the concept of equal access to justice for all, and his keen awareness of Alaska's unique legal landscape.

Josh was unanimously rated as "qualified" by the ABA and is a life-long Alaskan with a broad and impressive legal background.

As I mentioned, after clerking on the Oregon Supreme Court, he came back home to Alaska and was promoted to violent crimes supervisor after a number of years working in the Anchorage District Attorney's Office, where he worked to punish perpetrators of crimes and with victims of some of the heinous crimes, unfortunately, that we have in too high numbers in Alaska, particularly as it relates to sexual assault and domestic violence. In his career, he has been committed not only to prosecuting those kinds of crimes but to doing pro bono work to stem this very significant crisis that my State has with these heinous crimes of sexual abuse.

Rounding out his legal experience, Josh served as the environmental counsel for the Alaska Oil and Gas Association and, most recently, as the regional solicitor for Alaska for the U.S. Department of the Interior. Now, when the Federal Government controls over 60 percent of the lands in Alaska, the solicitor for the U.S. Department of the Interior position in Alaska is actually a really important one and is incredibly important in terms of qualifications for a Federal judge.

This wide-ranging experience will be incredibly valuable as a district court judge in Alaska because he is familiar—very familiar—with the numerous Alaska-specific laws that this body passes year after year, decade after decade: the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, and the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Act. This is an important point because very few States have such large, complex Federal laws that are focused solely on their State, and Federal courts often misinterpret these laws and don't understand these laws, to the detriment of the people I represent.

Let me just give you a recent example. There was a Federal case under the law I mentioned recently, ANILCA, as we call it in Alaska. It involved a moose hunter named John Sturgeon who had a hovercraft and wanted to go moose hunting, and overbearing Federal Government agents told him he couldn't use his hovercraft in certain areas considered Federal waters. John Sturgeon knew better. He challenged the Federal Government. There were 12 years of litigation, twice up to the U.S. Supreme Court, and Federal judges at the district and certainly the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals level getting this case wrong every single time. Finally, last year, in a unanimous 9-to-0 opinion, Justice Elena Kagan summed it up very succinctly when she ruled

against all of these Federal judges in the Ninth Circuit and for Mr. Sturgeon. She said: "If Sturgeon lived in any other State, his suit would not have a prayer of success."

She went on: "Except that Sturgeon lives in Alaska. And as we have said before, 'Alaska is often the exception, not the rule,'" under Federal law.

So the Supreme Court gets it, and Josh Kindred will get it. He understands Alaska's unique legal jurisprudence. He is committed to honoring the commitments this body has made to Alaska's first peoples and others in my great State, and he is committed to justice.

I believe he will serve with honor and integrity on the Federal court, and I urge my colleagues to vote for his confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Kindred nomination?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 41 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Collins	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lee	Shelby
Cotton	Loeffler	Sinema
Cramer	Manchin	Sullivan
Crapo	McConnell	Thune
Cruz	McSally	Tillis
Daines	Moran	Toomey
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Coons	Heinrich
Blumenthal	Cortez Masto	Hirono
Booker	Duckworth	Jones
Brown	Durbin	Kaine
Cantwell	Feinstein	King
Cardin	Gillibrand	Leahy
Carper	Harris	Markey
Casey	Hassan	Menendez

Merkley	Schatz	Udall
Murphy	Schumer	Van Hollen
Murray	Shaheen	Warner
Peters	Smith	Whitehouse
Reed	Stabenow	Wyden
Rosen	Tester	

NOT VOTING—5

Bennet	Klobuchar	Warren
Johnson	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes following the first vote be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The votes will be 10 minutes.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Matthew Thomas Schelp, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Schlep nomination?

Mr. CRUZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 42 Ex.]

YEAS—72

Alexander	Duckworth	Lankford
Barrasso	Durbin	Leahy
Blackburn	Enzi	Lee
Blunt	Ernst	Loeffler
Boozman	Feinstein	Manchin
Braun	Fischer	McConnell
Burr	Gardner	McSally
Capito	Graham	Moran
Carper	Grassley	Murkowski
Cassidy	Hassan	Murphy
Collins	Hawley	Paul
Cornyn	Hoeben	Perdue
Cortez Masto	Hyde-Smith	Peters
Cotton	Inhofe	Portman
Cramer	Jones	Reed
Crapo	Kaine	Risch
Cruz	Kennedy	Roberts
Daines	King	Romney

Rosen	Shaheen	Tillis
Rounds	Shelby	Toomey
Rubio	Sinema	Warner
Sasse	Sullivan	Whitehouse
Casey	Tester	Wicker
Scott (FL)	Thune	Young
Scott (SC)		

NAYS—23

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Schatz
Blumenthal	Harris	Schumer
Booker	Heinrich	Smith
Brown	Hirono	Stabenow
Cantwell	Markey	Udall
Cardin	Menendez	Van Hollen
Casey	Merkley	Wyden
Coons	Murray	

NOT VOTING—5

Bennet	Klobuchar	Warren
Johnson	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Fitzgerald Kness, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Kness nomination?

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 43 Ex.]

YEAS—81

Alexander	Cotton	Hyde-Smith
Baldwin	Cramer	Inhofe
Barrasso	Crapo	Jones
Blackburn	Cruz	Kaine
Blumenthal	Daines	Kennedy
Blunt	Duckworth	King
Boozman	Durbin	Lankford
Braun	Enzi	Leahy
Burr	Ernst	Lee
Capito	Feinstein	Loeffler
Cardin	Fischer	Manchin
Carper	Gardner	McConnell
Casey	Graham	McSally
Cassidy	Grassley	Menendez
Collins	Hassan	Merkley
Coons	Hawley	Moran
Cornyn	Hirono	Murkowski
Cortez Masto	Hoeben	Murphy

Paul	Rounds	Sullivan
Perdue	Sasse	Tester
Peters	Schatz	Thune
Portman	Scott (FL)	Tillis
Reed	Scott (SC)	Toomey
Risch	Shaheen	Warner
Roberts	Shelby	Whitehouse
Romney	Sinema	Wicker
Rosen	Smith	Young

NAYS—12

Booker	Harris	Stabenow
Brown	Markey	Udall
Cantwell	Murray	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Schumer	Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Bennet	Klobuchar	Warren
Heinrich	Rubio	
Johnson	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Philip M. Halpern, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Halpern nomination?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 44 Ex.]

YEAS—77

Alexander	Graham	Portman
Barrasso	Grassley	Reed
Blackburn	Hassan	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeben	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Brown	Inhofe	Rubio
Burr	Johnson	Sasse
Capito	Jones	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Carper	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	King	Shaheen
Collins	Lankford	Shelby
Coons	Leahy	Sinema
Cornyn	Lee	Stabenow
Cotton	Loeffler	Sullivan
Cramer	Manchin	Tester
Crapo	McConnell	Thune
Cruz	McSally	Tillis
Daines	Menendez	Toomey
Durbin	Moran	Van Hollen
Enzi	Murkowski	Warner
Ernst	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Paul	Wicker
Fischer	Perdue	Young
Gardner	Peters	

NAYS—19

Baldwin	Casey	Harris
Blumenthal	Cortez Masto	Heinrich
Booker	Duckworth	Hirono
Cantwell	Gillibrand	Markey

Merkley Schatz Wyden
Murray Smith
Rosen Udall

NOT VOTING—4

Bennet Sanders
Klobuchar Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that for the nominations just confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Virginia.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES. 68

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, pursuant to section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 and in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976, I move to discharge the Foreign Relations Committee from further consideration of S.J. Res. 68.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is pending.

Mr. KAINE. I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time on the motion to discharge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge.

The motion is agreed to.

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I move to proceed to S.J. Res. 68.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 68, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, finally, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 2 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I now rise to speak to the body in favor of the bipartisan War Powers Resolution, S.J. Res. 68, which is now pending before the Senate.

Before I address the resolution, I want to acknowledge the combat deaths of SFC Javier Gutierrez and SFC Antonio Rodriguez. Both of these Army sergeants, sergeants first class, were 28-year-olds who were killed last week in Afghanistan. While the incident is still under investigation, it appears that they were killed by a member of the Afghan security forces or somebody posing as a member of the Afghan security forces. As we know well, this is a security force that the United States has armed, equipped, and trained for 19 years.

Sergeant Gutierrez leaves behind a wife, Gabby, and four children, ages 2 through 7. His grandfather was a POW during World War II, and his father was a marine. He had previously deployed both to Iraq and Afghanistan.

Sergeant Rodriguez leaves behind a wife, Ronaleen. He had previously deployed to Afghanistan 10 times. I thought that was a misprint when I read it—a 28-year-old who had previously deployed to Afghanistan 10 times before he was killed.

We honor their memories and send our condolences to their families as well.

The resolution before the body today is about Congress reclaiming its rightful role in decisions about war. The resolution is pretty simple: We should not be at war with Iran unless Congress votes to authorize such a war.

While the President does and must always have the ability to defend the United States from imminent attack, the Executive power to initiate war stops there. An offensive war requires a congressional debate and vote.

This should not be a controversial proposition. It is clearly stated in the Constitution we pledge to support and defend. The principle is established there for a most important reason. If we are to order our men and women, like Sergeants Rodriguez and Gutierrez, to risk their lives and health in war, it should be on the basis of careful deliberation by the people's elected legislature and not on the say-so of any one person.

Congressional deliberation educates the American public about what are the stakes, what are the stakes involved in any proposed war.

Congressional deliberation allows Members of Congress to ask tough questions about the need for war, about the path to victory, and about how a victory can be sustained. And if fol-

lowing that public deliberation, there is a vote of Congress for war, it represents a clear statement that a war is in the national interest and that the efforts of our troops are supported by a clear political consensus. We should not allow this important process to be short-circuited.

Our Framers believed that the congressional deliberation would be the best antidote to unnecessary escalation.

I have spoken often about this topic on the floor during the 7 years I have been in the Senate, and I don't want to repeat arguments that I have made dozens and dozens of times here, but I do want to address at least three objections that I have made to this resolution.

First, there is an objection that says the bipartisan resolution is "an effort to restrain President Trump's powers." This is not a resolution about the President. The resolution does not say anything about President Trump or any President. It is a resolution about Congress.

I want a President that will fully inhabit the article II powers of Commander in Chief, but as a Member of the Article I branch, I want an article I branch that would fully inhabit the article I powers, including the sole power to declare war. This is not an effort to restrain President Trump or some other President. This is not an effort by a Democrat to point a finger or to restrain Republicans. No. In the history of this country, even in recent history, I believe we have often gotten it wrong with respect to the initiation of war, whether the President was a Democrat or Republican or whether the majority in Congress was Democratic or Republican.

The legislative branch, article I, has allowed too much power to devolve to the Executive in this fundamental question of whether the Nation should be at war. This is not directed toward President Trump. It would apply equally to any President. It is fundamentally about Congress owning up to and taking responsibility for the most significant decisions that we should ever have to make.

A second argument against the bill that I have heard made on the floor in recent days is that it would send a message of weakness to Iran or to other adversaries. I have to admit, I am more interested in the message that we send to the American public and to our troops and to our families. That is the message I am most interested in.

As a father of a marine and as a Senator from a State that is just chock-full of Active-Duty Guard and Reserve veterans, DOD civilian and DOD contractor military families, this bill sends a very strong and powerful message to our public and to our troops and their families that before we get into a war, there will be a careful deliberation about whether it is necessary.

That is a message of comfort. That is a message that can give our own public

and our troops confidence, but to the extent that we want to consider the message this might send to Iran and adversaries, I do not think that America sends a message of weakness when we proudly hold ourselves up as a nation of laws, and we pledge to follow the law when it comes to the monumental question about whether or not we should be at war.

In fact, I believe we are most effective in countering our adversaries—and, face it, most of our adversaries are authoritarian states which do not honor the rule of war—when we send a clear message that, in this country, we will stand for democratic principles, such as the rule of law, and we will follow those principles when we are making momentous decisions, such as whether or not we should be at war.

A third objection I have heard is this: It sends a message that America is not likely to use military force, a message that, thereby, might embolden bad actors. I find this argument bewildering.

I don't think anyone in the world questions whether America will use military force. We have been engaged in a war against nonstate terrorism now for 19 years. The pages in this book have known nothing but war. These two 28-year-olds who were just killed last year, they virtually knew nothing other than war during their whole lives.

Is America willing to use military action? We have been in a war for 19 years. We are losing troops on the battlefield—like Sergeants Rodriguez and Gutierrez—to this very day. We have tens and thousands of troops deployed around the world to fight a war against terrorism, and the current President is increasing the total footprint of those troops in the Middle East to prosecute this fight.

In Afghanistan alone, where these two sergeants were killed, we are spending \$45 billion a year. It is 19 years later, and we are still spending \$45 billion a year to prosecute this fight. No one can question whether the United States will protect itself or our allies, but the choice of when to fight wars and when to use other available tools is always a question of such importance that the most careful deliberation is warranted.

As I conclude, I just want to say this. I went and visited the Hampton veterans hospital last Friday as part of just, sort of, a regular visit maybe once a year just to check in with the Hampton VA, which is one of three VAs in Virginia, to see what they are doing. I know every Member of the Senate does the same thing, visiting VA hospitals in their States and elsewhere—going to see our veterans at Walter Reed, for example, or going to see wounded warriors who are at the hospital at Fort Belvoir in Virginia. Any visit of that kind produces a million emotions: pride in service providers, pride in resilience of our veterans as they are grappling with challenging illnesses and disabilities in their lives, often

long after they have served. The one impression that is always vivid when you visit a veterans hospital is this: the enduring consequences of war.

As I visited the Hampton VA, I spent time in, sort of, two particular units. One is a women's clinic. We have so many more women veterans, and a number of VAs that were not set up very well to deal with women are now having to really build out the capacity to deal with the growing number of women veterans and the issues that they are bringing to the table. I applaud what I saw in Hampton at the women's clinic.

I also spent time in the mental health unit that is trying to pioneer new technologies, magnetic imaging, to help people deal with some of the signature wounds of the Iraq and Afghanistan war: traumatic brain injury and PTSD.

We make a promise to these veterans that we will be there for them, even when we don't fully know the consequences of the promise we make because they don't know the consequences of what they will experience and suffer.

A signature aspect of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars that really doesn't have an earlier precedent is the 10-deployments phenomena. In what earlier war that this country fought do we have 28-year-old sergeants who are serving their 11th deployment in a theater of war? Those repeated deployments have a long consequence in the life of a person and in the life of those close to that person.

Madam President knows this from her own service: When you go to the VA and you grapple with the long consequences of war, it has to make an impression upon those of us in this body charged with the sole responsibility for declaring war that, if and when we do so, we owe it the most careful deliberation that we bring to any question that would ever result in the loss of lives. That is not too much to ask for us to deliberate carefully when what is at risk for those who serve, who depend upon us to make the best possible decision, are consequences that will last their own lifetimes and affect the lives of so many others.

That is what this resolution is about. I don't believe it should be controversial. It is certainly bipartisan, and I hope we will stand up for this important proposition that the careful deliberation of the Senate is the most necessary thing we can do and what we owe to our troops and their families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I come to the floor today to strongly urge all of my colleagues to join Senator Kaine, and I want to thank him for his extremely thoughtful and amazing approach to this.

I think it is so important that we reassert Congress's authority in decisions concerning our Nation's security

and curbing this administration's ability to put our troops in harm's way without consulting the American people.

Following the early January attack on U.S. troops deployed in Iraq triggered by President Trump's decision to launch a drone strike that killed Iran's Qasem Soleimani, I know that many Americans were frightened, as I was, to then watch tensions with Iran escalate so rapidly in realtime. I am glad the President has backed down and decided not to further escalate those tensions in recent weeks—as a voice for my home State of Washington, including all of our servicemembers and military families and communities. But we are not off the hook, and we have every reason to believe that Iran may retaliate again, which is why I remain deeply disturbed by President Trump's rush to incite conflict in ways that could have significant negative impacts on our strategic goals in the region and, more importantly, the long-term safety and security of Americans at home and abroad.

To date, neither President Trump nor his administration has provided any evidence to us here in Congress to justify his actions, and despite reports from the administration shortly after the attack that there were no U.S. casualties, we are now learning more than 100 servicemembers—100—have been diagnosed with traumatic brain injury following that attack—serious injuries that President Trump dismissed as simply “headaches.”

The American people expect their representatives—us—to have a say in decisions that may put their lives or the lives of a loved one at risk. As the daughter of a World War II veteran and Purple Heart recipient, here in the Senate I make decisions about our national security with deep concern for our brave servicemembers and their families, with a personal understanding of the sacrifices they make for all of us and our Nation and an unwavering commitment to ensuring that they have the support they need while they serve and when they come home.

That is exactly why our Constitution mandates that the power to declare war rests with Congress—not the Commander in Chief—because those decisions weren't meant to be made by one person alone. That is why I am glad that my friend from Virginia, Senator Kaine, is offering this War Powers Resolution, of which I am very proud to be a cosponsor.

Passing this resolution is a first step toward protecting our servicemembers and our interests in the region by removing our troops from hostilities in or against Iran unless there is a declaration of war or a congressional authorization for the use of force.

This isn't just an issue for Democrats. I am very proud that this resolution has bipartisan support because, no matter what side of the aisle you are on, we should all agree that Congress must play a role in our Nation's foreign policy, as well as matters related

to the health and safety of our servicemembers.

I am grateful for all of those who are serving in the Middle East and around the world, and that is why I refuse to stand by and accept that they could be put in jeopardy or that our Nation's foreign policy and safety could be upended by an impulsive, late-night tweet.

So I will continue to demand that the President provide his legal justification for the drone strike in Iraq, commit to coming before Congress in advance of any further escalating steps, and explain to us how he will move forward in the region with the goal of protecting Americans, our allies, and our interests.

In the meantime, considering the unique recklessness of this administration, it is urgently important for Congress to pass this resolution to block President Trump's ability to start a war with Iran and ensure that Congress is guaranteed the opportunity to hear whatever case the President may have before taking a vote to determine the path that we want our Nation to go down.

In 2002 I voted against the war in Iraq because I felt the administration was asking us to send our men and women into harm's way without a clear plan or a goal. Last week the House passed legislation to repeal that 2002 AUMF, which is a step in the right direction toward bringing our brave troops home.

The Senate should stand up and assert our authority to represent our constituents on this critical issue, too, because, as Senators, they are the people to whom we are all accountable. We have to be able to go home and look them in the eye and say that we gave questions as grave as decisions concerning war and peace the deliberation that they warrant and that we have done everything we can to protect our Nation and our servicemembers. You simply can't do that if you allow this President—or any President—to continue conducting foreign policy—especially by tweet—unchecked.

So Congress has an obligation to ensure a debate. We have an obligation to press this administration for a strategy and check its power if it doesn't present a compelling one, which so far it hasn't.

Passing this War Powers Resolution will help us—us—do exactly that, so I strongly urge our colleagues to support this resolution.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today we are taking up a War Powers Resolution ostensibly aimed at hostilities with Iran. The impetus for this resolution was the strike the President authorized to take out Iranian General Qasem Soleimani.

Iran has a long history of fomenting violence and conflict in the Middle East, and General Soleimani was al-

ways right in the center of that. As head of the Quds Force of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps, Soleimani masterminded Iran's terrorist activities for two decades. Iran has been linked to one in six U.S. military deaths in Iraq, notably through the IEDs that have become so emblematic of the War on Terror.

This was Soleimani's work. He is responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American soldiers and countless innocent civilians, and the threat Iran poses to U.S. personnel is an ongoing threat. At the end of December, an Iran-backed militia fired more than 30 rockets at an Iraqi military base, killing an American contractor and wounding four U.S. troops. Days later, Iran-backed protesters stormed the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad, conducting a 2-day siege of the Embassy before withdrawing.

The strike on General Soleimani wasn't just based on these recent attacks or on Soleimani's long reign of terror in the Middle East. The President authorized the strike on Soleimani because there was credible intelligence that Soleimani was planning imminent attacks against U.S. interests. That was the conclusion not of the President but of the U.S. intelligence community and nonpartisan experts like the CIA Director and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. It was in response to this conclusion from the intelligence community that the President ordered the strike.

The War Powers Resolution coming before the Senate was introduced out of concern that taking out Iran's top terrorist leader would lead to escalation, but that has not happened. The perspective provided by the nearly 6 weeks that have passed since Soleimani's killing underscores the one-off nature of the strike. The President has not escalated this conflict or used Soleimani's death as an excuse to send troops into action against Iran. In fact, this strike was designed to check escalation in the region—specifically, increasing aggression and imminent attacks by Iran.

We live in a dangerous world. The United States must be able to respond to imminent threats to our security. I support the robust interpretation of Congress's constitutional prerogatives when it comes to the declaration of war and the deployment of U.S. troops, but I also believe that the President has the authority and, indeed, the responsibility to protect the United States from imminent threats.

The strike against Qasem Soleimani has reminded those hostile to the United States that we will not stand idly by while U.S. personnel are threatened. It has removed the top terrorist leader from the arena, a leader responsible for the deaths of hundreds of Americans. It has reduced, although certainly not eliminated, the risk to our men and women in uniform deployed in the Middle East.

I believe that the President's action was justified, and I think this resolu-

tion is an ill-advised and potentially problematic response to the President's action.

With Soleimani's evil influence removed from the Middle East, Iran has the chance to chart a new course, to rethink its participation in terrorism and its oppression of its own people. I hope that Iran will moderate its activities, but, of course, we have to be prepared for the likelihood that it will not. We have to continue to ensure that our words and actions make Iran and any other hostile nation think twice before attacking American citizens.

We have to continue to ensure that our military and intelligence community have the resources they need to identify and to defeat any threat. I will continue to work to ensure that our military is the best prepared, best equipped fighting force in the world and that our intelligence professionals have the resources they need to protect our country.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). The Senator from Ohio.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

At the conclusion of President Trump's impeachment trial, I heard some of my Republican colleagues, most of whom I consider my friends, say that the President would be chastened by impeachment. Some of you told me you knew what he did was wrong. A number of Republicans told me they admit that he lies a lot. They would acknowledge extorting an ally for help in the 2020 Presidential campaign wasn't bad enough to rise to the level of warranting removal from office—even though Richard Nixon never did that; even though, just on the face of it, thinking of soliciting a bribe from a foreign country to help you in your reelection as President of the United States is worse than untoward.

But you told me—many of you on the Republican side—that holding the trial was enough to check his bad behavior. You said things like this—and these are quotes, but I will not mention who they were because they were private conversations. You said: "I think he has learned he has to be maybe a little more judicious and careful."

Some of you said these publicly too. A reporter asked another of you whether Trump might see acquittal as a license to do it again, and you responded: I don't think so.

One of my colleagues said: "I think he knows now that, if he is trying to do certain things . . . he needs to go through the proper channels."

Another colleague said: "The President has been impeached. That's a pretty big lesson. . . . I believe that he will be more cautious in the future."

Well, the President learned a pretty big lesson. The lesson he learned—because everybody, every single person, from the majority leader down the hall to every Republican sitting at this

desk and this desk and this desk—every Republican except for MITT ROMNEY voted to acquit. Every single Republican voted to acquit, so the lesson is he can do whatever he wants; he can abuse his office because he will never, ever be held accountable.

One Republican had the courage to stand up and do it. Every other Republican sitting at these desks said to the President of the United States: Yeah, it is OK. You have learned your lesson. Yeah, your lesson is that you can do whatever you want and this body will never, ever hold you accountable.

So do you know what? And I thank the Presiding Officer, by the way. Do you know what? The President went on what we call a PR tour—a personal retribution tour—starting at the prayer breakfast—the prayer breakfast—the next day when he attacked and he attacked and he attacked all kinds of people, continuing through to his speech in the East Room where many of my colleagues were in the audience clapping for the President when the President made these attacks on people.

They say he will never do it again; even if we vote to acquit, he will never do it again. But then they clap for him when he starts his personal retribution tour.

He removed Colonel Vindman, a patriot, a Purple Heart recipient who spent his life serving our country. He was an immigrant. He left the Soviet Union. He wanted freedom. He served in our country's military.

The President, when he attacked Colonel Vindman, mocked his accent. He grew up speaking Ukrainian, and his English was damn near perfect when I have listened to him, but he had a bit of a Ukrainian accent. He mocked his accent. And then he suggested he could be subject to military prosecution.

He removed Ambassador Sondland, who was a Trump appointee, after he testified to the quid pro quo.

Yesterday, President Trump continued this PR tour—his personal retribution tour—interfering at the Department of Justice. I am not a lawyer. I know the Presiding Officer is. Most of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are. But they know a President doesn't interfere with the Department of Justice. As part of his personal retribution tour, he is interfering there. He is strong-arming appointees to overrule the decision of career prosecutors.

Do you know what? These career prosecutors withdrew in protest. One of them resigned from the Department—more on that later.

Late last night, when the country's eyes were on the primary in New Hampshire, the President of the United States was on part of this retribution tour, and my colleagues had said: Oh, no, he has learned from impeachment. Well, he hasn't. He has learned he can get away with stuff. He yanked his own Treasury nominee, who was working on terrorist financing and financial

crimes, former U.S. Attorney Jessie Liu, who had worked as U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia and had worked on, among other things, oversight of prosecutions from Special Counsel Mueller's investigations. The Treasury Department has offered zero explanation. I am going to get a chance in a few minutes to ask the Treasury Secretary, coming in front of my committee, why they are withdrawing her nomination 48 hours before her confirmation hearing.

We can take a guess at why President Trump pulled down her nomination. She oversaw the U.S. attorneys prosecuting President Trump's criminal associates, his political operatives, like Rick Gates, Michael Flynn, and Roger Stone.

This is so obvious. There were people out there who displeased the President. One of them was doing his public duty. He is career military and had fled the Soviet Union. He was speaking under oath about what the President had done because he knew it was wrong to solicit a bribe from a foreign country. Another was a lawyer that oversaw the prosecution of some of the President's political operatives and political hacks—criminals, as it turned out. They oversaw the prosecution. The President is attacking them. The President is using his power to attack him.

My colleagues—who sit at this desk, and this desk, and this desk, and this desk on the Senate floor—think it is OK to acquit him and then tell me that he is going to quit acting the way he acts.

No sentient human being, including the Presiding Officer, would possibly think that way. Ms. Liu was scheduled to testify under oath before members of both parties at our hearing in the Banking Committee tomorrow morning. We need answers as to what she would have said. Were there discussions and decisions she was part of as U.S. attorney involving the President's associates that he didn't like? Was he afraid more would come out about the actions of some of the President's associates, the criminal actions? Was she aware of efforts by the President and his political appointees to interfere in the operation of our justice system? We need a swift and thorough DOJ inspector general investigation of these prosecutorial decisions.

With every passing day, we don't see a humbled President. We see a President unleashed. Again, he didn't learn a lesson from impeachment. Actually, he learned a lesson from his acquittal. The lesson he learned is that he can do whatever he wants. He is a President unleashed. He is bent on turning the arms of a government that is supposed to serve the American people into his own personal vengeance operation—his own personal vengeance operation.

I implore my colleagues: We can't let that stand.

The Department of Justice is supposed to be impartial and immune from

political influence, but it has become no more than a personal weapon, or it is becoming—it is not there yet, but it started to be—a personal weapon the President can unleash on his political enemies.

As I said, I am not a lawyer, but I know enough to know the Department of Justice and the executive branch are not there to serve the President of the United States. The Department of Justice and the executive branch are there to serve the same people we do—the people of Ohio, the people of the Presiding Officer's State of Utah, the people of Maine, Iowa, Tennessee, and every State across this country. No one—no one—should be above the law.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wyoming.

AMERICA'S TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, during the State of the Union, President Trump called on Congress to rebuild America's infrastructure. He specifically asked Congress to pass America's Transportation Infrastructure Act “to invest in new roads, bridges, and tunnels all across our land.” The Senate is ready to answer President Trump's call.

America's roads and bridges are important to every State, every community, and every Tribe in the Nation. The quality of our roads affects everyone. Our economy is built on a well-functioning road system that allows products from rural areas—like Utah, like Wyoming—to get to our population centers. Interstates like I-80, in my home State of Wyoming, are critical arteries of commerce. America's roads create American jobs, move American products, and they fuel America's economy.

In 2015, the U.S. transportation system moved a daily average of roughly 49 million tons of freight. That is an average of \$53 billion worth of freight every single day. The quality of our roads has to keep pace. We must maintain and upgrade and, where necessary, build America's highway infrastructure.

Last July, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, which I chair, unanimously passed America's Transportation Infrastructure Act. The vote was 21 to 0. I introduced this bipartisan bill with fellow leaders on the committee—Ranking Member CARPER, Senator CAPITO, and Senator CARDIN. This legislation will make a historic investment in our roads.

America's Transportation Infrastructure Act authorizes \$287 billion over 5 years from the highway trust fund. That is the largest investment in

America's roads included in any highway bill ever passed by Congress. Our bill is going to help the entire country. Senators on our committee represent rural areas like Wyoming, Iowa, and Alaska and urban areas like New York, Chicago, and Baltimore. America's Transportation Infrastructure Act is a win for them all.

Over 90 percent of the money in our legislation will go to States through highway formula funding. Formula funding gives each State the flexibility to address its specific surface transportation needs. The formula-based approach has been very successful in the past. It effectively and efficiently delivers infrastructure money to States, and they can make decisions as to which projects to pursue. America's Transportation Infrastructure Act maintains this important approach so States get the funds they need.

America's Transportation Infrastructure Act also expands successful Federal loan leveraging programs. A single taxpayer dollar in one of these Federal loan programs can leverage 40 times that much in actual infrastructure spending.

Between new authorizations, leveraging programs, State-match requirements, and input from other communities, our bill's total impact on infrastructure will be nearly half a trillion dollars.

America's Transportation Infrastructure Act is momentous, and it must be responsibly paid for. When our committee passed the legislation, it included a commitment that the bill should be paid for. The Environment and Public Works Committee doesn't have jurisdiction over revenues for the highway bill. That is why I am working closely with Senate Finance Committee chairman CHUCK GRASSLEY to make sure this legislation is paid for. It is no silver bullet. We all need to find multiple sources of revenue.

One thing the Democrats and Republicans agree on is that the people who use the roads should contribute to maintaining them. This must include drivers of electric vehicles. Right now, the drivers of electric vehicles contribute nothing to the highway trust fund. If these electric vehicles were contributing at a rate comparable to drivers in my home State of Wyoming, it would generate billions of dollars for road maintenance over the next decade.

Electric vehicle fees alone won't pay for this legislation, but it is an important start. I am going to continue to work with Chairman GRASSLEY to find responsible ways to fund the legislation.

It is time to make a historic investment in America's roads and bridges. America's Transportation Infrastructure Act will grow our economy, improve the safety of our roads, and enhance the quality of life for the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, today I would like to rise in opposition to Senator KAINE's War Powers Resolution, S.J. Res. 68.

I have had a longstanding opposition to the War Powers Act. I think it is an unconstitutional intrusion on the ability of any Commander in Chief to defend the Nation and to direct military operations.

This statute passed, I think, in the 1970s. It was a way to deal with the Vietnam war.

I have always believed the best thing Congress can do when it comes to dealing with military operations—longstanding conflicts that it disapproves of—is to cut off funding. I think that is what the Framers had in mind.

The inherent authority of any Commander in Chief to defend the Nation is part of our constitutional checks and balances. The President is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. You cannot have 535 people planning and implementing military operations. That 535 would be Congress. Can you imagine what would happen if our Nation had to respond in real time and we had to get 535 Members of Congress to agree on anything?

This resolution is designed to prevent actions against the Islamic Republic of Iran without congressional authorization. It does acknowledge in the law that we can take defensive action. We can always defend ourselves. I think that is inherent to putting people in harm's way.

I have been consistent over time. I have opposed the War Powers Act being used against all Presidents, Republican or Democratic. I will continue to do so because I do believe, from a national security point of view, this will create a nightmare for our country's ability to defend itself. Every Commander in Chief has to have the latitude and the flexibility to engage enemies of this Nation in real time and to send messages that are clear.

When the President decided to withdraw from the Iranian nuclear agreement early on in his Presidency, I supported that action. We are trying to find a way to replace it with something that is more sustainable and acceptable to the region and the world. Without boring everyone with the flaws in the Iran nuclear agreement, I thought it was a bad deal. It gave the Ayatollah and his henchmen a bunch of money without their having to change their behavior. It was tied to their nuclear program and had nothing to do with their missile program or their being the largest state sponsor of terrorism.

Now you see Iran has been acting out since this agreement has been signed.

Iran has been involved in operations in Yemen, Lebanon, and throughout the entire region. It has captured American sailors on the high seas and humiliated them. Its efforts in Lebanon put Israel's very existence at risk by its flooding Lebanon with weapons that could be used to destroy our friends in Israel, and it is the largest state sponsor of terrorism.

I applaud the President for standing up to the Iranians. They have attacked the largest oilfield in the world in Saudi Arabia, and they have attacked international shipping in the Strait of Hormuz.

The President decided to use military force against Soleimani, who was a member of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard and a commander who was on the international no-fly list—for lack of a better term—who was sanctioned by the U.N. I think he was a legitimate target of war because he had been pushing war against the United States for decades.

We have had at least 500 to 600 soldiers killed in Iraq from IEDs that had been developed in Iran and had been used inside Iraq. They have been very, very lethal to American forces.

Now we find ourselves in a position wherein Iran is getting more provocative, and the worst possible thing Congress could do would be to send a mixed signal.

I want the Iranians to know that the Trump administration would like a new deal and a better deal but that it has to occur through negotiations and that if they continue to dismember the region and develop technology that could destroy our friends in Israel or that could one day come to our homeland, they will be met with all options on the table.

The authors of this resolution are friends. Senator KAINE has had a longstanding concern about the original AUMF that had come right after 9/11. It is one thing to try to rewrite it; it is another thing to use the War Powers Act to tie the hands of the President at a time when our Iranian enemies—and they are the enemies of the United States and the region and the world—are becoming more provocative. The Iranian people could be a great ally one day, but the Ayatollah is a religious Nazi, in my view, and I can't imagine why we are doing this now. It makes conflict more likely, not less.

If this passes, the President will never abide by it. No President would. It will be vetoed, if that is the appropriate way to do it, but it is going to have no effect on his ability to conduct military operations. It will have an effect on our enemies' perception of the will of the United States to stand up to Iranian aggression. It will have an effect on our allies: Can you really trust America? Our friends in Israel are watching with great concern about this debate.

I will oppose this resolution—the fundamentally flawed concept of having a statute that would restrict military

operations based on the view of 535 Members of Congress. We can only have 1 Commander in Chief, not 535. I think the War Powers Act, as it has been written, is blatantly unconstitutional.

Having said that, we find ourselves at a time of choosing in the Middle East, for the Iranians are making calculations every day of how hard to push: What would the Americans do if we did this or that? I want the Iranians to understand that when it comes to their provocative behavior, all options are on the table.

Let me tell you the scenario that I fear the most. The Iranians are now up against the wall because of sanctions. What if they reactivate the centrifuges that have been dismantled or at least mothballed? They have probably not been dismantled. What if they began enriching uranium at 20 percent? What if they went from 3.5 to 20 percent? Going from 20 to 90 takes months, not years. What would be the appropriate response? Would that be a hostile act under the War Powers Act?

I know this: It would be an unacceptable outcome for the United States.

I hope the Trump administration is communicating to the Iranians that any effort to have a nuclear breakout—a dash to a bomb—would be considered a threat to the United States, our allies—particularly Israel—and would be met with military force if the provocation were to continue. I can't think of a more dangerous scenario in real time than the Iranians' making a miscalculation that the international community—particularly the United States—will sit on the sideline as they try to ramp up enrichment and have a breakout toward a bomb.

The regime believes that if it can ever get a nuclear weapon, it will be home free, that the world will back off. All I can say to the world is that containing the Ayatollah with a nuke is a non-option for me. If you are in Israel, it is not even close to being an option. What you have to understand is that the Iranians are wanting to make a bomb, not build powerplants for peaceful purposes. They want a bomb for a reason—not as an insurance policy to guarantee the regime's survivability but to enact a religious agenda that is very dangerous, very radical, and very real.

People don't want to believe things like this. After World War I, nobody wanted to believe that Hitler had a plan that included killing all of the Jews. People just thought he was bluffing and talking, rhetoric-wise, just to grab more land and that he would be appeased if you just gave him one more thing. It is hard for peace-loving people to imagine that folks like Hitler actually exist and will do the things they say they will do. It is hard for us here, in the safety of the United States, to imagine that someplace in the Mideast, there is a regime that is bent on our destruction because of our religious differences.

Here is what I do believe: If the Ayatollah had a nuclear weapon, he would

use it, and it would be a competition for the first use. Would the Iranians go after the Sunni Arabs, who are the mortal enemy of the Islamic faith and the regime? Would they go after Israel? There is no spot on the planet for a State of Israel in the radical Shiite theology. Would they come after us, the greatest of all infidels? I don't know where we would be—No. 1, 2, or 3—but we would be in the top three. I do know this: Our Arab allies and our Israeli friends can never let that day come.

The best way to prevent the Ayatollah from having a nuclear breakout is for Congress and this administration and every other administration to make it clear what will happen if you try. We were able to win the Cold War because all parties and every President adhered to the idea that we would stand up to the expansion of communism.

This is one of those moments in history in which I hope we do not miscalculate. The Iranians are watching. North Korea is watching. The world is watching. I am hoping that Congress will not miscalculate because, if we pass this resolution, the chance of war goes up, not down. The chance of a nuclear breakout becomes almost inevitable.

I ask all of my colleagues to think long and hard about how they will vote today. You may think nothing will really happen if this passes because it will never become law as we know law to be in the United States. You are right about that. Yet you are wrong about the signal it will send. It will send a signal that will be picked up by the most dangerous people on the planet that we really don't mean it when we say: When it comes to Iran's getting a nuclear weapon, it will never happen. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, in a few minutes, we are going to vote on this resolution to begin debate on it, and what most people would think by reading it is this is a resolution to diminish the chances of war with Iran.

I actually think that if this resolution were to ever pass and actually become law—or I would argue that even this debate we are having now, to some extent—potentially increases the chances of war, and I will explain why in a moment.

First, let me start out by saying I don't question the motives of the sponsors and proponents, the people who are in support of this. These are people with a long history of wanting to assert congressional oversight over the

conduct of armed warfare, and it is certainly something I respect.

The problem is that their intentions and how this will be perceived by the audience that I believe it matters the most to right now, and that is the leadership of Iran, perception and the reality are two different things, and the perception is very serious.

What is the perception? I can tell you, just moments ago, I went online before coming here just to see if anything has been written about it, and here is what I found. It was just one headline. That is all I needed because I think this broadly captures the way it is going to be talked about in the press and all over the world. Here is the headline from POLITICO: "Senate to rein in Trump war powers after Iran strike."

The first paragraph goes on to say: "The Senate is set to pass a bipartisan resolution . . . to limit President Donald Trump's authority to launch military operations against Iran weeks after the U.S. killed a top Iranian general."

That is the opening paragraph of that story. That is basically the way it is going to be reported, and I am going to explain to you why that is a problem.

One of Iran's objectives in the Middle East is to push the United States out of the region. They don't want us in Iraq to help the Iraqis fight ISIS. They don't want us in Syria. They don't want us to have military bases anywhere in the region, including Bahrain, as an example, where one of our major naval fleets is headquartered. They do not want us in the Middle East.

Their strategy to drive us out is attacks conducted primarily by surrogates, meaning other groups—groups they have created, groups they sponsor, groups they arm. Their strategy is to use those groups to kill Americans.

Their reasoning is, No. 1, if they use these groups, it gives them deniability so the world can't condemn them. They will go on and say: It wasn't us. It was some Shia militia or some other group that did it. So they think it gives them some level of plausible deniability.

