ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 970, INSISTING DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE COMPLY WITH REQUESTS AND SUBPOENAS

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–791) on the resolution (H. Res. 971) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 970) insisting that the Department of Justice fully comply with the requests, including subpoenas, of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subpoena issued by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to potential violations of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act by personnel of the Department of Justice and related matters, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 964 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. 6157.

Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1758

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. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota (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. 21 printed in House Report 115–785 offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY OF CONNECTICUT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in House Report 115–785.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. 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 75, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment which would increase funding for the Department of Defense's Sexual Assault Prevention and Response programs.

The men and women of our Armed Forces sacrifice a great deal to serve our country. When they enlist, they do so knowing that they may be sent into violent and dangerous situations to confront an adversary. What they do not sign up for is the violence of being sexually assaulted by one of their own fellow servicemembers.

We need to do better by all those who wear the uniform. I am encouraged that the Department of Defense has established Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program to prevent these crimes from occurring, and to ensure that victims have the resources they need to recover should an incident occur.

But the number of servicewomen and -men who experience sexual assault in the military remains staggering. Last year alone, the Department of Defense received over 6,750 reports of sexual assault involving servicemembers. Meanwhile, DOD estimates that only one in three servicemembers who experience a sexual assault file a report.

Clearly, sexual assault remains a serious issue in the Armed Forces. With over 1 million Active-Duty troops, and over 800,000 serving in the Guard and Reserves at installations all over the world, sexual assault prevention and response programs require our full support and funding. We must provide the best possible care and resources for our servicemembers who are dutifully and honorably serving and defending the United States.

That is why my amendment would increase funding for these worthwhile and vital programs, to ensure that they are there when servicemembers need them.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, sexual assault remains a serious problem in the military and one that we must continue to be addressing. The Department has implemented a number of measures to prevent and reduce sexual assault incidents, prosecute perpetrators, and better respond to victims. Despite this, there is still more to be done.

This bill provides $318 million, which is $35 million above the President's request for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response programs at the service level and at the Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program office.

I agree that this is a critical issue that requires attention at the highest level. All of the military services must continue to address incidents of sexual assault and make clear that the military has zero tolerance for such behavior.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her support and the support of the committee as well as the Rules Committee in moving forward this important amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 115–785.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 115–785.

Mr. FOSTER. 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 (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the procurement, the deployment, or the research, development, test, and evaluation of a space-based ballistic missile intercept layer.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, my straightforward amendment would prohibit the misguided use of taxpayer dollars to attempt to develop a space-based missile defense intercept layer.

As the Chair knows, the Senate-passed version of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 tasks the Missile Defense Agency with developing such a concept.

Mr. Chairman, we have been here before. The idea of a space-based intercept layer has gone in and out of fashion for the last 30 years, ever since President Reagan called for defending the United States against a massive first strike by developing a Strategic Defense Initiative system, commonly known as Star Wars.

But every time technologically competent outside experts have looked at this space-based concept, they deem it unworkable, impossibly expensive, vulnerable to simple countermeasures, easy for an opponent to destroy, easy to overwhelm with a small number of enemy missiles, or all of the above.

In fact, the former Director of the Missile Defense Agency, Admiral Syring said in 2016, that he had:

Serious concerns about the technical feasibility of interceptors in space, and its long-term affordability.

In order to reach an incoming ballistic missile during the first few minutes of flight, a large number of interceptors must be stationed in low-altitude orbit where they will be very easy for an enemy to destroy.

A report conducted by the American Physical Society in 2003 concluded that in order to ensure full coverage, a fleet of 1,000 or more orbiting satellites would be required to intercept just a single missile.

To put that in perspective, the United States today currently has slightly more than 800 satellites in Earth's orbit, and that includes commercial, scientific, and military satellites.

The National Academy of Sciences estimated that even an austere and limited network of 650 satellites would cost $300 billion, or roughly 10 times the cost of a ground-based system.

Setting aside the massive cost, a space-based missile defense system has inherent vulnerabilities that greatly limit its effectiveness. Even with thousands of interceptors deployed, only a few would be within range to target an incoming missile, and those could easily be overwhelmed by the launch of several missiles from one location.

And because interceptors must be stationed in low-altitude orbit, they could easily be detected, tracked, and destroyed. It is these limitations that led Admiral Syring to conclude that:

Essential space-based interceptor technologies have been worked on only sporadically over the years and, consequently, are not feasible to procure, to deploy, or operate in the near or midterm.

There is no doubt that a ballistic missile defense, if technologically feasible and economically justifiable, would be an important priority for our national security. So would be the Star Trek warp drive, or the transporter, if they were not technological fantasies.

But as a scientist, and, in fact, the only Ph.D. physicist in the U.S. Congress, I think that we have to listen to the experts and do our homework before investing hundreds of billions of dollars attempting to develop an unworkable system.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me and vote ''yes'' on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, as noted by Secretary of Defense Mattis:

Space is a contested domain by our strategic competitors just like air, land, and sea.

This dangerous amendment would place our country at a disadvantage with our strategic competitors by limiting the work that can be done to continue our efforts in protecting our dominance in space, and, further, from protecting our homeland from intercontinental ballistic missiles.

With the significant advances being made today by our adversaries in key areas, such as hypersonic weapons and expanding nuclear weapon proliferation, we must not restrict the Defense Department from pursuing options to deploy directed energy in space or any other capability that would result in the possibility of boost-phase capability that could be deployed from space.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is against even the possibility of investigating and going down this road. House authorizers and appropriators understand the importance of employing a layered missile defense capability, and this dangerous amendment would significantly constrain options for developing critical defensive capabilities in a gap of our current ballistic missile defense system.

A proponent of boost-phase missile defense, General Hyten, the commander of Strategic Command testified this year that:

The day you can actually shoot a missile down over somebody's head and have that thing drop back down on their heads, that will be a good day. Because as soon as you drop it back on their heads, that is the last one they are going to launch, especially if there is something nasty on top of it. I think directed energy brings that to bear, although such weapons do not yet exist in the U.S. arsenal.

Finally, I would also point out that the issue of space-based intercept was debated at length last year, passed with bipartisan support in the House Armed Services Committee, and that the National Defense Authorization Act last year passed with broad bipartisan support on the House floor.

This year, the Senate Armed Services Committee has also provided broad bipartisan support on this critical, technological development area. Now, is not the time to curtail this emerging potential capability.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I spent most of my career as an energy particle physicist and accelerator designer, designing and building complex technical systems. Nothing is less productive as a use of taxpayer money than designing and building a system, attempting to build a system that you know from the outset cannot and will not work.

