

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Hartzler amendment. No one in the Pentagon has called for this. In fact, we know right now Secretary of Defense Mattis is running a review of this issue. He does not need to be micromanaged by Members of this body to advance their own agenda.

Until last night, all of us had worked in good faith across the aisle to keep this important Defense bill free from political booby traps and land mines, but if you are feeling *deja vu*, well, don't worry, because I am, too. You may remember that I stood here last year and fought against a similar amendment, again to the Defense bill. That amendment would have allowed Federal contractors to fire LGBT workers under the pretense of religious observance.

I told you then that my dad was a disabled veteran, that he taught me to support and honor the military, but also to speak the truth and know the difference between right and wrong.

I told you that I had never voted against the Defense bill, and I never imagined I would. And then, after a lot of twists and turns, 43 of our Republican colleagues joined with us to vote down that discriminatory amendment, and I want to publicly thank them for their courage.

Well, here we go again. The Hartzler amendment would single out and rob a small group of military servicemembers and their families of their healthcare merely because these folks or members of their family experience gender a little differently.

Mr. Chair, it is that simple. We are talking about Americans who right now are risking their lives to keep us safe, and we should not undermine their military service.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, this amendment is not about defense, this amendment is about politics, and I congratulate Chairman THORNBERRY for urging that this amendment not be added to the bill in committee.

We ought to defeat this amendment. It has one purpose, and one purpose only: to politically denigrate some of our fellow citizens, to treat them less equally than we would want to be treated.

Let us not do that. Let us not sink to that level. We are better than that. We are representative of all of the people.

Reject this amendment. Get on with the defense of this country and its values.

Mr. Chair, I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment.

It is discriminatory.

It is disparaging to our military—to all our men and women in uniform.

And it hinders our armed forces from carrying out their mission of keeping our country safe.

It is appalling that the Rules Committee would even make this amendment in order, the first ever to come to this floor that directly takes away the rights of transgender Americans.

For those transgender Americans currently serving, it would deny them health care services open to other service-members.

For those thinking of enlisting, it would be a powerful deterrent, keeping talented, driven, and dedicated men and women from serving.

I hope my colleagues in both parties who are ashamed that this amendment has reached the floor will join me in voting to defeat it.

Mr. SMITH OF Washington. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chair, this is about addressing Korea, Russia, ISIS. We need every defense dollar to go to meeting those threats, not anything else, and we need to make sure our troops are ready and can be deployed.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the Hartzler Amendment.

Transgender individuals are part of the fabric of America and have always been part of our military, whether we have historically acknowledged them or not. Selectively denying healthcare to trans servicemembers, which is available to other members of the military, only serves to alienate, undermine, disrespect and ultimately harm those serving our country.

This amendment is a shameful and targeted attempt to enact a conservative agenda that singles out transgender individuals. It circumvents, our military's doctors and uses the denial of healthcare to force currently serving, and future transgender members of our armed services from their posts entirely.

Transition related care is considered medically necessary by nearly every major medical association. It should not need to be said that when a military physician determines that hormones, surgery or other transition related care is necessary, we must treat it as we would any other medical care. Anything less is an abdication of our duty to provide healthcare to those who have chosen to serve our country.

Using finances to tie the hands of our military's medical professionals to target transgender individuals demonstrates an appalling lack of respect for our servicemembers, their doctors and the democratic ideals of equality our country was founded on. I urge my colleagues to support our servicemembers by opposing this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. 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 Missouri will be postponed.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, 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. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess.

□ 1705

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia) at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 440 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. 2810.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1706

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. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (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, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 115-217, offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), had been postponed.