The second reason why they do it is they calculate that if Americans start to die in the Middle East, the American people will demand that we withdraw from the Middle East. So it is a pressure tactic that they are trying to institute.

They do direct attacks. As an example, I remind you that just a few months ago they were out in the ocean putting limpet mines on commercial vessels, and there were people in the city arguing: We have seen no evidence that it was the Iranians.

Well, it wasn't Luxembourg. It wasn't the Belgians. They are the only people in the region that had the ability to do it, but that is the kind of deniable attack that they seek to conduct and to kill Americans. By the way, the person who ran that program was General Soleimani. When I say "general," he really wasn't a general.

He was a terrorist with a uniform on, but the point being is, that is the campaign Iran is trying to carry out.

When they decide what kind of attacks to conduct against Americans, they weigh a couple things. The first is how many Americans can we kill before America retaliates because they don't want a war with America. They do not want an open conflict with the United States. It is a war they can't and will not win. So they are trying to see how many Americans they can kill, how much they can get away with before triggering a direct response from the United States, and part of the calculus they use to determine that is our domestic political environment.

I believe there is strong evidence that indicates—and I say this just from everything you see—that Iran already miscalculated once. They thought Soleimani could travel the region with impunity and plan attacks to kill Americans and nothing would happen, and they were wrong and they miscalculated. It was evident by their own body language and the things they did in the days after that they truly were shocked that the President took the steps he took. Hopefully, it reset their deterrence level.

We are in a period of time right now where it seems, from all indications, that Iran, at least in the short term, has decided to stand down on some of these attacks, but it is not because they have suddenly found peace in their hearts. It is because they are hoping the political process inside of Iraq will force us to leave there.

Eventually, if that doesn't happen, they are going back to these attacks. They continue to plan them on a regular basis. They continue to prepare for those attacks to happen. What is going to happen when that moment comes and they determine: We believe that the threshold of attack, meaning the number of Americans we kill, the number of attacks we conduct—how brazen they are—we think we can get away with a certain level because in America—in America, the President, Members of both parties, do not want him to attack us.

In fact, they would calculate: If we can even make it deniable, if we can even create some doubt that we were behind it and it wasn't just some other group that was going to attack us anyway, it is going to make it even harder for him to respond.

Now, that is not the reality. The reality of this administration is the reality of what I hope anyone who would ever occupy that position would be, and that is, if they know and they believe that American lives are at risk and they have a chance to disrupt it, they will do so. I believe—and I know this President would—if Americans are attacked and harmed, there would be a strong response in retaliation.

The President has the constitutional power—and I would argue the duty—to do both of those things. The problem

is, the Iranians may not believe it. They may say to themselves: It is an election year. The President doesn't want to start a war. There are Members of both parties who have, as POLITICO's headline says, reined in his war powers and decide that they can strike or conduct multiple strikes and terrorist attacks and miscalculate and elicit a response—a strong response—to which they would have to respond, to which we would have to respond. That is how a war starts.

That is the danger embedded in this resolution, not the intention of its sponsors, whom I truly do believe—I know they are standing for a constitutional principle they believe in. They are not the problem.

The problem is how this is going to be portrayed and how the Iranians are going to take it and what it will lead them to conclude they can get away with.

That is why I say that passing this, having this go into effect, even if the President vetoes it, sends a message, whether you like it or not—and with all due respect I say this—whether you like it or not, the message that this sends is that, in America, Members of both parties do not want the President to respond militarily to an attack and do not want the President to act proactively to prevent one.

That may not be the intention of the sponsors—I don't believe it is—but that will be how it is portrayed, and that is a chance we cannot take. We are playing with fire.

An Iranian miscalculation, an attack that goes beyond our redlines on what we would tolerate, is going to lead to a strong American response, to which they would have to respond, to which we would respond in kind. Suddenly, that is how you find yourself in an escalating conflict and even a war.

So I hope those who are thinking about supporting this will rethink their position because while your positions might be pure in terms of your constitutional views, the foreign policy impact—the real foreign policy impact that even this debate is going to have is to instill, in the minds of some in Iran, that there are certain kinds of attacks they can get away with, and the President's hands are tied by politics in Washington. That is a dangerous proposition and a fire with which we should not play.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from

Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 45 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Harris	Paul
Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Rosen
Brown	Jones	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Sinema
Casey	Lee	Smith
Cassidy	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	Young

NAYS—45

Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blackburn	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Graham	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Romney
Braun	Hawley	Rounds
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Kennedy	Shelby
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Loeffler	Thune
Daines	McConnell	Tillis
Enzi	McSally	Toomey
Ernst	Perdue	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Bennet	Sanders
Klobuchar	Warren

The motion was agreed to.

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S.J. Res. 68) to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, it has been more than a month since President Trump brought the United States to the brink of war with Iran by ordering the killing of Iran's top general, Qasem Soleimani.

Now, no one here mourns Soleimani's death. He was a ruthless killer. He has American blood all over his hands. But decisions over whether to attack sovereign nations or whether to send American troops to war are not decisions for the executive branch to make. These are decisions that the Constitution vests only in the U.S. Congress. That is why we need to pass, on a bipartisan basis, the War Powers Resolution that is currently pending before this body.

I want to come to the floor today to raise three issues for my colleagues—and I will try to do it briefly—surrounding the President's decision to use force against Iran and what the implications are for us, both as a body and as a nation.

First, when we are talking about the topic, I just think it is always important to level set. I think it is important for us to realize how much President Trump has thrown away.

This is a President who is running a master class right now on creating crises that didn't exist before he started flailing away in the china shop, and then this President claims we all have to get together behind his efforts to clean up the mess that he and his administration largely created.

Let's just remember where we were with Iran when President Trump came into office. When President Trump arrived in the Oval Office, Iran had stopped their quest for nuclear weapons capabilities. They were compliant with an intrusive inspections regime to make sure they didn't cheat on that agreement. Iranian-backed militias had stopped firing rockets at U.S. personnel in Iraq. In fact, those militias were actively working on a U.S.-led project—the eradication of ISIS.

President Obama had unified the entire world against Iran. Even Russia and China were working side by side with the United States to constrict Iran's nuclear program. And with the nuclear agreement secured, this global coalition had essentially been teed up for President Trump, to be used to make new progress to pressure Iran on a next set of concessions, on their ballistic missile program and their support for terrorist proxies across the region.

But President Trump threw this all away. And now, despite the sanctions that he has imposed on them unilaterally, Iran is more powerful than ever. We went from a construct in which we had the United States, Europe, China, and Russia aligned against Iran to a moment today where, on many issues, it is Iran, the European Union, China, and Russia aligned against the United States.

How much ground have we lost? This town tends to view power only through a military prism. So we have kind of lost sight of Iran's provocative actions because, since the strike in Iraq against our troops, we haven't had front-page headlines about what Iran is doing.

Let's talk about that strike for a moment, because we need to make it clear that, contrary to the administration's assertions, the Soleimani strike did not deter Iran at all. They levied a barrage of rockets at our forces in Iraq that were designed to kill. Some suggested that night, or the next day, that maybe their attack was calibrated to sustain minimal damage. Now we know that is not the case. In fact, it was calibrated to try to wipe out over 100 American soldiers. They missed. But,

of course, now we are finding out that they actually didn't miss. At first, the administration reported no injuries. Then, it was a few. Then, it was dozens. Now the injury report is over 100. Thank God that nobody was killed.

But let's be clear. Iran fired rockets that injured over 100 American soldiers, and we didn't respond at all. I am glad we chose a path of military deescalation, but nobody in this administration and none of their allies in Congress can pretend that we “restored deterrence.”

Second, it is important to note that Iran is retaliating. They are retaliating all over the region. In Iraq they are stronger than ever before. They have a new Prime Minister-designate who is incredibly close to Iran. They managed to get a vote in Parliament—non-binding, admittedly—to kick all American soldiers out of that country. We are still in the middle of a negotiation to try to keep some American military presence there to fight ISIS, but Iran has used this opportunity to get more and more embedded in the Iraqi infrastructure. And the protests—the anti-Iran protests that were happening in Iraq—are no longer making headlines because many of those elements are now lined up against the United States instead of against Iran.

Remember, Soleimani was working every single day to try to get American troops out of Iraq, and it may be that he gets closer in death to his goal than he did while he was alive.

In Yemen, Iran is fighting back. It is hard to see into the relationship between the Houthis and the Iranians, but the Houthis are acting out in provocative ways that are fundamentally different today than they were prior to the death of Soleimani. They are restricting humanitarian aid. They are launching attacks against civilian sites. We don't know that the Houthis are undertaking these actions because of orders from Iran, but it is likely that it is not coincidental that the Houthis' increase in activity in Yemen, further destabilizing a country that is really important to the United States, is happening at the very moment that Iran is looking for ways to get back at the United States for the Soleimani strike.

Remember, ISIS and al-Qaida are inside Yemen. The wing of al-Qaida that has the clearest designs against the United States takes advantage of the chaos inside Yemen to recruit, to grow, and to expand their territory. So as the Houthis are further destabilizing Yemen, the enemies of the United States are potentially getting stronger. Iran is, once again, back on the march inside Yemen.

Then, in Lebanon we had this moment in which there were protests on the streets that were demanding a Lebanese Government free of corruption and free of Iranian influence. We were this close to getting a technocratic government in Lebanon that might—that might—finally break the grip of

Iran on elements of Lebanese politics. Instead of taking advantage of that moment, the United States decided that it was going to cut off aid to the army that was protecting the protesters. The combination of that mistake and then the assassination of General Soleimani allowed Iran to upend the momentum that was running against Tehran inside Lebanon.

Now guess what we have in Lebanon. We have a Hezbollah government in Lebanon. Instead of getting a citizen-focused technocratic government, we have an Iranian-aligned Hezbollah government in Lebanon.

Iran is fighting back. They are escalating. They may not be shooting missiles at American military bases, but they are gaining ground. They are taking provocative actions throughout the region.

It is really important for us to understand that. It is really important for us to understand how we are losing ground in places like Iraq and Yemen and Lebanon and how much stronger Iran is getting as a direct consequence of the action that was taken without congressional authorization.

My third and last point is this. Even if we pass this War Powers Resolution, this President is still going to maintain that he has a Mack truck-sized loophole through which he can run military action overseas without coming to Congress.

As for the President's article II authority, he has it. I am not denying that the President doesn't have constitutional authority to protect America prior to a congressional authorization, but the President's article II authority has morphed over time into a monster, and Congress needs to do more than just pass War Powers Resolutions to contain this Godzilla.

For years, Presidents of both parties have stretched executive war-making power too far. I have been on this floor criticizing a Democratic President—President Obama—who I argued should have come to Congress for authorization for airstrikes against Libya and should have come to Congress to ask for authorization before launching an offensive against ISIS, or waging drone wars in Yemen and Pakistan. But President Trump has taken this abuse to new levels, and the threat of falling into a new war with Iran, based on whispers of intelligence and without any authorization from Congress, is a real possibility that we have to take seriously in this body.

In fact, I listened to an administration official this week make the case that the President was actually authorized to kill Soleimani because the IRGC, the military group that he led, was listed by the administration as a terrorist organization.

I know that many of my colleagues have heard the administration make elements of this argument as well. That is a ridiculous argument that fails on its face. Remember, the administration, not Congress, designates who

is on the terrorist list, so you cannot argue that the executive-level designation of a terrorist group is a declaration of war. It is not even a debatable proposition, but the administration is apparently making it.

So what I am saying is that we need to be looking toward the reform of the war powers process more broadly. The overreach of multiple administrations proves the need for an enforcement mechanism for Congress and, more specifically, definitions around the circumstances in which a President can use force before coming to Congress—a new War Powers Act. It should sunset the existing authorizations of military force and force us to come back to the table and write new authorizations for the military engagements that we still need to be in overseas, and it should create templates for new authorizations of military force that include reasonable sunset provisions on those new AUMFs and protections to make sure that those authorizations don't get stretched to cover groups and geographic areas that were never contemplated by the legislators who drafted the initial authorizations.

For many folks, it feels all too familiar to be down here today having this argument over the President's military escalation with Iran. We are talking about manipulated intelligence, a drumbeat of war. We are listening to the administration and its advocates bully Congress and the American people into avoiding this debate—the suggestion that, by questioning U.S. military objectives overseas, we are somehow hurting the troops.

It all brings back these flashbacks of the disastrous path to war in Iraq. This vote is essential, in my mind, so that we warn ourselves against going back down that wretched path again. So, yes, let's pass this resolution, but we can't stop there. Congress needs to do our job to reform the war powers system so that this President and future Presidents of both parties respect both Congress's role and the deepest responsibility that we all have to the American people when we make a decision to go to war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss my concerns with respect to Iran and to express my support for the Kaine resolution, of which I am a cosponsor.

No American mourns the death of Iranian General Qasem Soleimani, and my thoughts remain with the service members who were injured by Iran's retaliatory ballistic missile attacks in Iraq. The President was wrong to diminish their wounds by referring to them as "headaches." Traumatic brain injuries are serious, and the President's comments undermine efforts to educate our military personnel about their potentially lasting consequences. Unfortunately, the President still does not seem to grasp that his words and actions have real consequences.

Tensions with Iran and the potential for miscalculation remain exceptionally high. We are likely in a period of calm before the storm. No serious analyst doubts there will be a future Iranian violent reaction to the death of Soleimani and continued pressure by the United States.

This temporary calm is the result of several factors. First, Soleimani's death has caused a disruption in the command and control of the IRGC Quds Force. He is not irreplaceable, but he is very difficult to replace. Second, Iran's principle objective in Iraq is to expel the United States, to get them to leave Iraq.

The killing of Soleimani has given Iran political leverage it did not imagine, and violence at this time could dissipate that advantage, especially as Iraqi political leadership remains in flux. Finally, the tragic downing of the Ukrainian airliner swiftly reversed an outpouring of nationalistic ardor in Iran, with renewed criticism of the Ayatollah. Again, Iranian violence in Iraq or elsewhere at this time could exacerbate internal opposition.

The Iranians are likely to continue to act via proxies. For example, Iranian-backed Shia militia in Iraq have signaled their intent to avenge the death of Popular Mobilization Forces Deputy Commander Muhandis, who was killed along with Soleimani.

Our national security interests related to Iran, Iraq, and the counter-ISIS campaign are on a negative trajectory because of the administration's policies and the impulsive decision making we have seen. Since coming into office, the Trump administration has waged a maximum pressure campaign against Iran that has included crippling sanctions, the unilateral withdrawal from the Iran nuclear deal, and now the killing of Soleimani.

Secretary Pompeo and the President have stated that the goal of this campaign is allegedly to bring Iran to the negotiating table, but it instead has had the opposite effect of driving Iran so far into a corner that it now sees little downside to escalating and direct conflict with our country. In addition, the ripple effect of the so-called maximum pressure campaign has resulted in the following: the disruption of counterterrorism operations in Syria and Iraq to defeat ISIS; the direction from the Iraqi Parliament to remove U.S. troops from Iraq; the resumption of Iran's nuclear program; and the growing diplomatic distance of the United States from our traditional allies and partners. That is not what anyone would call a win. It should be clear to all that these policies are not working.

The administration continues to let events in the region dictate our response rather than proactively and strategically shaping them, in collaboration with our allies and partners, in a way that benefits U.S. national security and foreign policy objectives. We should take the opportunity now to

step back from the brink of conflict, engage in real diplomacy with Iran, and to rebuild our relationship with Iraq. We need a diplomatic channel, either directly or through third parties, to avoid miscalculation on either side that could lead to military conflict.

Such efforts in Iraq, however, have been made all the more difficult because of our reduced diplomatic presence in Baghdad. Indeed, according to the inspector general for Operation Inherent Resolve, the State Department has indicated that—in his words—"the ordered departure . . . has affected all operations of Mission Iraq, and has limited the Mission's ability to help Iraq become a more resilient, independent, democratic country, and to support counter-ISIS efforts."

Unfortunately, the situation at the U.S. Embassy in Iraq is indicative of our country's entire diplomatic structure, which has been hollowed out and hampered at every turn. I am particularly concerned that Secretary Pompeo has not assumed the traditional role of the Secretary of State in advocating for diplomatic options but, instead, has been the loudest voice in the administration for violence and confrontation. Weaponizing diplomacy as the first step, rather than the last, is a sure path to diplomatic failure.

War with Iran is not inevitable, but the risk that we stumble into conflict because of the President's misguided policies has never been higher. As dictated by the Constitution, the decision to take the Nation to war rests solely with the Congress. The Kaine resolution is an important step in preserving the constitutional role of Congress in matters of national security.

Some have argued that Congress should not debate the issues of hostilities with Iran. They claim that questioning the President's policies means one is not an opponent of the Iranian regime. I wholeheartedly disagree. Before being sent to war, our troops deserve to know that the Nation has determined the objectives of the armed conflict to be valid and worthy of their potential sacrifice. Our military men and women deserve to know that they have a clear mission and that they have the full backing of not only the Congress but also the American people whom we represent.

The administration not only owes the American people a transparent explanation for escalating conflict with Iran but also a credible strategy to conclude hostilities, if they occur, and ensure an enduring peace. As we have painfully experienced in Iraq and Afghanistan over much of the last two decades, securing the peace is no easy task.

I am also deeply troubled by the evolving and, at times, contradictory justifications offered by the administration for the killing of Soleimani. Even in a highly classified briefing to Senators following the strike on Soleimani, the administration failed to provide relevant details. There is simply no justification for refusing to

share intelligence with Congress that underpins the administration's assessment that Soleimani posed an "imminent threat" to Americans in the region. Determining imminence requires a careful and thorough analysis of both the immediate intent and the immediate capabilities of the enemy. The administration has not provided a sufficient response to the Senate on either point.

The President has repeatedly demonstrated a willingness not just to bend the facts but to indulge in outright fabrications. This behavior is particularly concerning and unacceptable when it may result in the deployment of troops into harm's way. Congress has a responsibility to demand and, if necessary, challenge the basis for assertions that could be used to take this country to war.

We must not repeat the mistakes that led us to war in Iraq in 2003. I voted against that conflict, in part because I believed it was an unnecessary war of choice and the Bush administration had not provided the American people with a sober assessment of the likely costs or the nature of the threat.

Going to war in Iraq took our focus off the priority effort to defeat al-Qaida and consolidate gains in Afghanistan, a decision that has contributed to our inability to secure the country in the years since. Once again, we are risking an avoidable conflict in the Middle East at the expense of our efforts to ensure the enduring defeat of ISIS and to place increased emphasis on the great power competition with China and Russia, in line with the National Defense Strategy.

Conflict with Iran is not a hypothetical proposition given the steadily escalating cycle of violence we have witnessed over the past 2 years, which has ultimately led to the outbreak of conventional military action between the United States and Iran involving the killing of Soleimani and Iran's retaliatory ballistic missile strikes in Iraq.

Iran has also announced that it will no longer comply with constraints placed on its nuclear program by the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or the JCPOA, likely resulting in a reduction of the so-called "breakout" timeline for Iran to produce enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon. Meanwhile, President Trump has declared repeatedly that he will not allow Iran to acquire such a weapon. Absent capitulation by Iran or a change in course by the administration, the President appears to be creating a situation wherein his only option is military action when it comes to preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. However, we have received no assurances that this administration would consult with Congress and seek authorization in advance if it believed it needed to take such military action. Congress cannot stand idly by as the President careens toward possible conflict.

The potential of conflict with Iran has already upended the priorities outlined in the President's own National Defense Strategy, led to the deployment of nearly 20,000 U.S. troops to the region in the last year, disrupted our operations against ISIS, and made Americans less safe.

The administration's ill-conceived approach has not worked, and the time has come to try real and sustained diplomacy rather than relying on blind faith in the power of coercion. I urge the President to change course and engage with our allies and partners with the goal of seeking a diplomatic solution to the current situation immediately.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORGAN ALLOCATION SYSTEM

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, Missourians and many of our closest neighbors waiting for the life-changing moment that happens when you have a liver transplant now have to have one more hurdle in the process that they have to go through to make that happen. There is a new, and I think terribly flawed, organ allocation policy.

Senator MORAN and I have really led an effort to slow this down. We have both been the chairman of the Health and Human Services Appropriations Committee. We understand how that agency is supposed to work and how some of these healthcare issues are supposed to be handled.

Frankly, I don't think either one of us think this one has been handled in the right way. With the policy we see today, nearly half the country is disadvantaged by a new policy that has been put in place.

It used to be that when someone donated a liver, those organs were matched with the transplant candidates, first at the local level, then regionally, and finally at the national level. It is my belief, and I think Senator MORAN's belief, that when you know your neighbors are going to benefit from that decision, you are more likely to make the decision that you want to be part of that organ donor community. In the neighborhood where we live and where the Presiding Officer lives, I think people have approached this in a pretty dynamic way, wanting to be part of that.

In Missouri, 17 percent of people are organ donors or at least willing to be organ donors. Other States in the Midwest and the South and, frankly, the rural parts of the country just simply have the highest donation rates of people who are willing to be an organ donor. That is not the case everywhere. In New York, for example, 32 percent of

people are organ donors. There is a big difference between 73 percent and 32 percent. I don't know how much of that difference relates to the fact that in Missouri and Kansas and Arkansas and other places, people look at this and they think: If I am willing to be an organ donor, then people I know—people whom my kids go to church with, go to school with, people we go to church with, people we see in the grocery store—have a better chance, if they have that crisis in their life, to benefit from it than others do.

On February 4, a new policy went into effect that will take livers that were specifically donated by Missourians and allocate them to other parts of the country. You will no longer know, if you are an organ donor, that the people who live closest to you have the greatest chance of getting that organ that you have been willing to donate. The change in liver allocation means that roughly 32 percent fewer liver transplants will happen in Missouri than will happen otherwise.

Senator MORAN is joining me here on the floor. We have both talked about this a lot. We had the group come into our offices. They are supposed to be making this system work. In Missouri, we have six transplant centers. We currently have 109 people on the transplant list—10 of them are younger than 18 years old—and they simply will not have as good an opportunity or likelihood to have a transplanted, lifesaving liver than they would have had before.

It is not just Missourians who suffer. As much as 40 percent of the country will see a decrease in what was available to them. In my view, this was not decided by transplant experts. Most of them have talked to us, in fact, about their concerns about having to transport—in this case again, livers—longer distances, having to take more time and expense to get that organ than they would otherwise.

It was decided by what appears to be an unaccountable government contractor—at least unaccountable to us. We have talked to them about this. We have been trying to make a case that makes sense and trying to make them not rush through this, but they did. The contractor in this case serves as the administrator of the organ allocation system and is the determiner of who gets the organ. It seems to me that there is a conflict there. Contractors held a contract for nearly 35 years. Again, it seems to me that competition might be a good thing here.

This policy became a policy without due process, without transparency, and I think without fully evaluating the consequences. I think it was rushed. In fact, even the Department of Health and Human Services—I will mention again, Senator MORAN and I have chaired their appropriating committee, and we shared our concerns on this. They failed to fully exercise the authority they had.

I turn to Senator MORAN now. I think we can do that based on how we asked

for this time. I join him as he talks about his concerns and my concerns. We had people come to us and talk about this and how important it is. I am glad to join him on the floor today.

I am disappointed for people in both of our States and in our part of the country, really, who are going to be disadvantaged by this new policy, where significant donors where we live are going to be having their donations sent to States where people simply don't sign up to be part of this process. If they did, there would have been no interest in changing the other system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I rise to support the remarks of my colleague from Missouri, Senator BLUNT. I thank him for his leadership. He is in an important position as the chairperson of the Health, Education, and Labor Appropriations Subcommittee, which is responsible for appropriating funds to the Department of Health and Human Services. I serve on that subcommittee with him. He is a leader in so many ways.

I am so pleased that we are allies in this issue of life and death for Kansans and Missourians. To my colleagues on the Senate floor, it is really a life-and-death issue for many of your constituents across the country but particularly in rural areas, in the Midwest, and in the South.

The decisions that are being made have huge consequences that will affect families, individuals, and their lives today and for years to come. I express my concerns and my deeply held belief that the Department of Health and Human Services is failing to do its job. Their harmful actions will damage the liver allocation policy in this country in the way I just described.

The policy discussion we are having here today is important. It is important any day, but it is relevant since National Donor Day is this Friday, February 14.

I want to take a moment to thank those across Kansas and Missouri and around the country who have donated their organs to give that gift of life. Senator BLUNT is right. I think there is a tendency on the part of people to donate an organ knowing that somebody—maybe they don't necessarily know them, but somebody who might live down the street or live in the same community or live in the same State. There is a sense of community across this country that is being destroyed. The end result of that is there will be fewer donors donating organs for the lives of others.

These changes to the United Network for Organ Sharing's distribution policy will redistribute the organs from States and regions that have high organ donor rates to areas that have historically underperformed. This results in patients in Kansas and those in the Midwest and Southern States to wait a much longer time for the organ.

I have spoken on this topic on the Senate floor before, as this destructive

policy was pushed forward. I spoke in 2018. We are still here today. The lack of interest and concern exhibited by those involved in this process is appalling to me. I stand here today because of the outright refusal of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to halt the implementation of this damaging and unfair health policy that has not withstood examination by either medical experts or our Nation's judicial system. In fact, the U.S. district court has been forced to place multiple injunctions on the implementation of this policy last year as HHS tried to force this policy upon patients across the Nation, despite a lawsuit from a collection of our Nation's best transplant centers.

The organizations that are fully engaged in opposing this process are the people who transplant the organs to those who are in desperate need of it. They are the experts—the surgeons, the transplant centers in universities and hospitals across a wide swath of the country. HHS has ignored the initial injunction order and began to implement this harmful policy. They had to seek a second injunction in order for the injunction to be upheld. In explaining the court order, this district judge in the district of Georgia described the policy as “difficult and wrenching,” “creating profound issues and institutional disruption” and concluded that this policy will undoubtedly cause harm to patients, particularly those in rural areas.

There is also mounting evidence that the United Network for Organ Sharing and its CEO have acted in callous disregard for rural areas in the Midwest and South throughout the development of this policy. These are the same areas that have the highest donation rates and play an enormous role in the life-saving transplant system. The people who live there are the ones who are being harmed.

Those who are crafting and implementing this system continually disregard the evidence that shows these areas are already suffering under the suffocating weight of HHS's new policy. As I said before, this policy tosses aside all public concerns from patients, transplant surgeons, and hospitals on best practices to improve the availability of organs across the Nation. There is no reason to have a regional fight. There are ways to do this that benefit all regions of the country.

It also carries the risk of decreasing those organ donations that will then damage everyone. This limits availability and access to donated organs and damages the ability for major transplant hospitals—in the case of Kansas, the University of Kansas Hospital—to perform these services for patients.

This is particularly frustrating because dating back to December 2017, the board of the Organ Procurement and Transplant Network has approved an equitable liver allocation process that served the entire community's

best interest. This was a necessary policy reform that took years of consideration that would benefit the entire country, based on compromise by transplant experts, patients, and important stakeholders.

That policy was abandoned. We were assured when it was abandoned by OPTN and Health Resources—or HRSA—that public comments would be considered. That policy that took years to develop and involved the valuation of experts and a give-and-take in a process was overturned so easily. We were promised we would have the opportunity for those who have concerns about this policy to have input, and the reality of that fact is that was a lie. It was not true.

Many concerns made by patients, by transplant centers, by surgeons were never considered in OPTN's rushed process to finalize the policy. The reasons they were not considered were because of the overwhelming negative response that caused the entire comment system to completely shut down. People across the country commented on it with such frequency that the ability for the telephone system to log the input crashed. Of course, did OPTN wait until they could get those comments and consider them? No, they made the decision without that input. In fact, the president of OPTN has informed many commenters in the transplant community that their concerns over the new policy were not even read by the board that approved the policy.

So the many transplant hospitals, surgeons, and medical professionals who had deep concerns and took time out of their busy days to express them were never heard. They were ignored. These are the people who are tasked with saving lives through the transplants they perform each and every day. Yet their opinions were essentially deemed invalid. It appears that HRSA's and OPTN's making policy in such a reckless fashion has become the normal state of affairs.

Despite the continual efforts by Senator BLUNT and me to get Secretary Azar to review, to modify, to consider, to reconsider, or to put on hold this policy, we have had no success. Additional oversight is desperately needed to restore some semblance of common sense in the actions and policies that are being taken and deployed.

I am deeply disappointed in the actions by Secretary Azar, HRSA, OPTN, and UNOS. This process has been flawed from start to finish, guided by not what is best for the country but how best to sidestep a specific, single lawsuit. Organ procurement and allocation policy is too important to be decided in this fashion.

Secretary Azar, the University of Kansas Health System typically performs 8 to 10 liver transplants per month. Since this policy has been implemented under your administration, it has performed zero transplants. This is as a direct result of the policy. At KU Hospital, current estimates are

that it may take up to 6 months before it is able to provide another one of these lifesaving donation organ operations. Meanwhile, those on the transplant list in Kansas watch their wait times grow, and their hope begins to dwindle.

This is really a lot about hope, and it is about saving lives, but if you are on a list that continually grows longer while you are waiting for that organ, what a depressing, discouraging circumstance for you and your family.

Secretary Azar's policy is causing direct harm to the people of my State. It is time that he steps up and takes responsibility for the actions of his Department, which are causing real harm to patients.

These transplant hospitals from across Missouri and Kansas and elsewhere have written the President and Secretary Azar within the last 2 weeks and have asked for a halt in the policy until we have had time to let a judge decide the issues in the court case and also to make sure that we ultimately get it right.

I call on Secretary Azar to halt the implementation of this disastrous policy and save lives from being unnecessarily lost.

Again, I thank my colleague from just across the State line, from the home of the Kansas City Chiefs, for his support in this effort. He has a voice that has to be heard and that will be heard, and I am pleased to be allied with him in his concern for the patients in my State and for the patients in his own.

I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, this policy is shortsighted and wrong, and it was rushed to its implementation. There was no reason for any of those things to happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

OPERATION HOMECOMING

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it is February 12, and I am here to remark on an anniversary and tell a story. It is quite appropriate that Senator LEAHY should be here on the floor with me because he is a great friend of Vietnam and has done great work in the U.S.-Vietnam relationship. We are about to be joined by Senator CARPER, who flew as a Navy pilot in Vietnam.

This story goes back to February 12, 1973. February 12, 1973, was the day that our POWs were freed in Vietnam. I told this story to DAN SULLIVAN when we were having dinner together a few months ago. He said: SHELDON, you should tell that story on the Senate floor and put it in the Senate RECORD. So, at DAN's suggestion, I am here today.

What happened on February 12, 1973?

Two things happened. The first was that the prisoners being held in North Vietnam were released at the Hanoi Airport and were delivered into U.S. custody, and that went quite smoothly. The North was organized, for the pris-

oners were there, and the planes were there. Our prisoners, who were released from North Vietnamese custody on that day—this one will look familiar to many of us here; he was our colleague John McCain—climbed aboard their aircraft and went to the Philippines for medical treatment.

Down at Tan Son Nhut Airport, in Saigon, things were a little bit different. Huey helicopters had been sent off to the rally point at Loc Ninh, where our helicopters were to pick up 27 American prisoners of war who had been held by the Vietcong, and that did not go smoothly. The helicopters took off. The military aircraft, with their hospital insignia, were waiting at Tan Son Nhut for our soldiers and Foreign Service officers to come out. Actually, the longest held POW in the group who was going out to the Tan Son Nhut Airport was a Foreign Service officer who had been held for more than 7 years. They were all waiting and waiting and waiting and waiting, and there were disagreements and uncertainties and suspicions. So the day on which the POWs were supposed to return and go to Tan Son Nhut wore into evening and then into night.

While everybody was waiting, there were some dignitaries there. This was the U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam at the time, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker. This was the Deputy Ambassador. This was the first time a U.S. Embassy had two Ambassador rank officials. It was because the operation was so big in Vietnam. The Deputy Ambassador was a guy named Charles Sheldon Whitehouse, who was my father. Because he was there and because I was visiting—one of a very small group of dependents who was in Vietnam at the time—I was there. I was on the field at Tan Son Nhut during that long day as we waited for the prisoners to come out and as we tried to get intel on what was holding things up, on why the helicopters were not bringing them back.

The day became night, and they brought out huge klieg lights that lit up the field. I can still remember the bright insects flying around in front of the lights, against the dark sky, in the hot night, on the hot tarmac of the airport. We waited and we waited and we waited, and we did not know when this was going to happen or what had gone wrong.

Then, late into the night, we finally heard the familiar “toka, toka, toka, toka” coming—the sound of the helicopters—which every person who spent time in Vietnam during that conflict remembers very, very well. Pretty soon, they came close enough that you couldn't just hear them—you could see them. You could see the red belly lights flashing on the helicopters. What happened is something that I will remember always. Obviously, after many years like this, memories can fade a little, but I think I have this right because it struck me very much at the time.

The helicopters came in, and they hovered in a row over the airfield. Now,

anybody who knows helicopters knows that the easiest thing to do is to fly them forward. It is harder to hover the helicopter than it is to fly it forward, and it is harder to hover a helicopter near the ground, because of the variations in the ground effect, than it is to hover it up high. What is very hard, which shows a mastery of helicopter piloting, is to be able to hover low above the ground in traffic, with other helicopters around that are beating the air and making it difficult to stay in place. So here came these helicopters. They lined up, one behind the other, at a hover—maybe 4 or 5 feet off the ground. You could hear the whine of the engines, and you could hear the beating of the rotors. The air was all kicked up by the wind that they had put up, but those pilots held that position.

I have never spoken to any of those pilots, but I took it as their last salute to their prisoner-of-war friends as they brought them out to freedom and, ultimately, home. This was their way they could show their skills and salute these men who were coming home.

Then all at once—it must have been by a signal on the radio—all of the helicopters—and I remember maybe 8 or 10 of them—settled down at once to the landing. All of the skids hit the pavement. They all wobbled a little bit and then settled. The engines kept roaring for a minute. Then, on another signal, all of the engines shut off. You could hear them wind down, and you could hear the blades slow down, and you could hear the quiet fall over the Tan Son Nhut airfield.

Out of those helicopters came these spectral men—these pale, undernourished, often ill men. One had to be carried out on a stretcher. One of them was photographed while greeting Ambassador Bunker. How glad he must have been to have seen a U.S. Ambassador. I don't know that there has been any time in the history of the U.S. Foreign Service when anyone has been more happy to see a U.S. Ambassador than these men who came off those helicopters were to see our Ambassador of Vietnam and to know that they were on their way home. With Ambassador Bunker and my father was also Fred Weyand, who was the MACV commander—the overall commander—of U.S. Forces.

One of the legendary Vietnam reporters, named Fox Butterfield, wrote about this evening in a story in the New York Times, and he closed out the story in this way:

After the freed men had boarded the plane for the flight to Clark [Air Force Base], General Weyand put his arm around Gen. John Vogt, the commander of the Seventh Air Force. They stood looking at the [departing hospital] plane.

“It's the greatest day we've ever had in Vietnam,” General Weyand said.

I had the chance to share that day. I had the chance to see what those remarkable helicopter pilots did in that final salute to their colleagues.

I thank DAN SULLIVAN for urging me to come to the floor and tell that story on this February 12 anniversary of their freedom.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, while the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island is still on the floor I recall that, just within the last year, I had the privilege of being on the lawn of our former Embassy in Saigon. I stood there with other Senators, Republicans and Democrats, and with officials from the State Department, and I was mesmerized as Senator WHITEHOUSE recounted what he had observed there a lifetime ago.

I think every one of us had the same reaction. We stood there and looked around. We could feel the helicopters, we could hear the helicopters, but of course we didn't see them. Mostly, I saw the face of my dear friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, and heard what he said. What he was saying ultimately showed his pride in being an American.

I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for recounting that again.

S.J. RES. 68

Mr. President, on another subject, last month the United States and Iran came frighteningly close to war. If any of Iran's missiles had killed American soldiers at those military bases in Iraq, President Trump would have reacted very differently and, most likely, without consulting Congress.

Rather than the self-congratulatory statements by the President who depicted the brazen, ballistic missile attacks against our bases that failed to kill any of our troops stationed there a victory, we could be in the midst of a calamity spiraling out of control.

Obviously, I think of the soldiers who have brain injuries from the attack, injuries that the President dismissed as minor headaches. Well, those who have actually served in the military and were not able to get deferments from serving know that an attack like that can produce lasting injuries.

This is the nightmare scenario we have to avoid. We have been on a path to war with Iran ever since President Trump recklessly abandoned the Iran nuclear agreement, with no credible alternative strategy. There was nothing to replace it.

Today, while the White House insists there is no need for the resolution we are debating because the danger is behind us, the possibility of war with Iran remains very real. As we saw only a month ago, we could again find ourselves on the brink of war with Iran at any time.

For too long, this President and previous Presidents have sent U.S. forces into hostilities without obtaining the consent of Congress, and the Congress has been a willing party. The Congress has abdicated its constitutional responsibility as the sole branch of government with the authority to declare

war. It has permitted the misapplication of open-ended and outdated authorizations for the use of military force.

The result is endless wars the American people don't support, at a cost of thousands of American lives lost and trillions of dollars spent that could have been far better used fixing problems here in our own country.

No one denies any President's right to act in self-defense, to respond to an imminent threat if reliable intelligence shows that such a threat exists. But neither is it credible to rely on an authorization for the use of force to remove Saddam Hussein—an authorization that was based on lies by the White House about nonexistent weapons of mass destruction—to justify attacks against Iran nearly two decades later.

Not a single Member of this body who voted for that use of force in 2002—and I did not because I had read the intelligence and knew the stories coming from the White House were not true. Not a single Member, though, who voted for that use of force can honestly say they could have imagined or intended that authorization for the use of force in Iraq would be used to justify armed hostilities against Iran so many years later.

A few weeks ago, a top administration official said it would be a mistake for the Senate to even have a debate about the President's war powers. He said it would embolden Iran's leaders if they saw that there are differences of opinion among us. Has he ever read a history book? Has he ever read our Constitution? He said it would be wrong for us to disagree on an issue as consequential as attacking another country, as though in the United States we should simply serve as a rubber stamp for the President.

That is so beneath the United States of America. That is so beneath our Constitution. It is so beneath the democratic principles we believe in, to be told by a top administration official that we shouldn't even debate an issue like this. As others have said, including Senators in the President's party, that is an insult, it is dangerous, and it belies a fundamental lack of understanding of Congress's role in this democracy.

Others, including the President, have falsely accused Democrats of sympathizing with Mr. Soleimani or even with the Ayatollah, both of whom are responsible for heinous crimes. That kind of baseless, partisan slander and fearmongering is what we have come to expect from this White House, but it belittles the Office of the Presidency, as does a statement from a top official that we should not discuss our disagreements.

But too many of our friends in the other party—unlike the way the Senate used to be—have remained mute. By saying nothing, they condone such reprehensible behavior. One can only wonder how they would react if the ta-

bles were turned and they were the targets of such despicable, *ad hominem* attacks.

Under the Constitution, it is our job, it is our responsibility to debate and vote, especially if it involves war and peace and the lives of our servicemen and women and their families.

I would make a suggestion to the President and to members of his Cabinet: Read the Constitution. And I would say to those in this body who too often ignore what the Constitution says: Read the Constitution. Think of the lives lost, the many more grievously wounded, the families destroyed, the millions of innocent people forced to flee the carnage, and the huge amount of tax dollars wasted because of that fateful vote in 2002. A vote based on false pretenses. A vote that made the world less safe. We can't afford to repeat that unforgiveable mistake.

This resolution, of which I am a cosponsor, ensures that debate will happen, and that we will have another chance to exercise our authority under article I of the Constitution and do what is right.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

VIETNAM

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, our Presiding Officer, if I am not mistaken, is a veteran himself—I want to say Army. Navy salutes Army. Different uniform, same team.