If there was suddenly a magic new technology, then we can revisit this decision. But the fundamental physics and the fundamental numerology of the attack versus defense balance in this has not changed in the last 30 years as we have examined this issue.

So I think that just because it would be nice if we could magically drop a launch missile back on the enemy's head, if we do not have plausible technology that could accomplish that, doing paper designs of systems that will not work is a blatant waste of taxpayer money.

Again, I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, well, let me just conclude by saying in opposition, if it hasn't been developed yet, you don't know that it doesn't work. We have hundreds or even thousands of bright minds. I appreciate my colleague's credentials, but we have hundreds of scientists and engineers working in the Missile Defense Agency and at the government-sponsored laboratories and in other parts of the defense community in the private sector, and at the Department of Defense in the government sector, and there are possibilities here that are being pursued that have great promise, have great potential.

I think it would just be the height of foolishness to cut it off all right now when there is not even any money being appropriated for this. It is just even the possibility that the gentleman is trying to cut off, when we have potential for something that would be helpful to saving our homeland, and making those who want to rain missiles on us have to suffer the consequences of those missiles coming back down on themselves. So we shouldn't foreclose the possibility and shut the door.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, I think this all comes down to technical feasibility. Whenever you are thinking of how to spend taxpayer money, you must make a judgment call as to what things are just way out there and are not going to happen in our lifetimes, and things which have a realistic chance of working on the time scale that we are planning for.

And when all of the experts that you convene to look at this unanimously say that this system makes no sense, then it makes no sense to spend taxpayer money until we get the breakthroughs that might some day make it possible.

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

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

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

Mr. FOSTER. 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 Illinois will be postponed.

□ 1815

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Illinois for a colloquy.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

As the only Ph.D. physicist in Congress, I would like to take a moment to highlight the risks of underfunding both nuclear nonproliferation and detection.

When discussing the dangers of nuclear weapons, we often overfocus our attention on missiles and missile defense. Unfortunately, proliferation challenges are changing significantly, and there are, unfortunately, many ways to deliver a nuclear weapon, for example, the smuggling of nuclear radiological materials into the United States through our maritime ports or borders or through the use of commercial and recreational vehicles to deliver waterborne nuclear devices.

We must focus our resources on developing and deploying technologies that will lead to a substantial improvement in our ability to detect, verify, and monitor fissile material and devices. And we must continue to strengthen our workforce at our national laboratories by continuing to recruit the best and the brightest technical experts.

I note that much of this expertise is the same as will be required to ensure complete, verifiable, and irreversible dismantlement of North Korea's nuclear weapons programs and their nuclear weapons.

We can have the most expensive missile defense system in the world, but unless we address these unconventional threats as well, it is simply a false sense of security.

So it is my hope that, by raising these concerns and rebalancing our spending, we will continue to develop new and innovative ideas to detect and monitor the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and materials and, ultimately, make the world a safer place.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and acknowledge his expertise as a fellow member of the Nuclear Security Working Group.

I am grateful that Mr. FOSTER has raised the important subject of nuclear smuggling and for his continued commitment to addressing nuclear security issues. We must be relentless in developing the technologies that will help us identify and counter nuclear smuggling before dangerous materials fall into terrorist hands.

The 2018 Nuclear Posture Review acknowledges the importance of nonproliferation and countering nuclear terrorism. But I do not believe the document is forward-thinking enough when it comes to developing a plan to address future threats. We must continue to invest in research and development of nonproliferation technologies so we will have the tools that we need to keep our Nation secure in an increasingly complex nuclear environment.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's raising it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 115–785.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to procure, or to extend or renew a contract to procure, any good or service from Zhongxing Telecommunications Equipment Corporation, ZTE Kangxun Telecommunications Ltd., or Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, ZTE and Huawei Technologies are owned by the Chinese Government. Time and time again, we have seen that these companies, along with many others, abuse and manipulate their placement in the market to attack sensitive American communications, the technology sector as a whole, and our national critical infrastructure.

There is no partisan disagreement on this point. Congress has been briefed many times on Chinese cyber attacks, espionage, and trade secret theft. We all know this is a problem. It is therefore astonishing, Mr. Chairman, that it is still possible that U.S. taxpayer dollars could be used to buy goods and services from these two bad apples.

My amendment would change that. Put simply—and it is very simple, Mr. Chairman—my amendment would prevent funds under this act to procure any goods or services from these two companies. This should be the start of a larger, coordinated effort to harden our defense supply chain, sensitive communications networks, and critical industries and infrastructure from modern threats, whether they come from China or anywhere else.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with my friends and colleagues in both parties in making that a reality, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment reaffirms existing DOD policy and supports the House NDAA, which also includes this provision.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 115–785.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of amendment No. 26 and seek time to speak in support.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 1, strike ''(CVN 80)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of amendment No. 26 to provide cost-effective funding for the Navy's fourth Gerald R. Ford-class aircraft carrier, CVN–81.

Let me be clear. Amendment No. 26 does not add any additional funding to the carrier replacement program line for fiscal year 2019. None. Not one dollar. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found amendment No. 26 would not score; it would not change the overall level of budget authority or outlays in the bill in fiscal year 2019. According to the Parliamentarian, this is simply a perfecting amendment to allow for already appropriated funds to be used for both CVN–80 and CVN–81.

I believe it is possible to be both a defense hawk and a fiscal hawk. My amendment supports both positions.

For defense hawks, amendment No. 26 fulfills a critical need for our U.S. Navy. The Navy's most recent force structure assessment identified a need to maintain 12 aircraft carriers to meet combatant commanders' needs and address a growing demand for U.S. presence around the world. However, under the current shipbuilding and ship retirement plans, the Navy would dip below 12 aircraft carriers beginning in 2025 and would atrophy to just 9 aircraft carriers by 2048. This is simply unacceptable.

By procuring an additional aircraft carrier now, we better position the Navy to meet future requirements. By supporting a strong aircraft carrier base, we also show a commitment to the aircraft that operate from the carrier. The F–35 Joint Strike Fighter, the FA–18 E/F Super Hornet, EA–18G Growler, MH–60S Knighthawk helicopter, MH–60R Seahawk helicopter, as well as the E–2C/D Hawkeye aircraft all

require an aircraft carrier to operate in the Navy.