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 115-217 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. BUCK of Colorado.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 10 by Mrs. HARTZLER of Missouri.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 220, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]

AYES—198

Adams	Ellison	Lowey
Aguilar	Engel	Lujan Grisham, M.
Barragan	Eshoo	
Bass	Espallat	Lujan, Ben Ray
Beatty	Esty (CT)	
Bera	Evans	Maloney
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Carolyn B.
Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean
Blunt Rochester	Fudge	Massie
Bonamici	Gabbard	Mast
Boyle, Brendan F.	Gallego	Matsui
Brady (PA)	Garamendi	McClintock
Bridenstine	Garrett	McCollum
Brown (MD)	Gomez	McEachin
Brownley (CA)	Gottheimer	McGovern
Bustos	Graves (LA)	McNerney
Butterfield	Green, Al	Meeks
Capuano	Green, Gene	Meng
Carbajal	Grijalva	Moore
Cardenas	Gutiérrez	Moulton
Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	Murphy (FL)
Cartwright	Hastings	Nadler
Castor (FL)	Heck	Neal
Castro (TX)	Higgins (NY)	Nolan
Chu, Judy	Himes	Norcross
Ciçilline	Hoyer	O'Halleran
Clark (MA)	Hunter	O'Rourke
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Palazzo
Clay	Jeffries	Pallone
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Panetta
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
Conyers	Kaptur	Payne
Cooper	Keating	Pelosi
Correa	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter
Costa	Kennedy	Peters
Costello (PA)	Khanna	Peterson
Courtney	Kihuen	Pingree
Crist	Kildee	Pocan
Crowley	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Cuellar	Kind	Quigley
Culberson	Kinzinger	Raskin
Davis (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
DeFazio	Kuster (NH)	Richmond
DeGette	Langevin	Rosen
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
DelBene	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
Demings	Lawson (FL)	Ryan (OH)
Dent	Lee	Sánchez
DeSaulnier	Levin	Sarbanes
Deutch	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Dingell	Lewis (MN)	Schiff
Doggett	Lipinski	Schrader
Doyle, Michael F.	LoBiondo	Schweikert
Duncan (TN)	Loeb	Scott, David
	Lofgren	Sensenbrenner
	Lowenthal	Serrano

Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi

Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela

Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

□ 1729

Messrs. CRAWFORD, POLIS, and DENHAM changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CAPUANO, BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, LEWIS of Minnesota, SHUSTER, DENT, and GRAVES of Louisiana changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would like to remind all Members that the upcoming votes are 2-minute votes. The Chair would also like to remind Members that they should stay close to the floor for 2-minute votes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 203, noes 218, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 367]

AYES—203

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Lucas
Denham
DesSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Ruiz
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte

NOES—220

Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moorenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palmer

Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Abraham	Davidson	Hollingsworth
Aderholt	Denham	Hudson
Allen	DeSantis	Huizenga
Amash	DesJarlais	Hultgren
Amodei	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Arrington	Donovan	Hurd
Babin	Duffy	Issa
Banks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins (KS)
Barletta	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins (WV)
Barr	Dunn	Johnson (LA)
Barton	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Bergman	Ferguson	Jones
Biggs	Fleischmann	Jordan
Billirakis	Flores	Kelly (MS)
Bishop (MI)	Fox	Kelly (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Black	Frelinghuysen	Knight
Blackburn	Gaetz	Kustoff (TN)
Brady (TX)	Gallagher	LaHood
Brat	Garrett	LaMalfa
Bridenstine	Gianforte	Lamborn
Brooks (AL)	Gibbs	Lance
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	Latta
Buck	Goodlatte	Long
Bucshon	Gosar	Loudermilk
Budd	Gowdy	Love
Burgess	Granger	Lucas
Byrne	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Calvert	Graves (LA)	MacArthur
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Carter (TX)	Griffith	Marino
Chabot	Grothman	Massie
Cheney	Guthrie	Mast
Coffman	Handel	McCaul
Cole	Harper	McClintock
Collins (GA)	Harris	McHenry
Collins (NY)	Hartzler	McKinley
Comer	Hensarling	McMorris
Comstock	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers
Conaway	Hice, Jody B.	McSally
Cramer	Higgins (LA)	Meadows
Crawford	Hill	Meehan
Culberson	Holding	Messer