I want to express my thanks to Senator WHITEHOUSE for his comments relating to the Vietnam war. I stand before you as the last Vietnam veteran serving in the U.S. Senate, with the death of John McCain.

I had the privilege of leading a bipartisan congressional delegation—three Democrats, three Republicans—back to Southeast Asia to try to find out what happened to our MIAs in 1991—Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos. One of the people with me in that delegation—amazing meetings we had with the brandnew leader of Vietnam, a Gorbachev-like character with whom we met during that visit. We carried with us to Southeast Asia on that trip a roadmap to normalize relations between the United States and Vietnam. Vietnam by that time was not North Vietnam, South Vietnam. Out of our meetings, we started something that went really well and led to normalizing relations. John McCain worked it here and John Kerry worked it here in the Senate. A bipartisan codel worked it in the House.

One of the members in the codel was a former POW—was Air Force, shot down over Vietnam, POW for 5 or 6 years—named Pete Peterson. He was a longtime friend and still is my friend. He became the first U.S. Ambassador to a united Vietnam all those years ago.

I know every time I run down to the Lincoln Memorial and I run back to the Capitol, I run past the Vietnam

Memorial with the names of 58,000 brothers and sisters with whom I served all those years ago.

So I want to express my thanks to Senator WHITEHOUSE for raising up our colleagues, my brothers and sisters, as he just did.

CLEAN ECONOMY ACT OF 2020

Mr. President, I rise today with a message to our colleagues and to this world we inhabit: Climate change has become the greatest threat to our planet. There are others, but this is the greatest.

This image right next to me was designed by climate scientist Ed Hawkins. From left to right, these are called warming stripes. In fact, this work of art is called “Warming Stripes.” It visualizes our planet’s annual average temperature from 1850 over here to 2018 over there, going from deep blue to a brilliant orange and red.

What this design fails to capture is just how menacing these rising temperatures have been and will continue to be for our planet and what this means for all of us who inhabit this planet today and will in the years to come.

Our rising seas are already at the highest levels ever recorded. Our Nation’s leading scientists have warned us that if we fail to start seriously reducing carbon emissions now, by the end of this century, we may well witness sea levels rise another 6 feet. I am 6 feet tall. Another 6 feet of sea level rise puts a large part of the United States and, frankly, other nations around the world underwater—underwater. The east coast and west coast won’t look like they do today.

For America alone, that would result in an estimated \$3.6 trillion—that is trillion with a “t”—\$3.6 trillion in cumulative damages to our country’s coastal properties—think gulf coast, west coast, east coast, Great Lakes—\$3.6 trillion in cumulative damage to our country’s coastal properties and infrastructure over the next 70 years.

I might add that the Flood Insurance Program for our country is, the last time I checked, billions of dollars and maybe tens of billions of dollars underwater, in the red, already.

While global temperatures warm, ice caps melt, and sea levels rise, we also know that the extreme weather we are witnessing throughout the world is not going to get better. It is going to get worse. The devastating hurricanes and typhoons, torrential rains and catastrophic floods, the heat waves and drought-fueled wildfires will only become more dangerous and more disruptive to our economy and to our lives. Let’s take a look at one of the places where that happened just last month.

This is a real picture from Australia. It is not a movie; it is a real picture. This is Australia.

The world watched in horror last month as bushfires scorched millions of acres of forest in Australia—an area the size of my native State of West Virginia. At least 25 people died in those

bushfires, including 3 American firefighters. Experts initially estimated that 500 million animals died in those bushfires. More recently, that was doubled to 1 billion animals—1 billion, in 1 country.

Meanwhile, our country has been no stranger to tragedy and devastation caused by wildfires—including fueled by drought and heat—like those that continue to plague the State of California. Scientists tell us that by 2050, we could face wildfire seasons that burn up to six times more forest area each year than today. I will say that again—wildfire seasons that burn up to six times more forest area each year than today.

If we do nothing to address carbon emissions, the extreme weather events we are experiencing now will pale in comparison to the devastation that lies ahead.

Last year, some 13 agencies across the Trump administration released a report that predicted that the United States could see climate-related losses of up to half a trillion dollars by the end of this century—half a trillion dollars.

If we do nothing, the effects from climate change could slash up to 10 percent of our gross domestic product by the next century—more than double the losses of the great recession. How much is 10 percent of our GDP? More than double the losses of the great recession.

This is something provided to us I think by the United Nations and called U.N. Warning. In order to avoid the most catastrophic impacts of climate change, the world’s leading scientists have warned us that we need to limit global warming to no more than 1.5 degrees Celsius—a 1.5-degree increase in Celsius, period. To do that, humanity would need to collectively reduce greenhouse gas emissions to net zero by the middle of this century. Right now, we are not on track to meet that goal. I wish we were. We are dangerously close to losing our only shot.

As the latest United Nations annual “Emissions Gap Report” made clear, collective global efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions are falling short, and time is running out.

If we want to avoid the most catastrophic impact of climate change, we need to step up. We need to step up our game.

This is a chart that indicates the countries that are not in the Paris accord. It looks like—I am looking at all these countries here, and I see only one country, ours, that is in red. Ours is the only country today that is not in the Paris Agreement.

The climate crisis is one that can be solved only by everyone who shares in the plan working together as one. That is why nearly 200 nations came together in common cause to implement the Paris Agreement and why they are working together to find solutions to the climate crisis, but instead of leading the world in this fight, America stands alone.

We know the EPA already has the authority and tools to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but under the Trump administration, EPA’s policies have been used to increase harmful emissions, not decrease them. President Trump is putting America in the slow lane while much of the rest of the world races toward a global clean economy.

President Trump claims Americans must choose between a healthy economy on one side and a healthier planet on the other side. In the words of a good friend of mine, that is malarkey—or in the words of President Trump, that is—fill in the blank. Come up with whatever you do.

Choosing between environmental progress and economic growth is a false choice. On the one hand, we do face a very real choice, one that was made clear in the U.N. report released this past December. We either act now on climate change or we “face the consequences of a planet [that has been] radically altered by climate change.”

I say let’s choose to save our one and only planet, planet Earth, and I say it is time for the United States to once again lead the world in this fight.

The next chart we are going to take a look at is something called the Clean Economy Act, which we introduced yesterday with over 30 cosponsors. I introduced with my colleagues—33 of them, actually—legislation that will put the United States on a path to achieve net zero emissions by 2050. The Clean Economy Act heeds the call for bold climate action while fostering economic growth that is fair for everyone.

The Clean Economy Act empowers the EPA to use the authorities and tools already at its disposal to reach net zero greenhouse gas emissions by no later than midcentury, 2050. This is the quickest way we can jump-start governmentwide climate action, by empowering agencies to use the tools they already have.

The Clean Economy Act builds upon successful climate programs in States, cities, and private companies, and ensures that economywide climate change actions continue regardless of who sits in the Oval Office. Our legislation sets important guardrails to make sure all Americans reap the benefits as we move our country toward net zero emissions.

Here are just three examples of those protections. The Clean Economy Act minimizes costs. First, EPA must maximize greenhouse gas reductions while minimizing costs to consumers and providing regulatory flexibility to industry.

Our next floorchart shows that the bill prioritizes environmental justice. Under our legislation, the EPA must consider and protect frontline communities. We know climate change disproportionately affects impoverished and disadvantaged communities. More often than not, these communities are downwind from dangerous pollution,

located near industrial facilities or factories, or located in areas that are already experiencing flooding and extreme weather fueled by climate change. This legislation will prioritize input from and investment in those communities.

Our next chart on the Clean Economy Act prioritizes American workers. The Clean Economy Act focuses on American competitiveness and on the American worker. Our legislation compels EPA to use American workers, domestic materials, and strong labor standards to get the job done—relying on our country's talents to get to net zero emissions no later than 2050—no later than 2050. The Clean Economy Act also requires EPA to work with other Federal agencies on programs to protect and uplift communities and workers displaced or dislocated by our transition to a cleaner economy, such as in places like West Virginia where my sister and I were born.

This legislation will not come at the expense of jobs or economic growth. Moving toward a clean economy will drive innovation and create millions of new jobs here at home. The Clean Economy Act is about realizing our true economic potential, potential that under this administration, sadly, has gone untapped. The Clean Economy Act hits what we call the sweet spot between organized labor, business community, and environmental group support.

I just want to thank the many organizations that helped us in crafting our bill, the Clean Economy Act, including the Environmental Defense Fund, Moms Clean Air Force, the League of Conservation Voters, NRDC, Environment America, the BlueGreen Alliance, and the Utility Workers. I also want to thank the organizations that joined me yesterday in unveiling this legislation, including the United Steelworkers, Sierra Club, the National Wildlife Federation, and CERES.

To say the least, it is disappointing that President Trump has decided to abandon the tremendous economic opportunity to create millions of clean energy jobs. There are already 3 million. Sadly, for the folks in West Virginia and Wyoming and other places, they lost a lot of coal mining jobs. The country is down to about 65,000 coal mining jobs, but folks who can be trained to mine coal can be trained to create windmill farms off of our coast. Folks who have the skills to mine coal have the ability to create corridors of fueling stations for hydrogen and natural gas and to create charging stations for electric-powered vehicles in the heavily traveled corridors across our country.

Part of what we tried to do in this legislation is to make sure that we looked out for those workers and to help make sure they have a place to go and ways to support themselves and their families while at the same time having clean air to breathe where they call home.

I think it is shameful that our President has forsaken our country's leadership in this fight for our one and only planet for the sake of misplaced political gain. That abdication of leadership will be a dark, indelible stain on his legacy, but while President Trump may not be up for the climate challenge, our colleagues and I are here to say to the world that the majority of Americans are ready for that challenge. We have faith in American innovation. We have faith in American workers to take on this climate fight and win. The Clean Economy Act will put the United States on a path to once again lead the world in the fight against climate change while lifting up America and American workers.

This bill corrects our President's failure to lead on this issue and directs the EPA and other agencies to move swiftly to address this serious problem for the good of our planet and for the strengthening of our economy and creation of even more new jobs.

Famed economist John Kenneth Galbraith once said these words:

All of the great leaders have had one characteristic in common: it was the willingness to confront unequivocally the major anxiety of their people in their time. This, and not much else, is the essence of leadership.

That is worth repeating. All of the great leaders we have had share one common characteristic, and that is the willingness to confront unequivocally the major anxiety of their people in their time. This, and not much else, is the essence of leadership. I am Tom Carper, and I approve that message.

The Clean Economy Act is our message to the rest of the world about climate leadership. The United States is preparing to once again lead the fight against this climate crisis. America, let's roll.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I am sorry. Will the Senator from New Mexico please yield?

Mr. UDALL. The Senator from New Mexico will yield.

Mr. CARPER. Thank you, Madam President, and I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Madam President, former Senator and Vice President Joe Biden was blessed with many wonderful staff members over the years, and one of them was John DiEleuterio.

I would like to take just 3 minutes to mention him. He just passed away. He was a giant in the State of Delaware and also served in the military.

REMEMBERING JOHN M. DIELEUTERIO

Madam President, I rise today on behalf of Delaware's congressional dele-

gation, Senator CHRIS COONS and Congresswoman LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER, in tribute to John M. DiEleuterio, a dedicated public servant who proudly served our State and country throughout his long career and life.

John was what I call a happy warrior—in the military for many years and in his service to the people of Delaware. He supported a multitude of nonprofits that focused on helping people in need. He was a person who loved people, and they loved him just as much.

John exemplified what it means to be the “go-to person” to get things done. His relationships and friendships with people throughout our State enabled him to get things done with speed and dispatch and, I would add, with a sense of joy.

John's persistence and innate ability to work a room and make connections, his strong work ethic and ever-present sense of humor was the core of what made John so successful. His impressive career included serving as State director—and you know how important our State directors are in New Mexico, Delaware, and Tennessee. He was State director for then-Senator Joe Biden, his longtime friend and former University of Delaware classmate. They were classmates together for a number of years.

His service included more than 30 years of combined service as a decorated officer in both the Delaware and Maryland Army National Guard. He had an impressive career for over 26 years with the Campbell Soup Company as their vice president of human resources.

In addition, John gave freely of his time serving all kinds of community groups, including serving on the board of the Delaware Military Academy, a blue-ribbon public high school. He served on the board of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, the Leukemia Society of America, the U.S. Service Academy Selection Committee, the Cavaliers Country Club, St. Anthony's Communion Committee, and New Castle County Ethics Commission, among others.

He was equally committed to his family, including his wonderful wife Marlene for 30 years, their children and grandchild, and the many friends he made along the way, and they are legion.

So on behalf of Senator CHRIS COONS and Congresswoman LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER, I am privileged to rise today to evoke the name of our dear friend John DiEleuterio. People from many walks of life loved serving with him, loved being with him. I am certainly one of them. The people of Delaware and our country are very fortunate to count John as a fellow Delawarean, and it is a far better place to live and work because of his stewardship.

I will close with the words of another beloved Delawarean who used to say this: If you want to be happy for an hour, take a nap. If you want to be happy for a week, take a vacation. If

you want to be happy for a lifetime, help people. Think about that. I will close with the words of another beloved Delawarean, who used to say this to us and to me: If you want to be happy for an hour, take a nap. If you want to be happy for a week, take a vacation. If you want to be happy for a lifetime, help people. That is exactly what John DiEleuterio did his whole life. He helped people. I said earlier he was a happy warrior. Boy, he was, and we are going to miss him. Thank you for allowing me to add these comments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

S.J. RES. 68

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, thank you for the recognition, and I very much appreciate Senator CARPER talking about the wonderful, young employees whom we have around us and the young people who come here who are dedicated and work, and we have some great ones on the committees. I see Mary Frances back here behind you, and I have Matthew Padilla over here on my right. There are so many great young people that just come to Washington or live in Washington, and they are really dedicated to see that we do a good job. It is wonderful to hear you talk about that young man.

I rise to affirm the Congress's constitutional authority to declare war and to support the War Powers Resolution before us. The chilling events of last month bring into stark relief why this resolution is absolutely needed. The President brought us to the very edge of war with Iran by his attack on its top general.

We must pass this resolution because, even if the President does not respect the plain words of the Constitution, the Members of this body should.

Look at this chart here. Here they are, clear as day: The "Congress shall have power . . . to declare War." The Congress alone has the power to declare war. The President does not.

I did not come to this view recently. I held the same view under President Obama's administration. I spoke up against his plans for airstrikes in Syria, and I voted against an authorization for those airstrikes in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. So, whether you support war with Iran or not, I urge every single Member here to stand up for our Constitution and to vote for this resolution.

Last month, as we were on the brink of war with Iran, the whole Nation and the whole world watched on edge, braced for conflict, bloodshed, and terror. Yet, to this day, this administration has not provided a serious justification for the strike on General Soleimani. The administration claimed the 2002 authorization for use of military force against Iraq justified the strike, but the AUMF, which I voted against, authorizes force "against the continuing threat posed by Iraq," not any threat posed by Iran. That author-

ization was passed in 2002, and here we are, 18 years later, and it is being specifically used to get us into another conflict.

The administration claims Soleimani posed an imminent threat to U.S. troops, diplomats, and citizens, but the administration gave no convincing evidence to the Congress or the American people that an attack from Iran on U.S. interests was imminent or that the killing would have stopped such an imminent attack.

During the Senate briefing, when we asked questions trying to get real answers about the evidence and why they didn't seek congressional approval, the administration wouldn't answer our questions. One Republican Senator, at the briefing that we had from administration officials, called that briefing the "worst" briefing he had ever had. He said it was "insulting and demeaning."

While the President claimed on Twitter, without evidence, that Iran had targeted four U.S. Embassies, his own Secretary of Defense disavowed that claim. We come to find out that the operation was planned months in advance and was even broader than General Soleimani. That is not a response to an imminent threat. That is an unauthorized and thus unconstitutional act of war.

In the end, the President all but admitted the attack was retaliatory, not defensive, when he tweeted that any justification for the strike "doesn't really matter . . . because of [Soleimani's] horrible past."

This President has misled the public on many things, big and small. It is clear that he will mislead us on the most consequential matters we face—war and peace. He cannot be entrusted with the sole power to risk lives of American troops in war, and he does not have that power under our Constitution.

The President's strike took us to the edge of an unauthorized war, but we didn't get here overnight. The President's unilateral decision to withdraw from the Iran nuclear agreement in May of 2018, combined with his disastrous maximum pressure campaign, destabilized the region. Since we pulled out of the nuclear agreement, the President dramatically increased the number of troops in the Middle East, despite his campaign promise to do the opposite.

Between May and December of last year, the President deployed an additional 15,000 troops to the Middle East. Days before the strike on Soleimani, he sent in 1,000 more Army and Marine troops. Post-strike, he sent 3,500 more troops. In response to our strike, Iran withdrew from the nuclear agreement's limits on the production of centrifuges, uranium enrichment, and research, decreasing the time for Iran to acquire enough fissile material for one bomb.

The Iraqi Parliament voted to oust U.S. troops from Iraq, which could lead to an increased ISIS presence. We have

refused to leave the country, setting up a conflict with our ally Iraq.

Our strike pushed the Iraqi Government and the people of Iraq closer to Iran and unified the Iranian people against us just as protests against the Iranian Government were sprouting up. The region is still a powder keg, and we just don't know when and where Iranian proxy forces will attack our troops.

Finally, worst of all, Iran launched a missile attack against U.S. troops in Iraq, risking American lives. While I am grateful no one was killed, I am anguished that more than 100 of our soldiers suffered from traumatic brain injury from the attack. While the President said he doesn't consider their injuries serious, I agreed with the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who asked the President to apologize for that callous remark. The President's insults to injured servicemembers is appalling, and his injury to the Constitution is deeply troubling.

We have a President who claims he doesn't need congressional approval to go to war with Iran. He has actually said that, under article II of the Constitution, he has "the right to do whatever I want as President." That sounds like a claim of total unlimited power. That isn't what our Constitution was about.

The Founders of our Constitution would be shocked to hear that and even more shocked to learn that Congress refuses to act to assert its power. The Founders rejected the notion that the President alone should have the power to send the country into war. They believed it unwise to vest the President—one person—with that power. So they vested that decision with the people's representatives, to make sure that any war would have broad-based support.

That decision makes as much sense today as it did 230 years ago. It is our job, as the representatives of the people, to decide whether to go to war. The American people do not want war with Iran. Yet, even if you disagree with the overwhelming will of the American people, the issue before us is not whether you would support war with Iran or not. The issue is whether we are going to uphold our oath to support and defend the Constitution.

The War Powers Resolution before us exercises that constitutional prerogative, ending hostilities unless Congress authorizes it. This President is fully capable of starting a war without getting congressional approval or even without consulting with us. He has already proved that.

The stakes are too high. We cannot wait until the next time he orders a strike he can't justify with consequences no one can predict. We cannot wait until the next time he gambles with American soldiers' lives. Now is the time to set straight the boundaries, not only for this President but for future ones as well. Now is the time to vote for this resolution and to send the President a message that there is

no support in Congress for an unconstitutional war of his own making.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I come to the floor today to add my voice to the debate on the system of checks and balances that are essential to and that define our very democracy. I am here, in no small part, because of a series of events that unfolded slowly over 40 years, and then, with a sharper tempo, near the end of last year, culminated in a strike by U.S. forces on January 3 that killed General Qasem Soleimani of the Quds Force of the IRGC of Iran.

That precipitated a series of briefings and debates here among Senators and with our constituents in the country, and, today, after an important 51-to-45 vote to proceed, we are debating this measure. This measure is S.J. Res. 68, from Senators Kaine, Durbin, Lee, and Paul, to direct the removal of U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

I want to simply make a few observations today about the importance of the war making power and the role of Congress.

In my view, we are at a critical inflection point in our Nation, one where history will question whether we served our Nation or served more partisan or parochial aims.

To be clear, I do not seek or want a war between the United States and Iran. I think our best path forward is a multilateral, several-nations-coming-together initiative to deescalate rising conflict between the United States and Iran, with so many—tens of millions of people—displaced from their homes around the world from conflicts ranging from Syria and Yemen, to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to the Central African Republic. There is conflict in many places in our world, and our country has seen what happens in the absence of effective diplomacy.

But I came to the floor today really in no small part because, in the group briefings that happened after the strike that killed General Soleimani, a number of points were made that I think deserve to be addressed.

One, a suggestion was made by one participant that simply debating whether the authorization for the use of military force that was adopted by Congress back in 2001 or 2002—simply debating whether that authorized this strike and simply questioning whether this strike should be authorized and future actions authorized by this Congress would weaken the morale of our troops and would send a signal to our enemies and adversaries of a lack of resolve by our Nation, and so we in Congress should simply allow the President, under article II, which gives to him, the Commander in Chief, responsibility, to simply exercise the overwhelming capabilities of the United States and our tremendous Armed

Forces to keep us safe and to push back on our adversaries.

I don't think anything could be further from the truth. I actually think it strengthens our democracy when we engage in a robust and vigorous debate on this question. I actually think showing that we have confidence in our Constitution and that we in the Senate realize that, over decades, we have gradually allowed our central role in authorizing war to be weakened—that retaking some of that role is, in fact, showing confidence in our democracy.

Let me be clear up front. I support the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces, and I have great confidence in their ability to carry out their mission. I am clear-eyed about the threat that Iran, the Islamic Republic of Iran, poses to our interests, to the region, and to the world. As one of the world's great state sponsors of terrorism, as one of the great sources of instability in the region, as a country that for 40-plus years has been genuinely opposed to much of what the United States believes in and tries to do in the region—I am clear-eyed both about supporting our troops and about the threat posed by Iran. But if we are to do right by the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces, whom we ask to go around the world and to serve us and to sacrifice for us and to keep us safe, we can do no less than to ask whether we are sending them with the full support of the American people.

This S.J. Res. 68 begins with a simple but important finding: "Congress has the sole power to declare war under article I, section 8, clause 11 of the United States Constitution," and "Congress has not yet declared war upon, nor enacted a specific statutory authorization for the use of military force against . . . Iran." That makes a simple point.

Previous administrations of both parties have overused the authorizations for the use of military force passed here in 2001 and 2002. An overwhelming majority of the currently serving Members were not present for the debates that led to those authorizations, and the fact patterns and circumstances that led to their being adopted have long since passed into history. So if we in this Chamber are to exercise our responsible role, we shouldn't simply let the President take the responsibility and possibly the blame for the conduct of war overseas; we should take that responsibility back on ourselves.

In 2001, Congress authorized the use of force against al-Qaida and associated forces based on the deadly strike against the United States and our territory that happened on 9/11 but did not authorize the use of force against Iran. In 2002, Congress did the same against Saddam Hussein's Iraq, which is one of Iran's greatest enemies, then and now. So, frankly, I think to suggest that either of these former authorizations for the use of military force, or AUMFs, authorize this action goes way beyond its scope.

I have heard from hundreds of constituents at home in Delaware about their rising anxiety and concern, and I have heard from many both currently serving and formerly serving that we should do our job, that Congress has a role, and that we need to debate and demand a strategy from this administration and a path forward that we can articulate and defend.

We are in a scenario now where the possibility of military conflict between the United States and Iran is entirely foreseeable. President Trump has drawn a line in the sand, much as his predecessor did, and said: We will never let Iran have a nuclear weapon.

With the United States having withdrawn from the Iran nuclear deal, the JCPOA, and with Iran and our European allies increasingly further and further apart on their conduct and with Iran restarting centrifuges and restarting enrichment, it is not an unforeseeable moment that, whether weeks or months or years from now but quite possibly months, a team from the senior ranks of our military will go to the President and say: Here is a range of options. That might include striking Iran. That is a fact pattern that requires Congress to have provided authorization.

Yes, I recognize there are exigencies, there are emergencies, there are moments when the President must take action to authorize our Armed Forces to strike in order to defend our troops and to defend our interests at home and abroad, but this entirely foreseeable scenario—one which we should all be working to avoid but which is foreseeable—is exactly why I am supporting the bipartisan resolution introduced by Senators Kaine and Lee.

The Senate must take back its responsibility for authorizing our Armed Forces to protect us overseas, and we need to show clear-eyed support for our Armed Forces and for the path forward.

President Trump, like all Presidents before him, does not have the authority to wage war without consulting this Congress. And Democrats and Republicans are concerned about this administration's apparent indifference toward Congress and its critical role in deciding matters of war and peace.

The House has just passed two measures to restrict the President's war-making powers. The Senate needs to have that same debate, that same discussion, and needs to take up and pass this resolution.

This is how our system of government works best—through respectful disagreement, through thoughtful, informed debate, and through votes in both Chambers to express the will of the American people.

Let me close by saying this to servicemembers whom I meet in Delaware and to many more serving around the country and around the world: War should be our last resort.

If diplomacy should fail in this case or others, I will insist our administration produce a clear strategy and a

mission for our troops that our service men and women can accomplish and that our Congress provide our military with the resources and authorities they need.

We are blessed with a system of democratic governance that challenges us in times when stakes are highest to rise to the occasion and to earn our place in the history of this democratic Republic. We do that by reaffirming our faith in our Constitution, including article I, which gives to this body the responsibility to weigh vital decisions of war and peace.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, debates between the executive branch and Congress over the power to conduct war is not a new topic, but in many ways, I think this debate has been blown out of proportion. A lot of this has to do with the decision made by President Trump, with the advice of his advisers, to eliminate one of the worst terrorists in the Middle East, Qasem Soleimani, who was plotting to burn down the American Embassy in Iraq and also threatened the lives of American troops—to take him off the battlefield. This is clearly within the President's authority under the Constitution. It really isn't a matter of whether Congress needed to give him the authority to do that.

I think we all agree that the President, as Commander in Chief, has to have his constitutional authority to defend American lives and American interests when Congress doesn't have the time—and we don't have the time—or is, frankly, not built for speed when it comes to addressing threats to national security like that.

We do have a shared responsibility, but primarily the responsibility of the Congress can be exercised through our appropriations authority. We could literally cut off the funds that the executive branch would use to conduct operations if Congress sees fit.

If this resolution succeeds, it will tie the Commander in Chief's hands while the threat posed by Iran and terrorist organizations, like the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, the IRGC, and the Quds Force that was headed by General Soleimani, remains high.

Actually, I think the President should be congratulated. Former general David Petraeus said that what the President did by taking Soleimani off the battlefield reestablished some level of deterrence. In other words, if you are going to be stepping into the shoes of the head of the Quds Force and the IRGC to lead terrorist attacks against the United States and our allies, you are going to have to think twice before you do that because you might end up in the same condition that General Soleimani did. Reestablishing deterrence is very, very important because when our adversaries sense weakness, it is a provocation and an invitation to

attack America and our allies and our interests.

Again, I know some of our friends were upset that General Soleimani was taken out by a drone strike, but he was one of the most consequential military leaders in the Middle East and was directly responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American servicemembers, training Shia militias and others in the war in Iraq, providing them with improvised explosive devices. Actually, they are designed so they literally will melt through armor like a hot knife through butter. That all came from Iran and resulted in the deaths of hundreds of American servicemembers.

When a successful mission carried out by U.S. forces finally brought an end to Soleimani's reign of terror, our colleagues couldn't even acknowledge the President's decisive action and that it undoubtedly saved lives. My mind immediately went back to, how did Republicans and Democrats act when President Obama directed the raid that took out Osama bin Laden? We didn't draw partisan lines. We didn't say: Well, he didn't have the authority to do that, so we are going to come back to Congress and tie his hands for the fight in the War on Terror. We didn't do that. The reaction is like night and day between the operation directed at taking out Osama bin Laden and the operation that took out General Soleimani, the head of a terrorist organization from a country that is a leading state sponsor of terrorism in the world.

As I said, I strongly disagree with the claim that President Trump's actions were outside his authority or that he should have come to Congress and sought congressional approval before acting.

You may remember what Congress was doing while the President was having to deal with this. The House was voting on Articles of Impeachment, and then the Senate had to conduct a trial of these Impeachment Articles. Obviously, it failed, but it took up time, where we literally could not have dealt with this emergency action and an opportunity to take a world-class terrorist off the battlefield.

This was clearly not only within the President's constitutional authority, but it was also his duty to prevent and stop threats against the United States, including those posed by the Iranian regime and their allies and the Shia militias. One of the other individuals who died in the attack directed at Soleimani was leader of the Shia militias in Iraq, had been plotting the destruction of the U.S. Embassy there and perhaps even a hostage situation, like we saw in 1979, but also plotting attacks against American servicemembers there assisting the Iraqi people in trying to rebuild their government and provide them a means to govern themselves safely and to eliminate the terrorist threat.

Passing this resolution would limit the President's authority to defend

American servicemembers against imminent attacks and would place our troops further in harm's way. So I will vote against the resolution, and I would implore our colleagues to do the same.

I know that, in an era of Trump derangement syndrome, anything that the President is for some people are reflexively against, and I think this falls in that category. Again, I don't question the motives of Members of Congress in wanting to make sure that the shared powers that Congress and the President have under the Constitution to wage war—I don't question their motives in trying to find the appropriate balance, but here I think we stepped across the line, literally, to try to tie the President's hands as a punishment for conducting a fully authorized operation against one of the world's worst terrorists, something we should applaud rather than condemn.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Madam President, on another matter, over the last year we have witnessed unprecedented foot-dragging, political gamesmanship, and downright obstruction by our Democratic colleagues in Congress on a number of bills. They have derailed the appropriations process. They have knuckle-dragged during important trade negotiations. They have held up things that used to have common support, non-partisan support—things like the Debbie Smith Act.

Of course, the Debbie Smith Act was designed to fund the testing of untested rape kits. This had been an area of broad bipartisan consensus that should be nonpartisan, but we saw the House of Representatives dragging their feet in order to gain leverage against the Senate for months, and they allowed the Debbie Smith Act to expire, along with potentially threatening the funding used to eliminate the rape kit backlog.

The latest tactics have now been deployed, if you thought that was about as low as things could get. The latest tactic is to weaponize the Violence Against Women Act. This is more than a 25-year program, and it is at the forefront of our commitment to support victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. Until recently, it always had been high above the political fray.

The first time this program came up for reauthorization, there were disagreements over some aspects of the bill, but we were able to work together and reach a compromise. That is the only way anything gets done around here—bipartisan compromise. But when it came time to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act last year, some in the House and some in the Senate saw an opportunity to score political points—not solve a problem, not reauthorize a program we all agree is important and necessary. They saw it as a political weapon. They allowed VAWA, or the Violence Against Women Act, to get caught in the crosshairs of a funding debate and insisted that we

should not fund that vital program because it was overdue for updates.

Well, let me be clear. Both sides agree there are things we could do to improve the Violence Against Women Act, and that is what our colleague from Iowa, Senator ERNST, has been leading on our side. But this “my way or the highway” legislative strategy isn’t the approach that is designed to get anything done, and vital funding for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault should never, ever be used as leverage to gain political advantage.

Though our colleagues allowed the authorization of the Violence Against Women Act to expire, thankfully, saner heads prevailed. It did receive record funding levels last year, but that doesn’t mean we are in the clear. We need to figure out a long-term solution that will reauthorize this important program. As the Presiding Officer knows—as we all know—there has to be an authorization bill and then funding to meet the terms of that authorization. We need both.

Last fall, we thought we were making good progress. As I said, Senator ERNST spent months working with the bipartisan group of Senators, including Senator FEINSTEIN, the senior Senator from California, trying to work on a compromise. Before these negotiations could be completed, Democrats got up and left the negotiating table and headed straight for the TV cameras and held a press conference condemning Republicans for not falling into line on their partisan bill.

Well, what was the big news at the press conference? Not that a deal had been reached or that negotiations were making progress. The Democratic leadership marched up to the microphone and said they would be introducing a near replica of the House’s partisan bill, which doesn’t have the support needed to pass it in the Senate. During the press conference, one of our colleagues, the Senator from Hawaii, even conceded five times that the bill was going nowhere, proving that our Democratic colleagues had no intention of introducing a bill that could become law.

If this sounds familiar, if you have seen this movie before, well, that is because we went through the same exercise back in 2012 and 2013. Our Democratic colleagues used this issue to attack Republicans up for reelection for not supporting their partisan bill at that time, after they chose not to negotiate in good faith for a bipartisan bill.

So I think that is what is happening again. They are not interested in reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act. If they were actually interested in solving a problem, we would solve the problem and get it passed, but they would rather have the issue that they can use in their campaigns for November and show contempt, frankly, for the people who would benefit from passing the Violence Against Women

Act and turn this into purely a partisan issue.

I believe that our colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, wants to get a bipartisan bill done. I have worked with her a number of times on a number of pieces of legislation. She is a good partner to work with on the other side of the aisle. I know her commitment to continue negotiating with Senator ERNST is genuine, but, frankly, I don’t think she is pulling the strings on the Democratic side.

I think our colleague, the Democratic leader, is the one preventing negotiations here, because his main goal, as we have seen through the impeachment circus and elsewhere, is to become the next majority leader, and he thinks this is the best weapon the Democrats can use to beat Republicans running for the Senate in 2020.

How shameful is that? How degrading and disrespectful is that to the people who would benefit from the passage of a consensus, bipartisan Violence Against Women Act?

I can only hope that cooler heads will prevail and that our colleagues across the aisle—but, principally, the Democratic leader—will just quit weaponizing this dispute over VAWA and return to the negotiating table. Until then, we will keep working on a bill that could win the support of folks on both sides.

Senator ERNST produced such a bill, an alternative to the bill produced by the Senate Democrats, and I am proud to cosponsor that legislation. Overall, this bill sends more funding and resources to the victims of sexual assault and sexual abuse than does the Democrat bill, and it authorizes the program for twice as long. That is critical to protecting the Violence Against Women Act from the kind of partisan games that we are seeing played out today, and it gives the Department of Justice the stability it needs to plan for the future, because it is the Department of Justice that hands out the grants to the various organizations that provide aid and comfort to victims of sexual assault.

While this increased funding would be a welcomed victory for the program, it is only part of what sets this bill apart. It goes further than other reauthorizations by addressing a number of horrific crimes that are being committed against women and girls in our country. Sex trafficking, for example, is not always recognized as a form of sexual assault, and this bill would change that.

It also enhances the maximum criminal penalties for sexual abuse of minors and other vulnerable groups. It takes aim at heinous crimes like mutilation and addresses crimes in rural areas and on Tribal lands.

This bill also takes aim at relatively new threats, like when abusive images and videos are posted online. It will empower victims of this kind of abuse to remove the content from the internet by using copyright takedown authority.

Unlike the Democratic bill, this legislation includes provisions of a number of bipartisan bills that have been introduced by our colleagues in the Senate. One example is a bill I introduced with Senator FEINSTEIN called the HEALS Act, which would remove some of the hurdles that exist between victims of domestic violence and safe housing. One of the toughest things for a victim of sexual violence and sexual assault is finding a safe place to live. This provision that Senator FEINSTEIN and I have included in Senator ERNST’s version of the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization includes greater flexibility for transitional housing so survivors can get back on their feet without fear of losing the roof over their head or exposing themselves to their attacker.

The Violence Against Women Act is a lifeline for countless survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault, and we need to come together to reauthorize this critical program. The bill introduced by Senator ERNST includes a range of bipartisan proposals to strengthen the Violence Against Women Act without the poison pills being offered by the Democrats’ version. I can only hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will return to the negotiating table and work with us to finally reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. This is simply too important to use as a partisan bludgeon during the runup to the 2020 election.

We need to address the problem. We need to solve the problem applying the 80-20 rule. If you can agree to 80 percent of it, let’s get it done, and we can save the 20 percent we don’t agree on for another day and another fight, and not hold victims of sexual violence at risk, as the status quo currently does.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I hadn’t planned to say anything about the Violence Against Women Act, but given the remarks from my colleague from Texas, let me just say that the bill that passed the House last year is here in the Senate. While it is true that it did not have a majority of Republican House Members supporting it, it did have Republican votes in the House. It expands protections under the Violence Against Women Act, and, like many bills that passed the House, it had very broad support.

It is sitting right here in the Senate, along with legislation that requires universal background checks to reduce gun violence, along with legislation to get secret money out of politics and make sure we refresh our democracy and reduce barriers to voting, along with many other bills, including a long-overdue increase in the Federal minimum wage.

I would suggest that the best way to find out whether or not it, in fact, has majority support here in the Senate is to let us vote on it, and anyone who

wants to vote against it, obviously, has a right to do so. It might well surprise us and pass here, and then we would have addressed a very important issue.

S.J. RES. 68

Madam President, I am here today specifically to talk in support of the joint resolution offered by Senator Kaine of Virginia that directs the President to remove U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities against Iran without an authorization from the Congress.

The Framers gave Congress, and Congress only, the power to declare war. As James Madison noted, “the history of all governments demonstrates that the executive is the branch of [government] most interested in war and [therefore] most prone to it.” The Constitution “has accordingly with studied care, vested the question of war in the legislature”—meaning in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. The Framers did that because they didn’t want one person—and one person alone—to be able to make such a momentous decision for the entire country.

They wanted to have a clear check on the President’s ability to send our sons and daughters into harm’s way.

The text of the Constitution cannot be more clear. Article I, section 8 states: “The Congress”—not the President—“shall have Power . . . To declare War.”

The resolution before us is equally clear. It reaffirms Congress’s power and “directs the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces for hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran or any part of its government or military, unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or specific authorization for the use of military force against Iran.”

That is what the resolution says. I hope my Senate colleagues see this resolution for what it is: a clear and important reminder to the executive branch of the power granted to Congress by the Constitution. The much tougher votes would come on questions of whether to authorize military action in Iran or any other circumstances. This resolution is a simple reaffirmation of our solemn duty to make these decisions.

Whether or not we agree with President Trump’s approach to Iran or the decision to strike Iranian General Qasem Soleimani, we should all agree that any decision to go to war should be made by Congress, not by the President alone.

The President’s ability to protect the United States and our forces from an imminent threat—or any other power granted to the President as Commander in Chief—cannot, and should not, be a blank check, not for this President, not for any other President.

Why are we here at this moment, discussing this important issue? Because just a short time ago, we almost stumbled into a war with Iran. And make no mistake, the tensions may not be playing out on our TV screens today, and

they may not be making headlines at this particular moment, but it is still a very dangerous and volatile time. The pot is still boiling, and unless cooler heads prevail, it could boil over at any moment. We cannot allow that to happen. We must not fall into another unnecessary war in the Middle East. Certainly, no one should take the United States to war without a full debate in the U.S. Congress and a vote in the U.S. Congress.

How did we get here? The Trump administration came into office with one organizing principle to undo everything the Obama administration did: Undo the Affordable Care Act; get rid of the Paris climate agreement; and, of course, get rid of the agreement to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

Reversing the policies of a previous President is a campaign slogan; it is not a strategy for the national security of the United States. In the case of Iran, the Trump administration put nothing realistic in its place.

The fundamental idea behind the nuclear agreement with Iran was simple and realistic. It recognized that Iran is a malign influence in the region. But it also recognized that a nuclear-armed Iran engaged in malign activities in the region is even worse. If our strategy could contain the Soviet Union, we could also apply a similar strategy to Iran.

The agreement to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, known as the JCPOA, came from a deliberate strategy and painstaking negotiations to unite key powers—powers that are often in disagreement—allies, competitors, and adversaries, including Britain, France, Germany, the European Union, China, and Russia.

Together, we created and enforced a truly global sanctions regime to bring Iran to the negotiating table to reach an agreement. It was that unity and pressure that succeeded in reaching the agreement to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

It was working. Under the agreement, Iran committed to dismantling large sections of its nuclear infrastructure, to severely limit its production of uranium and plutonium, and it agreed to an intrusive, around-the-clock international inspections. It was compliant with its obligations under the nuclear agreement, and we were succeeding in pushing back Iran’s so-called breakout time—the time it would need to build a nuclear weapon. Even this administration agreed with the international community that Iran was complying with the agreement. There was no need to beat the drums of war.