For fiscal hawks, the numbers are clear. A two-ship buy of CVN–80 and CVN–81 saves more than $1.6 billion in shipbuilder costs when compared to single ship procurements. When government-furnished equipment is included, the total savings are projected to reach $2.5 billion. Additionally, increasing the build rate encourages the shipbuilder and suppliers to make capital investments that produce production efficiencies and reduce costs for these and future ships in the Ford class.

We already have had great congressional support on this very issue. In December 2017, I led a letter with 131 House signatures to Department of Defense Secretary Mattis in support of this same dual aircraft carrier buy approach. This same provision also was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019. And H.R. 5515, which recently passed the House by an overwhelming bipartisan margin of 351–66 on May 24 of this year, is a signal of what needs to be done.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, but I do not plan to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I would like to use my time to express a note of caution to my colleagues. First, I am on record encouraging the Navy to look into constructing two aircraft carriers simultaneously. I understand the Navy is in the process of evaluating potential savings from a two-carrier buy, and I look forward to seeing that report.

Secondly, I support the Navy's fleet. Whatever the correct number may be in the end, the Navy definitely needs to have more ships to meet its mission. However, the construction of ships is very expensive. Even with the potential savings from a two-carrier buy, the expected cost of those ships would probably exceed $10 billion apiece. We also have a bulge coming up in the Navy's shipbuilding plan, as construction of the Columbia-class ballistic missile submarine gets underway.

I am not opposed to increasing the Navy's shipbuilding budget in future years, but it needs to be done in a manner that is in step with the industrial base and strategic needs of the whole Department of Defense.

Unfortunately, this body and the other body did not waive the last 2 years of the Budget Control Act. So I remind my colleagues that it is terrific talking about building more ships that we don't have the money for. The fact is, next year, this bill, left uncertain, will have $71 billion less in it, if the restrictions of the Budget Control Act are not changed.

I also would point out that two of my colleagues, who will very briefly be offering another amendment, are also cosponsors of an amendment that we will consider in a few minutes that will cut the carrier program this year by $49.1 million.

I also would emphasize to my colleagues who think we are not doing enough that the committee in the bill that is on the floor today has added $837,330,000 to the shipbuilding program that was recommended by the administration to be $21,000,871,437. And we have added two additional warships not requested by the administration.

So to imply somehow that we are weak-kneed and not spending adequately on building ships in this country is simply not true. I certainly support the objectives of my colleagues, and that is to look at an expanding Navy. But we also have to consider where we are from a budgetary standpoint today and not necessarily vote later to cut the carrier program in the same year by $49.1 million.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to first of all state very clearly that, in my opinion, both the chair and ranking member are strong supporters of our Navy and of a strong national defense, and any push in terms of these amendments is not a criticism of them at all in terms of the great work that they and their staff do putting forward a Defense Appropriations bill.

Again, very quickly, this amendment really just is an opportunity to try to take advantage of the savings that my friend, Mr. WITTMAN, described.

Block buy purchases have been tremendously successful. The last block contract for *Virginia* class, the Block IV, the PEO of submarines, Dave Johnson, was always very proud of the fact that we got 10 submarines for the price of 9 because of using the advantages of bulk purchases, which anyone who shops in Costco knows exactly what he was talking about.

Again, that is a fact, that we achieved great savings by using the block buy purchase mechanism. So I certainly strongly support Mr. WITTMAN's efforts here.

Again, I note that the $49 million that Mr. VISCLOSKY talked about is in the amendment that is fast approaching, but it was not to cut the program; it was talking to the Navy, a recognition that the change orders that occurred in the last carrier, which is first in class, will not occur to the same extent. So we are really just talking about excess change orders, which, again, as the learning curve improves for carrier production, the Navy and the Armed Services Committee calculated would produce that kind of savings without inefficiencies and without doing harm to the carrier program.

So, again, I thank the chairwoman and the ranking member for supporting Mr. WITTMAN's amendment. I look forward to working together in terms of both committees to try to achieve the goals of a strong 355-ship Navy.

□ 1830

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana). The gentleman from Virginia has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, I will be quick with my closing.

The bottom line is we need these carriers. We need $26 billion in the shipbuilding budget to reach 355 ships. So the $21 billion is admirable, but the pathway to get where we need to be of 355 is still out there for us. The challenge that we face ahead must be taken head-on. This is the first step in doing that.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MRS. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 115–785.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. 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 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,200,000)''.

Page 36, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment, which I am proud to colead with Congressman BARR of Kentucky and Congresswoman SINEMA and Congressman BIGGS of Arizona. This amendment would increase funding for the National Guard Counterdrug Program by $3 million and reduce funding for the operation and maintenance defense-wide account by a corresponding amount.

If the amendment is adopted, the House will provide $200 million in budget authority for the National Guard Counterdrug Program, which is approximately the amount that the National Guard Bureau indicates it can execute on an annual basis.

My colleagues and I offered this amendment for a simple reason. We believe the National Guard Counterdrug Program is important, that it is effective, and, therefore, that it should continue to receive robust funding. This is

especially true in light of the opioid epidemic that is harming so many communities and tearing apart so many families throughout this country, including in my district in central Florida and in Mr. BARR's district in central and eastern Kentucky.

Under the program, the National Guard Bureau distributes the money it receives from Congress to the National Guards in the States and the territories using a funding allocation model that examines the nature and scope of the drug problem in each jurisdiction. With this funding, National Guards may provide many different forms of authorized assistance to law enforcement agencies and community-based organizations, including analytical, reconnoissance, and training support.

This program is effective because it is targeted and tailored. Each State uses its funding in a way that reflects the drug interdiction priorities of its Governors, the capability of its National Guard, and the needs of its law enforcement partners at the Federal, State, and local levels.

For example, the Florida National Guard receives about $10 million a year under this program, which it uses to reduce the supply of and demand for illegal drugs in the State. Since 2014, support provided by the Florida National Guard has been instrumental in over 2,000 arrests and the seizure of nearly $14 billion in illicit drugs, property, and cash. National Guards in other States have their own success stories as well.

In conclusion, I hope my colleagues will support this bipartisan amendment, which is vital to our Nation's effort to disrupt and dismantle drug trafficking organizations and to protect our communities and our children from drug-related violence.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, this amendment increases funding for the National Guard's Counterdrug Program. We are very supportive of the counterdrug program. The bill in front of us increases funding at the same level that passed the House last year.

That being said, I understand this program is very important to many Members, and I support this amendment to provide a modest increase.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's support for this amendment, and I would just reiterate my view that the National Guard Counterdrug Program is important. I would respectfully ask my colleagues to support this amendment, which will help ensure this program is fairly funded.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands amendment No. 28 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in House Report 115–785.