NOT VOTING—15

Bilirakis
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cummings
Davis, Danny

Davis, Rodney
Gonzalez (TX)
Huffman
Johnson, Sam
Labrador

Lieu, Ted
Napolitano
Rush
Sanford
Scalise

Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton

Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NOES—218

Adams
Aguilar
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Españat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso

Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks

Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrad er
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Stefanik
Suo zzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez

Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

Vela
Vela

Cleaver
Cummings
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney

Yarmuth
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—12

Gutiérrez
Johnson, Sam
Labrador
Lieu, Ted

Napolitano
Sanford
Scalise
Speier

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

□ 1734

Mr. NUNES changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

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

RECORDED VOTE
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 234, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 368]
AYES—185

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Arrington
Babin
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy

Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fox x
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Huitzenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones

Jordan
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCa ul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Posey

Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Rutherford

Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Stivers
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Valadao

Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOES—234

Adams
Aguilar
Amodei
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Bridenstine
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Graves (LA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Huffman
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Delaney
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrad er
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Stefanik
Suo zzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman Wilson (FL) Young (IA)
Welch Yarmuth Zeldin

NOT VOTING—14

Bishop (UT) Hudson Napolitano
Cleaver Johnson, Sam Sanford
Cummings Kaptur Scalise
Davis, Danny Labrador Shuster
Davis, Rodney Lieu, Ted

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1738

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MRS. HARTZLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs.
HARTZLER) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 209, noes 214,
not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 369]

AYES—209

Abraham Duncan (SC) Jones
Aderholt Duncan (TN) Jordan
Allen Dunn Joyce (OH)
Amodei Emmer Kelly (MS)
Arrington Estes (KS) Kelly (PA)
Babin Farenthold King (IA)
Bacon Ferguson King (NY)
Banks (IN) Fleischmann Kinzinger
Barletta Flores Kustoff (TN)
Barr Fortenberry LaHood
Barton Foxx LaMalfa
Biggs Franks (AZ) Lamborn
Bilirakis Frelinghuysen Latta
Bishop (MI) Gaetz Lewis (MN)
Bishop (UT) Gallagher Long
Black Garrett Loudermilk
Blackburn Gianforte Love
Blum Gibbs Lucas
Bost Gohmert Luetkemeyer
Brady (TX) Goodlatte Marchant
Brat Gosar Marino
Bridenstine Gowdy Marshall
Brooks (AL) Granger Massie
Brooks (IN) Graves (GA) McCarthy
Buchanan Graves (LA) McCaul
Buck Graves (MO) McClintock
Bucshon Griffith McHenry
Budd Grothman McKinley
Burgess Guthrie McMorris
Byrne Handel Rodgers
Calvert Harper McCaul
Carter (GA) Harris Meadows
Carter (TX) Hartzler Meehan
Chabot Hensarling Messer
Cheney Herrera Beutler Mitchell
Cole Hice, Jody B. Moolenaar
Collins (GA) Higgins (LA) Mooney (WV)
Collins (NY) Hill Mullin
Comer Holding Murphy (PA)
Conaway Hollingsworth Newhouse
Cramer Hudson Noem
Crawford Huizenga Norman
Culberson Hultgren Nunes
Davidson Hunter Olson
DeSantis Hurd Palazzo
DesJarlais Jenkins (KS) Palmer
Diaz-Balart Jenkins (WV) Paulsen
Donovan Johnson (LA) Pearce
Duffy Johnson (OH) Perry

Pittenger Poe (TX)
Poliquin Poliquin
Posey Ratcliffe
Renacci Senenbrenner
Rice (SC) Sessions
Robby Shimkus
Roe (TN) Simpson
Rogers (AL) Smith (MO)
Rogers (KY) Smith (NE)
Rohrabacher Smith (NJ)
Rokita Smith (TX)
Rooney, Francis Smucker
Rooney, Thomas J. Stewart
Roskam Stivers
Ross Taylor
Rothfus Thompson (PA)
Rouzer Thornberry
Royce (CA) Tiberi
Russell Tipton
Turner
Upton