Then comes the Trump administration, with many of the same people who got us into the unnecessary war in Iraq, and they took a different path. Instead of working to build on the agreement to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, they tore it up. They alienated our allies who, even to this day, are still working to salvage that agreement.

Instead of building on the progress we had made, President Trump launched a campaign of what he called maximum pressure, which has resulted only in total failure.

Secretary Pompeo made 12 demands of Iran as part of the maximum pressure strategy, and the administration has not achieved any of them—not a single one. Instead, faced with increased economic pressure, Iran predictably lashed out. Instead of dialing down its malign activities in the region, it has intensified. Tensions have increased.

Without any endgame or any sign that this administration will negotiate in good faith—any sign of that—Iran has no incentive to change course.

It is long past time that we have a strategy that recognizes simple political geography. We must recognize Iran has a strong hand in Iraq. They are neighbors. They share a long border. They are both majority Shiite countries. Nothing we can do here will change those facts.

Instead of recognizing realities on the ground and smartly countering Iran’s natural advantages in the region, this administration’s policies actually strengthened Iran’s hands. In short, it has taken a bad situation and made it much worse. In this very combustible mix, a single spark can ignite a war. That almost happened just a very short time ago. We were on the brink.

We learned recently that the original action that set off the sequence of escalation may have been based on a mistake. A rocket fell into an Iraqi military compound where we had U.S. Forces providing some training and took the life of an American contractor in Iraq. The Trump administration claimed that the rocket was fired by an Iraqi militia force backed by Iran. Just very recently, Iraq—our ally Iraq—says that the rocket may have been fired not by Iranian-backed militia but by ISIS. We don’t know because the administration hasn’t shared any of that intelligence with us.

Acting on what may have been a false assessment from the start, we then saw a series of escalatory acts. Then, when things appeared to be cooling down, the President ordered the strike against Iran’s top military leader while he was visiting Iraq.

I think all of us know that no one in this Chamber is grieving the death of General Soleimani. He has lots of blood on his hands. Make no mistake, killing him has not weakened Iran’s hand in Iraq in the long term; it has strengthened it. There have been growing calls in Iraq to expel U.S. Forces, including a vote by Iraq’s Parliament, and increasing pressure to throw all U.S. Forces out.

What was Soleimani’s main objective in Iraq? What is Iran’s main objective in Iraq? To get rid of U.S. Forces there. So, in death, Soleimani has gotten closer to his goal of throwing out U.S. Forces than he did in life. That is not

a strategic success for the United States by any definition.

The administration justified its attack against Soleimani on the grounds that he posed an “imminent threat.” At least that is what they said at the beginning. Since then, we have heard a lot of other rationales. They used that particular expression because it has a very specific meaning under international law, and it was the only legally justifiable rationale for ordering the execution of Soleimani.

The problem they have is that it just isn't true. Soleimani was a very bad guy. He had blood on his hands. But it is not true that he posed an imminent threat under the definition that is applied in the use of force.

We know this because while the Trump administration took a very long time to do it, when they finally provided the Senate with the classified briefing on the situation, it was clear the evidence did not support the claim of an imminent threat. In fact, the information proved the opposite was true.

We have been here before. We have seen what happens when administrations manipulate intelligence or mischaracterize intelligence, which is closer to the case we are looking at now—mischaracterizing intelligence in order to justify a particular course of action.

In the case of Iraq, President Bush, Vice President Cheney, and many other members of that administration were determined to go to war to “remake” the Middle East. They searched for pretexts. They embraced a source called Curveball. They cherry-picked the intelligence to justify their predetermined plan.

We know the end of the story. We know the end of that story. Their claims that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction were fake, but the toll of the Iraq war was very real.

The cost in blood and treasure were nearly 4,900 American lives lost, and counting; tens of thousands wounded, and counting; \$2 trillion spent, and counting. The amount we will spend caring for those who bore the battle, and their families, will not be fully known for decades, if ever. The death toll of Iraqi civilians is not precisely known but is certainly horrific.

The biggest winner from the war in Iraq was Iran—Iran—that had fought in an almost 9-year war against Iraq and was able to take advantage of a weakened Iraq. It just goes to show the many unintended consequences of action not thoroughly thought through.

Before we get into another war in the Middle East, whether by design or by miscalculation, let's come to our senses. A war with Iran would do incalculable harm to the United States and to people throughout the Middle East. It will result in huge loss of American lives and the lives of thousands of other innocent people.

That is why our Founders did not put the power to take our country to war

in the hands of one person. They did not empower the President to take our Nation to war. President Trump has said that article II gives him “the right to do whatever I want as President.”

We know that is not true. We know that is not what the Constitution says. We know that the Framers vested the power to go to war in this Senate and the House of Representatives, and they did it for a reason.

For goodness sake, let us not betray our constitutional duty. Let us, at the very least, have the courage to assert the powers the Constitution entrusts in us.

I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to support my colleague, Senator Kaine, in support of this resolution before us, a resolution that would prohibit the United States from conducting offensive military strikes against Iran unless or until some time as Congress may authorize it.

This is how security policy in our constitutional Republic is supposed to work. It is how decisions like these are supposed to be made. Congress authorizes the use of military force and the President—as Commander in Chief—directs the military as it undertakes the effort to complete its missions.

This arrangement gives the American people the best of both worlds—a deliberative, representative legislature to declare war and a single, decisive Commander in Chief to lead the troops.

Unfortunately, Congress has not upheld its end of this responsibility. Our system of checks and balances—while very beneficial to the American people and while giving us the greatest opportunity to protect our freedom, our liberty, and our system of government—imposes a degree of rigor and accountability on Congress, which its Members, unfortunately, sometimes are inclined to shirk whenever possible. This trend has sadly gained momentum for decades, and it has done so under Presidents, House of Representatives, and Senates of every conceivable partisan combination. Now, nearly two decades into multiple wars without clear missions or paths to victory, it is time for Congress to reassert, on behalf of our constituents, our vital constitutional role in American warmaking.

Before addressing the merits of this particular resolution, let me first dispel two very mistaken assumptions being made about it.

First, it is not about defying President Trump. Quite to the contrary, this resolution supports President Trump and his particularly deferential approach—one that defers to the American people, one that accepts, at the outset, the fact that we can't fight wars all around the globe in perpetuity, and we certainly can't and shouldn't do that without the consent of the American people and that of their elected representatives in Congress. Indeed, on this issue, President

Trump is the most restrained and the most Constitution-minded Commander in Chief we have had in decades. I believe he is the most restrained and Constitution-minded Commander in Chief we have had in my entire lifetime. He is exactly the kind of partner Congress needs in order to get the Constitution's warmaking process back on the rails—back on the same rails that were designed in 1787.

Second, this resolution is not about condemning the strike against General Soleimani last month. After all, the strike against Soleimani worked. He was an enemy of the United States, with the blood of hundreds of Americans and thousands of Iraqis, Syrians, and even other Iranians on his hands. Everything we know about him and his work of terror confirms that he was planning to kill again and to do so soon.

Rather, what this resolution is about is Congress reclaiming its rightful powers to restore accountability and consensus to this most grave of all public policy decisions that we, as Members of Congress, are asked to make.

I understand why Members of Congress are OK with pretending to be pundits on matters of national security, cheering the troops when things go well and attacking the President when they don't, but we are not just political pundits on cable news shows. We have a job to do based on an oath that we took right here in this Chamber to uphold and “protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.”

In order to enable the President of the United States to do his job correctly, we have to be willing to do ours. You see, this is part of the evil design of the military industrial complex to convince Members of Congress, first and foremost, that they don't have to and shouldn't want to put their name on the line when it comes to war power. This unfairly puts the blame and the accountability all on the President of the United States. That is wrong.

Just as importantly, it disconnects the American people from their elected representatives here in the Senate and in the House of Representatives from a process that really could put not just American treasure but also American blood—the blood of their own sons and daughters—on the line. That is not right.

The Founders could not have been any clearer about this. That is especially true when it comes to the greatest Founder of them all. Remember when the Miami and Wabash Indians attacked Americans north of the Ohio River between 1791 and 1794, President George Washington carefully confined his military operations to exclusively defensive measures. “The Constitution,” Washington wrote, “vests the power of declaring War with Congress, therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have deliberated upon the subject, and authorized such a measure.”

Our first President, George Washington, was a humble man, and he was a modest man. One of my favorite paintings in this entire building can be found in the Capitol Rotunda, where you see George Washington handing his commission back to the Continental Congress. This at the moment when he had ascended the apex of power; this at the moment when he was the most respected, well-known person, certainly, in the Western Hemisphere, possibly in the entire world; this at a moment when, in any other land and any other point in world history, George Washington was in a position to become a Monarch, a King, he chose not to be. He said right then and right there: not on this soil; not on my watch. I am handing my commission back to the Republican institution that employed me to begin with.

So, yes, he was a humble man, and he was a modest man, but this wasn't just an act of humility or modesty; it was duty. He understood that he had taken an oath to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. As President, he would not deviate from it because he had taken an oath that he wouldn't.

Under the Constitution—whose drafting President Washington oversaw before he was President of the United States, while he was President of the Constitutional Convention and to which he swore an oath of office later—the power to direct war would reside in him as President of the United States as Commander in Chief, but the power to declare war resided exclusively with Congress.

This was, of course, very different than the form of government that we had left just a few years prior to that. Under our previous system of government, the one based in London, the Parliament had no role in declaring war. Declaring war was up to the Executive, the Monarch, the King. The King could—and in many instances would and did—take the country to war. It was the job of the legislative branch of government, of the Parliament, to figure out what to do about it, how to fund it, and where to go from there, but it was up to the King and the King alone to take us to war.

This, Alexander Hamilton explained in Federalist 69, was exactly the kind of system we didn't want. It would be up to Congress in the first instance to declare war. Congress and Congress alone would have this power. Why? Well, because it is the branch of government most accountable to the people with the most regular intervals. When the American people are called upon to put their own blood and treasure—their own sons and daughters on the line in the name of safety, security, freedom—nothing else can suffice but a vote in Congress. George Washington understood that.

Donald Trump understands that today, and to his great credit, President Trump has followed this standard. He has countered recent Iranian ag-

gression through economic sanctions. They are working, and it appears that Iran is standing down. Tehran has already had to cut back support for international terrorist organizations and its nuclear program, and its oil exports are plummeting. Iran's economy has been crippled, contracting by almost 10 percent. The Iranian people know it is the fault of their own government, their own government officials. Tens of thousands of Iranian protesters have taken to the streets to protest their own government, even knowing that such action may lead them to injury or imprisonment or even death.

Even the New York Times has admitted that the Iranian regime is losing the will to confront the United States. There may be a pathway to peace and prosperity for the Iranian people through sanctions relief and trade if the Iranian Government is willing to cease its support for radical Islamic militant organizations and abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons and ICBMs.

Until then, the United States, under President Trump's leadership, will maintain maximum pressure through sanctions and defend the United States from any further attacks.

I stand firmly behind President Trump in this course of action, and like President Trump, I believe that we ought to avoid war if we can. After nearly two decades of military entanglement in Iraq and Afghanistan—much of which was fostered by Department of Defense bureaucrats deceiving Congress and misleading the American people, as we have recently tragically learned—the last thing we need is another aimless, protracted conflict in the Middle East. The other last thing we need is to have such a conflict occur without Congress even authorizing it.

In any event, war with Iran is currently neither warranted nor consistent with our strategic interests. To be very clear, under this resolution, the President would retain all of his authority as Commander in Chief to take defensive measures against active threats to U.S. persons, assets, and the homeland, including our Armed Forces abroad and our diplomats in U.S. Embassies, even without a declaration of war or authorization for the use of military force. Such power inheres and resides in article II. He already has that power. Nothing in this resolution can or would or even attempts to undermine or erode that power.

However, even when defensive measures are conducted, the administration should share the justifying evidence with Congress. This, you see, is how this inherent tension between, on the one hand, the congressional war declaration of power in article I and, on the other hand, the article II power that the President has as Commander in Chief. This is how they are held in balance. It is for that information-sharing process to be ongoing.

As a separate branch of government—the branch with the constitu-

tional prerogative over the power to declare war—we are not required to simply accept an administration's talking points as a matter of faith, especially after almost two decades of deception in Afghanistan. Intelligence-sharing ensures that Congress can appropriately determine whether it should or should not provide the administration with further authority to conduct offensive military force.

The intelligence so far shared with Congress on recent actions taken against Iran has fallen short, but my main concern with the briefing that I called the “worst” that I had ever witnessed on military matters in my more than 9 years in the Senate was that we were given no indication, whatsoever, that any ongoing offensive action against Iran would occur with consultation and authorization from Congress. This was inexcusable.

This was, moreover, not the President's approach. It was not something that would have occurred in the President's presence. It certainly is not something that would have been communicated by the President, himself, because this is not how Donald Trump operates. That briefing was not the President's fault. That briefing was the fault of individuals who decided to go off on a detour of their own, forgetting whom they represent. Worst of all, in that briefing, it was suggested that engaging in public debate, discussion, and deliberation about further military action in Iran—in other words, precisely what we are doing right here and right now—would somehow empower our enemies and undermine the morale of our men and women overseas. This is as false as it is insulting to the American people and demeaning to the constitutional framework to which each of us has sworn an oath. It is contrary to our very form of government.

Constitutionally separated powers, exercised with accountability to the people via checks and balances, are precisely what makes the United States strong. Bowing to the politicians' impulse to avoid responsibility and subvert our constitutional duty—that is what empowers our enemies and undermines the morale of our Nation.

Whether the United States sends our young men and women into harm's way, yet again, is on us—not to cheer or jeer but, rather, to decide and stand accountable for. So, of course, that decision ought to be made at the end of a very public debate that requires not only our attention but our contributions and, ultimately, our assent. Our names have to be on the line if we are going to offer up our fellow beings to stand in harm's way.

For too long, Congress has deliberately and in a very cowardly manner shrunk from its constitutional responsibility for its own narrow, selfish, shallow, political interests. Yet, by taking itself out of the process of debating and declaring war, Congress has taken the American people out of the process, and that is simply unacceptable.

It is time to turn the page.

Osama bin Laden is dead, and so are the 9/11 terrorists. General Soleimani is dead, and Iran is weakened and isolated. Saddam Hussein is dead and has been out of power for a generation, and Iraq is a sovereign nation that can and should dictate its own course. We now face new challenges. Our priorities have rightfully changed, and they must.

While this resolution speaks only to offensive action against Iran, I believe it is time to repeal the 2002 AUMF and bring our troops in Iraq home. It is also time to repeal the 2001 AUMF and bring our troops in Afghanistan home. That is a question that we can and should address in this body.

In the meantime, we as a body and as a nation should at least agree that there is no justification for further military action in Iran in the absence of a new authorization for use of military force or a declaration of war by Congress.

This resolution is consistent with the President's desire to keep us out of excessive, unnecessary, and especially undeclared, unconstitutional wars. It is consistent with the vision of our Founding Fathers, who sought to make it harder to enter into war by the requiring of express consent from a bicameral legislature, and it is consistent with the conviction that the American people, whose sons and daughters lay down their lives to defend us, should get a say in this matter.

President Trump wants to make America great again. I stand with him. The military-industrial complex wants to make America Great Britain again, and I stand strongly against the military-industrial complex. Making America Great Britain again would include such things as giving the executive the power and keeping the legislative branch out of the power of declaring war. That is wrong. That is not what our Constitution allows. It is not even what President Trump wants. We need to support this resolution.

COMMEMORATING UTAH WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

Mr. President, on February 14, 1870, a remarkable thing happened in Utah—something that changed the course of history not just in our State but in our entire Nation.

Seraph Young, a 23-year-old schoolteacher, became the first American woman to cast a vote in a political election under an equal suffrage law. It was a moment that both followed and preceded a long line of remarkable contributions from Utah women—women who have pioneered and led in our State and in our Nation.

Take Mary Fielding Smith, the wife of Hyrum Smith, who was one of the early leaders of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. After Hyrum was murdered, the resilient widow followed in Brigham Young's footsteps. She took her children and led a group of pioneers across 1,300 miles of wilderness into the West.

Through a combination of faith and grit, she braved treacherous weather, a massive buffalo stampede, and a myriad of hazards and successfully led the entourage to a settlement where they could build a new life and live in freedom.

Other Utah women continued to blaze trails, and Martha Hughes Cannon stands out among them. At a time when women rarely went to college, Martha aspired to be a medical doctor. She earned a degree in both medicine and pharmaceuticals. A skilled public speaker, she also earned degrees in oratory and public speaking, which gave her four degrees by the time she was 25 years old. In the late 19th century, she quickly became a leader in Utah's burgeoning women's suffrage movement, and she put her speaking skills to good use.

At a large suffrage meeting in 1889, held at Temple Square, she argued:

No privileged class either of sex, wealth, or descent should be allowed to rise or exist. All persons should have the [same] legal right to be the equal of every other.

In the first year that women could vote and run in a Utah election, Martha ran as a Democrat for one of the five State Senate seats. She even ran against her own husband. She became the first woman to be elected as a State senator either in Utah or in any other jurisdiction in the United States, and she went on to sponsor many successful and influential legislative proposals. All the while she was in public office, she continued to run her private medical practice and raise her three children.

It is, indeed, fitting that we will soon be installing a statue of this extraordinary woman here in the U.S. Capitol Building.

Fast-forward to today, when Utah women are continuing to carry the banner of public leadership and service.

We have Ruth Watkins as president of the University of Utah; Astrid Tuminez as president of Utah Valley University; Noelle E. Cockett as president of Utah State University; Denece Huftalin as president of Salt Lake Community College; and Beth Dobkin as president of Westminster College.

We have Gail Miller, philanthropist and entrepreneur, who took over the ownership of the Utah Jazz after Larry, her late husband, died. She took over his other companies as well. She has led the team and companies with exceptional grace, dedication, and success and has helped their philanthropic arm champion education, homelessness, and family causes. We also have Carine Clark, president and CEO of Banyan, who is forging paths in Silicon Slopes and Utah's tech community.

In all different capacities and in all different fields, Utah women are continuing to make invaluable contributions in our State and in our Nation. These women have offered and continue to offer much needed gifts to their families, communities, schools, churches, businesses, and governments.

When Martha Hughes Cannon spoke before a U.S. Senate committee about the success of women's suffrage in Utah, she said: "The story of the struggle for Woman's suffrage in Utah is the story of all efforts for the advancement and betterment of humanity."

As we approach the 150th anniversary of Seraph Young's groundbreaking vote and as we enter the centennial year of the 19th Amendment, it is only fitting that we honor the legacy of these remarkable women and all they have given to my State and to our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

S.J. RES. 68

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 68, which, as I understand, we will be voting on tomorrow. It is a resolution that was introduced by Senator Kaine. I acknowledge Senator Kaine's longstanding commitment to the U.S. Senate's and Congress's carrying out our constitutional responsibilities as they relate to the authorization for use of military force, which rests solely with the Congress of the United States, and we have a responsibility to speak as to that authority.

In the last Congress, with Senator Flake, there were efforts in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to try to bring us together in regard to the passage of an AUMF, the authorization for use of military force, because we had seen successive administrations using our military without their having authorization from Congress.

S.J. Res. 68 is aimed at one specific conflict for which we can come together, and I am optimistic that we will be able to act on this resolution. It deals with the use of force in Iran. It is very specific as to say that, unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or a specific authorization for use of military force against Iran, there is no authority to use our military against Iran.

Now, certainly, for legitimate reasons, the President can use force to defend us from an imminent attack. That is, certainly, how I think all of us perceive the authorization for use of military force from Congress needs to be qualified. In the case of an urgent situation, the President can, in fact, act.

Why do we need this resolution passed now?

I need not tell my colleagues that there is a heightened sense of tension between the United States and Iran. It has been building for some time—certainly, with the U.S. military action in which General Soleimani was killed. He was the leader of the Quds Force in Iran, and he was taken out by our U.S. military. That has presented a heightened tension between the United States and Iran.

Congress has the sole responsibility to commit our troops to combat. It is in article I, section 8 of the Constitution that Congress has the power to declare war. This is not a decision made

by the President; it is a decision made by Congress. Our Founders were very concerned about having the appropriate balance between the executive branch and the legislative branch. It is called checks and balances. We did not want a monarchy. We wanted to make sure that there was sufficient support before war was declared; that it was in our national security interest; that the Congress and the President and the American people were all together in the effort if we were going to initiate war against another country; that the use of the military should always be a matter of last resort; and that we should always exhaust diplomacy—that we should always exhaust other means before America initiates war against another country or the use of military force.

This authority that rests in Congress was tested in the Vietnam war. The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was passed by Congress at the early stages during the Vietnam conflict to give the President the authority to use force to defend our military against attacks coming from Vietnam. It was never intended to lead us into an act of prolonged war, but, as we know, it was used by successive administrations for maintaining a prolonged war in Vietnam. I think historians would agree that this was an abuse of the interpretation of authorization and that the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was never intended for offensive military operations in Vietnam. Yet it was used for that purpose.

In 1973, Congress took action to make sure this would never happen again. It passed what is known as the War Powers Act. Now, the War Powers Act was passed in a strong bipartisan vote by both the House and Senate, and it was vetoed. Congress overrode the President's veto because we knew that it was our responsibility to commit our troops to battle.

What does the War Powers Act require?

First, it requires consultation by the President with Congress, in every possible instance, before our committing troops to war. That is the exact language in the War Powers Act. There are consultation requirements. Then there has to be reporting within 48 hours of American troops being sent into hostilities or into situations in which imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances. Third, the War Powers Act requires an end to foreign military action after 60 days unless Congress provides a declaration of war or an authorization for the operation to continue an authorization for use of military force, an AUMF.

Why do we need S.J. Res. 68 if we have the War Powers Act?

Like Vietnam, now in Iran, the President is usurping the constitutional powers of Congress by saying he has certain authorities that go well beyond what was intended in the Constitution or in the War Powers Act.

Let me get to General Soleimani for one moment. He was killed on January 2, 2020, in Baghdad. There is no sorrow over his loss. He was an evil person who caused the death of so many different people. He was clearly a person who is not missed in this world. That is absolutely accurate.

But President Trump's actions violated all three of the provisions of the War Powers Act that was passed in 1973 to try to prevent this type of circumstance that happened in Vietnam from happening again.

Now, why do I say all three? Well, first, was there an imminent threat that allowed the President to make this decision without congressional authorization?

Well, we have been through a classified briefing, and I am not going to talk about what was presented in that classified briefing, but I think it is fair to say that we were not presented with the documentation at all that there was an immediate threat against America.

The President has not made that case, and we have heard public comments that have been made by administration officials that they did not know about specific threats at that particular time.

So, one, the War Powers Act was violated because there was not an imminent threat before the President used military action.

No. 2, we now know that this had been planned for some time as one of the potential operations that could have been given to the President to respond to Iranian action; that is, taking out General Soleimani. So there was plenty of time to consult with Congress, but yet, before the military action, there was no prior consultation with Congress—a second violation of the War Powers Act.

Then, third, congressional notification and removal of troops within 60 days. The President has not submitted nor does he intend to submit to Congress an authorization for use of military force or a declaration of war against Iran. He clearly does not intend to do it, but he has made it clear by his own statements that he will use force again against Iran if he believes it is justified, and his determination of justification is not what Congress intended when it passed the War Powers Act in 1973.

Even more urgent, the President claims that he has authorization from Congress. So the President, through his lawyers, has said: Well, OK, maybe we don't have the inherent power, but we have specific authorization that has been previously passed by Congress that allows us to use military action against Iran.

So let me go through the two authorizations that are still active and used by Presidents.

First, we had the authorization to use military force that was passed in 2002. This is the authorization that was passed to go after Iraq.

Now, I must tell you I voted against this authorization. I thought that there was no evidence that Iraq was involved in the attack on our country on September 11, 2001. I didn't think there was evidence of that so I opposed that resolution in the House of Representatives when I was a Member of the House of Representatives. That resolution says the use of force to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq. We are talking about Iran, not Iraq. How could the President conceivably use the 2002 authorization to claim that he had authority to go after an Iranian general? I don't understand that. I can't figure that out for the life of me, but that argument has been made.

Then we have the old fallback of the 2001 AUMF that was passed immediately after the attack on our country on September 11, 2001. That authorization was passed "to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons that planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attack that occurred on September 11, 2001."

Now, this has been used by many administrations so it goes back well before President Trump in the misuse of the 2001 authorization.

Iran was not involved in the attack on our country in 2001, 9/11. So how do you use this authorization to say you have authorization now to take out a general in Iran or use force in Iran? It is clear to me that that is a total misreading of the authority of Congress. Congress never intended, when they voted for that authorization now 19 years ago—almost 19 years—that it intended that it would be used as it is being used today. That is a total misuse of the authorization by Congress.

So in regard to Iran today, there is no AUMF; we have not passed authorization for Iran; the President has already shown that he will act and will not comply with the War Powers Act; and he is likely to use force again that could lead to a lengthy military engagement with Iran. That is a possibility.

So we need to pass S.J. Res. 68 because it is specific—it is specific to Iran—that there is no congressional authorization.

And just as importantly, if the President wants to use the military, he must seek prior authorization from Congress as is envisioned in the Constitution of the United States. It gives the President the power to protect us against imminent threat.

So for good reason, Congress has the constitutional powers here. My generation paid a very heavy price because of the Vietnam war in the way that we got into the Vietnam war without the voice of the U.S. Congress giving the specific authorization. Let us not cede our responsibility under the Constitution or allow the President to exceed his.

I urge my colleagues to support and vote for S.J. Res. 68.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, when the Senate begins its debate, as it has been doing today on the War Powers Act, in considering this resolution, we are considering whether to do our duty to the Constitution.

The debate over war powers is bigger than any one Senator, bigger than any one President, and bigger than any political party. The debate over war powers is a fundamental constitutional debate, and the Constitution and our Founding Fathers were clear: The power to declare war lies in the legislature.

Madison put it this way: The executive is the branch most prone to war. Therefore, the Constitution, with studied care, vested the power to declare war in the legislature.

Yet we have increasingly deferred and delegated the war powers back to the executive. We have abdicated our role as the body that should be deciding with the people when to go to war.

While the President may have the power to repel an attack, Congress has done little to stop increasingly bold arguments that everything is in response to an imminent attack.

I will never forget President Obama coming to speak to the Republican caucus a few years ago, and he said: Well, they were under imminent attack, and we were like: Who, in the Libyan war, and he said: Well, Benghazi. And it was like: For goodness' sake, we thought imminent attack was of America, not of a foreign city. That is how far afield we have come, that a President would come to us and say: I can do whatever I want if there is an imminent attack of a foreign city. How ludicrous.

Given Congress's inaction, it should come as no surprise that administration lawyers increasingly argue that everything is imminent and that statutes limiting their authority actually don't limit their authority; that the statutes actually say they can do whatever they want.

Presidents actually argue that article II of the Constitution—this is what gives the President power. Article I is the congressional power; article II is the President. They argue that the article II section of the Constitution lets the President do anything he or she wishes; that there are no limits on Presidential authority. That is absurd.

Under President Obama, we droned hundreds of people in Pakistan; we bombed Libya to help defeat Qadhafi; we put military personnel in dozens and dozens of countries around the world fighting militants and regional thugs here and there, but with each passing year it had less and less to do with 9/11. It is hard to explain to someone how a goat herder in Mali has anything to do with the attacks of 9/11. Yet every President comes back to us and says: Well, you voted for this proclamation in 2001. It gives me the power to do whatever I want wherever I want.

In our Republic, if we are going to go to war, the Constitution says you must come to Congress, not for consultation but for permission.

Today's vote is not a vote for or against the current President. Today's vote is for or against the Constitution. Either you believe that war requires the permission of Congress or you don't.

Why is this vote necessary? Because we live in a topsy-turvy world, where Presidents now argue that their war power is absolute. Don't talk to me. I will do what I want—but the Constitution envisioned that we did not ever want one person to decide when we went to war.

Presidents now argue that a decades-old authorization of force against a long-deceased autocrat—Saddam Hussein—is still valid and applies to an Iranian general, and that is absurd. That is insulting to the people; it is insulting to the Constitution; and it shouldn't be.

You cannot argue that the Constitution gives the President unlimited power and say: Oh, well, if that doesn't work, I am also arguing that in 2002 Congress voted to go to war with Saddam Hussein, and that gives me the power to kill an Iranian general.

Presidents have also argued that bombing is not war. They argue somehow that bombs are not war and that there is a certain attitude of, well, maybe 100 soldiers aren't, maybe 1,000. What does it take to be at war?

They argue sometimes that we are not in hostilities when we are dropping bombs everywhere around a country. They sometimes argue that battles are kinetic action and not really war.

We have been at war too long in too many places. It is time to bring our soldiers home.

This week, I joined the President to honor two of our soldiers who were killed in action. I stopped with the President at Dover Air Force Base. Let me tell you, it was a sad and somber memorial for two of our Nation's heroes. But people need to think about this. This isn't a chess game. This isn't a geopolitical chess game and we are just moving troops here and there and they are somehow represented by symbols on a big map or a board. This is about people. It is about our young people of our country, and they deserve better. Our soldiers deserve to know what they are fighting for. Our soldiers deserve to know what the mission is. Our soldiers deserve to know if we are making progress. They deserve to be told the truth.

America's longest war in Afghanistan is in its 20th year. We now have kids fighting who weren't even born when the war began.

My committee this week held a hearing to discuss the Afghanistan Papers—papers that reveal that the highest ranking officials in our military and in our government and in our State Department have known for many years that the Afghanistan war lacks a real

mission; that it lacks a real national security rationale.

My vote today is not simply about Iran or the killing of Soleimani. My vote today is about the constitutional requirement that Congress must declare war. This vote should be 100 to 0. It is a vote for or against the Constitution. This is about acknowledging the Constitution says no one man, no one woman can take a nation to war.

Many Members will quietly acknowledge that the separation of powers assigned Congress the power to declare war, but when push comes to shove, many Senators are afraid to appear to oppose a President of their own party.

For me, this debate is not about party. I have supported the constitutional mandate that Congress must declare war under both Democratic and Republican Presidents, and I will continue.

For me, this debate is not a dry and esoteric or meaningless debate. It is a debate about life and death. It is a debate that, more than any other debate, embodies our commitment to our soldiers. It is a debate that strikes at the heart of our duty to do everything possible to protect human life.

Today's vote is historic in that the majority of the House and the Senate will now be on record affirming Congress's power over issues of war. Even at the height of the Vietnam war, the height of America's probably most unpopular war, congressional majorities did not stand up and assert their constitutional prerogative. Today we are doing that. That is a step forward.

In the aftermath of the most partisan impeachment in our history, today, though, marks a high-water mark for the bipartisan assertion of the separation of powers.

For me, it will have all been worthwhile when I see our troops returning home to their families safe and sound. For me, it will all be worthwhile when we finally end the Afghan war, when we finally end the Iraq war, and when we finally end the wars in Yemen and throughout Africa. When that day comes, I look forward to standing arm-in-arm across the political divide to welcome our brave soldiers home. Until that day, I will continue to fight for the truth that great nations don't fight perpetual wars.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

(The remarks of Mr. ENZI pertaining to the introduction of S. 3287 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here on the Senate floor to talk, once again, about the addiction crisis in our country. Over the past 4 years, I am told I have given over 64 speeches on this topic, and that is because it is a crisis, and a national one, and we have done a lot here in this Senate and also in the House of Representatives to deal with the issue.

We passed some important legislation. We are making some progress, but, gosh, prescription opioids, heroin, fentanyl, methamphetamine, and cocaine continue to harm so many people in our communities and so many of the families we represent. We put new policies in place to help deal with it—better prevention, better treatment, and better recovery efforts.

Among other things, we passed legislation like the SUPPORT Act, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, the 21st Century Cures Act, and the STOP Act. Through these new laws, we have also provided over \$4 billion in additional Federal resources just over the last 3 years to be able to combat this epidemic—particularly, the opioid epidemic.

In Ohio alone, our State received nearly \$140 million through the CARA and Cures legislation. It has gone toward innovative, evidence-based programs to try to figure out how we intervene at the appropriate time to keep people who are addicted from overdosing and, instead, to get them into treatment and into longer term recovery in a successful way.

I have gone to visit many of these programs across our State, and I can tell you many of them are working, and they are working because local volunteers, local communities, and the State are also involved. So that is the positive thing. I was very pleased that the year-end spending bill passed with a record \$658 million, as an example, in funding for these CARA grants that again go to these innovative ideas back home.

Let me give you an example of one. In many of our communities now, we have the ability, after somebody has overdosed, not to simply have them go back home and go to the same neighborhood and get addicted, and continue to be addicted and overdose again and again and again, but, rather, to intervene and to go there with law enforcement, with treatment providers, with first responders, and get them into treatment.

It is working. In a program I was recently at in Columbus, OH, the RREACT Team, 80 percent of the people whom they go to visit end up getting into treatment. And the evidence is, not only are they getting into treatment, but because there is the ability to monitor that, they are also going into longer term recovery programs. It is helping to save lives, but for the first responders, it is also a great relief because no one is more frustrated than they are. Think about it. You help

somebody through an overdose by applying Narcan—that miracle drug that reverses the effects of the overdose—and the next day they are right back again. This is the right thing to do, and, again, we have made progress in that.

The good news is, it looks like it is starting to pay off. After many, many years of increases in overdose deaths every single year, finally, we are making progress. In States like mine, overdose deaths had climbed to the No. 1 cause of death in our State; in other words, surpassing car accidents or anything else. There were more people dying of drug overdose deaths than anything else.

Nationwide, we had some great success between 2017 and 2018. We now have those numbers in. In 2017, we had about 70,700 people who died of overdoses. In 2018, it went down to about 67,700. That is a decrease of 4 percent. Now, that is nothing to write home about, 4 percent. On the other hand, this is after three decades of increased overdose deaths every year and in some years substantial increases. So just to have that 4-percent decrease—and we are waiting for the 2019 figures to become available—was a big deal.

In Ohio, we are one of the States that has been hardest hit. In 2018, our number was a 22.4-percent reduction. We were one of the States that led the country in this, and I am proud of that. That means a lot of lives saved. Still, though, the overdose rate is way too high—way too high.

On the positive side, I think we are also seeing more accountability for the opioid crisis, in particular. As courts around the country hear cases of those affected by prescription opioids, like OxyContin, these drug companies are being held accountable by individual States, by some local governments, and by the Federal Government. Every day we learn more about what they did and how wrong it was.

The sheer number of pain pills that drug companies pumped into the United States is astounding, with more than 100 billion pain pills between 2006 and 2014. So during that one period of time, 8 years, there were 100 billion pain pills.

We have one county in Southern Ohio, Scioto County, where we had 48 million opioid pain pills distributed by manufacturers during those 8 years. By the way, that is 617 pills for every man, woman, and child in that one county in Southern Ohio. We were flooded with pain pills that were addictive, and we have to be sure that that kind of a crisis doesn't start again.

As I travel around the State of Ohio, I hear stories all the time of people who had an accident or had an injury, and they took pain medication prescribed by a doctor. That led to physical addiction. Something in their brain changed. They became addicted. They couldn't get the prescription drugs because they are too expensive or not accessible enough, so they turned

to heroin. In many cases, the tragedy that occurred was not just an overdose but sometimes an overdose and a life lost. I hear this all the time.

Just this morning at my weekly Buckeye Coffee, where we have constituents come in once a week and meet with Ohioans, I met an impressive young man from northeast Ohio. He told me about his brother, Dylan. He reminded me that I had met his mom. I already knew about Dylan because his mom had told me, but Dylan struggled with pain pill addiction before tragically dying of an opioid overdose. It is a pattern that we have seen too often in our communities, and it needs to stop.

We are making some progress there, I think partly because of the lawsuits, partly because we increased awareness, partly because of the Federal legislation we discussed that has helped on this, and partly because doctors and others are beginning to get the message.

We have cracked down on pill mills as well. I mentioned Portsmouth, OH, and Scioto County, OH, where there were hundreds of pain pills per person. They had pill mills. Because of all of that, the number of prescription pain pills prescribed between 2013 and 2018 fell by more than 80 million—about a 33-percent decrease nationwide. So pushing back against this opioid flow that flourished for way too long here in the United States is helping, and that is a positive sign as well.

Again, while the CDC—Centers for Disease Control—has shown an overall decrease in drug overdose deaths for the past 18 months or so, I want to talk tonight about some new troubling trends and the need for us in Congress not to take our eye off the ball because sometimes around here, you get a little progress, and you think: OK. Let's go on to the next thing. Unfortunately, that is not the way addiction works, and we have seen this over time.

Back in the 1990s, we thought we had solved the cocaine crisis; we didn't. Now some think we have solved the opioid crisis; we haven't. In addition, there are new troubling trends I want to talk about tonight.

The most worrying is, while the overall number of opioid deaths has fallen, the number of overdose deaths related to the very deadliest of opioids—synthetic opioids like fentanyl or carfentanil—has actually increased. In fact, in 2018, more deaths were attributed to fentanyl than to heroin and prescription drugs combined. So it has shifted. Think about this. From the prescription drugs to the heroin, now to fentanyl.

Fentanyl is 50 times more powerful than heroin. A few flakes of this stuff can kill you. Unfortunately, it is being mixed into other drugs, partly because it is so powerful and a few flakes can kill you.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, 40 percent of drug overdoses in 2017 were at least partly because of

fentanyl use—40 percent. It is by far the largest problem. That data also showed that overdose deaths due to fentanyl had increased by 88 percent per year since 2013. So it has been going up really since the 2013, 2014 time period.

We are seeing this mixing occur in a lot of overdose reports from Ohio communities, where declining prescription opioid and heroin use has opened the door now for this other form of addiction. In particular, psychostimulants, as they are called, like crystal meth and cocaine, are being laced with fentanyl. This is a deadly combination. According to our State's deputy attorney general for law enforcement, Carol O'Brien, Ohio law enforcement officials in 2018 tested double the amount of methamphetamine samples as they had in 2017 and triple the amount from 2016. So crystal meth is, unfortunately, making a resurgence in our communities.

By the way, you may remember in the past couple of decades in your community you heard about these meth houses, where people would be cooking meth, literally, in a home or in a trailer or in the basement and causing environmental concerns and so on. You don't hear about that anymore. Do you know why? It is because crystal meth coming straight from Mexico is so powerful and so cheap that people don't have to make it at home anymore. That is a bad thing because this has expanded to the people who have become addicted to methamphetamine because of this powerful crystal meth.

Today I met with law enforcement officers from around the State of Ohio. The FOP was in town, the Fraternal Order of Police. Many of my colleagues met with them. They confirmed this troubling trend. They told me that the crystal meth and the cocaine, because they are psychostimulants, are much more difficult for them to deal with and puts their lives and their safety more at risk, as well as the citizens whom they are there to protect. Why? Because it causes a more violent reaction.

Think about it. With heroin, with other opioids, prescription drugs, fentanyl, people talk about the nodding effect. It calms people more. Whereas, with heroin, with cocaine, and with the other psychostimulants, like crystal meth, it makes people more agitated and more violent. We have seen not just more assaults on individuals but more violent crime overall coming out of this. So it is a shift that is impacting our police officers and our citizens, as well, in terms of increased violent crime.

I am really pleased to say that the legislation we passed in December—just about a month and a half ago—responded to this issue of the increase in meth and cocaine. It is because it included our legislation called the Combating Meth and Cocaine Act. It is a really important bill. Basically, what it says is, let's give local communities

the flexibility to use the opioid grant money that I talked about earlier, that has increased over the last 3 or 4 years, also to be used for psychostimulants. I felt very strongly about this because I was hearing it back home: Thank you very much for your help on the opioid crisis. By the way, we have shifted now in our community. Opioids are not as big a deal, but we need the funding to also help us deal with the consequences of crystal meth or cocaine.