Mr. COURTNEY. 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 22, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,500,000)''.

Page 24, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $49,100,000)''.

Page 24, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,001,435,000)''.

Page 24, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $246,510,000)''.

Page 24, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

Page 24, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $685,825,000)''.

Page 26, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $386,325,000)''.

Page 27, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $30,900,000)''.

Page 29, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $73,000,000)''.

Page 32, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $26,100,000)''.

Page 32, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $159,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 964, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a bipartisan, straightforward amendment that funds long-lead materials to boost construction of Virginia-class submarines to three per year, starting in 2022.

This amendment comes in response to the adamant, persistent warnings of our combatant commanders in testimony before Congress—Admiral Harris of the Pacific Command and General Scaparrotti of the European Command—that submarines are their number one unfilled priority.

This appropriations bill, unlike the NDAA, which passed 351–66, unfortunately, does not give the Navy the tools to answer that demand signal.

Here is the reality: Today, the fleet has 52 subs. The two per-year build rate in this bill will result in a drop to 42 submarines in 2028, as shown on this chart from official numbers straight from the Navy, because subs are aging out faster than the two-per-year build rate can replace.

My amendment does answer the demand signal of the COCOMs, raising the build rate to three per year at the earliest possible window, based on Navy analysis of industrial base capacity that was submitted to Congress last February.

Mr. Chairman, right now, in real time, the next 5-year block contract is being negotiated, which will determine the Nation's submarine construction until 2023. If this amendment fails, Members should be crystal clear that our Nation cannot get that time back to magically add subs later. It takes 5 years to build an attack sub, and this year's bill coincides with block negotiations in a make-or-break moment.

The offsets to pay for this amendment were part of the NDAA that a bipartisan majority of us just passed on May 24 and do not—I repeat, do not—cut a single ship or plane from the base bill, despite some of the claims that are flying around regarding this amendment.

In particular, a last-minute DOD letter out yesterday about out-year impacts is pure speculation. We will talk about this more later.

I am proud to say that my amendment is supported by some of America's most distinguished Navy officers, the last two CNOs, Admirals Roughead and Greenert; the former Fleet Forces Commander, Admiral Robert Natter; and the former Commander of Sub Forces, Admiral Michael Connor; as well as the Navy League and the metal trades of the AFL–CIO.

Mr. Chairman, they understood the urgency expressed by other COCOMs. Now the question is whether Congress will rise to the challenge they threw down.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, it really is this compelling argument: Are we, as a nation, willing to make the commitment to ensure our future national security?

Here is the deal: We are losing submarines at a breakneck pace because we are not building them fast enough to replace the ones that are retiring.

In 2020, the Chinese—just the Chinese—will have 70 submarines. They are building them at a rate of six per year. So, by 2029, when we have 42, they will have 124.

Are we willing to do that as a nation? Are we willing to take that risk? Are we willing to look at our children and grandchildren and tell them that, when we had a chance to do something, we didn't do it?

At 5:48 today, the United States Naval Institute news released an article that says: ''Congress Faces Last Chance to Add 2 Virginia-Class Attack Subs to the Next Block Buy.'' Last chance.

Here is our chance to do what is right for the Nation. Here is our chance to do what is right for national security. Here is our chance to look at our children and grandchildren and tell them we did the right thing. We saw what was coming and we stood strong, and we built the submarines necessary to defend this Nation.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support just as strongly as my friend from Virginia in support of the amendment from my good friend from Connecticut.

Mr. Chairman, we have a serious strategic issue with respect to submarines. This amendment would give the Navy the option—just an option, Mr. Chairman, not a requirement—to procure submarines at a faster rate than it is currently planning right now.

As we face bigger threats from China, from Russia, and in force projection in general, we need to look at all options, all especially when we are routinely briefed, as we all are on the Armed Services Committee, on the strategic deficiencies that we find right now.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out and make sure everyone knows I have zero shipyards in Arizona. We do not build any ships in Arizona. We are landlocked.

I support this amendment not just because I am a marine and because I am a patron; I think it is in the best interests of our country and national defense.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

We have an opportunity that doesn't come around all that often, thank God. Apparently, there are people who think this isn't important to our national defense.

I went up to an electric boat just 2 months ago. This is the most complicated machine ever designed, ever built in the history of the world. You don't turn this on and off like a spigot of water.

This is about saving our country. You heard the chairman talk about how we are falling behind as a country. How can we sit by and let this go? We must come together. We have to build this now or we are putting our country at risk.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Connecticut has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend both Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. WITTMAN for their tireless effort on the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

As they have already stated, our Navy is being squeezed and desperately needs more ships, especially submarines. Numerous civilian and military officials, including Secretary Mattis, have testified about the need for these submarines.

The goal of this amendment to ensure the Navy has the necessary resources in 2019 so that they can officially pursue and negotiate the multiyear contract is extremely important.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut and my colleague from Virginia for their hard work.

Mr. Chair, following are my remarks in their entirety:

I would like to commend both Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. WITTMAN for their tireless work on the Seapower Subcommittee on the House Armed Services Committee supporting our nation's Navy and our shipbuilding industrial base. As I have the honor of representing Newport News, Virginia, home to thousands of shipbuilders, I appreciate their work and commitment to this issue.

As Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. WITTMAN have already stated, our Navy is being squeezed and desperately needs more ships, especially *Virginia*-class attack submarines. Numerous civilian and military officials, including Defense Secretary Mattis, have testified before Congress that we need more submarines. And that's the goal of this amendment—to ensure that the Navy has the necessary resources in FY2019 that they would need in order to efficiently pursue and negotiate the next multiyear block contract in the early 2020.

Specifically, this amendment provides funding for a submarine reactor, industrial base support and other critical items. The amendment does not bind Congress or the Navy into any specific course of action. If the Navy opts not to pursue the option to purchase additional submarines, that reactor and other material purchases with these funds will be absorbed into submarines that the Navy has already contracted to buy.

Our shipbuilding industrial base is critical to our national security. Making these investments today will both save money for our Navy and provide more certainty for our shipbuilders. This amendment is supported by unions, the Navy League, and retired flag officers.

Mr. Chair, we have heard warnings for years that our submarine fleet is at risk of dropping to levels that would make in incredibly difficult for the Navy to achieve its mission. This amendment guards against that from becoming a reality.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so that Congress can preserve the option for the Navy to build as many submarines as possible, and as cost-effective as possible, in the next five-year block contract.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD letters from Admiral Greenert, Admiral Roughead, and the two most recent CNOs, Admiral Natter and Vice Admiral Connor.