NOES—214

Adams Frankel (FL)
Aguilar Nolan
Amash Norcross
Barragán Gallego
Bass Garamendi
Beatty Gomez
Bera Gonzalez (TX)
Bergman Gottheimer
Beyer Green, Al
Bishop (GA) Green, Gene
Blumenauer Grijalva
Blunt Rochester Gutierrez
Bonamici Hanabusa
Boyle, Brendan Hastings
F. Heck
Brady (PA) Higgins (NY)
Brown (MD) Himes
Brownley (CA) Hoyer
Bustos Huffman
Butterfield Issa
Capuano Jackson Lee
Carbajal Jayapal
Cárdenas Jeffries
Carson (IN) Johnson (GA)
Cartwright Johnson, E. B.
Castor (FL) Kaptur
Castro (TX) Katko
Chu, Judy Keating
Cielline Kelly (IL)
Clark (MA) Kennedy
Clarke (NY) Khanna
Clay Kihuen
Clyburn Kildee
Coffman Kilmer
Cohen Kind
Comstock Knight
Connolly Krishnamoorthi
Conyers Kuster (NH)
Cook Lance
Cooper Langevin
Correa Larsen (WA)
Costa Larson (CT)
Costello (PA) Lawrence
Courtney Lawson (FL)
Crist Lee
Crowley Levin
Cuellar Lewis (GA)
Curbelo (FL) Lipinski
Davis (CA) LoBiondo
Davis, Danny Loebsock
DeFazio Lofgren
DeGette Lowenthal
Delaney Lowey
DeLauro Lujan Grisham,
M.
DelBene Luján, Ben Ray
Demings Lynch
Denham MacArthur
Dent Maloney,
DeSaulmier Carolyn B.
Deutch Mullin
Dingell Maloney, Sean
Doggett Mast
Doyle, Michael Matsui
F. McCollum
Ellison McEachin
Engel McGovern
Eshoo McHenry
Españalat Meeks
Esty (CT) Meng
Evans Moore
Faso Moulton
Fitzpatrick Murphy (FL)
Foster Nadler

Wagner Walberg
Walgreen Walden
Walker Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Cleaver Labrador Scalise
Cummings Lieu, Ted Valadao
Davis, Rodney Napolitano
Johnson, Sam Sanford

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1741

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MAST. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 369, I
mistakenly voted “no” when I intended to vote
“yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 183, noes 242,
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 370]

AYES—183

Abraham DeSantis Jones
Aderholt DesJarlais Jordan
Allen Duncan (SC) Kelly (MS)
Amash Duncan (TN) King (IA)
Amodei Dunn Knight
Arrington Estes (KS) Kustoff (TN)
Babin Farenthold LaMalfa
Bacon Ferguson Lamborn
Banks (IN) Fleischmann Latta
Barr Flores Long
Barton Fortenberry Loudermilk
Bergman Foxx Love
Biggs Franks (AZ) Lucas
Bilirakis Frelinghuysen Luetkemeyer
Bishop (MI) Gallagher Marchant
Bishop (UT) Garrett Marshall
Black Gianforte Massie
Blackburn Gibbs McCarthy
Blum Gohmert McCaul
Brady (TX) Goodlatte McClintock
Brat Gosar McHenry
Bridenstine Gowdy McCaul
Brooks (AL) Granger Meadows
Brooks (IN) Graves (GA) Messer
Buchanan Graves (LA) Mitchell
Buck Graves (MO) Moolenaar
Bucshon Griffith Mooney (WV)
Budd Grothman Mullin
Burgess Guthrie Noem
Byrne Handel Norman
Calvert Harper Nunes
Carter (GA) Harris Olson
Carter (TX) Hartzler Palazzo
Chabot Hensarling Palmer
Cheney Herrera Beutler Paulsen
Cole Hice, Jody B. Pearce
Collins (GA) Higgins (LA) Perry
Collins (NY) Hill Pittenger
Comer Holding Poe (TX)
Conaway Hollingsworth Poliquin
Cramer Hudson Posey
Crawford Huizenga Ratcliffe
Culberson Issa Hurd
Davidson Jenkins (KS) Roby
Dent Johnson (LA) Rogers (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rohrabacher Smith (MO)
 Rokita Smith (NE)
 Rooney, Francis Smith (TX)
 Rooney, Thomas Smucker
 J. Stewart
 Ross Taylor
 Rothfus Tenney
 Rouzer Thompson (PA)
 Royce (CA) Thornberry
 Russell Tipton
 Rutherford Trott
 Schweikert Wagner
 Scott, Austin Walberg
 Sensenbrenner Walker
 Sessions Walorski

Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (IA)

Watson Coleman
 Welch

Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Young (AK)
 Zeldin

Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Brooks (IN)
 Brooks (AL)
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Capuano
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Coffman
 Cohen
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Connolly
 Cook
 Correa
 Crawford
 Crist
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davis (CA)
 DeFazio
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 Dent
 DeSaulnier
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donovan
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duffy
 Ellison
 Emmer
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Esty (CT)
 Evans
 Faso
 Fitzpatrick
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gaetz
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Gomez

Palazzo
 Pallone
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Higgins (LA)
 Higgins (NY)
 Hill
 Holding
 Hollingsworth
 Hudson
 Huffman
 Huizenga
 Hultgren
 Hurd
 Issa
 Jayapal
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (MS)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kihuen
 Kildee
 Kildee
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Knight
 Kuster (NH)
 Kustoff (TN)
 Lance
 Langevin
 Latta
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (MN)
 Lieu, Ted
 LoBiondo
 Loebsock
 Lofgren
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham,
 M.
 Luján, Ben Ray
 Lynch
 MacArthur
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Marchant
 Marshall
 Massie
 Matsui
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNerney
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Moulton
 Mullin
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Neal
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nolan
 Norcross
 Norman
 O'Halleran
 O'Rourke
 Olson

NOES—242

Adams
 Aguilar
 Barletta
 Barragán
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Bost
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capuano
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cook
 Cooper
 Correa
 Costa
 Costello (PA)
 Courtney
 Crist
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Demings
 Denham
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donovan
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duffy
 Ellison
 Emmer
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Esty (CT)
 Evans
 Faso
 Fitzpatrick
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gaetz
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Gomez

Gonzalez (TX)
 Gottheimer
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hanabusa
 Hastings
 Heck
 Higgins (NY)
 Himes
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Joyce (OH)
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kihuen
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 LaHood
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (MN)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Speier
 Stefanik
 Stivers
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tiberi
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walden
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine

NOT VOTING—8

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

□ 1745

Mr. FERGUSON changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”
 So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. THOMAS J. ROONEY OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY) 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 107, noes 318, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 371]

AYES—107

Adams
 Aguilar
 Amodei
 Barletta
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bera
 Bishop (GA)
 Blunt Rochester
 Bridenstine
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Carson (IN)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Clyburn
 Comer
 Conaway
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costello (PA)
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crowley
 Davidson
 Davis, Danny
 DeGette
 DelBene
 Demings
 Denham
 DeSantis
 Deutch
 Dunn
 Evans
 Gaetz
 Garrett

Gonzalez (TX)
 Gowdy
 Graves (MO)
 Guthrie
 Gutiérrez
 Hastings
 Heck
 Himes
 Hoyer
 Hunter
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Jones
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kilmer
 Kinzinger
 Krishnamoorthi
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lipinski
 Love
 Maloney, Sean
 Marino
 Mast
 McKinley
 Messer
 Mooney (WV)
 Moore
 Murphy (FL)
 Nunes
 Payne

Pearce
 Peters
 Pingree
 Renacci
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Roby
 Rogers (KY)
 Rooney, Thomas
 J.
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Ruppertsberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Schiff
 Scott, David
 Shimkus
 Sinema
 Sires
 Swalwell (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Titus
 Upton
 Vargas
 Velázquez
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Watson Coleman
 Webster (FL)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Yoder