I thank my colleagues for passing that legislation. It is going to make a big difference, and I think we will now begin to see the ability to address this new threat.

The U.S. attorneys for the Northern and Southern Districts of Ohio have recently weighed in and told me what is going on in terms of this mixing of cocaine and crystal meth with fentanyl. They say it is a crisis. Preliminary data from Cuyahoga County, which is in Cleveland, OH, suggested about 45 percent of the fatal overdoses in the county last year were associated with cocaine, much of that mixed with fentanyl. By the way, that is twice the amount of heroin overdoses over that same time period from the previous year, which shows how, again, the frontlines of addiction have shifted, partly in response to our successes on the opioid front.

We are hearing similar things in the Southern District of Ohio, where more than a third of overdose deaths are from cocaine and fentanyl, where they just had 10 overdose deaths from the combination of fentanyl and cocaine in the last several days.

I met with the Columbus, OH, police chief, Tom Quinlan, on Friday, in the middle of a spike there, a spike in overdose deaths that they have seen from this mixture. In the first 10 days of February, this month, Columbus, OH, Franklin County, had 28 overdose deaths involving some combination of fentanyl and cocaine—28 in 10 days.

I was actually in Columbus on Saturday, a day in which five people died from overdoses of a mixture of fentanyl and cocaine.

Just yesterday, the Columbus police informed me that in one drug bust, they seized over 200 grams of cocaine and nearly 2 kilograms of fentanyl. That is enough to kill about 1 million people.

Again, we have made some progress on the opioid front, no question about it. We have made progress in terms of the overprescribing of prescription drugs, but, unfortunately, my colleagues, this issue is not going away. The more flexible funding we got in at the end of the year is important, and we will begin to see that take effect here over the next several months—it is just being implemented now—but we have to deal with it.

The other thing we have to deal with in terms of fentanyl is being sure that some evil scientist doesn't slightly change the molecular compound of fentanyl, making it an analog of

fentanyl that is not illegal. You have to schedule a drug to make it illegal. As we have seen an uptick in these fentanyl copycats, we have seen the reality that it is not just about fentanyl. It is also about carfentanil, and it is also about other analogs.

As an example, we had an 819-percent increase from just a year ago in Cleveland with carfentanil deaths in 2019. So from 2018 to 2019, there was an 819-percent increase.

That is why the DEA—the Drug Enforcement Administration—has made the right call in 2018 in temporarily making these fentanyl-related substances, like carfentanil, illegal to possess, transport, or manufacture. Thanks to that designation, our law enforcement officials have been better able to protect our communities by seizing and destroying this fentanyl-related substance because it is illegal.

We had a real problem in the last couple of months here in Congress because, as of early this month—just last week—that scheduling of those analogs expired, and we almost had a situation where these drugs were going to become illegal. Thank goodness, at the last minute, we stepped in, and we provided a temporary extension; otherwise, again, last week, we would have had a real crisis.

Unfortunately, the temporary extension, like so much stuff around here, was kind of kicking the can down the road. So in May of next year—just a year and a few months from now—again, it is going to expire.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me, Senator MANCHIN, and others on both sides of the aisle in passing legislation that puts these analogs on the schedule, making them illegal permanently. It should be permanent. The legislation is called the FIGHT Fentanyl Act. Again, it just codifies what the DEA has done but also gives them the flexibility to be able to schedule new things, as, again, these scientists come up with ways to slightly alter the molecular compounds for these incredibly dangerous and deadly drugs.

By the way, our legislation has strong bipartisan support but also has the support of every single attorney general in every State in America and six territories. Fifty-six of our attorneys general have come forward and endorsed our bill, and I thank them for that.

Let's do that. Let's push back against these deadly copycats of fentanyl and be sure that our communities are just a little bit safer.

Again, we have made a lot of progress in the fight, but as we have seen, addiction—not a particular drug but addiction—is really the crisis we face. As we have made progress against opioids, including an unprecedented Federal response here—and I appreciate that very much—we now see the playing field changing. We see these psychostimulants like cocaine and crystal meth making a comeback. We see this mixing with fentanyl.

Again, the funding bill passed last year will help as it begins to implement these changes. We need to be sure that the FIGHT Fentanyl legislation is passed, and we need to be sure that we continue the funding. It is easy to say: Well, this crisis is better; let's move on. We have to keep our eye on the ball.

So I thank my colleagues as we go through the funding process again, but we have to keep the funding for the CARA legislation and others.

We also have a new bill called CARA 2.0, so Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act 2.0, and it expands the reach of these evidence-based programs we are talking about, particularly longer term recovery programs, because we have learned that it is so critical to actually get somebody into recovery and keep them in recovery for a long enough time so they don't relapse.

In that legislation, we also have important legislation with regard to opioid prescriptions because that is still a problem. We say that there should be a limit of 3 days for acute pain—not for chronic pain but for acute pain, limit it to 3 days. That comes from a recommendation by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention but also from the FDA.

I have heard from too many families—like the young man I heard from this morning—about someone whose child has become addicted because the doctor gave them too many opioids. By the way, I now know several families whose son or daughter was given opioids when he or she had a wisdom tooth removed, which apparently is one of the top two or three most common procedures in America. Doctors and dentists are still giving these kids opioids. I think that is wrong, and I think that should be stopped altogether. In the meantime, 3 days is a sensible limit. A doctor can always prescribe more if you have an issue. And I think there are proper exceptions for chronic pain.

I think our legislation would make a big difference. It also has a prescription drug monitoring program, which would require States to make their monitoring programs and their data available in other States because people go from State to State to get these prescription pain pills. This would help against overprescribing, making sure people are treated as soon as possible and identified.

I urge my colleagues who are not yet cosponsors of any of these bills—the FIGHT Fentanyl bill and the CARA 2.0 bill—to help us and to join us in responding to this ever-evolving challenge we have, which is not just an opioid problem; it is an addiction problem. Every State represented in this Chamber is affected by this epidemic, and these two bills at least provide us an opportunity to continue to give law enforcement the tools they need to give our communities the help they need to be able to overcome this crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

S.J. RES. 68

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, the Constitution vests Congress with the power to declare war and ultimately to authorize the use of military force in order to provide a critical check on a President's decision to deploy troops overseas. Congress has for too long abdicated this responsibility in deference to Presidents from both parties.

Presidents have used a broad interpretation of the 2001 and 2002 authorizations for the use of military force to justify American military interventions in far-flung theaters such as Yemen and North Africa. I have supported bipartisan efforts to revisit these authorizations because nearly 20 years later, they are still being used to justify action unforeseen by the Congress that initially approved them.

This effort has become more urgent as this President's reckless, impulsive actions are bringing us precipitously close to war with Iran. Contrary to whatever he says, Donald Trump's Iran policy has not made us safer. In fact, his Iran policy has undermined America's national security, isolated the United States from our allies, put the safety of American troops at risk, and, yes, brought us closer to war.

To understand how we arrived at this moment and why Congress needs to act, we should begin by evaluating the consequences of the President's misguided and dangerous decision to withdraw from the Iran nuclear deal.

By all accounts, the administration inherited a deal that was working, one painstakingly negotiated over many months with the UK, France, Germany, Russia, China, and Iran.

It bears repeating. The deal explicitly stated in its first paragraph that "Iran reaffirms that under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop or acquire any nuclear weapons," and it put a comprehensive, intrusive, and verifiable enforcement mechanism in place to achieve this objective. It blocks pathways Iran would need to produce the highly enriched uranium or plutonium it would take to produce a nuclear weapon. Under the verification regime created by the deal, international inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency, the IAEA, were afforded extensive access within Iran to ensure their compliance.

The Iran nuclear deal was reached through tough, principled diplomacy. These negotiations culminated in an agreement that world leaders could credibly declare would prevent Iran from ever obtaining nuclear weapons.

In May 2018, President Trump recklessly undermined our credibility and isolated the United States from our allies by unilaterally withdrawing from the Iran nuclear deal. It is important to emphasize that Iran was in compliance with the agreement when the President tore it up.

Our unilateral withdrawal from the agreement and the administration's

subsequent so-called maximum pressure campaign has exposed the United States to enormous risk. We have seen the consequences almost every day for the past 2 years as Donald Trump has engaged in an escalating and increasingly violent tit-for-tat with Iran.

The President's chaotic escalation culminated with his impulsive and incredibly risky decision to target and kill high-level Iranian and Iraqi military officials, including Iranian General Soleimani, on Iraqi soil.

The question before us is not whether General Soleimani deserved this fate. He was a loathsome figure who was responsible for killing many U.S. servicemembers and for orchestrating terrorism throughout the Middle East. The question before us is whether carrying out this risky and provocative act made the United States and the Middle East safer or more secure. It has not.

Over the past month, the consequences of the President's impulsive actions have become clearer. We now know President Trump directed the attack without notifying leaders in Congress or our Iraqi partners or even our allies who have troops positioned in Iraq. He ordered the attack without preparing for what came next, exposing the United States to further hostilities without a plan for how to deescalate tensions.

After Iran retaliated with a coordinated missile strike on American military infrastructure in Iraq, the President was quick to reassure the public that no American soldiers were harmed in the counterattack. We now know this was a lie. After weeks of denials—or even comments from the President that some troops were suffering from "headaches"—the Pentagon on Monday finally acknowledged that 109 servicemembers suffered traumatic brain injuries in the Iranian attack. For the President of the United States to make light of these serious injuries—injuries that, in many cases, may impact these soldiers for the rest of their lives—is unconscionable and dishonors the service and sacrifices made every day by our men and women in uniform.

In a sign that tensions continue to escalate, the President has deployed more than 14,000 additional servicemembers to the Middle East in the wake of the strike on General Soleimani, exposing even more Americans to potential retaliation from Iran or its regional proxies. These developments further reinforce our conclusion that President Trump did not give much thought to the consequences of his actions.

The administration has provided ever-evolving and very troubling after-the-fact explanations that fail to assuage our concerns about this impulsive decision. Only a few weeks ago, the President tweeted in all caps that "Iran will never have a nuclear weapon." Given that the President tore up the Iran nuclear deal which would have prevented Iran from ever getting a nuclear weapon, one cannot help but

question where this bellicose rhetoric is coming from and what it portends.

The American people have made it explicitly clear that they do not want to go to war with Iran, especially if war is the result of the President's reckless and impulsive actions. It is therefore imperative that Congress exercise its exclusive—exclusive—war powers under article I of the Constitution to prevent this President from launching a disastrous war with Iran.

In normal times, we could have confidence during a crisis like this that the President of the United States would mobilize a whole-of-government response to this crisis, and in normal times, the President would lead our allies and the international community in seeking a diplomatic outcome to our escalating tensions with Iran, but these are not normal times.

Congress must reassert its constitutional authority by demanding the President seek explicit authorization prior to any military action against Iran. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Senator TIM KAINE's War Powers Resolution tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues, many of whom have spoken already in support of S.J. Res. 68, which I am proud to cosponsor. It prohibits an unauthorized, unconstitutional war with Iran. It seeks to prevent the Trump administration from stumbling into a real and reckless military conflict. I want to thank bipartisan colleagues who have provided leadership in this effort, and it has been truly bipartisan as an effort. I appreciate their efforts and from many other colleagues to reassert our constitutional war powers and to represent the will of the American people.

Americans do not want a new war. They do not want another endless military conflict that harms our national interests without protecting our national security. The Constitution trumps any statute. Without congressional authorization and anything short of a declaration of war from the Congress, starting a war with Iran would be unconstitutional.

Congress did not authorize war with Iran when it passed an authorization to use force against al-Qaida more than 18 years ago in the wake of 9/11. Congress did not authorize war with Iran when it passed an authorization to use military force against Saddam Hussein's regime in 2002. Very simply, Congress has not authorized war with Iran in any way, shape, or legal form.

The President's authorizations for use of military force in no way cover starting a new war with Iran. We cannot let the intent of either of those authorizations to be so distorted and stretched as to be a pretense for such a war. That is why this resolution is so important. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it tomorrow.

But just as alarming as the lack of legal authorization for war, is the Trump administration's lack of strategy. It isn't that we have a dangerous policy toward Iran. It is that we have no policy, no strategy, and no endgame, which is the most dangerous situation of all.

I am pleased that we have deescalated the dramatic rise in tensions between Iran and the United States, which well serves the interests of both countries. We must continue the potential for reducing, not escalating, military tensions, but President Trump's reckless actions that brought us so close to military conflict are still in play. We need to continue to deescalate, not raise, the level of tension, if possible.

These kinds of reckless actions, in fact, brought us close to expulsion from Iraq and halted key training exercises with our allies in the counter-ISIS mission. As is the case with most of the Trump administration's military strategy—or lack of it—we are just lurching from one crisis to another, with no objectives, no means to an end, no decision on ending, all putting our security and our allies at grave risk. Congress, not to its credit, has failed to conduct critical public oversight that is necessary to hold the administration accountable and to insist on a strategy, an endgame, a set of objectives.

The Trump administration has kept Congress and the American people in the dark under the guise of classification. I will say, on a personal note, that at the end of so many of our classified briefings in the SCIF, I will say to a military officer or to an intelligence community representative: Our adversaries and our enemies know what you have just told us because you are telling us about what they are doing. And they know we know, and we know they know. In fact, they know a great deal about what we are doing. The only ones who don't know are the American people. They are kept in the dark.

The Trump administration cannot wage war while hiding behind classification gag orders behind closed doors. The Trump administration tried to make the claim that there was an "imminent threat" to justify the strike against Soleimani. I disagree. The Trump administration failed to provide the evidence in any setting, classified or not, to support this claim, and the American people deserve to know our path forward with Iran.

There is no conceivable reason that our goals must be kept secret from Members of Congress or the people we represent, and we certainly must prevent a reckless administration from pursuing a war when it is unwilling to account to the American people. In short, there is a fundamental purpose that is served by a declaration of war. It gives the people who will have to sacrifice in that war a voice in the decision. We represent those people—the families of soldiers, marines, airmen,

and sailors whose lives will be in harm's way, as well as themselves. It gives a voice to the experts in this body who may have a perspective and a wisdom on these topics. That is a useful check on the executive branch.

Let us not forget that military actions conducted without a strategy and without the consent of the American people have real consequences for all who serve our Nation in uniform.

We continue to hear reports about the number of troops who have suffered brain injuries in the Iran strike against Iraq military bases. The total is now up to 109 American servicemembers. The President of the United States has minimized those kinds of injuries as headaches, but, in fact, traumatic brain injury—concussion, post-traumatic stress—are among the most painful and damaging wounds of war, in part because they are invisible and they are sometimes minimized.

So let us never forget the consequences of war—the consequences to our economy, to our faith in American democracy, to the credibility of our leaders, to our people in lives lost and damaged. That is true especially of a war that has never been authorized by Congress and fails to have the support of the American people.

That is why this vote is so important today. There are many, many reasons to vote in favor of S.J. Res. 68. I call on my colleagues to send a clear, unmistakable message to this administration: You do not have congressional authorization, you do not have the support of the American people, and you do not have permission from this Congress, under the Constitution, to wage war or to begin it against Iran.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I am proud to rise in support of S.J. Res. 68, the Kaine-Lee resolution to "remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran or any part of its government or military."

This resolution is crucial at a momentous moment in our Nation's history. As U.S. Senators, we are no strangers to tough decisions. When this institution is functioning properly, we make such decisions all the time. There are tough questions, and we make tough decisions on which programs to fund or on who sits in judgment over their fellow citizens on the Federal bench or on issues of civil rights or equality or fairness. Yet, without doubt, the most difficult decision any Senator will ever face is whether to authorize war—whether to, through such authorization, open the

gates to send the men and women of our Armed Forces into harm's way.

It is a solemn responsibility that all of us here take very seriously, and it is a responsibility that the Founding Fathers intended to rest solely here in the Congress of the United States of America, not down Pennsylvania Avenue, in the White House, not in the hands of any one person sitting in the Oval Office.

At the Constitutional Convention in 1787, George Mason, a delegate from Virginia, said he was "against giving the power of war to the executive" because the President "is not safely to be trusted with it."

In speaking to the Pennsylvania ratifying convention that same year, James Wilson stated:

This system will not hurry us into war; it is calculated to guard against it. It will not be in the power of a single man, or a single body of men [such as just the Senate or just the House], to involve us in such distress, for the important power of declaring war is vested in the legislature at large.

James Madison, the "Father of the Constitution," wrote to Thomas Jefferson in 1798:

The Constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war to the Legislature.

All of these comments and so many more are about the gravity of deciding to go to war—deciding on whether hundreds or thousands or tens of thousands will walk into the face of danger, suffer injuries, suffer death. Questions about war are questions of great human calamity that cannot be taken lightly. They cannot be taken at the spur of the moment. They cannot be taken with the judgment of a single individual.

Our Founders noted that the decision should not be by any single President, not by a particular individual. This is not about the individual in the Oval Office at this moment; it is about the Founders' vision that it should be the collective decision of Congress, representing the people of the United States, to weigh this question of national defense—whether or not we should send our sons and now our daughters into harm's way in a military fashion, where many will be injured and many will die. It is an issue of the National Treasury as well because the cost of war is a huge cost in blood and a huge cost in injuries and a huge cost to the Treasury. That is why this responsibility was placed with us and with the House of Representatives.

In this Constitution—and all Senators here probably have one in their desks—one just simply has to look in article I, section 8, which is where that specific responsibility is given to us, not to the President, not to the executive. Upon coming into this body, we did swear an oath to this Constitution, not to some vision of our personal desire that maybe a President would be better at making this decision and not

to any scholars' opinion but to this document, which vests its power in this body, not in the President of the United States.

For too long, Congress has allowed a steady expansion of the exercise of military power without authorization—without a declaration of war from Congress. So this is one of those rare moments in which we are standing up to say: No. Any decision to conduct war against Iran needs to come in accordance with the Constitution, in accordance with the War Powers Act, in accordance with the decision and debate that would occur here.

S.J. Res. 68 lays out what the War Powers Act reads, which is, "At any time that United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States, its possessions and territories without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs." This is a debate over whether the Congress should so direct.

Indeed, it also lays out in this document the vision of our Constitution and reads that the question of whether U.S. forces should be engaged in hostilities against Iran should be answered following a full briefing to Congress and the American public of the issues at stake—a public debate in Congress and a congressional vote as contemplated by the Constitution.

This resolution does not read that Congress will not debate the issue; it reads that Congress should debate the issue if the President so requests and come to a decision as to whether to open the gates of our Nation to war. It then proceeds to do exactly what the War Powers Act provides for, which is to "[direct] the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran or any part of the government or military unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or a specific Authorization for Use of Military Force."

This is all about the vision of our Constitution. Are we going to support it? Are we going to say no to this warfare unless it is authorized as envisioned by the Constitution or are we going to say, "No. We don't want the burden of that responsibility. It is a tough decision to make. We are not sure we will get it right, so we will just let the executive do what he wants even though the Constitution says no"?

Let us honor the vision of the Constitution. Let us support this that is before us. Let us ponder how easy it is for there to be a cycle of provocation, an escalation. We have seen that in Iran. Iran is not a friendly power to the United States of America. Iran has been involved in activities that we greatly oppose in its supporting forces in Syria, in Lebanon, and Yemen; in its developing ballistic missiles; in its creating concerns inside of its neighbor Iraq with its Iranian militias. The United States has been involved in this cycle of provocation and escalation.

We made a deal with Iran of economic assistance to Iran if they abandoned their nuclear program. They abandoned the nuclear program, and the inspectors certified they had abandoned it. Then, we have broken the deal, and we have tightened the sanctions, making life very difficult for the people of Iran.

Iran launched rockets at our forces inside of Iraq, and the United States responded and attacked militias sponsored by Iran, killing a good score of Iranians in the process and assassinating an Iranian general. Iran responded with ballistic missiles attacks at the U.S. forces in Iraq, injuring, at this moment, an estimated 100 U.S. forces—a cycle of provocation and escalation.

We are on the edge of war. We are involved in hostilities that have not been authorized, and the Constitution essentially says, in this situation, it is Congress's responsibility to debate and wrestle with whether to unleash our forces against Iran. So let's carry that responsibility, and as we do so, let's think how close we were to a third major war in the Middle East.

We had a war and are still at war in Afghanistan. Now, the authorization for the use of military force in regard to Afghanistan was very narrowly tailored. That authorization said that our forces are authorized to attack those who attacked us on 9/11 and those who harbor those forces.

It is now as if that AUMF had language added to it, language which essentially said and: any other group we disagree with in the world. The words that are often quoted as being part of that AUMF are "and related forces."

But do you know what? That language isn't in that AUMF. This Congress gave a very, very narrow assignment for the authorization of force, and it has been expanded massively. We could debate whether or not that authorization has been stretched to the breaking point. I think it has. I think it has been abused. It has been misused, and it dishonors the fact that Congress was so specific with that authorization.

The result is that here we are, 19 years later. We didn't pursue a simple mission of taking out the training camps. We pursued a mission that has cost this Nation \$1 trillion and thousands of our sons and daughters and tens of thousands with lifetime injuries.

So we have that war. We know what kind of damage and costs there can be to an ill-considered strategy.

Then, we have the war we had against Iraq and authorized by a 2002 authorization for use of military force, or AUMF, and this was also very narrowly crafted. The President is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in order to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq—not posed by anyone else, just by Iraq—and to enforce

the relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq—very, very specific.

Now, the administration is arguing that this AUMF from 2002, about Iraq, provides authority to go to war against Iran. It is just like the stretching of the 2001 AUMF that said go after those who harbored the 9/11 terrorists but has been stretched to go after other groups all over the world.

But in both these cases, it was an authorization. Congress did debate. Yes, they have been abused after they were passed, but what there wasn't was an open door without Congress involved.

So we must do our job here and realize the gravity of these conflicts and get the full, extensive information and make sure there is no fake news in that information.

On the Iraq AUMF, this body operated on the solemn guarantee that there were weapons of mass destruction being developed by Iraq. It proved out to be false.

So when we do hold the debate over Iran, let's make sure we get the absolutely honest intelligence, not the spin, not the cherry-picked intelligence, not partial, not selected to drive a conclusion—the honest, fully honest, situation of our activities and their activities and the threats that they pose.

That is the responsibility we have—to make sure that the information we wrestle with is absolutely accurate and then to weigh the heavy cost of different strategies that may or may not involve force before we vote for force. It is a big responsibility, and I have heard Members of this Chamber say: You know what; it is such a tough decision. What if I get it wrong? Let's just let the Executive make that decision. If I misjudge it and don't vote to go to war and, for example, maybe there were those weapons of mass destruction equivalent to Iraq, I don't want to make that mistake, and people back home will not like it if I make that mistake. If I vote to go to war and the information is wrong and the strategy is wrong, well, then, people back home won't like that either.

So let's just ignore the Constitution. Let's just ignore our oath to the Constitution. Let's just let the person down Pennsylvania Avenue do what he wants because we don't like the burden imposed on us by this document that says that issue has to be debated here.

The decision to use force has to be debated and decided here, not there, because it is too big a question to leave to a single individual.

Our Constitution starts out with these words: "We the people." They did not want to create a King. They did not want to create an imperial Presidency that acted like a King. They wanted a nation run of, by, and for the people.

The question of war is our responsibility. We must make the decision here, and that is why I urge my colleagues to take and say yes, we will vote for this S.J. Res. 68 because it says we are demanding the administra-

tion do what the Constitution demands, which is to place the question of going to war with Iran with this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from North Dakota.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the only first-degree amendments in order to S. J. Res. 68 be the following: 1301, 1322, 1305, 1314, 1320, and 1319; I further ask that no second-degree amendments be in order to the amendments listed, with the exception of amendment No. 1319; that the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow; and that there be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to each vote. Further, I ask unanimous consent that all debate time on S.J. Res. 68 expire at 1:45 p.m. tomorrow, with the last 40 minutes, equally divided, under the control of Senators RISCH, INHOFE, MENENDEZ, and KAIN; and finally, that upon use or yielding back of that time, the joint resolution be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution, as amended, if amended, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NOS. 1301, 1322, 1305, 1314, 1320, AND 1319, EN BLOC

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments listed be called up by number en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendments by number, en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CRAMER], for other Senators, proposes amendments numbered 1301, 1322, 1305, 1314, 1320, and 1319.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1301

(Purpose: To amend the findings)

In section 1, insert after paragraph (3) the following:

(4) Members of the United States Armed Forces and intelligence community, and all those involved in the planning of the January 2, 2020, strike on Qasem Soleimani, including President Donald J. Trump, should be commended for their efforts in a successful mission.

AMENDMENT NO. 1322

(Purpose: To amend the findings)

On page 2, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

(5) More than 100 members of the United States Armed Forces sustained traumatic brain injuries in the Iranian retaliatory attack on the Ain al-Assad air base in Iraq despite initial reports that no casualties were sustained in the attack.

AMENDMENT NO. 1305

(Purpose: To exempt from the termination requirement United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at designated terrorist organizations)

On page 4, line 14, insert "except United States Armed Forces engaged in operations

directed at entities designated as foreign terrorist organizations under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189)," after "or military,".

AMENDMENT NO. 1314

(Purpose: To amend the findings)

On page 1, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

(2) The President has a constitutional responsibility to take actions to defend the United States, its territories, possessions, citizens, service members, and diplomats from attack.

AMENDMENT NO. 1320

(Purpose: To amend the findings)

In section 1, strike paragraph (6) and insert the following:

(6) The United States Armed Forces are not currently engaged in hostilities, as contemplated by the War Powers Resolution, against Iran. The United States strike against terrorist leader Qasem Soleimani to protect the lives of United States service members and diplomats is lesser in scope, nature, and duration than, and consistent with, previous administrations' exercises of war powers.

(7) The United States' maximum pressure strategy against Iran has reduced the Government of Iran's resources available to attack the United States and United States interests by limiting the resources available to the Government of Iran to support weapons development and terrorist proxies throughout the region.

AMENDMENT NO. 1319

(Purpose: To amend the rule of construction)

In section 2, amend subsection (b) to read as follows:

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to prevent the United States from defending itself, including its territories, citizens, troops, personnel, military bases, and diplomatic facilities from attack, including acting to prevent an attack; or

(2) to restrict missions related to force protection of United States aircraft, ships, or personnel.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CORONAVIRUS OUTBREAK AND PANDEMIC PREPAREDNESS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, since first emerging in Wuhan, China, on December 31, the outbreak of a new coronavirus, COVID-19, "novel coronavirus", has spread to 25 countries, infected more than 44,000 people, caused at least 1,100 deaths, forced entire cities into lockdown, triggered hundreds of international flight cancellations, restricted hundreds of Americans to U.S. military bases in Federal Government quarantine, and caused significant economic harm to countries and businesses around the globe, all this in only 6 weeks, with no end in sight.

The virus has infected and killed more people and has done so faster

than the SARS outbreak in China in the early 2000s, which infected 8,098 people and caused 774 deaths worldwide. The World Health Organization—WHO—has formally declared a public health emergency of international concern—the sixth such declaration since 2009—and the outbreak will get worse, possibly far worse, before it gets better.

While the novel coronavirus outbreak is alarming and is creating fear around the world, it should not be surprising.

Scientists, epidemiologists, and other global health experts have for years warned that infectious disease outbreaks will continue to occur more frequently and cause greater harm, and that most emerging viruses will spread from animals to humans. Such zoonotic viruses are increasingly common as human activity, including population growth and expanding human encroachment into wildlife habitat, increases contact between animals and humans, which is what happened in Wuhan.

The coronavirus strain threatening us today is believed to have emerged from a bat, and potentially passed through another animal before infecting humans in a live-animal market. Such animal markets, which in China and many other countries include bats, rats, birds, porcupines, and other animals infected with viruses, are sources of protein for hungry humans, but also serve as breeding grounds for zoonotic diseases.

Scientists estimate that there are more than 1.6 million unknown viral disease species in mammalian and avian populations, of which an estimated 600,000 to 850,000 have the potential to infect humans. As we saw during SARS, Ebola, and MERS and are now seeing once again, infectious disease outbreaks threaten not only human health but also cause economic harm and social upheaval.

We should all be asking whether we, the United States and the international community, are doing enough to combat and prepare for this known and escalating threat. It seems obvious that we are not.

In fact, while the President and Secretary of State have repeatedly said that protecting the health and safety of American citizens is their highest priority, that is not borne out by the facts. The American people should be aware that the Trump administration has consistently proposed cuts in funding for the very programs designed to help prevent outbreaks and contain the spread of infectious diseases like the novel coronavirus. Even in the President's fiscal year 2021 budget request sent to Congress this week, in the midst of a deadly infectious disease outbreak that will almost certainly become a global pandemic, the administration has proposed to pay less than half of what the U.S. owes WHO, in addition to requesting a 10 percent cut to U.S. Agency for International Development—USAID—pandemic preparedness

programs. It is a reckless game of Russian roulette with a global threat we absolutely must prepare for. Yesterday, it was SARS, then it was Ebola; today, it is Ebola again and a coronavirus. Tomorrow, it may be something that is even deadlier and spreads even faster. Fortunately for the American people, Congress has rejected those cuts in the past and increased funding for most global health programs, and I am confident we will do the same this year, but far more needs to be done.

Funding for pandemic preparedness at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, USAID, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, and other Federal agencies that play an indispensable role in preparing for and responding to outbreaks should be significantly increased, not forced to cut programs and personnel as the administration has proposed. It makes no sense to be shortchanging the agencies and programs we all depend on to protect public health, keep our ports of entry open, and keep our commerce flowing.

Pandemic response is critical, but often, by then, it is too late. We can and must do more to proactively reduce pandemic risk. One approach I have urged is for a global viral discovery effort. Such a concept was proven successful through USAID's PREDICT program, which used the collection and analysis of wildlife samples in areas of the world most at risk for zoonotic disease to identify new emerging viruses with pandemic potential. PREDICT was able to discover hundreds of disease pathogens at their source, rather than waiting for human infection.

In China, the PREDICT program sampled more than 10,000 bats and identified more than 500 new coronaviruses, including a strain that is a 96 percent match to the 2019 novel coronavirus strain. The known existence of and readily available data on such a close relative is one reason China was able to quickly sequence the novel strain and identify the animal source of the outbreak.

As the 10-year PREDICT program comes to an end this year, USAID is working to design the next phase of programming to build on the successful analytical and modeling work demonstrated through PREDICT. Others in the international community should use the lessons learned and techniques proven through PREDICT to inform their own efforts.

Investing in biomedical research focused on infectious disease is another crucial, proactive step to reducing pandemic risk. The NIH's National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases—NIAID—has a unique mandate to conduct and support basic and applied research on established infectious diseases and also to quickly launch a research response to newly emerging and reemerging infectious threats. With NIAID support, scientists design

and develop new diagnostics, treatments, and preventive strategies, including vaccines, which can be deployed to protect and treat people worldwide.

Yet, in the midst of the novel coronavirus emergency, the President's budget would cut \$3.1 billion from NIH and assumes the reduction is spread across-the-board to all 27 Institutes and Centers, including NIAID. Slashing infectious disease research programs threatens our ability to develop better therapeutics and vaccines for high priority pathogens, as well as the rapid development of medical countermeasures against emerging infectious diseases, like the coronavirus, when they arise.

The President's budget features similar dangerous cuts to CDC programs that have been pivotal in combating the novel coronavirus response, proposing a \$693 million overall decrease from fiscal year 2020. Although the administration touts its \$175 million proposal for Global Health Security in fiscal year 2021, it simultaneously cuts almost \$100 million from other crucial global health investments, including in global HIV/AIDS, global polio eradication, global immunization, and the global public health capacity and development programs. This is short-sighted and dangerous.

The President's budget proposes only \$50 million, a \$35 million decrease compared to fiscal year 2020, for CDC's Infectious Disease Rapid Response Reserve Fund—IDRRRF—which has served as the primary source of funding for responding to the novel coronavirus outbreak. This risks potentially undermining the agency's ability to access funding to initiate an early and rapid response to emerging pandemic threats like novel coronavirus when the U.S. is faced with a public health emergency. The administration also proposes an \$85 million cut to the CDC's Center on Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Disease and a \$25 million cut to the Public Health Preparedness and Response Program.

Slashing these programs weakens CDC's ability to provide rapid scientific support during outbreaks of infectious disease, maintain support for global health programs that build core public health capabilities and bolster frontline preparedness internationally, and ensure that State and local health departments are ready to handle many different types of emergencies that threaten the health and resilience of families, communities, and the Nation. Thus, while the White House named its fiscal year 2021 budget *A Budget for America's Future*, it is anything but that. There is no better example of where this Administration's rhetoric clashes with reality than the drastic cuts they propose to the very programs that protect the American people from deadly communicable diseases.

I continue to urge USAID, other Federal agencies, the White House, and Members of Congress to support a more

proactive approach to reducing pandemic risk. Today, we are struggling to control outbreaks of Ebola and the novel coronavirus, and while we don't know which viruses will next attack us, we do know it is not a matter of if: but when, and we must do everything we can to prepare. The more information we have about potential zoonotic viruses, the better able we will be to respond. The stakes are immense. Thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, even millions of lives could be lost, and the amount of funding necessary to control it would be incalculable.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I was presiding over the Committee on Foreign Relations while the chairman was voting. The vote ended before I was able to return and cast my vote in favor of the confirmation of John Fitzgerald Kness to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE 2020 ARKANSAS BUSINESS HALL OF FAME HONOREES

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the newest members of the Arkansas Business Hall of Fame.

Arkansas native Olivia Farrell is a shining example of what a lifetime of hard work and devotion looks like. After graduating from the University of Arkansas at Little Rock in 1978, she joined the Arkansas Writers Project, selling ads for the Arkansas Times. Shortly after, the Writers Project also created Arkansas Business, which was later purchased by Farrell and became the Arkansas Business Publishing Group, where she served as CEO.

Not only did Farrell find personal success in business, but she also sought to help bring more women into the business community. As such, Farrell created and promoted an annual magazine highlighting the top 100 women in Arkansas. This list encouraged companies and their stakeholders to bring more women into their ranks. Furthermore, she created the Women's Foundation of Arkansas to promote increased investment in women's education, business opportunities, and philanthropy.

Some of her most notable awards include being inducted in the Arkansas Women's Hall of Fame, as well as being the recipient of the Business and Professional Leader of the Year award by the Rotary Club of Little Rock. Her leadership and kindness have been the subject of much deserved praise.

Reynie Rutledge was born in Smackover, AR. Growing up in a small Arkansas town taught him the value of hard work and doing the right thing. He earned an undergraduate degree in industrial engineering from the Univer-

sity of Arkansas prior to earning his MBA in 1973. Upon leaving school, he was hired as a loan officer at Worthen Bank in Little Rock. A few years later, Rutledge took a gamble in purchasing First Security Bank, which at the time had only three branches and \$46 million in assets. Under his leadership, the small Searcy, AR, bank grew into a \$5.9 billion dollar holding company with over 77 locations across 17 counties and 34 communities, with more than 1,000 employees across the State.

Rutledge has always given back to the Natural State. He has been an active member of Searcy's First United Methodist Church since 1977 and also serves on the Searcy Water Board. Rutledge has also served as a member of the University of Arkansas Board of Trustees, chairman of the selection committee of the Arkansas Business Hall of Fame, and chairman of the Arkansas Bankers Association. Some of the many accolades he has received over his career include the University of Arkansas 2000 Volunteer of the Year, 2012 University of Arkansas Distinguished Alumni Award, and 2011 Lifetime Achievement Award from the Walton College of Business.

Gerald B. Alley was born in Pine Bluff, AR. As the son of a businessowner, he saw firsthand the hard work and commitment required to produce a thriving business that maximizes a person's ability to give back to their community. After finishing his education and working for his father, Alley enrolled at the University of Arkansas at the age of 16, majoring in finance. After graduating from the University of Arkansas, he continued his education at Southern Methodist University, where he earned his MBA.

Along with the help of his brother, Troy, Jr., he started Con-Real. Under his leadership, Con-Real built the largest parking garage in Texas. Additionally, the company helped build schools, stores, and other facilities that provided entertainment and essential services to the community. As Alley gained more experience as a business leader, he expanded Con-Real's services and launched another firm focused on medical construction which represented the largest medical system in the U.S. Today, Con-Real offers a multitude of services ranging from real estate to technology and innovation while consistently promoting minority firms.

Aside from his business ventures, Alley serves on the executive advisory board at the Walton College of Business at the University of Arkansas. Additionally, he is on the advisory board at the Cox School of Business at Southern Methodist University and is also a member of the board of trustees at the school. After years of business and philanthropic success, he has proven to be a role model for anybody who values dedication, hard work and perseverance.

Charles Nabholz was born near Squirrel Hill, AR. Hailing from a farming

family, he was instilled with a strong work ethic that served him well. Though the family business began in 1949, he began his career with Nabholz Construction after graduating from Conway's St. Joseph High School in 1954.

He began his career with the company as a laborer. Eventually, Nabholz founded and managed Con-Ark builders, a company that would later merge with Nabholz Construction. After a brief stint out of the State, he returned to serve as Governor Frank White's director of State Building Services. He continued to serve as a valuable asset outside of the State government, helping to create Nabholz Properties and serving as chairman of the board for the Nabholz Group in 2000. In 2014, he was named chairman emeritus of Nabholz Group.

Charles Nabholz is an extremely involved member of his community. Not only is he a member of the several Arkansas trade associations, but he actively participates in or has previously contributed his time to several groups such as the Conway Regional Medical Center Foundation, the Conway Chamber of Commerce, and the Arkansas Research Alliance. Among the many honors he has received are an award for Leadership in Free Enterprise and the Distinguished Citizen Award.

I congratulate each of these honorees for their valuable contributions to Arkansas and the industries they represent. Our State is certainly better off because of the work each has done to advance their own careers, as well as the companies they have led. This honor is a fitting way to acknowledge them and memorialize their legacies in the Natural State's business community.●

TRIBUTE TO JIM BYRUM

• Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Mr. Jim Byrum's term of service as president of the Michigan Agri-Business Association, as well as his contributions to Michigan's agriculture industry as a whole.

Jim was born and raised in Onondaga, MI, the fourth generation of his family to live on the family farm. He maintained his passion for agriculture by spending his career advocating for individuals in the industry and the industry itself, first as the executive director of the Michigan Bean Commission, then as the State executive director of the Michigan Farm Service Agency, and finally as the president of the Michigan Agri-Business Association.

Founded in 1903, the Michigan Agri-Business Association supports Michigan agriculture through State and national education, promotion, and advocacy. During his 24 years as president, Mr. Byrum has guided the association and its members through expansive changes in environmental awareness, agricultural genetics, and economic factors. With his past experience and in

his role as head of the Michigan Agri-Business Association, Mr. Byrum solidified his reputation as a well-respected leader in agricultural policy and, through the association, represented and championed the needs of the over 500 member organizations from every agricultural sector in Michigan. He expertly communicated with lawmakers and stakeholders to ensure that Michigan remained a leader in agriculture, the State's second largest industry.

It is my honor to congratulate my friend Jim Byrum for his decades of service to Michiganders, especially in his outgoing role as president of the Michigan Agri-Business Association. As the association reflects on the end of Mr. Byrum's term as President, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating him for his tireless dedication to Michigan's hard-working agricultural workers and all of us who depend on the goods and services they provide.●

RECOGNIZING THE YESCO CENTENNIAL

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I commend youth team sports in general, and the sponsors of my youth football team in particular. For those that may not know, I love football. I played it, coached it, and now watch my sons learn the same valuable lessons I did many years ago. Youth sports teach important life lessons and help build pride and a sense of community within schools, neighborhoods, and even cities. I learned those lifelong lessons growing up in Las Vegas, where I played for a youth football team called the Cavaliers. My dad even volunteered as the team's equipment manager.