JUNE 2018.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee.
Hon. ROBERT WITTMAN,
Chairman, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.
Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member, House Armed Services Committee.
Hon. JOE COURTNEY.
Ranking Member, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommitee.

DEAR CHAIRMEN THORNBERRY AND WITTMAN, AND RANKING MEMBERS SMITH AND COURTNEY, Thank you for your leadership in passing another timely and insightful NDAA for 2019. In my opinion your respective committees have led the way in Congress in proposing strategic and coherent defense related legislation.

I want to pass along my belief in the importance of this bill's provision regarding the expansion of our undersea capabilities—particularly the submarine fleet.

During my 40-year career, including my tenure as CNO, our Navy ''owned'' the Undersea domain. Navy's superiority in the undersea domain has been unchallenged, predominantly due to the excellence of the submarine force. This is no longer assured. Real threats are emerging—fast.

Our industrial base builds the finest submarines in the world. Combatant Commanders consistently request a robust submarine presence. And, the demand for submarine presence has grown even more since I retired in 2015. Navy's recent Force Structure Assessment, embraced by the Executive and Legislative Branches, validates a need for 66 submarines. The need is real and urgent. However, without near term additional legislative action our fleet is on track to reach 41 attack submarines by 2029. This will leave our future civilian and military leaders woefully short of a key platform to meet emerging challenges in the undersea (and surface) domain.

The House 2019 NDAA recognized that sustaining an SSN build rate of two-per-year would not arrest, and reverse, the decline in the undersea fleet. Authorizing additional resources for increased SSN production, specifically preserving the option to use available industrial capacity in 2022 and 2023 to reach a three-per-year build rate, is exactly the kind of thoughtful and tangible legislative action, and messaging, we need. Again, your respective committees are leading the way. As Congress continues its work on defense authorization and appropriation in the near term, I would urge your colleagues to see the opportunity and flexibility inherent in this option—and support the plan laid out in the 2019 NDAA passed by the House.

Our undersea superiority is being challenged. The recent acknowledged loss of intellectual property (Sea Dragon) is a recent example. I urge the Congress to embrace this unique opportunity presented by the House 2019 NDAA. Our security depends on this sort of bold and innovative action.

Sincerely,
JONATHAN W. GREENERT,
Admiral, USN (Retired).

JUNE 17, 2018.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee.
Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member, House Armed Services Committee.
Hon. ROBERT WITTMAN,
Chairman, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.
Hon. JOE COURTNEY,
Ranking Member, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

DEAR CHAIRMEN THORNBERRY AND WITTMAN AND RANKING MEMBERS SMITH AND COURTNEY: I appreciate your Committee's and Subcommittee's support of the U.S. Navy reflected in your markup of the 2019 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA).

The National Security Strategy, National Defense Strategy and your NDAA address and articulate the realities of once again confronting peer adversaries. In that regard, our undersea dominance will be challenged aggressively and simultaneously in several geographic regions. Whoever controls the undersea domain and sea lanes vital to us and our allies will have the upper hand in crisis and conflict history bears that out and our time is no different. Investments in capabilities (sensors, communications, weapons and quiet propulsion, etc.) will matter greatly but submarine capacity, the number of submarines we have to dominate in dispersed geographic areas, is vital. In confronting peer

adversaries at sea we must acknowledge and anticipate high-end, complex maritime warfare will result in some loss of capital assets which cannot be replaced quickly. Our submarines, because of their lethality, will be aggressively hunted and we must anticipate losses in that force. The Navy's recent Force Structure Assessment (FSA) validates the need for 66 attack submarines (I believe that number should be 72) yet we are on a path to 41 in 2029. The House 2019 NDAA recognizes this shortfall and thoughtfully and prudently seeks to enable increasing the Virginia Class submarine build rate to three ships per year in 2022 and 2023 by authorizing expenditures to that end.

Our peer adversaries are investing in research, technology and capacity. This is not what we think they will do, it is what they are doing. Our submarines and the industrial base that produces them are superior but we will need more of them and it in the coming years. We must continue to maintain our dominance and I urge your committee and your colleagues in the Senate and those on the House and Senate Appropriation Committees to definitively provide for at least three submarines in fiscal years 2022 and 2023. The gap in submarine capacity between the U.S. and our peer competitors is growing to our disadvantage. Proactive investments must be made now to arrest that growing disparity in submarine force structure and avoid the consequences of being. for the first time in decades, at a disadvantage under the sea.

Sincerely,

GARY ROUGHEAD,
Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired).

JUNE 12, 2018.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman,
House Armed Services Committee.
Hon. ROBERT WITTMAN,
Chairman, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.
Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member,
House Armed Services Committee.
Hon. JOE COURTNEY,
Ranking Member, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

DEAR CHAIRMEN THORNBERRY AND WITTMAN, AND RANKING MEMBERS SMITH AND COURTNEY: I am Robert J. Natter, Admiral, US Navy Retired. I am submitting to you my personal views and strong endorsement in support of one particular 2019 NDAA provision regarding our nation's submarine fleet. Firstly, I want you to know that I am not a submariner (I was a surface warfare officer); I am not a constituent; I do not live in a State that builds our nation's submarines; and I do not consult for or represent in any way our two major submarine building shipyards.

I do address this important issue from my perspective as a former Seventh Fleet Commander dealing with, among other challenges, North Korea, China, Freedom of Navigation operations around Taiwan and in Southeast and East Asia waters, and the readiness and combat planning associated with US Navy forces throughout Asia and Indian Ocean waters. I was also Commander of US Fleet Forces Command for three years and in that capacity was responsible for training, equipping and deploying all US-based Navy forces in response to national tasking.

Since I left the service, threats to our nation and our potential adversaries' capabilities have increased significantly. In the meantime our forces, while improving technologically, have diminished in numbers while being tasked at a level not seen since Cold War days. The Navy's recent Force Structure Assessment clearly validates the need for increased ship and aircraft numbers to meet our defense needs. It also clearly validated the need for a MINIMUM of 66 attack submarines (SSNs). Having said that, we are now on a dangerous build slope of having only 41 SSNs by 2029. The House 2019 NDAA agreed that the current build rate of two submarines per year would not reverse the decline of our undersea fleet.