NOES—318

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Arrington
 Babin
 Bacon
 Banks (IN)

Barr
 Barragán
 Barton
 Bergman
 Beyer
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)

Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Blumentauer
 Bonamici
 Bost

Woodall Yoho Young (IA)
Yarmuth Young (AK) Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Cleaver Johnson, Sam Sanford
Cummings Labrador Scalise
Davis, Rodney Napolitano

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1750

Messrs. KIND and CHABOT changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. CROWLEY and Ms. JACKSON LEE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 115-217.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 12 . REPORT ON STRATEGY TO DEFEAT AL-QAEDA, THE TALIBAN, THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND SYRIA (ISIS), AND THEIR ASSOCIATED FORCES AND CO-BELLIGERENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the United States strategy to defeat Al-Qaeda, the Taliban, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), and their associated forces and co-belligerents.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An analysis of the adequacy of the existing legal framework to accomplish the strategy described in subsection (a), particularly with respect to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) and the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note).

(2) An analysis of the budgetary resources necessary to accomplish the strategy described in subsection (a).

(c) CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the report required by subsection (a), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense shall testify at any hearing held by any of the appropriate congressional committees on the report and to which the Secretary is invited.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 440, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, since 2001 when we passed the original Authorization for Use of Military Force against al-Qaeda and against associated enemies, the nature of the war on terror in which we find ourselves has changed dramatically. We now find ourselves fighting enemies that simply did not exist at the time in areas that nobody in Congress anticipated we would be at war.

This has caused a number of us to have very serious concerns as to whether or not the original Authorization for Use of Military Force is still relevant, and frankly, many of us have concerns that the war-making power of Congress is slipping away from us. Indeed, we find ourselves engaged since that original AUMF in 14 different countries on more than almost 40 different occasions without Congress authorizing the use of force. In our view, a new AUMF is necessary.

However, I also recognize that needs to come through a process. My effort here is to try and set up a process where the administration can participate, we can have an orderly discussion, and the appropriate committees can mark up a new AUMF if Congress, indeed, thinks it does—and again, I think many of us do.

A new AUMF would provide clear authority for ongoing operations against ISIS and other terrorist groups, and it would fulfill the constitutional responsibility of Congress to authorize the use of force. My amendment directs the President to put forward a strategy, an analysis, and a framework that we can actually debate and take action on.

The underlying bill being considered today provides authorization for training and equipping our military. Just as important is the time to debate and deliberate how that military should be used to defeat our enemies.

Recently, in an appearance before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Secretary Mattis made an appearance, and I actually asked him would it be helpful to have an AUMF. At that time, he said it absolutely would be helpful.

Our men and women who we have deployed in places, again, that nobody in 2001 thought they would be deployed to, need to know that the Congress of the United States is fully supportive of their deployment.

So this amendment would direct that the President, within 30 days after the passage of the legislation, present to Congress a report that, again, justifies the action, tells us the strategy, lays out the objectives. Within 30 days after that report was received, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense could be called before the relevant committees to actually explain and defend that.

Now, again, in my view, I still think we need a new Authorization for Use of Military Force, but I want to start a process whereby that would begin, and I think this would help us achieve that. If others have an opinion, that is fine

too, but I think they would still find the report useful and the testimony invaluable.

Sooner or later, Congress needs to take responsibility. I think with the best will in the world, we have slipped into almost endless warfare in a lot of places that none of us anticipated we would be.

□ 1800

Again, these are not actions that I necessarily question, but I think they have not been authorized, not been debated, not been examined, and, frankly, the American people have been denied that debate. Also, frankly, they have been denied the opportunity to hold their Members responsible.

Remember, that original Authorization for Use of Military Force was 2001. Almost 80 percent of the Members of this body have been elected since that original authorization. I think they ought to listen to the debate, and, frankly, their constituents ought to be able to hold them accountable.