As a former member of the Cavaliers youth football team, I am honored to recognize a special milestone of the sponsor of my team, the Young Electric Sign Company—YESCO. In 2020, YESCO celebrates its 100th year; a centennial event is scheduled February 20, 2020, in Salt Lake City, UT, the company's home base.

In many ways, the story of YESCO is the story of America: innovation, invention, a restlessness to move beyond the status quo, and commitment to others. The history of YESCO resonates with me, the son of an immigrant. YESCO was founded in 1920 by an immigrant from Liverpool named Tom Young, who borrowed \$300. By the end of that decade, he had 27 fulltime employees. By 1932, YESCO was building signs in Las Vegas, which is now a showcase of YESCO signage.

Today, YESCO is creating hundreds of signs for the new football stadium in Las Vegas, the Raiders' \$2 billion Allegiant Stadium. The largest video board will be 180 feet on the front of the stadium, facing Interstate 15 and Dean Martin Drive, not far from where my team the Cavaliers played youth football. As a Floridian, I note that YESCO contracted with Disney World in the

1980s to create sophisticated, high-tech signs at EPCOT Center.

The 2028 Summer Olympics will be hosted by Los Angeles. Men and women's soccer matches will be played at the new, state-of-the-art Banc of California Stadium, which will feature a high-tech LED digital sign built by a U.S. company called YESCO. Many of those athletes got their start because of volunteer coaches, dedicated parents, and corporate sponsors that understood the meaning of community.

As a parent and as a former football player, I salute the men and women who volunteer to coach youth sports and the corporate sponsors who help put kids on the field.

Congratulations, YESCO, on 100 years of growth and leadership. Thank you for your community involvement and for putting a football jersey on a skinny kid in Las Vegas who someday would be elected to the U.S. Senate.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawals which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1980. An act to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a comprehensive women's history museum, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1980. An act to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a comprehensive women's history museum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following joint resolution was discharged from the Committee on Foreign Relations by motion, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1546a, and placed on the calendar:

S.J. Res. 68. Joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 3275. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3961. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3962. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3963. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2019 report of the Federal Coordinated Health Care Office; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3964. A communication from the Director of the Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological Material from Jordan" (RIN1515-AE51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 5, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3965. A communication from the Director of the Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Emergency Import Restrictions Imposed on Certain Archaeological and Ethnological Material from Yemen" (RIN1515-AE50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 5, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3966. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, sixteen (16) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of State, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 10, 2020; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3967. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Traffic in Arms Regulations: U.S. Munitions List Categories I, II, and III" ((RIN1400-AE30) (22 CFR Parts 121, 123, 124, 126, and 129)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 6, 2020; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3968. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Parts A and B Supplemental Awards for Fiscal Year 2019 Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3969. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidelines for Determining the Probability of Causation under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000; Technical Amendments" (RIN0920-AA74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 5, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3970. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Documents and Regulations Management, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Administrative Simplification: Modification of the Requirements for the Use of Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) National Council for Prescription Drug Programs (NCPDP) D.0 Standard" (RIN0938-AT52) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 31, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3971. A communication from the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the office's Congressional Budget Justification, Annual Performance Plan for fiscal year 2021, and the annual Performance Report for fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3972. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 5, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3973. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-203, "Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Support Clarification Amendment Act of 2019"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3974. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-204, "Primary Election Filing Requirement Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3975. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-216, "Parkside Parcel E and J Mixed-Income Apartments Tax Abatement Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3976. A communication from the Associate Director, Office of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Annual Sunshine Act Report for 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3977. A communication from the Director of the Office of Financial Reporting and Policy, Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "FY 2019 Agency Financial Report"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3978. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of of

Competition, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Commission Reporting Requirements Under Section 8 of the Clayton Act" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 5, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3979. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to applications for delayed-notice search warrants and extensions during fiscal years 2018 and 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3980. A communication from the Chief of Regulatory Development, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Compliance Date for Entry-Level Driver Training" (RIN2126-AC25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 5, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3981. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revocation of Class E Airspace; Grundy, Virginia" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0785)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 7, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3982. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Winona, Minnesota" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0764)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 7, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3983. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0442)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 7, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3984. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0702)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 7, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3985. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0860)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 7, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3986. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0725)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 7, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3987. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0610)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 7, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3988. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0721)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 7, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3989. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-1078)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 7, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3990. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0858)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 7, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3991. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 5, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-180. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urging the United States Congress and the President of the United States to enact S. 1575 or similar legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 627

Whereas, Of the more than 15 million soldiers who served in the armed forces in World War II, only 3,000 were Rangers; and

Whereas, The 1st Ranger Battalion was formed at the onset of the United States' involvement in the conflict as an elite unit modeled after the British Commandos; and

Whereas, The Rangers were highly and rigorously trained to attack in the dead of night from the least likely route and climb cliffs and speed march, enabling them to infiltrate deep behind enemy lines on foot; and Whereas, There were six Ranger Battalions deployed during World War II, all of which were strictly volunteer; and Whereas, Each battalion was comprised of approximately 500 men; and

Whereas, At least 48 World War II Rangers came from this Commonwealth, 33 of which remained overseas in American battlefield cemeteries; and

Whereas, Three World War II Rangers in D Company, 2nd Ranger Battalion were from Altoona; and

Whereas, Two of the three climbed the cliffs at Pointe du Hoc and one destroyed five of six long-range artillery pieces at Pointe du Hoc; and

Whereas, There are only 41 known World War II Rangers alive nationwide; and

Whereas, It is imperative that these heroes are given the honor they deserve; therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives urge the President and the Congress of the United States to enact S. 1757 or similar legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each house of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

POM-181. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan urging the United States Congress and the President of the United States to increase funding for the Great Lakes restoration initiative to \$475 million per year; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 157

Whereas, The Great Lakes are a critical resource for our nation and central to the economy, heritage, and quality of life of Michigan and the other seven states within the Great Lakes region. The Great Lakes hold over 84 percent of the United States' surface freshwater and drive a thriving regional economy, directly supporting 1.5 million U.S. jobs and generating \$62 billion in wages. More than 30 million U.S. residents depend on the Great Lakes for drinking water; and

Whereas, The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) has provided crucial funding to support long overdue work to protect and restore the Great Lakes. In partnership with the states, local governments, and other organizations, the federal government has invested more than \$3 billion and supported over 4,700 projects over the last decade, including around \$600 million for more than 1,100 projects in Michigan; and

Whereas, The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative represents a sound investment in both the environment and the economies of the Great Lakes region. A 2018 study calculated that for every federal dollar invested in Great Lakes restoration there is \$3.35 in additional economic activity, with older industrial cities like Detroit seeing an even higher return on investment; and

Whereas, Real progress has been made in cleaning up and restoring the Great Lakes thanks to the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. One-third of the region's toxic hot spots have been cleaned up, sparking redevelopment and business opportunities on waterfronts. Area farms and conservation orga-

nizations have increased conservation practices, which have reduced harmful nutrient runoff, and habitat and wildlife connectivity continue to improve, with nearly 5,000 miles of rivers cleared of dams and other barriers; and

Whereas, Far more work needs to be done to ensure every person has a clean community in which to live, safe beaches to enjoy, and healthy fish to eat. Substantial limitations and threats to the use of the Great Lakes remain whether toxic algal blooms shutting down Toledo's drinking water supply, invasive carp threatening billion-dollar fisheries, or contaminated sediments restricting recreational opportunities; and

Whereas, The time to act is now. The ecological, economic, and health risks are too high. The problems will only get worse and the solutions more expensive and challenging in the future; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we memorialize the President and Congress of the United States to increase funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative to \$475 million per year to boost the region's work of cleaning up toxic contamination, reducing runoff pollution, stopping invasive species, and protecting and restoring wetlands and other habitats; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 3277. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to strengthen the infrastructure of, access to, and reporting of Medicaid home and community-based services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 3278. A bill to modify the requirements for the Administrator of the Small Business Administration relating to declaring a disaster in a rural area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 3279. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide additional entitlement to Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to certain veterans and members of the Armed Forces who require extra time to complete remedial and deficiency courses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 3280. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that high-taxed amounts are excluded from tested income for purposes of determining global intangible low-taxed income only if such amounts would be foreign base company income or insurance income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3281. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to require recycling of beverage containers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 3282. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the oversight of contracts awarded by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 3283. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to allow States to use incentive payments available under the child support enforcement program to improve parent-child relationships, increase child support collections, and improve outcomes for children by supporting parenting time arrangements for noncustodial parents in uncontested agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3284. A bill to create a moratorium on the government use of facial recognition technology until a Commission recommends the appropriate guidelines and limitation for use of facial recognition technology; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. BURR, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 3285. A bill to modify eligibility requirements for certain hazard mitigation assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 3286. A bill to restrict certain Federal grants for States that grant driver licenses to illegal immigrants and fail to share information about criminal aliens with the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 3287. A bill to modify the government-wide financial management plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 3288. A bill to provide for the protection of and investment in certain Federal land in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 296

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 648

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 648, 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.

S. 685

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 685, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General.

S. 800

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 800, a bill to establish a postsecondary student data system.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1081, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1093

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1093, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the troops from the United States and the Philippines who defended Bataan and Corregidor, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service during World War II.

S. 1123

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1123, a bill to transfer and limit Executive Branch authority to suspend or restrict the entry of a class of aliens.

S. 1352

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1352, a bill to establish a Federal Advisory Council to Support Victims of Gun Violence.

S. 1381

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1381, a bill to modify the presumption of service connection for veterans who were exposed to herbicide agents while serving in the Armed Forces in Thailand during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

S. 1508

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1508, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide enhanced penalties for convicted murderers who kill or target America's public safety officers.

S. 1725

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1725, a bill to permit occupational therapists to conduct the initial assessment visit and complete the comprehensive assessment under a Medicare home health plan of care for certain rehabilitation cases.

S. 1757

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1757, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1918

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1918, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for summer food service program delivery.

S. 2054

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2054, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2177

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2177, a bill to provide taxpayers with an improved understanding of Government programs through the disclosure of cost, performance, and areas of duplication among them, leverage existing data to achieve a functional Federal program inventory, and for other purposes.

S. 2300

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2300, a bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to establish a program to incentivize innovation and to enhance the industrial competitiveness of the United States by developing technologies to reduce emissions of nonpower industrial sectors, and for other purposes.

S. 2332

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2332, a bill to provide for the modernization of the electric grid, and for other purposes.

S. 2483

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2483, a bill to counter efforts by foreign governments to pursue, harass, or otherwise persecute individuals for political and other unlawful

motives overseas, and for other purposes.

S. 2662

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2662, a bill to amend sections 111, 169, and 171 of the Clean Air Act to clarify when a physical change in, or change in the method of operation of, a stationary source constitutes a modification or construction, and for other purposes.

S. 2669

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2669, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by Federal campaigns to detect and report such acts, and for other purposes.

S. 2816

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2816, a bill to ensure that fixed broadband internet access service assisted by any Federal broadband support program meets a minimum speed threshold.

S. 2970

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2970, a bill to improve the fielding of newest generations of personal protective equipment to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 3020

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3020, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with States or to award grants to States to promote health and wellness, prevent suicide, and improve outreach to veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 3217

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3217, a bill to standardize the designation of National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes.

S. 3226

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3226, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain abortion procedures, and for other purposes.

S. 3263

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3263, a bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to reduce the production and use of certain single-use plastic products and packaging, to improve the responsibility of producers in

the design, collection, reuse, recycling, and disposal of their consumer products and packaging, to prevent pollution from consumer products and packaging from entering into animal and human food chains and waterways, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 68

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 68, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. CON. RES. 34

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 34, a concurrent resolution affirming the importance of religious freedom as a fundamental human right that is essential to a free society and protected for all people of the United States under the Constitution of the United States, and recognizing the 234th anniversary of the enactment of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom.

S. RES. 458

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 458, a resolution calling for the global repeal of blasphemy, heresy, and apostasy laws.

S. RES. 469

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 469, a resolution supporting the people of Iran as they engage in legitimate protests, and condemning the Iranian regime for its murderous response.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 3287. A bill to modify the governmentwide financial management plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Chief Financial Officer Vision Act of 2020, shortened to be the CFO Vision Act of 2020. I am pleased to have Senators WARNER, GRASSLEY, JOHNSON, LANKFORD, and PERDUE join me as cosponsors of this bill to strengthen Federal financial management and improve financial and performance data.

Improved financial management—this is numbers; I know this puts people to sleep—improved financial management and better data can help us make more informed budget decisions and ensure that taxpayer money is wisely and appropriately spent. Effective

financial management helps to safeguard taxpayer money and ensure that it is used lawfully, efficiently, and effectively for the purposes intended.

Thirty years ago, Congress passed the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, known as the CFO Act. This law laid a new foundation for Federal financial management. It established a financial management leadership structure, provided for long-range planning, required audited financial statements, and strengthened accountability reporting, among other reforms. The CFO Act also called for improvements in the integration of agency accounting and financial management systems, in performance measurement and cost information, and in our financial management workforce.

Since enactment of that act, we have seen substantial improvements in Federal financial management. Today, agencies have CFOs in place to provide leadership and accountability over financial operations, and most agencies receive clean audit opinions on their annual financial statements. However, serious and persistent problems remain.

Many agencies have struggled to modernize legacy accounting systems and are unable to integrate their financial and performance data. Oftentimes, the Federal Government is unable to show the relationship between dollars spent and results achieved. After more than 20 years of trying, the Government Accountability Office still cannot give an opinion on the Federal Government's consolidated financial statements. They cite serious financial management problems at the Department of Defense, among other issues.

The legislation we are introducing would update that 1990 law in a handful of key ways to ensure sustained progress in improving Federal financial management. It is based in large part on a GAO—Government Accountability Office—review of the 1990 law and testimony last October from the Comptroller General of the United States, Gene Dodaro, before the Senate Budget Committee.

First, the CFO Vision Act would standardize CFO and Deputy Chief Financial Officer responsibilities, which do vary across Federal agencies. To allow for better strategic decision making, the Chief Financial Officer Vision Act would specify that the Chief Financial Officer responsibilities should include budget formulation and execution, planning and performance, risk management and internal controls, financial systems, and accounting.

The bill would also ensure that the Deputy Chief Financial Officers could provide continuity in the event of a Chief Financial Officer vacancy. Major financial management improvement initiatives can take years to implement, potentially outlasting the CFO's tenure. By establishing appropriate statutory responsibilities for the Deputy Chief Financial Officers, the bill

would help minimize the effects of the CFO turnover.

Secondly, the bill would update the governmentwide and agency-level planning requirements to ensure they are reasonable and allow for proper planning and monitoring. The updated plans would include projected milestones and estimated implementation costs. Annual status updates would allow Congress to track progress toward these milestones and how closely actual costs match those that were projected.

Third, the CFO Vision Act would require the Office of Management and Budget to develop performance-based metrics to determine the status and progress of agencies and how they are making progress toward achieving cost-effective and efficient government operations.

Currently, only limited financial management performance-based metrics exist, such as the financial statement audit opinion and reporting of identified material weaknesses. All accountants understand these terms.

Currently, only limited financial management performance-based metrics exist, such as the financial statement audit opinion and the reporting of identified material weaknesses. I could say that a third time, and still people wouldn't understand it.

This new requirement would provide a more complete and consistent measurement of the quality of the agencies' financial management. These performance metrics would be required to be included in the governmentwide and agency-level financial management plans and status reports. That means we will have more information to work with.

Finally, our bill would require agency management to annually assess and report on the effectiveness of internal control—whether they are really keeping track of everything and ensuring that it is correct—the effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting and other key financial management information. Auditors would also be required to independently assess internal controls. Such assessments will improve confidence in the reliability of financial reporting.

The CFO Vision Act builds on the CFO Act's foundation. By updating it, we can achieve more effective financial management, which I believe will ultimately lead to increased accountability and results and understanding by the Senators.

I am pleased that our bill has been endorsed by the National Taxpayers Union, the Project on Government Oversight, the DATA Coalition, the R Street Institute, Citizens Against Government Waste, Truth in Accounting, and Taxpayers for Common Sense. I think that means that there are accountants on the boards of all of those. This shouldn't be a controversial piece of legislation. It just should be an essential update so we know what is happening with the trillions of dollars that

we are allocating, spending, and checking up on. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1314. Mr. CRAMER (for Mr. RISCH) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

SA 1315. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 1316. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 1317. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 1318. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 1319. Mr. CRAMER (for Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. PERDUE)) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, supra.

SA 1320. Mr. CRAMER (for Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. RISCH)) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, supra.

SA 1321. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1322. Mr. CRAMER (for Mr. REED) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, supra.

SA 1323. Mr. CRAMER (for Mr. GRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1365, to make technical corrections to the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1314. Mr. CRAMER (for Mr. RISCH) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; as follows:

On page 1, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

(2) The President has a constitutional responsibility to take actions to defend the United States, its territories, possessions, citizens, service members, and diplomats from attack.

SA 1315. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

In section 1, strike paragraph (6) and insert the following:

(6) The United States Armed Forces are not currently engaged in hostilities, as con-

templated by the War Powers Resolution, against Iran. The United States strike against terrorist leader Qasem Soleimani to protect the lives of United States service members and diplomats is lesser in scope, nature, and duration than, and consistent with, previous administrations' exercises of war powers.

SA 1316. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

On page 4, line 19, insert "or to prevent the President from employing all the instruments of national power, including military force, to prevent the Islamic Republic of Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon" after "attack".

SA 1317. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

On page 4, line 19, insert "including the threat of an attack posed by the acquisition of a nuclear weapon by the Islamic Republic of Iran" after "attack".

SA 1318. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

On page 4, line 19, insert "and its allies, including Israel," after "defending itself".

SA 1319. Mr. CRAMER (for Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. PERDUE)) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; as follows:

In section 2, amend subsection (b) to read as follows:

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to prevent the United States from defending itself, including its territories, citizens, troops, personnel, military bases, and diplomatic facilities from attack, including acting to prevent an attack; or

(2) to restrict missions related to force protection of United States aircraft, ships, or personnel.

SA 1320. Mr. CRAMER (for Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. RISCH)) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; as follows:

In section 1, strike paragraph (6) and insert the following:

(6) The United States Armed Forces are not currently engaged in hostilities, as contemplated by the War Powers Resolution, against Iran. The United States strike against terrorist leader Qasem Soleimani to protect the lives of United States service members and diplomats is lesser in scope, nature, and duration than, and consistent with, previous administrations' exercises of war powers.

(7) The United States' maximum pressure strategy against Iran has reduced the Government of Iran's resources available to attack the United States and United States interests by limiting the resources available to the Government of Iran to support weapons development and terrorist proxies throughout the region.

SA 1321. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, strike line 3 and insert the following:

SECTION 1. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to fulfill the intent of the framers of the Constitution of the United States and ensure that before the President commits United States Armed Forces to hostilities, Congress either declares war or authorizes the use of military force, except where necessary to protect the United States from an imminent attack.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

SA 1322. Mr. CRAMER (for Mr. REED) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; as follows:

On page 2, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

(5) More than 100 members of the United States Armed Forces sustained traumatic brain injuries in the Iranian retaliatory attack on the Ain al-Assad air base in Iraq despite initial reports that no casualties were sustained in the attack.

SA 1323. Mr. CRAMER (for Mr. GRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1365, to make technical corrections to the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT.

Title XVII of division A of Public Law 114-328 is amended—

(1) in section 1703(e)—

(A) by striking "equal to" and inserting "not to exceed"; and

(B) by striking "covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts" and inserting "used to reimburse the applicable appropriations";

(2) in section 1704(a) by striking "subject to the availability of appropriations," and inserting "from the Claims Fund"; and

(3) by striking section 1707(a).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the majority and minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 12, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 12, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 12, 2020, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 12, 2020, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 12, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 12, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: John Leonard Badalamenti, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, Anna M. Manasco, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, Drew B. Tipton, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, and Kathryn C. Davis, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 12, 2020, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Gary Jones and Kristin Butler, two legislative fellows on my staff, be granted privileges of the floor for the duration of the 116th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following interns in my office be granted floor privileges until May 1, 2020: Paige Grande, Michael Sugden, William Scott, and Noah Velafric.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dan Flavin, a Government Accountability Office detailee on the Budget Committee, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

B-47 RIDGE DESIGNATION ACT

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 343, S. 490.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 490) to designate a mountain ridge in the State of Montana as "B-47 Ridge".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 490

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "B-47 Ridge Designation Act".

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF B-47 RIDGE, MONTANA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The unnamed mountain ridge located at 45°14'40.89"N, 110°43'38.75"W that runs south and west of Emigrant Peak in the Absaroka Range in the State of Montana, which is the approximate site of a crash of a B-47, shall be known and designated as "B-47 Ridge".

(2) *REFERENCES.*—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the ridge described in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to "B-47 Ridge".

(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR PLAQUE.—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the installation and maintenance of a plaque on B-47 Ridge that—

(A) memorializes the 1962 crash of the B-47 aircraft at the site; and

(B) may include the names of the victims of the crash.

(2) *AUTHORIZED TERMS AND CONDITIONS.*—The Secretary of Agriculture may include any terms and conditions in the authorization for a plaque under paragraph (1) that the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be necessary.

(3) *FUNDING.*—No Federal funds may be used to design, procure, install, or maintain the plaque authorized under paragraph (1).

Mr. CRAMER. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 490), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1365 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1365) to make technical corrections to the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CRAMER. I ask unanimous consent that the Graham amendment at the desk be agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1323), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT.

Title XVII of division A of Public Law 114-328 is amended—

(1) in section 1703(e)—

(A) by striking "equal to" and inserting "not to exceed"; and

(B) by striking "covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts" and inserting "used to reimburse the applicable appropriations";

(2) in section 1704(a) by striking "subject to the availability of appropriations," and inserting "from the Claims Fund"; and

(3) by striking section 1707(a).

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. CRAMER. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 1365), as amended, was passed.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2020

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate complete its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, February 13; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S.J. Res. 68 under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAMER. For the information of all Senators, we will vote in relation to six amendments starting at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:17 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, February 13, 2020, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

JAMES P. DANLY, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2023, VICE KEVIN J. MCINTYRE.

FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND

WILLIAM G. DAUSTER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND AND THE FEDERAL DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ROBERT D. REISCHAUER, TERM EXPIRED.

FEDERAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND

WILLIAM G. DAUSTER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FEDERAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ROBERT D. REISCHAUER, TERM EXPIRED.

FEDERAL SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND

WILLIAM G. DAUSTER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FEDERAL SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ROBERT D. REISCHAUER, TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

LORENZO CANDELARIA, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2024, VICE SHELLY COLLEEN LOWE, TERM EXPIRED.

HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

TONY HAMMOND, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 10, 2025, VICE JAVAI ANWAR, TERM EXPIRED.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

CATHERINE BIRD, OF TEXAS, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE JULIA AKINS CLARK, TERM EXPIRED.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

CRAIG EDWARD LEEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, VICE PATRICK E. MCFARLAND, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

KENNETH CHARLES CANTERBURY, JR., OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES, VICE BYRON TODD JONES, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

DAVID W. DUGAN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE DAVID R. HERNDON, RETIRED.

IAN D. JOHNSTON, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE FREDERICK J. KAPALA, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

TYREECE L. MILLER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JEFFREY THOMAS HOLT, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

FRANKLIN ULYSES VALDERRAMA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE RUBEN CASTILLO, RETIRED.

CHRISTY CRISWELL WIEGAND, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE PETER J. PHIPPS, ELEVATED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RICHARD E. ZUCKERMAN, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE KATHRYN KENEALLY, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

WESLEY M. BAKER
CARTER L. BROWN
ZACHARY J. DONES
JOHN G. MOORE
JEDIDIAH J. RODGERS
JOSEPH M. TEMPLE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DAVID D. HAWKINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBERT M. WAGNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

PETER J. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ANDREW S. EVANS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOHN M. CRAIGHEAD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JOSE GARCIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

OSAZE E. OKORO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

SETH P. OLCESE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JAMAL D. SNELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

RYAN T. ARMSTRONG
MARK A. KAPERAK
KURT N. SISK
KEVIN M. TRUJILLO
RANDALL D. WENNER
SCOTT C. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MICHAEL L. MARSH
MICHAEL B. PRATT
BRIAN W. STEVENS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be colonel

SYED I. AHMED
KEVIN S. AKERS
ZACHARY M. ARTHURS
JASON W. BENNETT
TAMARA L. BIEGA
MATTHEW A. BORGMAN
JOANNA G. BRANSTETTER
MARK D. BUZZELLI
JOSEPH G. CHEATHAM
ERIC CHIN

SUNGHUN CHO
PAUL CLARK
DANIEL V. CORDARO
JOHN M. CSOKMAY
DANIEL CUADRADO
SCOTT P. CUDAS
DAVID C. DEBLASIO
MATTHEW J. ECKERT
BYRON J. FALER
EDWIN A. FARNELL IV
ERIC C. GARGES
DAVID L. GREENBURG
CHRISTINA D. HAHN
JASMINE J. HAN
MELVIN D. HELGESON
PETER M. HENNING
MARC W. HERR
ADAM L. HUILLET
NICHOLAS JASZCZAK
CHESTER C. JEAN
PETER KREISHMAN
ADRIAN T. G. KRESS
ANJALI N. KUNZ
ANTON P. LACAP
JEFFREY N. LACKEY
JEFFREY T. LACZEK
JEFFREY B. LANIER
ABIGAIL J. LEE
JOSEPH M. LURIA
ASHLEY MARANICH
NEIL MCMULLIN
ETHAN A. MILES
CAELA MILLER
JASON M. NAKAMURA
ANICETO J. NAVARRO
JUSTIN D. ORR
DAVID J. OSBORN
JAMES O. OYEKAN
MATTHEW PFLIPSEN
MATTHEW A. POSNER
SAMUEL L. PRESTON III
JENNIFER PUGLIESE
ERIC W. RAWIE
MEAGAN M. RIZZO
KATHLEEN M. SAMSEY
KEITH A. SCORZA
ROBERT SHIH
EVA SMETANA
VANCE Y. SOHN
DAVID R. STAGLIANO
JUSTIN J. STEWART
GERALD W. SURRETT
JACOB L. TURNQUIST
CHRISTINE M. VACCARO
ROXANNE E. WALLACE
ERIC D. WEBER
ROSS A. WITTERS
SCOTT E. YOUNG
D014798

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be colonel

BRADLEY AEBI
JAMES P. ARNOLD
TRAVIS J. AUSTIN
CHAD BANCARTER
CHUN Y. CHAN
HUI F. CHIU
KETRA T. GEORGE
JOHN K. GOERTEMILLER
KELLY J. JOHNSON
DANIEL D. KERSTEN
SOOMO LEE
PHILLIP W. NEAL
DAVID D. NELSON
LISA M. NOREY
KEVIN B. PARKER
JERROD L. SANDERS
JILL E. SANDERS
DAVID TUCKER

To be colonel

AZURE L. UTLEY
KEVYN WETZEL

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MA-
RINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

BENJAMIN M. ABLES
DAVID J. ABMA, JR.
JOSEPH C. ACCOUNTIUS
TYSON W. ADAMS
JESSE D. ADKISON
GABRIEL AGUIRRECARDENAS
JOSEPH P. ALBANO, JR.
HECTOR R. ALEJANDRO
SHAWN M. ALEXANDER
SALAHUDIN E. ALI
LUKE D. ALMENDINGER
JESHUA O. ALSTON
ANTONIO R. ALVARADO
JOSE E. ALVARADO
MARIANO ALVARADO
JORDAN D. AMES
ALEXANDRA B. ANDERSON
BRIAN M. ANDERSON
ERIC S. ANDERSON
JONATHAN R. ANDERSON
WESLEY D. ANLKER
MEREDITH B. ANTHONY
DARICK A. APTIZ
EMANUEL ARAICA
DYLAN A. ARMKNECHT
DANIEL J. ASHMORE
EZRAEL C. ATAJAR
JUSTIN D. ATKINS
JOHN E. AUER
LANE C. AVERY
ALEX L. AVILA, JR.
JOSE A. AVITIA
MATTHEW S. BABCOCK
ANDREW W. BATTY
PHILIP M. BALMES II
CAMERON J. BARKER
TYLER K. BARRETT
ALEX W. BARRON
BRIAN P. BARRY
ANDREW C. BARTON
CODY M. BARTON
OWEN E. BASHAW
BRIAN D. BASSI
FELIPE A. BAYONA
KEITH A. BEERS
JUDAH M. BEGAB
RYAN D. BEIL
JESSE A. BENNETT
RICHARD B. BENNING
BRYAN C. BERGMAN
TREVOR A. BERGMAN
CHRISTOPHER R. BERTUCCI
DAVID M. BICK
RALPH W. BIDDLE
MATTHEW D. BIESECKER
ROBERT D. BILLARD, JR.
MICHAEL P. BILLINGS
PETER M. BIRKELAND, JR.
KEVIN J. BISHOP
JUSTIN R. BISSELL
LARRY S. BLACK, JR.
NATHAN J. BLACKWELL
ALEXANDER B. BLANK
STEPHEN A. BLOODSWORTH
ALLAN R. BOEHM
STEPHAN A. BOHANAN
BRADLEY M. BOLTON
ANDREW B. BONELL
JONATHAN B. BONG
KATHERINE E. BOOKHOUT
KYLE A. BOOKHOUT
JOSHUA C. BOOKWALTER
GREGG R. BORMAN
JONATHAN E. BOUSKA
ANTONIO B. BOYD
KATE M. BRANNON
LOGAN A. BREWER
ANTHONY R. BRICH
BENJAMIN J. BRIDA
BENJAMIN P. BROADMEADOW
JASON M. BROCK
JOSEPH O. BROMEN
STEPHEN K. BROWER, JR.
AARON E. BROWN
AUSTIN A. BROWN
CALEB O. BROWN
RICHARD A. BROWN
STEPHEN A. BROWN
MICHAEL E. BRUCE
JOSEPH C. BURGER II
MARTIN X. BURKE
NICHOLAS J. BURLEY
TIMOTHY A. BURNAM
JACOB T. BURTON
PHILLIP G. BUSCHANG
BRUCE H. BYRD
AARON A. CADORETTE
OWEN E. CAHILL
CENTRY T. CALHOUN
RONALD CALLOWAY II
NATHAN A. CAMPBELL
TYREL L. CAMPBELL
MATTHEW J. CAREY
TODD A. CARLSON
GEORGE W. CARPENTER II
RHETT E. CARPENTER
DARRIN K. CARRIER

MARCO I. CARRILLO
GREGORY H. CARROLL
SEAN P. CARROLL
CLAUDIO G. CASANOVA
ERIC D. CASH
JACOB S. CASTILLO
JOSE A. CASTILLO
NICHOLAS C. CASTLE
VINCENTPHI J. CATRINI
JAMESON L. CAUBLE
PATRICK M. CAVALLARO
BOULAT CHAINOUROV
JONATHAN A. CHAMPAGNE
DAVID W. CHARLES
ADAM L. CHASE
JONATHAN S. CHAVEZ
BRENDAN J. CHESLEY
DAVID J. CHESTER
IVAN CHEUNG
DOMINIC J. CHIAVEROTTI
MATTHEW A. CHOMIAK
STEVEN E. CHRISTOPHER
GEORGE J. CHRONIS
JOEL M. CHUPREVICH
BRIAN A. CHWALISZ
CHARLES M. CLARK
MICHAEL R. CLARK
ROBERT M. CLARY
ROBERT C. CLIFFORD
ALEXANDER W. CLONINGER
DAVID A. COLE II
ANDREW H. COLLIVER
FRANKLYN A. COLORADO
NICHOLAS I. COMPTON
TIMOTHY J. CONDUSS
DANIEL R. CONNOLLY
KENNETH A. CONOVER III
MICHAEL J. COOK
MICHAEL A. COOLEY
SHANE K. COOLEY
PETER J. CORCORAN
NICHOLAS J. CORMIER
MATTHEW W. CORNACHIO
ROBERT J. COSTELLO, JR.
TANNER W. COURTNEY
BRANDON W. COX
STEVEN A. COX
JONATHAN D. CRASE
ADAM E. CRAWFORD
ADAM M. CRISE
JORDAN E. CROCKETT
ANDREW C. CRUZ
JOHN P. CRUZ
MICHAEL A. CUBILLOS
JEREMIAH J. CULP
RACHEL E. CUMMINGS
SEAN A. CUNNINGHAM
WILLIAM C. CUNNINGHAM
WILLIAM H. CUNNINGHAM II
PRESTON P. CURRY
SEAN T. DALEY
JARED S. DALTON
RYAN J. DALY
THOMAS J. DAMREN
CHRISTOPHER M. DANIEL
MATTHEW E. DANIELSON
TYLER W. DAVENPORT
SAMUEL P. DAVID
TREVOR S. DAVIDSON
ADAM T. DEITRICH
BRANDON T. DELL
CHARLYNE DELUS
GRAHAM T. DENNISTON
TODD A. DENTON
CHRISTOPHER A. DENZEL
BENJAMIN M. DIAMON
JUAN DIAZ
ANDREW S. DIBBLE
MATTHEW D. DIESKA
MALLORY A. DIETRICH
BRETT H. Disher
SARA R. DIXON
BRANDON M. DORSETT
MATTHEW G. DORTON
CHRISTINE E. DOUELLE
CHRISTOPHER M. DOYLE
STUART A. DRASH
THOMAS R. DUDMAN
PERRY A. DUNCAN
KYLE S. DURANT
ANDREW C. DUWELL
ROBERT E. DZVONICK
SCOTT A. EASLEY
RODNEY L. EBERSOLE
DANIEL C. ECKERT
JORDAN A. EDDINGTON
COLIN J. EDWARDS
ELLE M. EKMAN
JOSHUA P. ELLIOTT
KENNETH M. ENDICOTT
DANIEL E. ENGLISH
JOSHUA K. ENTREKIN
CHAD M. ERNST
BRANDON L. ERWIN
DANIEL A. ERWIN
KEVIN S. ESTES
AARON J. FALK
EVAN A. FARLEY
JUSTIN E. FARWELL
DANIEL J. FAWCETT
BRITTANY R. FAYOS
CHARLES M. FELPS
JOHNATHAN R. FERGERSON
JACOB A. FERNANDEZ
JOSHUA N. FERNANDEZ
MARK A. FERRIS
EVAN K. FIELD

MARY C. FINNEN
JOSEPH W. FISCHER
JEREMY A. FISHER
BRIAN C. FLAHERTY
JONATHAN F. FLAUCHER
KEVIN S. FLEISCHER
CHRISTOPHER K. FLETCHER
LEWIS C. FLINN
STEVEN A. FLOOD
JASON M. FLORENCE
ANDRE C. FONTANESS
JOSEPH R. FORBES
TYLER W. FORD
ZACHARY P. FOX
ADAM J. FRANKLIN
LUKE M. FRANKLIN
MANUEL R. FRANQUEZ II
MICHAEL S. FRAZER
THOMAS R. FRICTON
RYAN J. FULLMER
ZACHARY A. FULMER
DAVID A. FUNNI
JASON H. FURMAN
PATRICK J. GALLAGHER
TRAVIS J. GALLOWAY
JAMES J. GALVIN III
ANTHONY J. GANTT, JR.
AARON A. GARBADÉ
ANDY A. GARCIA
BERNARDO J. GARCIA
MICHAEL L. GARCIA
MIGUEL S. GARCIA
TYLER W. GARRETT
BRANDON J. GARTON
ALEXANDRA S. GASS
RORY C. GATES
ANDREW J. GERDES
EARL D. GERLACH
ZACHARY D. GERMERSHAUSEN
MELISSA I. GIANNETTO
BRYAN A. GIBBS
JEFFREY D. GIBSON
KELSEY W. GIBSON
LOGAN A. GIGER
NATHAN D. GILREATH
GRAY P. GISH
JEREMY W. GLASS
STEFAN A. GLIWA
JAMES D. GLOVER
ERIK S. GODINEZ
GEORGE W. GOLDEN II
JEREMY G. GOLDSTEIN
DANIEL GONZALEZ
TY E. GOODBAR
THOMAS J. GOODMAN
MATTHEW J. GORDON
SCOTT R. GORNAILL
OUSMANE M. GOUMANDAKOYE
KINGSLEE G. GOURRICK
BRETT E. GRADY
DANIEL P. GRANT
ANGELA R. GRDINA
CHRISTOPHER M. GREEN
JUSTIN T. GREEN
BRIAN R. GREUNKE
JASON R. GRIFFIN
CLAYTON A. GROOVER
SHANNON L. GROSS
ALEXANDER I. GRUBBS
GERARDO GUETA
ROBERT J. GUILFOYLE
ADAM L. GUSME
KATHERINE H. GUTHRIE
PIERCE C. GUTHRIE
CYRUS B. HALL II
TREVOR W. HALL
SHANE F. HALPERN
LEIF C. HALVERSON
BRIAN C. HAMPTON
JANELL G. HANCOCK
MATTHEW S. HANKS
MICHAEL T. HANLON
KRISTIN E. HANNA
JAMES A. HANSEN
JON D. HARDCASTLE
WILLIAM L. HARDING
CLAYTON D. HARRIS
DAVID J. HARRIS
JONATHAN M. HARRIS
ROBERT M. HARRISON
RYAN J. HART
CAMERON C. HARTNER
PATRICK S. HASSETT
THOMAS W. HATHAWAY
TALYA C. HAVICE
JOSEPH W. HAWKINSON
RICHARD A. HAYEK
KYLE J. HAYHURST
HERMAN R. HAYNES
MICHAEL A. HAYNES
STEPHANIE G. HEBDA
TYLER T. HELMICK
JOHN F. HELMS
LUCAS A. HELMS
JESS M. HESSOCK
DAVID J. HEUWETTER III
ANDREW M. HICKS
ANDREW N. HILLER
JAMES J. HOERTT
PETER H. HOPFINGA
NORMAN B. HOLCOMBE
RYAN F. HOLAND
TRAVIS A. HOLAND
MICHAEL K. HOLLOMAN
BLAIR J. HOLVA
RYAN H. HOMIRE
NICHOLAS G. HONAN