Authorizing additional dollars for increased SSN production to reach a three-per-year build rate addresses our national security disadvantage while reducing the unit cost of these valuable assets. As you and your Committees work with the Appropriators I encourage all your fellow members to embrace and support the build plan called for in the 2019 House NDAA with its increased build rate for our SSN fleet. In my view, if there is sufficient funding for only one more weapon or ship system, that ship should be an SSN. This is due to its inherent survivability, flexibility (anywhere on the globe) and effectiveness against the highest end threats.

I urge you and your fellow Congressional leaders to convince your colleagues that this provision is necessary, cost effective, and the right thing to do for our country. Thank you for your continuing service to our nation and strong leadership in Congress on behalf of our defense needs.

Most sincerely,

ROBERT J. NATTER,
Admiral, US Navy Retired.

JUNE 12, 2018.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman,
House Armed Services Committee.
Hon. ROBERT WITTMAN,
Chairman, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.
Hon. ADAM SMITH,
Ranking Member,
House Armed Services Committee.
Hon. JOE COURTNEY,
Ranking Member, Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

DEAR CHAIRMEN THORNBERRY AND WITTMAN, AND RANKING MEMBERS SMITH AND COURTNEY: Thank you for passing the National Defense Authorization bill for FY2019 out of the House, especially the bill's provisions relating to the needed expansion of our undersea fleet.

Submarines are critically important to national security. During my time as Commander of the Submarine Force from 2012 to 2015, I struggled to pace the growing undersea needs of combatant commanders around the world. Many high priority missions can only be accomplished by submarines because peer competitors improved their anti-access technology and long-range strike capability. Submarine demand continues to grow. The most recent force structure assessment that increased the attack submarine requirement from 48 to 66.

Without additional action, our undersea fleet will drop to 41 attack submarines in 2029. This reduced fleet size will leave our civilian leaders and military commanders without the tools they need to keep ahead of changing threats and challenges around the globe. Mitigating this decline in the undersea fleet should be a top priority for the Navy, the Congress, and our nation.

The 2019 NDAA as passed by the House last month recognizes that simply sustaining the two-a-year production rate of Virginia-class submarines will not arrest the decline in our undersea fleet. By authorizing additional resources for increase submarine production, the bill preserves the option for utilizing available capacity in 2022 and 2023 to achieve a three-submarine build rate in those years. This will reduce the looming shortfall we face in the coming decade and help alleviate the mis-match in submarine demand and resources.

As Congress continues its work on the defense authorization and funding measures in the weeks ahead, I would urge your colleagues to support the plan you have laid out in the 2019 NDAA passed by the House. At a time when our nation's leading edge in the undersea domain is being challenged by competitors around the world, this is an opportunity that we cannot afford to miss.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. CONNOR,
Vice Admiral (ret), U.S. Navy.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, again, I want to thank Mr. VISCLOSKY and Ms. GRANGER for the courtesy and, again, having parity in terms of the time. I realize this is an extraordinary situation. They have a lot of folks who want to take the opposite position, but this is a really good comity in terms of the field.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank the ranking member for his work on this Defense Appropriations bill as well as Congresswoman GRANGER. In particular, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. COURTNEY, for his tireless work as the ranking member of the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee and Mr. WITTMAN for his tireless work.

Our submarines are the true unsung heroes of our naval fleet, and I know from firsthand experience because much of the critical fabrication work of these amazing submarines is done by my constituents in my home State of Rhode Island.

Admirals continuously tell us that they cannot get enough submarines, which are desperately needed across the globe to protect the interests of the United States. In fact, they are only able to meet some 60 or 65 percent of the demands of the requests of the combatant commanders for the use of these submarines.

Despite this urgent need, the number in our fleet is actually dropping. By 2028, it has been reported the number of submarines will drop from 52 to 42. So how can we support this near 20 percent drop when we have the ability to do something about it?

Thankfully, there is a plan to close at least some of this gap by procuring additional submarines in 2022 and 2023. But we can't increase our sub production by 50 percent on a dime. We need to make investments today if we are to be in a position to help reduce the bottoming out of our sub fleet.

The hardworking employees of our defense industrial base need to build additional capacity now. We need to act immediately if we are going to be in a position to provide more submarine reactors in the out-years.

□ 1845

This amendment will ensure that we have the flexibility going forward. That is why we included similar language in this year's National Defense Authorization Act, which overwhelmingly passed this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the urgency is particularly evident because our adversaries are not standing still. DOD has estimated that China will have an estimated between 69 and 78 submarines in 2020, and the CSBA has estimated that they will have between 80 and 100 submarines somewhere between 2022 and the 2030 time frame. We cannot, in good conscience, ignore the startling growth of this adversarial fleet.

Mr. Chair, subs not only deter our adversaries, but they also build up our allies and ensure a more prosperous, secure world. Funding our Virginia-class and Columbia-class programs must remain an absolute priority. Anything less is an affront to our national security.

This amendment continues our practice of robust investment in our submarine fleet, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, may I ask the Chair how much time is remaining.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, having been pretty close to this issue over the last 12 years, I would like to add just a little bit of perspective in terms of this initiative which, again, started at the Seapower Subcommittee.

The last two times block contracts were being negotiated was in 2007 and in 2012. In both instances, the Congress plussed up the budget for submarine construction exactly the same way we are doing it in this amendment: by funding long-lead materials; advanced procurement; purchase of a reactor, which will be built in Ohio, by the way. That gave the Navy the tools to increase their block buy.

It was done, incidentally, over the objection of the Department of Defense. I was there with Mr. Murtha and Mr. YOUNG who, again, decided to override that objection at the time. That is when we went from one-sub-a-year to two-subs-a-year production.

In 2012 we had a similar situation where the White House, the Obama administration, only requested nine subs in the next block contract, the block 4. Again, the two committees working together boosted that block authority in appropriations to get to 10 a year. Again, that was over the objections of the Department of Defense.

I realize we are going to hear a lot from my colleagues, my good friends, about Mr. Shanahan's letter that objects to my amendment. I would just say that that is not the first time we have heard that. Luckily, we have leadership in Congress which withstood those arguments. Otherwise, we would be in a worse predicament than we are today.

Again, follow past precedent. The 23 bipartisan amendment cosponsors and I strongly urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank both the chair and the ranking member for the time they have allotted.

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

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

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, this amendment increases funding for the Virginia-class submarine program by $1 billion, at the expense of other critical Navy and Air Force programs.

The Department of Defense, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Air Force, and the National Coast Guard Association of the United States all oppose this amendment.

In fact, the Deputy Secretary of Defense sent a letter detailing the harmful effects this amendment has on multiple critical National Defense Strategy programs. His quote: ''disrupt multiple critical National Defense Strategy programs.''