ERIK S. HOPKINS
 ANDREW R. HORGAN
 LUCIANA E. HORGAN
 CAROLYN M. HORIYE
 TRAVIS E. HORNER
 JASON R. HOTALEN
 MICHAEL C. HOWLEY
 DI HU
 BRIAN K. HUA
 CAMERON A. HUBBARD
 NICHOLAS W. HUDDLESON
 CHANCE A. HUGHES
 JESSE D. HUME
 DANIEL C. HUPP
 KYLE E. HUSTON
 PAUL M. HUTCHINSON
 ROYCE B. HYLAND
 STEPHANIE V. IACOBUCCI
 OKECHUKWU U. IHENACHO
 JEFFREY D. ILLIES, JR.
 HECTOR J. INFANTE
 ANDREW G. IRVIN
 AKHIL R. IYER
 GREGORY R. JAUNAL
 MARC D. JESSUP
 VINCENT E. JOCHEN
 ANDREW J. JOHNSON
 GRAHAM K. JOHNSON
 JACOB A. JOHNSON
 MATTHEW A. JOHNSON
 THOMAS C. JOHNSON
 ANDREW B. JONES
 DAVID O. JONES
 MORGAN T. JORDAN
 ELLIOTT A. JOSES
 ZEBULUN Z. JOSEY
 BRENT E. JURMU
 GREGORY J. JURSCHAK
 JOSEPH H. KACZMAREK
 KAIPONOHA H. KAHEAKUENHADAI
 ALTAN D. KANDIVELI
 STEVEN D. KASDAN
 KYLE E. KAUFFMAN
 ALBERT D. KAYKOV
 EVAN F. KEEL
 DENNIS C. KELLER, JR.
 MICHAEL S. KELLY
 MICHAEL D. KENNEDY
 JOSHUA T. KETTENTON
 NICHOLAS S. KING
 KEOCAN R. KINKADE
 KYLE E. KIRCH
 PATRICK M. KIRK
 RYAN M. KLENKE
 WILLIAM J. KNIES
 JONATHAN E. KNIGHT
 ERIC A. KOEPE
 PHILLIP G. KOHLER
 JON M. KOSHUTA
 MARK P. KRATZER
 WADE T. KREAMER
 JASON E. KREMER
 CHRISTOPHER C. KRUSEMARK
 JOSHUA R. KUIPER
 YUK W. KWAN
 ZACHARY P. LAMAR
 WILLIAM M. LAMBUTH, JR.
 GEOFFREY R. LANCASTER
 GERALD F. LANDHOLT III
 DANIEL A. LANE
 ALEX M. LANG
 DANIEL P. LANGFORD
 JOSHUA E. LANGHAM
 ERICK C. LAQUE
 RICHARD B. LARGER, JR.
 ANDREW M. LARK
 CHASE T. LAURITA
 BENJAMIN H. LEAPE
 QUENTIN M. LEDAY
 DANIEL LEE
 JOHN C. LEE
 JONG M. LEE
 JUSTIN E. LENIO
 JOSHUA A. LETTEER
 MELINDA A. LEWALLEN
 TYLER C. LEWIS
 BRIAN T. LEWTON
 JOHN H. LINDBERG, JR.
 LAURA R. LINDENTHAL
 PAUL R. LINDHOLM
 SCOTT C. LINDSAY
 SETH J. LONG
 WILLIAM D. LONG
 MATTHEW H. LOOKFONG
 ADRIAN L. LOPEZ
 CESAR A. LOPEZ
 CRISTINA LOPEZ
 JOSEPH R. LOUSCHE
 MICHAEL R. LOVEJOY
 MATTHEW D. LOWEN
 FREDERICK A. LUMPKIN
 SAMUEL R. LUTZ
 NICHOLAS G. MACALUSO
 MICHAEL J. MADRID
 PATRICK A. MADRID
 JEFFREY P. MAGNUSSEN
 PHILIP M. MAHNE
 JASON K. MAHUNA
 JEFFERY A. MALLINGER
 RICKY M. MANSYUR
 ZACHARY S. MARAVILLAS
 JONATHAN R. MARSH
 RICHARD C. MARSHALL
 DANIEL P. MARTIN
 JOSHUA L. MARTIN
 KEVIN F. MARTIN
 LEWIS H. MARTIN

CORINNA R. MARTINEZ
 ROBERTO A. MARTINS, JR.
 MATTHEW R. MASSMAN
 JOSHUA K. MAST
 NATHAN J. MAST
 MICHAEL A. MATHEWS
 KRISTIN A. MATHIAS
 JACOB T. MATHIESON
 ERIN D. MATHIS
 MICHAEL A. MAU
 JOSEPH P. MAY
 TRAVER K. MAYFIELD
 ROYSE W. MAYO
 WILLIAM H. MCCABE, JR.
 BEN E. MCCAULEY III
 ADAM L. MCCOY
 BRANDEN C. MCGAHA
 JAMES J. MCGEADY
 THOMAS P. MCKAVITT III
 IAN T. MCKECHNIE
 CLIFTON K. MCKENZIE IV
 KYLE K. MCLEOD
 CONOR L. MCMAHON
 TAYLOR A. MEAVE
 ERIC C. MEEDER
 NICHOLAS J. MEIER
 ROWDY L. MEINEN
 STEPHEN C. MERCER
 HOLLY J. MEREDITH
 JOSEPH C. MESSMER
 DALE E. METCALF, JR.
 MICHAEL H. MIERSMA
 JONATHAN A. MIKKELSON
 ANDREW J. MILLER
 DAVID A. MILLER II
 JORDAN D. MILLER
 PATRICK K. MILLIKIN
 AARON P. MILLS
 THOMAS D. MILROY
 GAVIN J. MIRANDA
 ANDREW M. MIRSCH
 SAMUEL J. MODICA
 KATIE L. MODZELEWSKI
 PATRICK J. MOECHER
 NICHOLAS K. MOELLER
 ANTHONY J. MOLESPHINI IV
 EMILIE M. MONAGHAN
 MICHAEL P. MONAGHAN
 DYLAN T. MONTAMBO
 ERIC M. MONTGOMERY
 MARK C. MOORE
 PATRICK R. MOORE
 ELI J. MORALES
 PAUL P. MOREAU
 RICARDO F. MOREIRA
 ALEXANDER A. MORROW
 ROBERT W. MORTENSON
 CORY C. MOSSBERGER
 WILLIAM J. MOSSOR
 CAMERON B. MOURY
 CORY R. MOYER
 JESSE F. MOYLES
 AUSTIN J. MUFFLY
 SUZANNE L. MULET
 JEFFREY T. MURDZA
 JASON C. MURPHY
 DOUGLAS M. MURRAY
 NICHOLAS P. MUSTO
 JOHN T. NANCE
 ROBERT M. NARANJO
 AMEEN A. NASSER
 NATHANIEL P. NAVARO
 MOISES A. NAVAS
 TRAVIS A. NEESMITH
 JOSE M. NEORETE
 DARYL C. NEILL
 THOMAS S. NELL
 BRADLEY L. NELSON
 BRIAN C. NERI
 JONATHAN E. NEWBOLD
 CHARLES Z. NEWCOMB
 CHRISTOPHER M. NGUYEN
 JOEL C. NIENABER
 ERIC K. NILSSON
 WESLEY M. NIX
 MICHAEL H. NOLAN
 SCOTT W. NOONAN
 STEVEN E. NYE, JR.
 CHRISTOPHER W. OBRIEN
 KEVIN T. OCONNOR
 LIAM P. OLONE
 NICHOLAS S. OLTMAN
 TIMOTHY A. ORNELAS
 KYLE N. OWENS
 DAVID A. PADGETT
 WILLIAM C. PAFFETT
 BRETT A. PAPALE
 CHUN H. PARK
 ZULLY G. PASINDORUBIO
 DANIEL J. PATON
 TAYLOR H. PAUL
 MATTHEW L. PAULL
 NICHOLAS D. PELTIER
 TYLER A. PENCEK
 BRANDON W. PENNER
 DAVID H. PERKINS
 THOMAS J. PERNA
 NICHOLAS D. PETERS
 BRYAN S. PETERSON
 ROBERT D. PFEIL II
 PAUL E. PFLOKE
 DAVID V. PHAM
 SAMUEL E. PHILLIPS
 STEVEN R. PICKETT
 ROGER G. PIERCE
 FRANCISCO L. PIETRI
 EDWARD T. PINNELL III

CLIFFORD E. PLASS
 LUKE E. PLAYER
 ALEXANDER M. POLIVKA
 ALEXANDER M. PONCE
 JOSEPH R. POPOVICH
 AUSTIN J. PORTER
 ROSS A. POSPISIL
 NICHOLAS A. PRETTY
 BENJAMIN M. PRICE
 SEAN K. PRICE
 MATTHEW R. PRIMM
 LOUIS E. PROSPERIE III
 EDWARD C. PROULX
 JACOB D. PRYOR
 DANIEL J. PUTNAM
 NICK G. PYPER
 BENJAMIN E. RADCLIFF
 BRIAN R. RAIKE
 DUSTIN M. RALPH
 ANTHONY A. RAMSEY
 CHARLES C. RANDOLPH
 BRETT E. RANKIN
 RYAN C. RATCLIFFE
 BRANSON C. REED
 KIEL A. REESE
 JORDAN M. REID
 PATRICK S. REILLY
 RANDY L. RHINEHART
 LESLIE R. RICE
 PHILLIP H. RICHARD
 JACOB J. RIES
 ZACHARIAH D. RILEY
 CIPRIANO RIVERA
 JONATHAN M. RIX
 CHRISTOPHER A. ROBBINS
 DAVID W. ROBERTS
 KYLE O. RODGERS
 BRADLEY T. ROENSCH
 MATTHEW S. ROLAND
 JEFFREY J. ROLLINS
 DANIEL A. ROMANS
 JOSE C. ROMERO
 RYAN M. ROOP
 TED A. ROSE
 VICTOR C. ROSE
 KYLE R. ROSEN
 KEITH Q. RUDOLF
 ERIC J. RUSSELL
 ALEX W. RYAN
 JESSICA L. RYAN
 ANTHONY R. RYBICKI
 RUSS G. RYDER
 ROBERT H. RYLAND
 BARNARD J. SABIN
 JOHN J. SABOL III
 MEREDITH L. SAKOVICH
 MARISOL SALGADO
 SEAN C. SASSO
 RYAN S. SAWYER
 JONATHAN C. SCARFE
 NICHOLAS J. SCARSELLA
 SCOTT A. SCHAETTLER
 CHRISTOPHER S. SCHECKEL
 PHILIP R. SCHMITZ
 BRANDAN R. SCHOFIELD
 LUKE W. SCHOLL
 CHELSEA R. SCOTT
 MICHAEL D. SCOTTO
 THOMAS G. SCOVEL
 JOSHUA W. SEDLOCK
 COREN M. SEGLEM
 JAVIER E. SEGURA
 JUSTIN J. SEIGNEMARTIN
 WILLIAM D. SHANAHAN
 DAVID M. SHANK
 DAVID S. SHARP
 JOSHUA G. SHARP
 JAMES G. SHATZLEY
 MICHELLE M. SHOENBERGER
 JACOB A. SHOWALTER
 ISAAC J. SHULTS
 CYNTHIA G. SIEBEN
 STEVEN C. SIFUENTES
 J.C. SIMPSON
 MATTHEW J. SIMPSON
 BRUCE A. SIMS
 SHAWN L. SINNOTT
 WESLAND C. SINOR
 JAMES M. SISSON II
 PATRICK A. SKEHAN
 BRANDON L. SMITH
 CURTIS A. SMITH
 JONATHAN S. SMITH
 JAY T. SNELLING
 JONATHAN R. SNIDER
 ZACHARY K. SNIVELY
 JOHN M. SNYDER
 JOSHUA B. SOLTAN
 MATTHEW T. SOMMER
 DANNY D. SORRELLS
 BRANDY A. SOUBLET
 AARON T. STAGGS
 CLINTON R. STASCHKE
 SCOTT A. TEELE
 BRITTANY S. STEENBERGE
 RYAN W. STEENBERGE
 JAMES F. STENGER
 KEVIN E. STEPHENSON
 CHARLES J. STEVENSON
 CONOR W. STEWART
 WILLIAM L. STEWART
 KEVIN J. STIER
 MATTHEW E. STILSON
 NATHAN W. STINSON
 ROBERT T. STOCKMAN III
 ALICE K. STODDARD
 MARK R. STONE

KELLY T. STRECK
 JOSEPH P. STRUMOLO
 ERIC T. STYLES
 SCOTT D. SUESS
 JAMES P. SULLIVAN, JR.
 KEVIN M. SULLIVAN
 BENJAMIN F. SUTPHEN
 LAURA A. SWANSON
 MICHAEL P. SWEANEY
 DILAN M. SWIFT
 RICHARD G. SYKES
 ANDREW L. TAULBEE
 JASON A. TAYLOR
 RICHARD M. TEDESCHI
 JONATHAN R. THOMAS
 MARTIN O. THOMAS
 MYRON J. THOMAS
 BRYAN A. THOMPSON
 VERONICA A. TIJERINA
 SETH M. TOMPKINS
 KEVIN P. TRACY
 NICHOLAS B. TRAPASSO
 MATTHEW D. TREVINO
 CHRISTOPHER J. TROKE
 MICHAEL L. TROMBITAS
 OWEN T. TROTMAN
 MICHAEL R. TRUMM
 HUY N. TRUONG
 JONATHAN D. TURELLO
 MATTHEW D. TWEEDY
 MYLES F. TWEEDY
 KRISTOPHER A. ULBRICH
 ROTHANA L. UM
 NOLAN R. UTTERBACK
 MICHAEL T. VALDEZ
 ADAN VAZQUEZ
 JAMES H. VEGA
 TAMARA J. VELDING
 AARON E. VIANA
 TRAVIS J. VONEPS
 CURTIS WADE III
 MICHAEL J. WAGAMAN
 MATTHEW A. WAGNER
 NICHOLAS E. WAGNER
 PETER R. WAGNER
 KHALID R. WAHEED
 JONATHAN W. WALKER
 BRIAN M. WALSH
 BRETT J. WARMING
 KRISTINA F. WARREN
 HELEN C. WATSON
 MICHAEL D. WATTS
 RAYMOND C. WEBB II
 JONATHAN D. WEBBER
 RICHARD WEBER
 SCOTT J. WEIBLING
 MATTHEW D. WEINBERG
 JEFFREY R. WEINMEISTER
 JOSHUA B. WELCH
 JERRY W. WELLS IV
 LAN M. WELPE
 CHRISTOPHER R. WERNER
 JOSHUA M. WESTLUND
 SEAN R. WETHERILL
 PAMELA R. WHALEN

PHILIP M. WHEAT
 DANIEL P. WHELAN
 DAVID L. WHITE
 DOUGLAS D. WHITE
 JAY S. WHITE
 DANIEL W. WILLETT
 ANDREW T. WILLEY
 ISAAC S. WILLIAMS
 RYAN P. WILLIAMS
 BRANDON M. WILSEY
 JOHN C. WILSON III
 SCOTT T. WILSON
 THOMAS M. WILSON
 WYATT E. WILSON
 NATHAN R. WININGS
 ZACHARY J. WINTERS
 MICHAEL J. WISH
 SCHUYLER M. WITT
 ROBERT W. WOLFF
 CLINTON L. WOODS
 AUSTIN C. WORTH
 TIMOTHY D. WRENN, JR.
 JAMES J. WUESTMAN
 BRYANT C. YEE
 ZACHARY S. YOXTHEIMER
 JENNER M. YUHAS
 MATTHEW S. ZACH
 DANIEL H. ZIMLICH
 GREGORY R. ZINGLER

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:
 DEANNA M. J. AYALA, OF MINNESOTA
 ROBERT HENRY HANSON, OF MARYLAND
 DARYA CHEHREZAD, OF CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

CASEY EBEN BEAN, OF MARYLAND
 CHRISTINE STROSSMAN, OF FLORIDA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:
 CLAY M. HAMILTON, OF TEXAS

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 11, 2020:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOHN HENNESSEY-NILAND, OF ILLINOIS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND

PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF PALAU.

DONALD WRIGHT, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA.

DOROTHY SHEA, OF NORTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE LEBANESE REPUBLIC.

TODD C. CHAPMAN, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC OF BRAZIL.

THE JUDICIARY

ANDREW LYNN BRASHER, OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 12, 2020:

THE JUDICIARY

JOHN FITZGERALD KNESS, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

PHILIP M. HALPERN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

JOSHUA M. KINDRED, OF ALASKA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA.

MATTHEW THOMAS SCHELP, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on February 12, 2020 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nominations:

JESSIE K. LIU, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR TERRORISM AND FINANCIAL CRIMES, VICE SIGAL MANDELKER, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 6, 2020.

J. DAVID PATTERSON, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PERSONNEL AND READINESS, VICE LAURA JUNOR, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 9, 2020.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO COMMEMORATE CITIZENS NATIONAL BANK'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Citizens National Bank in southern Kentucky, an incredible milestone for a small business in rural America.

The first Citizens National Bank opened on Valentine's Day in 1920 in Somerset, Kentucky's public square. Over the last 100 years, this community bank has been recognized as a local leader, affording individuals and families the opportunity to achieve home ownership, loaning seed funds for entrepreneurial dreamers to start their own businesses, and providing a safe and secure way for families to grow their savings and retirement accounts.

Persevering through changes in technology, the bank converted to its first computer system in 1986, added full service automated teller machines (ATMs) in the 1990's, and ventured into mobile banking in 2011. Citizens National Bank was first granted trust powers in 1999 and was listed as a 5 Star Bank by the Bauer Financial Group in the same year, providing new opportunities for growth and progress.

Today, the bank's slogan is, "Moving Forward Together" and it is an honor to join the countless residents in our region in recognition of Citizens National Bank's centennial year of service spanning four counties. Congratulations to the long line of leaders who established and guided this community bank over the years, providing financial security and hope for local families.

THE SMALL BUSINESS SIZE STANDARD MANUFACTURING CLARIFICATION ACT

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, our Nation's small business manufacturers have an invaluable impact on our economy.

This past October, I introduced H.R. 4702, the Small Business Size Standard Manufacturing Clarification Act of 2019. This legislation will help thousands of defense and national security small businesses compete against much larger corporations when applying for federal contracts. It is near impossible for these small defense businesses to plan and secure larger contracts on a 12-month basis. This legislation expands the time from 12 months to up to 60 months. Defense-related small business manufacturers need that extra time to justify their small business designation

due to changes in technology and competition from much larger corporate contracts. Size standards for both revenue-based and employee-based small business manufacturers are not at a level that recognizes the changes in the current marketplace for defining small businesses that support the federal sector.

Recently, the House passed H.R. 5130, the Capturing All Small Businesses Act, which raises the standard to a 24-month basis. Still, it is not enough to properly support our small business manufacturers in the national security sector. In the defense industry, a small business that grows to over 1,600 employees has to compete in a market with companies of more than 25,000 employees.

I am committed to supporting our Nation's small businesses and fixing the issues addressed in the Small Business Standard Manufacturing Clarification Act. I urge the House to consider this legislation and join me in supporting our small business manufacturers.

RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BAKU POGROMS

HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Madam Speaker, today I rise to condemn the violence inflicted upon Armenians on the 30th anniversary of the Baku Pogroms in Azerbaijan. I believe that condemning these actions today will help prevent renewed aggression against citizens of Armenian descent who continue to live in Azerbaijan, while bringing attention to efforts to erase these atrocities from our collective memory. Further, I reaffirm our nation's commitment to an enduring, peaceful, and democratic resolution of the Artsakh conflict.

From 1988 to 1990, the Armenian population in Soviet Azerbaijan was the target of ethnically targeted pogroms in the cities of Sumgait, Kirovabad, and Baku. Beginning on February 27, 1988 in Sumgait, Armenian Christians were indiscriminately murdered, raped, and maimed by mobs of criminals and thugs. According to independent reporting, police in Baku allowed the pogroms to continue for 3 days, during which time hundreds are estimated to have been murdered in cold blood.

Despite vocal U.S. and international protests over the Sumgait pogroms, renewed anti-Armenian pogroms were launched in Kirovabad on November 21, 1988 that lasted for seven days. Fourteen months later in the capital, Baku, another pogrom was launched against its Armenian minority. These vicious attacks against unarmed civilians led to the displacement of thousands of Armenian families fleeing systematic violence as refugees.

Madam Speaker, on this 30th anniversary of the Baku pogroms, I want to emphasize the importance of remembering these crimes against humanity. I call on the Azerbaijani government to acknowledge that these atroc-

ities occurred, and that it seeks justice for the victims by prosecuting those who committed these horrific acts of violence. I also call upon the government of Azerbaijan to take all appropriate action to prevent further tragedies of this nature, and to do whatever is necessary to begin the healing process for the families of the victims. I call on the Azerbaijani government to respect the rights of all minorities living within its borders.

ANNIVERSARY OF ANTI-ARMENIAN POGROMS IN AZERBAIJAN

HON. JAMIE RASKIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, this year we honor the memory of hundreds of ethnic Armenians killed—and hundreds of thousands displaced—between 1988 and 1990 in brutal and violent pogroms in Azerbaijan. In the 1980s, citizens in Azerbaijan of Armenian heritage embarked on one of the first pro-democracy movements against the Soviet Empire, calling for self-determination, fair treatment, and an end to discrimination. This pro-democracy movement was met with extreme brutality in waves of pogroms and forced deportations of Armenians from Azerbaijan. Mobs violently attacked ethnic Armenians in the cities of Sumgait in late February 1988, Kirovabad in November 1988, and the capital, Baku, in January 1990.

For three days in February 1988, mobs murdered, raped, assaulted, and burned alive ethnic Armenians. This came as the result of years and decades of anti-Armenian rhetoric and policies engineered by the Azerbaijani government, contributing to a lethal climate of dehumanization, racism, and religious intolerance.

Despite an international outcry, including bipartisan resolutions, statements and letters from concerned members of Congress, the violence continued. Between 1988 and 1990, according to human rights organizations, an estimated 300,000 to 350,000 Armenians fled Azerbaijan under threat of violence or were deported. The failure of the government to legitimately address simple democratic demands, and the violent response to largely peaceful movements, fueled a spiral of reactionary intercommunal violence and prolonged armed conflict in the region. Today, I stand to remember and honor all of those killed, wounded and displaced in these anti-Armenian pogroms.

The lessons of the events of 1988 to 1990 are obviously acutely relevant as we look around the world today. Ethnic and religious hatred that foments violence is on the rise—the Rohingya in Burma have been slaughtered, Uighur Muslims in China are being put in concentration camps because of their religion, and tens of thousands of Jehovah's Witnesses have been declared extremists in Russia for following their peaceful religion.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

When human beings are denied their universal freedoms, and when governments put in place dehumanizing rhetoric, policies, and laws; then hatred, violence, and suffering follow. I urge my colleagues to stand with me in recognition of the plight suffered by ethnic Armenians thirty years ago and to stand vigilant against the use of ethnic and religious hatred to stir violence against minorities here in the United States and around the world.

RECOGNIZING MR. RANDY ROUTON

HON. VAN TAYLOR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize my friend, Mr. Randy Routon for his nearly thirty-four years of dedicated service in mental health as the Chief Executive Officer of LifePath Systems, a mental healthcare provider in Collin County.

Randy's steadfast leadership helped thousands of families and individuals throughout our community gain access to life changing mental healthcare. Randy's inspiring dedication was also illustrated by his role on many boards, committees, task forces, and clubs throughout our community.

I proudly worked with him during my time in the state legislatures towards our shared goal of ensuring everyone in Collin County has a chance to receive high quality of mental healthcare.

I know Randy looks forward to spending more time with his wife, Diane, as well as their six children and six grandchildren during his retirement.

As Randy prepares to begin his next chapter, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in thanking Randy Routon for his selfless and dedicated career of serving those around him.

CELEBRATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, it is with great respect and sincere admiration that I rise today to celebrate Black History Month and its 2020 theme—African Americans and the Vote. 2020 marks the 100th anniversary of the ratification of the 19th Amendment. This year's theme reflects on the extraordinary contributions of African Americans throughout the history of our democracy as we reflect on the ongoing efforts to ensure equality for all Americans. As we reflect on the past, this year's theme focuses on the fight to ensure that African American voices and votes mattered in America.

The year 2020 commemorates the 115th anniversary of the 15th Amendment, which granted African American men the right to vote. When the amendment was first introduced, it did not mention black men. After the

conclusion of the civil war, however, abolitionist Frederick Douglass spoke before the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society advocating for the right for black men to vote. While the debate continued, in 1869, 150 African American men from seventeen states gathered for the first national meeting of African Americans in the history of the United States.

The year 2020 also marks the 100th anniversary of the ratification of the 19th Amendment. During this time, the Women's Rights Movement was intertwined with the Antislavery Movement. African American women played a prominent role in the movement by organizing, attending, and speaking out at political and religious events, thus leading to the ratification of the 19th Amendment. We honor these brave and dedicated women who contributed to the foundation of African American liberty including Sojourner Truth, Harriet Tubman, Maria W. Stewart, Henrietta Purvis, Harriet Forten Purvis, and Sarah Redmon, among many others. As we pay tribute to these heroes of American history, let us remember their profound perseverance, sacrifice, and struggle in the fight for freedom and equality and the remarkable impact their contributions have had in shaping our great nation. This month and always, it is important that we honor and celebrate America's greatest advocates for equal rights and civil liberties.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in celebrating Black History Month and honoring those who fought, and continue to fight, for civil rights and justice. We honor the African American men and women who have played such a crucial role in changing the landscape of American society for the better.

SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF PAULDING COUNTY'S 200TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Bicentennial of Paulding County, Ohio, the last frontier to be settled in our great state. Our country was founded because of the brave pioneers who ventured into the Great Outdoors in order to create a better life for future settlers.

In 1819, Captain James Riley and his surveyors trudged through the mosquito infested Great Black Swamp to lay out the township lines for what would later become Paulding County.

The Great Black Swamp covered more than 1,500 square miles. It was created more than 10,000 years ago after the glaciers receded and formed the Great Lakes. From the surveyor's notes, we know that the Ottawa and Shawnee Indian tribes inhabited this land of deciduous swamp forest. The giant oaks, hickory, elm, ash, and many other large tree species created a dense canopy, which blocked sunlight from reaching the forest floor. The dense forest and mucky conditions made settlement of the area extremely difficult as Paulding County, in its entirety, laid beneath

the swamp. The landscape required drastic alterations before settlers were able to make Paulding County into the flat, agriculturally rich region that it is today.

In 1820, this area was named Paulding County in honor of John Paulding, an American hero during the American Revolution who aided in the capture of Major John Andre, a British spy who was the co-conspirator of Benedict Arnold.

The celebration of the 200th Anniversary of Paulding County reminds our community of the determination and pioneering attitude upon which counties throughout Ohio and our country were founded. Congratulations to Paulding County on this significant milestone.

RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BAKU POGROMS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise in recognition of the 30th anniversary of the Baku Pogroms against Christian Armenians that took place from 1988 to 1990. In February 1988, the Armenian population in Soviet-controlled Azerbaijan became the victim of racially motivated, violent pogroms that started after peaceful protests took place against Moscow's arbitrary separation of Armenia and decades of repression and discrimination. The violence began with the Sumgait pogroms in February of 1988, and continued in Kirovabad (November 1988), and Baku (January 1990). Following this, the Armenian community suffered through a failed war of aggression by Baku to subjugate the people of Artsakh.

During this time, hundreds of Armenian civilians were killed, raped, beaten, maimed, and expelled from their homes for no reason other than their ethnicity. These hateful acts were fueled by anti-Armenian rhetoric from Azerbaijani officials and citizens. These pogroms were part of a systemic effort to ethnically cleanse Azerbaijan of Armenians and to send a message to Armenians to stop challenging Soviet Azerbaijani authorities.

For over 30 years, Azerbaijan has attempted to cover up these crimes against humanity and has propped up the perpetrators of the Baku and Sumgait Pogroms as national heroes. It is critical that the United States government recognize and denounce this ethnically motivated violence and attacks on innocent children, women, and men in Armenian communities.

We must all be aware of the history of violence targeting the Armenian people. I am grateful that the State of Illinois emphasizes Armenian genocide education and I will work with my colleagues to promote legislation to help facilitate more states doing the same. We must ensure that the victims of the Sumgait and Baku pogroms are never forgotten and that such hateful acts of violence never happen again. We must remain committed to achieving a lasting peace in the Caucasus, and ensure that the people of Artsakh are able to live free from Azerbaijani abuse and aggression.

RECOGNITION OF EMILIE MA, PRUDENTIAL SPIRIT OF COMMUNITY AWARDS HONOREE

HON. ANDY BIGGS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Emilie Ma, a young student from my district who has been named an honoree in Arizona by the 2020 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program. She was recognized for volunteering her time to help families struggling with poverty.

Ms. Ma assists with charitable efforts for low-income families at the Native Health Center. She donates her time to a club she founded at her school named the Modern Health Organization which provides services to patients with mental and physical needs. Ms. Ma has been an example to her peers, inspiring them to care for others and their communities.

We must encourage and support the kind of selfless contributions young citizens like Ms. Ma make in the lives of others. We all need more empathy. Everyone can work together to help the health and vitality of our towns and neighborhoods. Young volunteers, like Ms. Ma, are inspiring examples to all of us and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREATER PHOENIX GAY & LESBIAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. RUBEN GALLEG0

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. GALLEG0. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the Greater Phoenix Gay & Lesbian Chamber of Commerce (GPGCLCC). As one of the longest-standing LGBT agencies in our state, GPGCLCC has promoted an inclusive business environment by empowering and supporting LGBT and LGBT-allied businesses in Phoenix.

The GPGCLCC is the oldest non-profit LGBT chamber of commerce in the United States and has been recognized as one of the strongest and fastest growing in the nation. By expanding opportunities for its over 2,000 members and supporting Phoenix charitable organizations, the chamber has fostered economic justice within the LGBT community and a spirit of giving in the city's private sector. In addition to monthly professional development and networking events, the GPGCLCC encourages community engagement through events like "LGBT Night Out at the Ballet" and their Small Business Saturday Block Party. They have cultivated a well-rounded outlook in which businesses are not only economically beneficial to their community; they contribute to the culture and environment of their area as well.

As the organization celebrates its fortieth anniversary, I wish to congratulate the Greater Phoenix Gay & Lesbian Chamber of Commerce on all of its achievements and thank them for their service to our city.

RECOGNIZING LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to take this moment to recognize Lithuanian Independence Day. The Lithuanian American Community, Inc., East Chicago Chapter, will be commemorating this special occasion with a celebratory event on Sunday, February 16, 2020, at the Chesterton Moose Lodge 1623 in Chesterton, Indiana.

On February 16, 1918, an Act of Independence was signed by the Council of Lithuania, which gave the country its independence from Germany. This day is proudly celebrated as State Independence Day. Lithuania maintained its independence until 1940 when it was annexed by Russia. The country remained under Soviet rule for almost fifty years before regaining its freedom in 1990. Independence Restoration Day is celebrated on March 11 each year in honor of Lithuania's reestablished independence. Lithuanians in Northwest Indiana and all over the world celebrate these days of independence with great enthusiasm and pride.

The members and leaders of the Lithuanian American Community, Inc., East Chicago Chapter, are to be honored, not only for their commitment to preserving tradition, but also for their dedication to civic, cultural, educational, and social programs. For their significant contributions to the community of Northwest Indiana and beyond, the members and leaders of the Lithuanian American Community, Inc., East Chicago Chapter, are worthy of the highest praise.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day and honoring the members and leaders of the Lithuanian American Community, Inc., East Chicago Chapter, for their loyalty and dedication to their culture and traditions. The Lithuanian community has played a key role in enriching the quality of life and diversity of Northwest Indiana, and we are truly grateful for the organization's service to Northwest Indiana and beyond.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL THOMAS A. BUSSIÈRE

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Speaker, I am deeply honored to express my gratitude to Lieutenant General Thomas A. Bussiere for his years of dedicated service to the United States of America, the Air Force, and the great state of Alaska.

As Commander of Alaskan North American Aerospace Defense Command Region, Alaskan Command, and Eleventh Air Force, at Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska, he is responsible for the integration of all military activities in the Alaskan joint operations area, operations to defend North American air sov-

ereignty from foreign military aviation incursions, and the planning and execution of all homeland defense operations within the area of responsibility.

In 1935 Brigadier General Billy Mitchell stated, "I believe that in the future, whoever holds Alaska will hold the world. I think it is the most important strategic place in the world." Since taking command in August 2018, General Bussiere has expanded upon General Mitchell's sentiment and has become a tireless advocate for Alaska and Arctic readiness. So much so that he is the first Alaskan Command Commander to be designated as the USNORTHCOM Lead for Arctic Affairs.

Since graduating from the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps at Norwich University in 1985, General Bussiere has exemplified what it means to be an American Airman. However, he is more than the stars on his shoulders and the wings and ribbons on his chest that illustrate his military career. General Bussiere has also endeared himself to Alaska's communities. Additionally, he has continued to work with and advocate for Alaska Natives. In a show of respect, three Native communities bestowed Native names upon him; giving him the Inupiat name of Alongnonnuq, the Yup'ik name Evuneq, and the Tlingit name Litseenikaa.

On January 13, 2020, Secretary of Defense Mark T. Esper announced that the President nominated General Bussiere for assignment as Deputy Commander, U.S. Strategic Command. While I am saddened to see him leave Alaska, I am proud that he will continue serving as a sentinel for our Nation.

STANDING UP FOR SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, AND MEDICAID

HON. ANGIE CRAIG

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Ms. CRAIG. Madam Speaker, the President's budget, released yesterday, proposed cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. I'll never stand for that. We have to make sure that we're protecting our seniors. We can't go back to a time when our seniors were living in poverty. We also have to make sure that we protect folks with disabilities.

I have authored a number of pieces of legislation that would reduce out-of-pocket costs and the price of prescription drugs. We can't support this budget, and I'll keep fighting to make sure that health care is affordable and that we take care of this nation's seniors.

HONORING MR. JAMIE WILLIS FOR HIS SERVICE TO OUR NATION

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor a great Texan and United States Army veteran, Jamie Willis of Copperas Cove, Texas.

Since 2016, Jamie has run Canes for Veterans Central Texas, an organization that creates free walking sticks for veterans in need.

While serving our country overseas as a cavalry scout in Operation Desert Storm, Jamie was involved in an accident that left him briefly paralyzed and now disabled, and wrestling with severe depression and PTSD. When he returned home, he would travel to the local VA for treatment where he was issued a cane to use that never held up. So, he decided to make his own out of repurposed Christmas trees.

An effort that started out as a necessity three years ago has now grown to a team of 60 volunteers who have made more than 220 canes. Jamie says crafting these canes is his true calling and they have brought him back from the brink of taking his own life—and he has changed the lives of those around him.

I want to honor Jamie today and thank him on behalf of the 25th District of Texas for his continued service to our nation. In God we trust.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOEL PACKER

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Ms. DeLAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Joel Packer, a true hero for education and a dear friend.

Joel Packer is known across the education community as a champion for education funding. He spent more than 40 years advocating for students both in the public and private sector. Starting at the Student Association of the State University of New York, his career as an advocate grew with his work in D.C. at the National Education Association, and most recently, The Raben Group and the Committee for Education Funding (CEF) before his retirement in 2016.

Joel worked on critical issues like education funding, higher education, environmental hazards in schools, and civil rights. He was on the front lines of the push to improve testing in No Child Left Behind and was always there to remind us who we need to be prioritizing in the Congress: our children and their education. Joel championed the coalition of education advocates at CEF and masterfully represented the interests of a diverse group of educational institutions. Joel led the CEF's fight against education budget cuts in 2015, never giving up on his mission to ensure a genuine federal investment in our children's education. Throughout his career, Joel's dedication demonstrated the kind of intensity and willingness to collaborate necessary to win in the fight for education. Moreover, his passion for education and bettering the lives of all students was clear. Joel was an expert when it came to education policy and the Appropriations process; he knew, and helped all of us learn, how good ideas and good policies are not good enough—not without the necessary resources to make a difference.

I feel lucky to have known such a tremendous advocate for education in this country. Joel was many things—he was an amazing husband, a proud father and grandfather, an inspiring mentor and colleague, and an unwavering friend. Joel was taken from us too suddenly, and my deepest condolences go to his family. We will miss Joel and his bound-

less passion for fighting for what is right and for what our nation's children need most. Joel's values and mission will live on in those of us who remain in the fight, and we fight in his honor.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering Joel Packer. He was a true champion for education and his leadership will never be forgotten.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BAKU POGROMS: REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of the victims of pogroms against the Armenian population in then-Soviet Azerbaijan thirty years ago: These attacks against Armenian Christians happened between 1988 and 1990 in the cities of Sumgait (February 27 to 29, 1988), Kirovabad (November 21 to 27, 1988) and the city of Baku (January 13 to 29, 1990).

It is clear that the pogrom of Armenians in Baku was not a spontaneous and one-time event, but the culmination of a series of ethnic violence waged against Armenians. In 1988, the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh, an ethnic Armenian enclave forcibly separated from Armenia and incorporated into Soviet Azerbaijan, began to voice their demand for reunification with Armenia. Their peaceful protests were reinforced by the February 20, 1988 vote by the Soviet of People's Deputies in Karabakh requesting the transfer of the region to Armenia. These events were taking place in the context of Mikhail Gorbachev's Perestroika and Glasnost. Unfortunately, Moscow and Azerbaijani authorities rejected these calls and strong anti-Armenian sentiment was whipped up, including calls for the death and ouster of the Armenian population.

On February 27, 1988, a massive pogrom was carried out in Sumgait where the Armenian population was brutally slaughtered and expelled. The Sumgait pogrom was followed by a pogrom in Kirovabad, the second largest city in Azerbaijan, where all the Armenians were expelled. After these tragedies, a massive migration of Armenians from Azerbaijan began, along with the migration of approximately 200,000 Azerbaijanis and Muslim Kurds who exited Armenia. By 1989, Armenians remaining in Azerbaijan stayed only in those places where they had well-established communities, as in Baku.

In January 1990, a series of Azerbaijani political rallies took place, and on January 13th, a crowd of about 50,000 divided into groups and began raiding and invading Armenian homes, brutalizing the inhabitants, including women and children, and destroying and burning houses, businesses and other community structures. The rallying cry was to cleanse the city of Armenians. The violence, killings, rapes, beatings, looting and forcible expulsion of Armenians persisted between January 13th and 20th. It is still unknown the exact number of people killed, but estimates place the death toll around 450 people. Throughout it all, local militia and Soviet troops stood by as the violence escalated over a week's time. Not until

the evening of January 20th, after most of the Armenian population had fled or been expelled from Baku, did the Soviet Army intervene to stop the seven-day massacre.

Garry Kasparov was born in Baku in 1963. His mother was Armenian. In 1985, he became the youngest ever World Chess Champion. In January 1990, he was excelling in his competitions, and ranked as the No. 1 chess player in the world. Yet in January 1990, he bravely returned to Baku, into the midst of massacre and carnage, to rescue and evacuate the families of his friends and relatives. Describing those events, he has testified that:

"No one would halt the Armenian pogroms in Baku, although there were eleven thousand soldiers of internal troops in the city. No one would intervene until the ethnic cleansing was carried out. The pogroms were happening not in a random place, but in the huge capital city with blocks of flats. In such a megapolis as Baku, the crowd simply cannot carry out targeted operations like that. When the pogrom-makers go purposefully from one district to another, from one apartment to another, this means that they had been given the addresses and that they had a coordinator."

I don't mean to simplify the complex history and people of this region, but these pogroms set the stage for more than two decades of aggression by Azerbaijan against Armenians, during which Azerbaijan initiated and lost a war against Nagorno Karabakh. Azerbaijan's persecution of Armenians continues even today in attacks against Nagorno-Karabakh, now known as the Republic of Artsakh.

There has yet to be an independent investigation of the events that occurred between 1988 and 1990 that emptied Azerbaijan of its Armenian population. No one has been held accountable for the violence and the deaths. Azerbaijan remains in turmoil because of the fanaticism and thirst to ethnically cleanse the entire region of Armenian Christians.

The U.S. Congress forcefully spoke out during the period of 1988 to 1990 against these massacres and expulsions of Armenians by Azerbaijan. We have rejected the Azeri war against Nagorno Karabakh and stood in solidarity with the Armenian people of Artsakh. We will continue to do so.

Madam Speaker, today I remember all the victims and I honor all the survivors of these terrible acts of ethnic cleansing. May all the people of Armenia and Artsakh live in peace and freedom for which they have sacrificed and suffered so much.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HARLEY ROUDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I missed votes on Tuesday, February 11, 2020 as I was traveling after attending a memorial service in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Roll Call Vote No. 57 (On Ordering the Previous Question): YEA; Roll Call Vote No. 58 (On Agreeing to H. Res. 844): YEA; and Roll Call Vote No. 59 (On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1980, as Amended): YEA.

RECOGNIZING LINDA RENÉ
MATTHEWS ON HER RETIREMENT

HON. MARCIA L. FUDGE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a constituent, employee and friend, Linda René Matthews, as she retires from the U.S. House of Representatives, where she has served in the District Office of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio since January of 2009.

In fact, she served me so well while I was Mayor of Warrensville Heights, Ohio, that I knew she would be invaluable as a congressional staffer. I was right.

Linda has been a strong, stable force, who has always understood the needs of constituents and worked hard to be of service to them and me. Her loyalty is unfaltering, her advice always candid, and her care for the integrity of my offices unquestionable.

After more than 20 years with me, Linda has decided to retire effective February 29, 2020. She leaves a legacy that set a standard in so many ways. She is more than the title of Scheduler/Office Manager implies, serving so many years as a member of my team of advisors. So, I say:

Whereas, Linda René Matthews has spent most of her professional life as a public servant; and

Whereas, Ms. Matthews has served the people of Northeast Ohio for over twenty years, first in the Office of the Mayor of Warrensville Heights and now in the District Office of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio; and

Whereas, Ms. Matthews is a life-long resident of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio; and

Whereas, Ms. Matthews has served the constituents of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio with distinction for more than eleven (11) years; and

Whereas, Ms. Matthews is retiring as Scheduler and Office Manager in the District Office of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio;

Resolved, that the 11th Congressional District of Ohio acknowledges, salutes and celebrates its resident and servant leader, Linda René Matthews, this 12th day of February 2020, for her record of excellence in service, and unqualified loyalty to the District's constituents.

CONGRATULATING DR. CHARLENE
M. DUKES ON HER RETIREMENT
AS PRESIDENT OF PRINCE
GEORGE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate an outstanding and trailblazing leader in higher education in Maryland's Fifth District. Dr. Charlene M. Dukes will be retiring as President of Prince George's Community College this June after thirteen years at the helm.

She is the first woman to lead the College in its sixty-two-year history.

Dr. Dukes's time as President has been characterized by growth and a deepening of the College's mission. She oversaw a partnership with Prince George's County Public Schools to create the first middle college in our state as well as a new Teacher Academy, Academy for Health Sciences, and two P-Tech Schools. The College joined with the University of Maryland Global Campus to launch a 3D Scholars Program and to expand programs in information technology and math. Under President Dukes's leadership, the College built new buildings at its Largo campus, including Lanham and Bladen Halls, the Culinary Arts Center, the Center for Performing Arts, and the Center for Health Studies. She led the effort to begin a major renovation this year of Marlboro Hall, the College's largest classroom facility.

A proponent of streamlining operations to enhance the quality of its services, Dr. Dukes oversaw a process of realigning the College's organizational structure under the 2019–2021 Strategic Plan. That plan focuses on increasing student success, growing the College's regional impact, and ensuring that the College's organization excels in helping it serve the 40,000 students who benefit annually from its courses and programs.

Before becoming the eighth President of Prince George's Community College, Dr. Dukes served on the Prince George's County Board of Education and as adjunct faculty at the Community College of Allegheny County in Pittsburgh. She also taught at Prince George's Community College and at Morgan State University. Former Governor Martin O'Malley appointed her to serve on the State Board of Education from 2007 to 2015, and she was the Board's President for the last three years of that period. Recognized by Washington Magazine as one of the 100 most powerful women in the metro area in 2011, 2013, 2015, and 2017, Dr. Dukes was inducted into the Maryland Women's Hall of Fame in 2013. She continues to serve on the boards of Prince George's County Chamber of Commerce, the Biden Institute, the Business Roundtable, the Greater Washington Community Foundation, the Institute for Higher Education Policy, and Campus Compact, among other nonprofits.

When Dr. Dukes retires at the end of June, she will leave a powerful and lasting legacy for the College and for the county and state she has so faithfully served in the cause of higher education. Because of her leadership, thousands of Maryland students have access to quality, affordable community college that can serve as a pathway to opportunity and success. I join in thanking her for her service, and I congratulate her on her upcoming retirement.

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL
CELEBRATION OF THE KIWANIS
CLUB AND THE ZONTA CLUB OF
JOLIET

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Centennial Celebration of the Kiwanis Club of Joliet and Zonta International.

Since its formation in 1920, The Kiwanis Club of Joliet has had a strong commitment to our community. They have supported cherished programs like Big Brothers/Big Sisters, the Center for Disability Services, the Guardian Angel Community Services, and many more. Currently, they sponsor several high school and middle school community clubs, inspiring our youth to give back as well.

The Zonta Club of Joliet is a service-based organization committed to promoting women both locally and globally. Through fundraisers, they finance scholarships, grants, international projects, and charities. They are also the sponsors of the Joliet Central High School Fearless Females, a club dedicated to empowering young women.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Kiwanis Club of Joliet and Joliet International for 100 years of dedication to our community, and I wish them the best in the years to come.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DECREASE
NOISE LEVEL ACT

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of the Decrease Noise Level Act.

For millions of Americans, noise from aircraft is a constant source of torment, whether they live right near an airport or under a regular flight path. Chronic exposure to excessive noise can lead to sleep deprivation, task interruptions, among other negative consequences, which result in untold costs on society in diminished work productivity.

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) currently uses a Day-Night average noise level to assess the level at which noise exposure becomes "significant" in residential communities. However, the level that the FAA has currently deemed acceptable is 65, a full 10 decibels higher than what Europe allows.

FAA's use of 65 DNL as "significant" is based on severe and immediate health impacts, at which point damage has already been done. It is essential that the FAA considers quality of life, long-term health impacts, home values, and overall economic impact. I believe reasonable noise congestion levels should be based on a standard that falls well before the point at which long-term health is impacted.

That is why I am introducing the Decrease Noise Level (DNL) Act—a bill that would require the FAA to immediately lower the level of noise that is considered "significant" to 60, and create a plan to lower it to 55 within 10 years. It would also require community outreach from the FAA to promote its recent study that considers alternatives to the DNL as a metric to measure noise.

I urge my colleagues to join me to pass this important legislation.

GREAT LAKES RESTORATION
INITIATIVE**HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate House passage of H. R. 4031, the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act of 2019, which will support the health of America's Third Coast. The Great Lakes provide drinking water to more than 30 million people, support more than 300,000 jobs, and are home to more than 3,500 plant and animal species. The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative is a multi-agency program that addresses threats to this ecosystem, such as algal blooms and invasive species. More than 4,700 projects have already been completed under GLRI, leading to healthier fisheries, clean drinking water, and stronger wildlife habitats.

I was proud to cosponsor this bill to reauthorize GLRI with increased funding. I thank my colleagues for passing this bill last week and I urge swift passage in the Senate.

CELEBRATING THE 40TH
ANNIVERSARY OF PHOENIX PRIDE**HON. RUBEN GALLEGO**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. GALLEGO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of Phoenix Pride. As one of the longest-standing LGBTQ+ organizations in our state, their work has taken the values of diversity, inclusivity, and equality to every corner of the state of Arizona.

Phoenix Pride is a groundbreaking pillar of advocacy for the city's LGBTQ+ community. In addition to producing the two largest annual LGBTQ+ events in Arizona, they work extensively to reach out to marginalized communities, preserve the unique culture and history of LGBTQ+ Arizonans, and provide scholarship funding for LGBTQ+ students. In fact, the organization awarded over \$47,000 in scholarships in 2019 and has helped dozens of students reach their academic goals since 2008.

Thanks in part to the hard work of Phoenix Pride, Phoenix ranks among the most LGBTQ+-friendly cities in the state, with protections against discrimination and a strong, involved LGBTQ+ community. Our city certainly would not be the same without their tireless work for equality and justice.

They have served as a beacon of hope and growth in the fight for equality for decades. The changes experienced and catalyzed by Phoenix Pride over the last forty years have been tremendous, and I join them in working to ensure that the next forty bring even more progress.

As they celebrate their fortieth anniversary, I wish to congratulate Phoenix Pride on all of their achievements and thank them for their service to our city.

HONORING DR. LYNDA YOUNG

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Lynda Young, whose term as chair of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) Committee on Federal Government Affairs wraps up later this month. I have had the honor and privilege of calling Dr. Young a friend and working with her for many years, and I know her to be a brilliant pediatrician and tireless advocate for the well-being of all children and families.

For 34 years, Dr. Young has been a practicing pediatrician in Worcester, Massachusetts as well as serving as a Professor of Pediatrics at the University of Massachusetts Medical School. Throughout her career, she's worked with numerous non-profits serving children in Central Massachusetts and devoted countless hours to advocating on behalf of children at the local, state and national levels.

After serving as a member of the AAP's Committee on Federal Government Affairs for several years, it was no surprise that Dr. Young was elected chair in 2016. During her tenure, she's never shied away from a fight where the well-being of children was in question. Among her many accomplishments during her time as chair include serving as a plaintiff in a successful federal lawsuit against the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) which resulted in a court order requiring the FDA to finalize graphic warning labels for cigarettes; fighting for a 10-year extension of the vitally important Children's Health Insurance Program; defeating attempts to repeal and replace the transformative Affordable Care Act; and co-chairing four national AAP Legislative Conferences in Washington, D.C. Dr. Young has also been an integral contributor to the AAP's Blueprint for Children: How the Next President Can Build a Foundation for a Healthy Future, which outlines federal policy priorities for the next presidential administration on improving children's health.

Madam Speaker, for all of Dr. Young's accolades and accomplishments, none resonate more than the day-in and day-out care she provides for children and their families as a pediatrician. She is compassionate and reassuring during tough times. She takes the time to really listen to and take an interest in her patients. She is always there for them and she has made an extraordinary difference in the lives of thousands of children. And I speak from firsthand experience—Dr. Young was my children's pediatrician in Worcester.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to warmly congratulate Dr. Young on her successful tenure as chair of the AAP's Committee on Federal Government Affairs. I look forward to continuing to work with her to improve the lives of all children and their families.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, due to a medical reason, I was unable to vote on the following 10 Roll Call Amendments/Bills.

Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 60 (DeGette Amendment)—Makes changes to Title I—Colorado Wilderness and designates an additional 60,000 acres wilderness; NAY on Roll Call No. 61 (McClintock Amendment No. 2)—Authorizes local counties to veto Congressionally approved wilderness designations; NAY on Roll Call No. 62 (McClintock Amendment No. 3)—Allows the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior to veto wilderness and wild and scenic river designations authorized by Congress under this Act if the areas do not meet the definition of wilderness in the Wilderness Act or the criteria for designation under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act; YEA on Roll Call No. 63 (Panetta Amendment)—States that the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may manage for fire, insects, and diseases in wilderness areas designated by this Act; NAY on Roll Call No. 64 (Westerman Amendment No. 6)—Allows the Secretary of Agriculture or Secretary of the Interior to exempt from wilderness designations under the Act any area determined by the Secretary to be at high risk of wildfire; NAY on Roll Call No. 65 (Westerman Amendment No. 7)—Strikes all designations of "potential" wilderness under the bill; YEA on Roll Call No. 66 (Cunningham Amendment)—Ensures that military aircraft overflights, units of special air space, and flight training routes are allowed over wilderness areas designated by this Act; NAY on Roll Call No. 67 (Tipton Amendment No. 9)—Strikes wilderness additions in the 3rd Congressional District of Colorado; NAY on Roll Call No. 68 (Republican Motion to Recommit on H.R. 2546); and YEA on Roll Call No. 69 (Final Passage of H.R. 2546)—Protecting America's Wilderness Act (Rep. DEGETTE—Natural Resources).

SUPPORTING H.J. RES. 79 AND THE
EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT**HON. STENY H. HOYER**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, the Gentlelady from California, Ms. SPEIER, has introduced H.J. Res. 79, legislation that would provide for the Equal Rights Amendment's immediate adoption as the Twenty-Eighth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. As Majority Leader, I am proud to bring that legislation to the Floor this week. Because House rules prohibit the addition of further cosponsors to a bill once the committee report has been filed, however, I am not able formally to cosponsor this legislation. I am in support of the bill and request to be considered by this body as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 79.

RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE BAKU POGROMS**HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 30th anniversary of the Baku Pogroms. These atrocities, in addition to

pogroms committed in Sumgait, Kirovabad, and Maraga, should never be forgotten. During this horrific period, the Armenian population of the former Soviet Azerbaijan were the victims of state-sponsored violence. These acts of violence paved the way for outright war against Nagorno-Karabakh and decades of conflict. The legacy of this conflict persists today.

The Soviet-sanctioned violence against the Armenian population in Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabakh earned strong condemnation from the United States Congress, which we are proud to uphold today. The systematic looting, maiming, and murder of Armenians permitted and encouraged by the Soviet Government remain a terrible stain on our world history. On this anniversary, it is vital that we recommit ourselves and United States policy to healing the pain caused by anti-Armenian aggression.

I urge the Trump Administration to support life-saving programs like demining assistance in Nagorno-Karabakh, as well as officially recognize the Republic of Artsakh. It is past time to implement carefully crafted, bipartisan proposals to cement peace in the region. Only by doing so can we honor the memory of the countless victims of the anti-Armenian pogroms and their descendants. I am proud to stand with Armenians and Armenian-Americans on this solemn day.

CITY OF SAN JOAQUIN CENTENNIAL

HON. TJ COX

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. COX of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the City of San Joaquin which celebrates its 100th anniversary this month.

The City of San Joaquin is a vibrant community located in rural Fresno County on what was previously part of a large ranch settled by Jefferson James, a miner and cattle rancher. After James' passing, his heirs sold their property to settlers, led by a gentleman by the name of Benjamin F. Graham, who created a formal plan for the community to be named Grahams town.

Graham sold the land to a company that, under the direction of their representative Dr. Herman Janz, established the community of San Joaquin. When the Southern Pacific Railroad established a line passing through San Joaquin in 1912, the flow of commerce expanded the area's economy. On February 14, 1920 the community elected to incorporate and became formally established as the City of San Joaquin.

Over the years, San Joaquin has become a hub of the agricultural industry with farms that produce food that feeds the world. Today, San Joaquin is known as the "everything is possible city" and continues to be a beacon of progress, aptly demonstrating a wholesome, rural way of life.

It is communities like San Joaquin that have shaped California's Central Valley, and indeed our country, into what it is today. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the City of San Joaquin and its residents on their first 100 years and in wishing them well in the many years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on Tuesday, February 11, 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 58 and YEA on Roll Call No. 59.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOE BONAMASSA

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, Joe Bonamassa is one of the most gifted, talented and accomplished singer, songwriter and guitarists in modern day blues. Blues is a quintessential American musical art form and Joe, throughout his life, has embraced and excelled in his pursuit of mastering this music. Joe, in exhibiting his extraordinary talents at the very early age of 4, was blessed to have his parents, Len and Debra Bonamassa, do everything possible to nurture and develop Joe's undeniable talent. Joe met the blues legend BB King after his mother received a call asking him to be the opening act for a concert headlined by King. Joe's incredible talent so impressed BB King that he was asked to continue as the opener and did over 20 shows with King by 1989. Len and Debra made significant sacrifices to help Joe realize his potential, including engaging Danny Gatton to mentor and train him. Len, who owned a guitar shop with his wife and a musician himself, cultivated not only Joe's interest in music but also his love of guitars. It is that connection with the guitar that is evident in all that Joe pursues in the world of music. He is an avid collector of guitars and amplifiers and is a subject matter expert on both the history and the mechanics of these instruments. He graciously shares his extensive collection of guitars and amplifiers with the public at one of the greatest guitar collections in the world—Nerdville, California. The "Bonaseum" as it is sometimes called displays some of the most historic and iconic guitars and amplifiers in the history of modern music.

Joe has released 13 studio albums and a fantastic series of live albums and DVDs that capture the essence of what makes him extraordinary, which is his ability to connect with folks before a live audience. His incredible talent and the phenomenal musicians he selects to play with him make for an unparalleled experience for his fans. Joe has pioneered a different way of doing business in the music industry. Not satisfied that he couldn't perform his music the way he wanted but the way the music industry dictated in a ones size fits all mentality, Joe broke the mold and did things his way. He took a big risk in developing a new business plan for his musical enterprise and was not sure at the time if he would survive in the music industry. He has persevered and now prospers in performing his craft the way he believes is best. He saw that there is a connection between recording and live per-

formances and has revolutionized the industry by developing and implementing a business that connects studio recording, live performances and booking his own shows. He has focused on playing smaller venues where the experience matches his style and magnitude of his performance. He has performed for over 30 years and continues to practice relentlessly and work incredibly hard at his craft. Every day he wakes up he is excited about the guitar and is equally thrilled to play it. Joe is one of the most thoughtful, caring and passionate artists in the music business. He has done a tremendous service to the world of blues music by creating the Keeping the Blues Alive Foundation. This foundation each year brings together some of the best blues artists on the planet to share their talents with folks in a close, intimate setting. This connection with music fans is a great opportunity for both emerging and established artists to enjoy playing in a small venue and to raise money for a great cause. The Foundation awards grant money to extend the reach and value of the musical experience, especially in schools. Joe is extremely accessible, humble, and infinitely committed to encouraging others to pursue their musical interest just as his mom and dad from childhood. Our nation truly values the efforts and contributions of Joe Bonamassa to the world of music and his efforts to preserve guitar history and to inspire others in their musical pursuits.

RECOGNIZING JUDGE JAMES L. ROBERTS, JR.

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Circuit Judge James L. Roberts, Jr., who retired from the Pontotoc County Courthouse after a 48-year judiciary career.

Judge Roberts was born on June 8, 1945, in Pontotoc County, Mississippi. He attended public school in Pontotoc County and later pursued higher education at Millsaps College in Jackson, Mississippi. He then earned his M.B.A. at Mississippi State University in Starkville and later received his J.D. from the University of Mississippi in Oxford.

As a life-long public servant, Judge Roberts served as Pontotoc County Prosecuting Attorney, municipal judge, chancery judge, circuit judge, Mississippi Supreme Court Justice, and was the Mississippi Commissioner of Public Safety for four years.

Throughout his life and to this day, Judge Roberts has set an example for others to follow. He and his wife, Mrs. Rose D. Roberts, are active members of Pontotoc First United Methodist Church. He has served the church as administrative council member and chair, trustee member and chair, finance member and chair, lay leader, head usher, and Sunday School Teacher.

I thank Judge Roberts for his lifelong dedication to the law and for making Mississippi a better place. I wish him many years of good health.

RECOGNIZING BOB DRAKE OF EAST HELENA, JORDAN ALEXANDER OF HELENA, AND RICK ABRAHAM OF MONTANA CITY WITH SPIRIT OF MONTANA COMMENDATION

HON. GREG GIANFORTE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Bob Drake of Helena, Jordan Alexander of East Helena, and Rick Abraham of Montana City for their many decades of service to their volunteer fire departments.

Bob grew up knowing he wanted to be a firefighter. His father was one of the founding members of the former Lakeside Fire Department that was created in 1973. In 1995, Bob followed in his father's footsteps and became a volunteer firefighter. Six years later, Bob became the department's volunteer fire chief. Bob will retire this month after 25 years on the job.

Jordan began his firefighting career at just 17, working at the station in Bozeman. After two years, he graduated high school and went on to college. After Jordan made his way to Helena in 1989, he started volunteering at the Baxendale Volunteer Fire Department. In 2012, he became fire chief. This month, Jordan retired after 30 years of total service.

Rick started firefighting in 1989 for the Montana City Volunteer Fire Department. In 2001, he became fire chief. Rick says it never ceases to amaze him how volunteers leave birthday parties or Christmas dinners in a moment's notice to help people in their time of need. In June, Rick will retire after 31 years at the department.

These men say their favorite part of the job is the impact the department has on the community. They help people on their worst days. They help their neighbors, friends, and families who face catastrophe. Everyone in the

community breathes a little easier as they see each of these men and their departments coming down the road to help in their time of crisis.

Bob, Jordan and Rick also spoke about the power of the volunteer and how they join the department with their day jobs and hobbies. The banker comes, the nurse comes, the electrician comes, and the teacher comes. The volunteers form a diverse, powerful group that serves their community to its fullest.

Madam Speaker, for their incredible leadership at the helm of the Tri-Lakes Volunteer Fire Department, Baxendale Volunteer Fire Department, and the Montana City Volunteer Fire Department, I recognize Bob Drake, Jordan Alexander, and Rick Abraham for their Spirit of Montana.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Mr. EMMER. Madam Speaker, on February 10th and 11th, I was unable to cast my vote on pieces of legislation. If present, I would have voted YEA on H.R. 2932 (Roll Call No. 55), YEA on H.R. 3413 (Roll Call No. 56), NAY on the Previous Question (Roll Call No. 57), NAY on H. Res. 844 (Roll Call No. 58), and YEA on H.R. 1980 (Roll Call No. 59).

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily

Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 13, 2020 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's record.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 25

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine surface transportation reauthorization, focusing on public transportation stakeholders' perspectives.

SD-538

MARCH 4

10 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2021 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

MARCH 5

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2021 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S999–S1049

Measures Introduced: Twelve bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3277–3288. **Page S1041**

Measures Passed:

B–47 Ridge Designation Act: Senate passed S. 490, to designate a mountain ridge in the State of Montana as “B–47 Ridge”, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1045**

Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act Correction: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1365, to make technical corrections to the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S1045–46**

Cramer (for Graham) Amendment No. 1323, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1045**

Measures Considered:

Iran War Powers—Agreement: Senate began consideration of S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S1006–12, S1012–36

Pending:

Cramer (for Cruz) Amendment No. 1301, to amend the findings. **Page S1036**

Cramer (for Reed) Amendment No. 1322, to amend the findings. **Page S1036**

Cramer (for Cotton) Amendment No. 1305, to exempt from the termination requirement United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at designated terrorist organizations. **Page S1036**

Cramer (for Risch) Amendment No. 1314, to amend the findings. **Page S1036**

Cramer (for Rubio/Risch) Amendment No. 1320, to amend the findings. **Page S1036**

Cramer (for Sullivan) Amendment No. 1319, to amend the rule of construction. **Page S1036**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of the joint resolution. **Page S1006**

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 45), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution. **Page S1012**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that the only first-degree amendments in order to the joint resolution be the following: Cramer (for Cruz) Amendment No. 1301 (listed above), Cramer (for Reed) Amendment No. 1322 (listed above), Cramer (for Cotton) Amendment No. 1305 (listed above), Cramer (for Risch) Amendment No. 1314 (listed above), Cramer (for Rubio/Risch) Amendment No. 1320 (listed above), and Cramer (for Sullivan) Amendment No. 1319 (listed above); that no second-degree amendments be in order to the amendments listed with the exception of Cramer (for Sullivan) Amendment No. 1319, and Senate vote on or in relation to the amendments in the order listed at 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, February 13, 2020, and that there be two minutes of debate equally divided prior to each vote; that all debate time on the joint resolution expire at 1:45 p.m., with the last 40 minutes equally divided under the control of Senators Risch, Inhofe, Menendez, and Kaine; and that upon the use or yielding back of that time, Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution, as amended, if amended, with no intervening action or debate. **Page S1036**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the joint resolution at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, February 13, 2020. **Page S1046**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 54 yeas to 41 nays (Vote No. EX. 41), Joshua M. Kindred, of Alaska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Alaska.

Pages S1000–05, S1049

By 72 yeas to 23 nays (Vote No. EX. 42), Matthew Thomas Schelp, of Missouri, to be United

States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri. **Pages S1005, S1049**

By 81 yeas to 12 nays (Vote No. EX. 43), John Fitzgerald Kness, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois. **Pages S1005, S1049**

By 77 yeas to 19 nays (Vote No. EX. 44), Philip M. Halpern, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York. **Pages S1005–06, S1049**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

James P. Danly, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2023.

William G. Dauster, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years.

William G. Dauster, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years.

William G. Dauster, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years.

Lorenzo Candelaria, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2024.

Tony Hammond, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation for a term expiring December 10, 2025.

Catherine Bird, of Texas, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years.

Craig Edward Leen, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General, Office of Personnel Management.

Kenneth Charles Canterbury, Jr., of South Carolina, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.

David W. Dugan, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois.

Iain D. Johnston, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Tyreece L. Miller, of Tennessee, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Tennessee for the term of four years.

Franklin Ulyses Valderrama, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Christy Criswell Wiegand, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Richard E. Zuckerman, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, and Marine Corps. **Pages S1046–49**

Nominations Withdrawn: Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nominations:

J. David Patterson, of Tennessee, to be Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, which was sent to the Senate on January 9, 2020.

Jessie K. Liu, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, which was sent to the Senate on January 6, 2020. **Page S1049**

Messages from the House: **Page S1039**

Measures Referred: **Page S1039**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S1000**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1039–40**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S1040–41**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1041–43**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1043–44**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1038–39**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1044–45**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1045**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S1045**

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—45) **Pages S1004–06, S1012**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 8:17 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 13, 2020. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1046.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SEMIANNUAL MONETARY POLICY REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress, after receiving testimony from Jerome H. Powell, Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

SPACE MISSIONS OF GLOBAL IMPORTANCE

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine space missions of global importance, focusing on planetary defense, space weather protection, and space situational awareness, after receiving testimony from

Thomas Zurbuchen, Associate Administrator, Science Mission Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; William Murtagh, Program Coordinator, Space Weather Prediction Center, and Kevin M. O'Connell, Director, Office of Space Commerce, both of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; and Moriba K. Jah, University of Texas, Austin.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY BUDGET

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2021 for the Department of the Treasury, after receiving testimony from Steven T. Mnuchin, Secretary of the Treasury.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness: Senators Cornyn (Chair), Crapo, Roberts, Thune, Portman, Toomey, Scott (SC), Cassidy, Daines, Young, Sasse, Casey, Wyden, Stabenow, Cantwell, Menendez, Cardin, Brown, Warner, and Cortez Masto.

Subcommittee on Taxation and IRS Oversight: Senators Thune (Chair), Crapo, Enzi, Cornyn, Burr, Portman, Toomey, Lankford, Warner, Menendez, Carper, Cardin, Bennet, and Whitehouse.

Subcommittee on Social Security, Pensions, and Family Policy: Senators Portman (Chair), Grassley, Cassidy, Lankford, Young, Brown, Bennet, Casey, and Cortez Masto.

Subcommittee on Health Care: Senators Toomey (Chair), Grassley, Roberts, Enzi, Thune, Burr, Scott (SC), Cassidy, Lankford, Daines, Young, Sasse, Stabenow, Cantwell, Menendez, Carper, Cardin, Brown, Casey, Warner, Whitehouse, Hassan, and Cortez Masto.

Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure: Senators Scott (SC) (Chair), Grassley, Crapo, Roberts, Enzi, Cornyn, Burr, Daines, Bennet, Wyden, Cantwell, Carper, Whitehouse, and Hassan.

Subcommittee on Fiscal Responsibility and Economic Growth: Senators Cassidy (Chair), Scott (SC), Sasse, Hassan, and Wyden.

Senators Grassley and Wyden are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

U.S.-LIBYA POLICY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States-Libya policy,

after receiving testimony from David Schenker, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, and Christopher T. Robinson, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, both of the Department of State.

GLOBAL PANDEMICS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine protecting the United States from global pandemics, after receiving testimony from Nikki Clowers, Managing Director, Health Care Team, Government Accountability Office; Julie L. Gerberding, former Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, North Wales, Pennsylvania, and Scott Gottlieb, former Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, Westport, Connecticut, both of the Department of Health and Human Services; Luciana Borio, former Director for Medical and Biodefense Preparedness, National Security Council, Arlington, Virginia; and Asha M. George, Bipartisan Commission on Biodefense, Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of John Leonard Badalamenti, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, who was introduced by Senator Scott (FL), Anna M. Manasco, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, who was introduced by Senators Shelby and Jones, Drew B. Tipton, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, and Kathryn C. Davis, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

HOME HEALTH CARE IN RURAL AMERICA

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine home health care in rural America, after receiving testimony from Leigh Ann Howard, Northern Light Home Care and Hospice, Waterboro, Maine; William A. Dombi, National Association for Home Care and Hospice, Washington, D.C.; Warren Hebert, HomeCare Association of Louisiana, Lafayette; and Francis Adams, Washington, Pennsylvania.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 27 public bills, H.R. 5857–5883; and 9 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 90; and H. Res. 849–856, were introduced. **Pages H1123–25**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1125–26**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1049**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:57 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H1055**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Dr. Lance Watson, St. Paul's Baptist Church, Richmond, VA. **Page H1055**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:03 p.m. and reconvened at 3:31 p.m. **Page H1104**

Colorado Wilderness Act: The House passed H.R. 2546, to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, by a yea-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 69. **Pages H1058–H1104, H1104–12**

Rejected the McClintock motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 199 yeas to 215 nays, Roll No. 68. **Pages H1110–12**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–50 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. **Pages H1066–89**

Agreed to:

Brown (MD) amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 116–395) that encourages the Secretary of Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to ensure service-member and veteran access to public lands; **Pages H1092–93**

Tipton amendment (No. 10 printed in H. Rept. 116–395) that requires the Department of Defense to conduct a study on the impacts that the expansion of wilderness designations in the Western United States would have on the readiness of our armed forces with respect to aviation training; **Pages H1101–02**

Kilmer amendment (No. 11 printed in H. Rept. 116–395) that clarifies that the Washington State Department of Natural Resources retains the authority to manage all lands currently owned by the state of Washington; directs the Secretary of Agriculture to satisfy the requirements of section 3(d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(d)) for new Wild and Scenic Rivers designated on the Olympic Peninsula through an updated land management plan for the Olympic National Forest; **Pages H1102–03**

Schrier amendment (No. 12 printed in H. Rept. 116–395) that requires GAO conduct a study on how the preservation of wilderness lands can help reduce the risk of flooding in residential areas; **Pages H1103–04**

DeGette amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 116–395) that makes changes to Title I—Colorado Wilderness and amounts to an approximate 60,000 acres of additional wilderness designations under Title I (by a recorded vote of 229 yeas to 189 noes, Roll No. 60); **Pages H1089–90, H1105**

Panetta amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 116–395) that states that the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may manage for fire, insects, and diseases in wilderness areas designated by this Act (by a recorded vote of 406 yeas to 12 noes, Roll No. 63); and **Pages H1093–94, H1107**

Cunningham amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 116–395) that ensures that military aircraft overflights, units of special air space, and flight training routes are allowed over wilderness areas designated by this Act (by a recorded vote of 419 yeas to 1 no, Roll No. 66). **Pages H1096–97, H1109**

Rejected:

McClintock amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 116–395) that sought to delay wilderness designations under the Act until the affected county formally approves such designation (by a recorded vote of 181 yeas to 239 noes, Roll No. 61); **Pages H1090–91, H1105–06**

McClintock amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 116–395) that sought to allow the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, to exclude from wilderness designations under this Act any areas that do not meet the definition of wilderness in the Wilderness Act; allows the same for river segments that do not meet the criteria for designation under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (by a recorded vote of 182 yeas to 236 noes, Roll No. 62); **Pages H1091–92, H1106–07**

Westerman amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 116–395) that sought to allow the Secretary

of Agriculture or Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, to exempt from wilderness designations under the Act any area determined by the Secretary to be at high risk of wildfire (by a recorded vote of 193 ayes to 228 noes, Roll No. 64);

Pages H1094–95, H1107–08

Westerman amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 116–395) that sought to strike all designations of “potential” wilderness under the bill (by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 233 noes, Roll No. 65); and

Pages H1095–96, H1108–09

Tipton amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 116–395) that sought to strike wilderness additions in the 3rd Congressional District (by a recorded vote of 183 ayes to 234 noes, Roll No. 67).

Pages H1097–H1101, H1109–10

H. Res. 844, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2546) and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) was agreed to yesterday, February 11th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, February 13th. **Page H1113**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H1058.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and eight recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1105, H1105–06, H1106–07, H1107, H1107–08, H1108–09, H1109, H1109–10, H1111–12, and H1112. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

Committee Meetings

AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PUBLIC WITNESS DAY 2

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “American Indian and Alaska Native Public Witness Day 2”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Farm Credit Administration. Testimony was heard from Jeffery Hall, Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation; and Glen Smith, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS—OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights. Testimony was heard from Susan Tsui Grundmann, Executive Director, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights.

APPROPRIATIONS—CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the Congressional Budget Office. Testimony was heard from Phillip Swagel, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PUBLIC WITNESS DAY 2

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “American Indian and Alaska Native Public Witness Day 2”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LAND BASED RANGES: BUILDING MILITARY READINESS WHILE PROTECTING NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled “Land Based Ranges: Building Military Readiness While Protecting Natural and Cultural Resources”. Testimony was heard from Jordan Gillis, Principal Deputy, Assistant Secretary of the Army, Energy, Installations, and Environment; Todd C. Mellon, Principal Deputy, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Energy, Installations, and Environment; and Jennifer L. Miller, Principle Deputy, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Energy Installations, and Environment.

THE PRESIDENT’S FISCAL YEAR 2021 BUDGET

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The President’s Fiscal Year 2021 Budget”. Testimony was heard from Russell Vought, Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget.

PROTECTING WOMEN’S ACCESS TO REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH CARE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Protecting Women’s Access to Reproductive Health Care”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SAVING ENERGY: LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND STORAGE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “Saving Energy: Legislation to Improve Energy Efficiency and Storage”. Testimony was heard from Mark W. Menezes, Under Secretary of Energy, Department of Energy; and public witnesses.

A REVIEW OF DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION AT AMERICA’S LARGE BANKS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion held a hearing entitled “A Review of Diversity and Inclusion at America’s Large Banks”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EQUITABLE ALGORITHMS: EXAMINING WAYS TO REDUCE AI BIAS IN FINANCIAL SERVICES

Committee on Financial Services: Task Force on Artificial Intelligence held a hearing entitled “Equitable Algorithms: Examining Ways to Reduce AI Bias in Financial Services”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS: AN ANALYSIS FROM FORMER U.S. NEGOTIATORS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism held a hearing entitled “The Middle East Peace Process: An Analysis from Former U.S. Negotiators”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5736, the “Transnational White Supremacist Extremism Review Act”; H.R. 5780, the “Safe Communities Act of 2020”; H.R. 5802, the “TSA Child CARE Act”; H.R. 5804, the “DHS Blue Campaign Enhancement Act”; H.R. 5823, the “State and Local Cybersecurity Improvement Act”; H.R. 5824, the “Federal Law Enforcement Training Research and Reporting Act of 2020”; H.R. 5811, the “TSA Personnel Workplace Improvement Act of 2020”; H.R. 5828, the “DHS Illicit Cross-Border Tunnel Defense Act”; H.R. 5822, the “Homeland Security Acquisition Professional Career Program Act”; and S. 2035, the “TSA Credential and Endorsement Harmonization Act of 2019”. H.R. 5736, H.R. 5780, H.R. 5804, H.R. 5811, H.R. 5822, H.R. 5823, and H.R. 5828 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 5802, H.R. 5824, and S. 2035 were ordered reported, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2214, the “NO BAN Act”; H.R. 5581, the “Access to Counsel Act of 2020”; H.R. 5546, the “Effective Assistance of Counsel in the Digital Era Act”; H.R. 3283, to amend title 4, United States Code, to permit the flag of the United States to be flown at half-staff in the event of the death of the Mayor of the District of Columbia; and H. Res. 694, recognizing the Importance of the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the Laws Derived Therefrom. H.R. 2214 and H.R. 5581 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 5546, H.R. 3283, and H. Res. 694 were ordered reported, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 644, the “Navajo Utah Water Rights Settlement Act of 2019”; H.R. 1904, the “Indian Water Rights Settlement Extension Act”; H.R. 4444, the “Western Area Power Administration Transparency Act”; H.R. 5316, the “Move Water Now Act”; H.R. 5347, the “Disadvantaged Community Drinking Water Assistance Act”; S. 832, a bill to nullify the Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865; and a Committee resolution authorizing issuance of subpoenas related to mismanagement, waste, fraud, abuse, and wrongful conduct in relation to functions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 644, H.R. 1904, and H.R. 5347 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 4444, H.R. 5316, and S. 832 were ordered reported, without amendment. The Committee resolution was agreed to, as amended.

HEARING WITH CENSUS BUREAU DIRECTOR

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Hearing with Census Bureau Director”. Testimony was heard from Steven Dillingham, Director, U.S. Census Bureau; Nick Marinos, Director, Information Technology and Cybersecurity, Government Accountability Office; J. Christopher Mihm, Managing Director, Strategic Issues, Government Accountability Office; and Albert E. Fontenot, Jr., Associate Director for Decennial Census Programs, U.S. Census Bureau.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2986, the “BEST Act”; H.R. 4230, the “Clean Industrial Technology

Act of 2019”; H.R. 5374, the “Advanced Geothermal Research and Development Act of 2019”; H.R. 5428, the “Grid Modernization Research and Development Act of 2019”; and H.R. 5760, the “Grid Security Research and Development Act”. H.R. 2986, H.R. 4230, H.R. 5374, H.R. 5428, and H.R. 5760 were ordered reported, as amended.

CHALLENGES AND BENEFITS OF EMPLOYEE-OWNED SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Challenges and Benefits of Employee-owned Small Businesses”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ANIMALS IN DISASTERS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled “Animals in Disasters”. Testimony was heard from R. Douglas Meckes, State Veterinarian, North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services; Teresa MacPherson, Canine Search Specialist, Fire and Rescue Department/Virginia Task Force 1, Fairfax County, Virginia; and public witnesses.

DATA PRIVACY AND PORTABILITY AT VA: PROTECTING VETERANS’ PERSONAL DATA

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Technology Modernization held a hearing entitled “Data Privacy and Portability at VA: Protecting Veterans’ Personal Data”. Testimony was heard from Paul Cunningham, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Information Security, Chief Information Security Officer, and Chief Privacy Officer, Office of Information and Technology, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

MISSION CRITICAL: EXAMINING PROVIDER RELATIONS DURING THE TRANSITION TO VA’S NEW COMMUNITY CARE PROGRAM

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Health; and Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a joint hearing entitled “Mission Critical: Examining Provider Relations During the Transition to VA’s New Community Care Program”. Testimony was heard from Kameron Matthews, Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Community Care, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5821, the “HOSPICE Act”; H.R.

5825, the “Transparency in Health Care Investments Act of 2020”; and H.R. 5826, the “Consumer Protections Against Surprise Medical Bills Act”. H.R. 5821, H.R. 5825, and H.R. 5826 were ordered reported, as amended.

EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND NATIONAL SECURITY: POSTURING THE U.S. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY FOR SUCCESS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Strategic Technologies and Advanced Research held a hearing entitled “Emerging Technologies and National Security: Posturing the U.S. Intelligence Community for Success”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2020

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine United States Northern Command and United States Strategic Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2021 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Judy Shelton, of California, and Christopher Waller, of Minnesota, both to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 9 a.m., SD-538.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the Semi-annual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress, 9:30 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2021 for the Department of Health and Human Services, 9:30 a.m., SD-215.

House

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Civilian Security, and Trade, hearing entitled “Assessing U.S. Security Assistance to Mexico”, 9 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled “The Youth Bulge in Africa: Considerations for US Policy”, 10 a.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet, hearing entitled “Protecting Federal Judiciary Employees from Sexual Harassment, Discrimination, and Other Workplace Misconduct”, 8:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, February 13

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S.J. Res. 68, Iran War Powers, and vote on or in relation to amendments to the joint resolution at 10:30 a.m. Senate will vote on passage of the joint resolution at 1:45 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, February 13

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.J. Res. 79—Removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Biggs, Andy, Ariz., E173
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E177
Cox, T.J., Calif., E177
Craig, Angie, Minn., E173
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E174
Emmer, Tom, Minn., E178
Foster, Bill, Ill., E175
Fudge, Marcia L., Ohio, E175

Gallego, Ruben, Ariz., E173, E176
Gianforte, Greg, Mont., E178
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E175, E176
Kelly, Trent, Miss., E171, E177
Latta, Robert E., Ohio, E172
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E176
McGovern, James P., Mass., E174, E176
Meng, Grace, N.Y., E175
Payne, Donald M., Jr., N.J., E176
Raja, Krishnamoorthi, Ill., E171

Raskin, Jamie, Md., E171
Rogers, Harold, Ky., E171
Rouda, Harley, Calif., E174
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E176
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E172
Taylor, Van, Tex., E172
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E172, E173
Williams, Roger, Tex., E173
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E177
Young, Don, Alaska, E173



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.