These are must-have programs, like the DDG 51 guided-missile destroyer, the *Nimitz*-class aircraft carrier, the Global Hawk, and the TAO fleet oiler, just to name a few.

I have also received a letter from the National Guard Association opposing this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD the letters I received from the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the National Guard Association.

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, June 26, 2018.

Hon. KAY GRANGER,
Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington. DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRWOMAN: The Department of Defense (DoD) objects to the proposed amendment by Representatives Courtney and Wittman that cuts over $1 billion from the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 President's Budget. The FY 2019 cuts disrupt multiple critical National Defense Strategy (NDS) programs, including the carrier program and Air Force research and procurement. Combined with the out-year cost of finishing the incrementally funded submarines. the Department would be required to cut over $6 billion from multiple programs such as reducing, the buys of Arleigh Burke-class destroyers, oilers and fast frigates.

The FY 2019 President's Budget request supports a robust. balanced shipbuilding program. providing $23.7 billion for ten combat ships and eight support ships. including, two Virginia-class submarines. DoD is committed to growing the size of the Navy, investing over $20 billion per year across the Future Years Defense Program. Consistent with the NDS. Dolls request balances ship procurement with readiness and other systems to be a more lethal joint force and meet future capabilities.

The Virginia-class submarine provides crucial capabilities to the joint warfight. The current Navy fleet faces known shortfalls in attack submarine inventory in future years. However, in the FY 2019 President's Budget we balanced the investment in this capability against other critical capabilities in areas such as space and cyber, and in emerging areas such as autonomy and artificial intelligence.

The Department appreciates Congressional support for growing the Navy's fleet and ensuring robust future capabilities. Working together we will find solutions that make us stronger and safer.

PATRICK M. SHANAHAN.

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2018.

Hon. KAY GRANGER,
Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRWOMAN: On behalf of the 45,000 members of the National Guard Association of the United States (NGAUS), I write today to express our opposition to the proposed amendment by Representatives Courtney and Wittman which provides funding for long lead time materials to construct additional Virginia-class submarines in FY 2022 and FY 2023.

We share the concerns of the Department of Defense as outlined in their June 26th letter of objection. Primarily, our concern centers on the fact that while programmatic adjustments are identified for the beginning of the program, this change will create an unfunded liability across the multi-year procurement cycle. As you know, the National Guard is often supplemented with Congressional assistance from your committee and I worry that creating such a large additional requirement will unduly force cuts in other critical defense funding over the next several years.

I thank you and your staff for your efforts in writing this expansive and important piece of national security legislation. Thank you, as always, for your continued support of the men and women of the National Guard. My staff and I stand by to assist in any way, and I look forward to continuing our great work together.

Sincerely,

J. ROY ROBINSON,
Brigadier General (Ret.),
President, NGAUS.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, not only does this amendment cut $1 billion from vital programs in FY19; it will leave future Congresses with at least a $6 billion shortfall. That is not the appropriate way to spend our taxpayers' dollars.

The Navy is not committed to funding these two additional submarines in the future. In fact, the Statement of Administrative Policy on the House-passed NDAA specifically objects to adding two additional submarines above what is currently in the President's budget.

This amendment takes $346 million that has been set aside for the reactor core for the last *Nimitz*-class carrier refueling overhaul. Delaying this procurement for yet another year hurts

this program and creates serious production gaps. This will directly impact the ability of the manufacturer to provide *Columbia*-class core reactors in a timely manner, and it introduces risk to the schedule for the *Columbia*-class submarine program. That is unacceptable.

The amendment takes $315 million from other shipbuilding programs, funds that will have to be repaid in future years. It takes more than $245 million from the DDG 51 guided-missile destroyer program, a critical missile-defense-capable ship that is deployed throughout the world.

This amendment is asking Congress to fund $1 billion now but create a bill for the future, a bill that will not be paid due to the imminent threat of the return of sequestration.

Some Members have asked if we can just fix this amendment in conference. Let me be very clear on that point. The answer is no. We will not be able to fix the damage this amendment causes in conference. Should this amendment pass, all cuts will be included in the conference report.

I received a letter today from Representative COURTNEY and Representative WITTMAN asking me to reconsider my position on their amendment. Their letter says that this amendment doesn't lock the Congress or Department into any course of action. That is not true.

Who will pay for these subs, and where will they find the money? Cutting $1 billion out of critically important programs so the Navy can have options in future negotiations of additional submarines is also irresponsible, especially when the Navy has neither requested nor budgeted them.

Since when is it acceptable to give $1 billion to someone so they can have options?

Their letter also claims they have not heard of any concerns about the proposed first-year offsets. This is not true. In May of this year, the Navy warned that any reductions to the DDG 51 destroyer program will affect the ability of the Navy to achieve any—any—multiyear procurement savings.

Mr. Chair, I will continue to oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I would emphasize that I am strongly opposed to this amendment and join with the chairwoman.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, with whom I feel very privileged to work, for allowing me this time. I rise tonight in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chair, first I want to say, I have the utmost respect for the many sponsors of this amendment, and particularly Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. COURTNEY. They have shown tremendous bipartisan support and leadership in their tireless support of the Navy. They are excellent in their roles on their committees, and I consider them both great colleagues and friends.

However, this amendment is the wrong way to support our Navy. The amendment would cut $1 billion in funding from a variety of extremely important Navy and Air Force programs to fund advanced procurement for two *Virginia*-class submarines.

While they have made an excellent case about how important strategically those submarines are—and I agree with them on that—the problem is that one of them will be the DDG 51 program, which is supported at Bath Iron Works.

I am proud to be from Maine and to have Bath Iron Works and their excellent workforce in my district. The men and women of Bath Iron Works have been proving the adage ''Bath Built is Best Built'' for decades, and I oppose any efforts to cut from the DDG 51 program.

My colleagues have said that this amendment is funded by potential multiyear procurement savings in future years in the targeted the programs and, therefore, we should take that funding from these programs now. But the rationale ignores critical military and defense needs and the budgets that have been agreed upon.

The amendment will abandon several agreed-upon key national defense priorities, including increasing the ships in our Navy, a critical priority. Ships that I am proud to say are being manufactured, designed, and engineered by many hardworking men and women in my district.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which would add $1 billion in advanced procurement for two additional *Virginia*-class submarines in FY 2022/23.

The Navy has a substantial plan for submarines. It achieves the mission of a 355-ship Navy by 2050 and does it in a way that is fiscally responsible and provides for stability of the industrial base.

In a letter from the Secretary of the Navy to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, the Secretary states: ''The FY 2019 President's budget provides sufficient funding to procure the ships included in the FY19–FY23 Future Years Defense Program.''

An advanced procurement amendment of $1 billion in FY19 and, by the way, an additional $6 billion tail, would take from much-needed programs that have already been considered by the committee. Additionally, it would jeopardize the future programs and assume risk in other areas.

Mr. Chair, I certainly urge a ''no'' vote on this, and I will remind my Members, as my friend from Indiana mentioned, we have a cliff coming in 2020. Making a commitment to spend an additional $7 billion, which we don't have, is not a good idea. We ought to be working on trying to resolve that cliff issue.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, the chairwoman, the ranking member, and I wholly support the U.S. Navy and, also, the Navy's plan to get to the 355-ship number.

This bill already supports the purchase of 12 new ships, including two new *Virginia*-class attack submarines. However, this amendment for an additional two more *Virginia*-class subs will wind up cutting, as you heard, much-needed money from other vital programs. The Department of Defense estimates that it would cut $7 billion from other programs over the next 5 years, by the way, impacting military readiness and other vital equipment procurement.

So, again, while we must obviously pursue an aggressive shipbuilding program, it must be balanced. The *Virginia*-class sub is absolutely a critical national security capability, but we do not want to sacrifice other equally critical capabilities while we do that.

Mr. Chair, I would respectfully urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. Chair, I would again emphasize, first of all, that the committee recognizes the needs of the United States Navy, and in the underlying legislation we have increased—increased—the administration's request.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, we have increased the underlying budget request by $837 million, and we have added two ships.

The best description for the amendment before us is shortsighted cannibalism. It eats other important Navy and Air Force programs in 2019 to feed the *Virginia*-class submarine. In doing so, it creates a myriad of problems in the out years.

The chairwoman mentioned a number of the programs that were cut in this proposal. I mentioned one in a previous amendment. I would emphasize that some of the gross numbers that have been mentioned include a cut of $10.5 million from weapons procurement from the United States Navy. It does, I emphasize, cut from carriers $49.1 million. It takes $20 million from fleet oilers. It takes $26.1 million from our research and development from the Navy and $262.9 million from the Air Force.

This is not new money. This is not free money. We are taking money from programs that need it in 2019.

Mr. Chair, I would also point out that Mr. COURTNEY mentioned two letters that were referenced by the chairwoman. I would also reference two other letters. The suggestion was made that we hear from the administration all of the time.

□ 1900

Well, Chairman MCCAIN, in the Senate, on May 30, 2017, heard from Admiral Richardson relative to the Navy's unfunded priority list for fiscal year 2018. Admiral Richardson, who is Chief of Naval Operations, mentioned 38 priority items for the United States Navy. It did not include this item. It included a request for an additional $4,796,000,000. It didn't include this item.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter that was sent to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN on February 22 of this year from Admiral Richardson for the Navy's unfunded priority list for this year, 2019. It includes 25 items. I have been scanning this with my bifocals, looking for this item of importance to the United States Navy, and I have not been able to find it in their request for an additional $1,502,270,000.

The sponsors' claim that this gives the Navy the option to construct two additional *Virginia*-class submarines during the next 5-year block contract, cutting $1 billion for useful programs this year, to give the Navy an option to do something in 4 years, does not make a bit of sense to me.

The sponsors say that this amendment sets the Navy up well for a multiyear procurement agreement, and I might not be able to argue that, in particular. However, in their quest to set that up, they are, in fact, damaging the ability of the United States Navy to set up a multiyear procurement program for the DDG–51 program.

Mr. Chairman, for all of these reasons, I am strongly opposed to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I urge the rejection of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. COURTNEY. 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 Connecticut will be postponed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, earlier in this debate, we thanked all the members of the staff who made this great bill a reality through their good efforts: the professional staff, associate staff, and all those who work in our personal offices. Again, I would like to do that on all of our behalf.

Mr. Chairman, I especially thank Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their leadership, and the involvement of all those on the floor in the production of this bill. But, at this time, I would like to offer special recognition to one in particular: the late Stephen Sepp, the Appropriations Committee's resident budget expert.

Sepp, as he was known by all, died earlier this month, but he left his mark on this bill and on our committee. His funeral was held today at St. Peter's Catholic Church, in Olney, Maryland, and attended by hundreds of Members and his friends from Capitol Hill and the appropriations family.

Among many things, Sepp was the caretaker of the all-important 302(b) sub-allocations. Through his careful work from his desk in the Capitol, upstairs here, and from home, in the final months of his illness, he ensured that the Congress provided adequate funding—may I say well over $1 trillion—not just for the Department of Defense, but for all 12 Appropriations bills.

This, of course, required a deep understanding of the policy and budgetary needs of each and every aspect of these bills, and a base of knowledge and situational awareness of all the various political factors at play. He expertly maneuvered this huge responsibility with skill, savvy, and an immense amount of poise.

Sepp embodied strength, facing both professional and personal challenges equally with grace and fortitude. In short, he made a difference in the lives of all he touched—literally millions—as well as the lives of Americans in every part of the country.

We extend our love to his wife, Diem; his two children; and family. We will always remember him.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to follow the chairman's remarks, and associate myself with his remarks relative to the staffer who has been lost.

The chairwoman was kind enough in the general debate to mention the staff and the Members who have been so instrumental in this work product, and I would be remiss if I did not conclude by again thanking the full committee chairman, as well as Mrs. LOWEY.

I can't thank Chairwoman GRANGER enough. This has just been a pleasant and productive experience, and I appreciate her leadership very much. I appreciate the work of all of the members of the subcommittee, as well as all of our staff. That includes our clerks, Jennifer Miller and Rebecca Leggieri, as well as Walter Hearne, Brooke Boyer, B.G. Wright, Allison Deters, Collin Lee, Matthew Bower, Jackie Ripke, Hayden Milberg, Bill Adkins, Sherry Young, Barry Walker, Jennifer Chartrand, Chris Bigelow, Johnnie Kaberle, Jonathan Fay, Joe DeVooght, and Christie Cunningham. I can't thank them enough.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WITTMAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, 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. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2385. An act to establish best practices for State, tribal and local governments participating in the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; in addition, to the Committee on Homeland Security for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 27, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 2229. To amend title 5, United States Code, to provide permanent authority for judicial review of certain Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 931. To require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 28, 2018, at 9 a.m.