So I would urge adoption of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I will not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PALMER). Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cole amendment. I am a great admirer of the gentleman from Oklahoma. We have worked together on several bipartisan letters to Speaker RYAN asking that the Speaker bring to the House floor an AUMF to address the fight against the Islamic State in Syria, Iraq, and elsewhere. I value the gentleman's leadership and desire to find common ground with Members on both sides of the aisle.

But it is frustrating, Mr. Chairman, to know that this amendment was made in order while every other amendment to require the House to take concrete action on these wars were denied their right to debate.

Maybe my good friend from Oklahoma is right and Congress has to take baby steps. It needs yet another report on Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria. Its Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services need to be ordered to hold hearings with the Secretaries of Defense and State to review these matters.

But what then?

According to this amendment, nothing.

Now, I have had my fill of Congress doing nothing. I admire the gentleman from Oklahoma. I support his amendment. But I am sick and tired of reports. After 16 years in Afghanistan, we need a debate on the future of U.S. military engagement there, and we need it now.

The gentleman said “sooner or later.” Well, after 16 years, we have already arrived at sooner and later. After

6 years of military operations in Iraq and Syria, we need to vote on an AUMF to address the fight against the Islamic State, and we need it now.

How much longer will Congress keep sending our brave servicemen and -women to war while it sits on its hands back here in Washington safe and sound?

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, but I demand that the House Republican leadership find the courage to act on these matters now. Our troops and their families deserve more than silence from a Congress that has no qualms about sending them to war but fails to have the political courage to take a vote.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), who is the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Oklahoma and his consistent and strong leadership on this issue. I, like him, believe that it is time to have a new AUMF, given the change of circumstances and the evolution of the threats which we face. This is the third administration that has had to take the 2001 AUMF and stretch its meaning to encompass all sorts of groups in all sorts of circumstances.

I think, from a legal standpoint, we need to update the AUMF so that we are consistent with the intent of the Constitution. The even more important point is the point that the gentleman from Oklahoma made, and that is that the men and women who are out there risking their lives deserve to know that they have the full backing of the country that comes from an AUMF that Congress has passed.

I do want to take exception with one point that is sometimes made. This House has voted twice to update the 2001 AUMF. It voted in 2011 and in 2012 to update that AUMF to include associated forces. It happened to be part of the NDAA, even though the Armed Services Committee is not the committee of jurisdiction. The Foreign Affairs Committee worked with us, and we passed it twice in the House. It did not survive contact with the Senate, and although there was some detention language that came from it, but there had been efforts in this House to update this language.

But I think the gentleman's approach is exactly right as for the strategy, the budget that goes with it, and the legal framework we are to follow, including the AUMF. So I do think it is a methodical, deliberate process that will take us closer to doing what we ought to do, and that does include updating this Authorization for Use of Military Force against terrorist groups as that terrorist threat evolves.

I commend the gentleman for his amendment and I support it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), who is the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I really want to follow up on the committee chairman's remarks. He is absolutely right. In 2011 and 2012, I was actually very intimately involved in the process of trying to update the AUMF, and I have all the bruises and scars to show for it. It is a very difficult process.

The main thing I want to accomplish in my 2 minutes here is to explain to everybody why we haven't updated it, because there are actually very clear reasons. I am not sure they are good reasons, but they are very clear. Every-one sort of acts like: Well, we just haven't done it. Why are we twiddling our thumbs?

The reason is because, well, lawyers and how words are interpreted. As we went through and tried to word it exactly correctly, and as we negotiated with the Senate, we discovered that basically no matter how you word it, two groups are going to oppose it for diametrically opposite reasons. One side is going to say that it is too broad; it gives the President way too much power for too long a period of time and gives him too open a hand. Other groups will look at that exact same language and say that this unfairly restricts the President; it is going to make it more difficult.

You have these conversations those of us on the committee have with the Pentagon as they are trying to figure out—I haven't had as many conversations with the current administration as with the previous, but I talked at length with the Obama folks about deciding what could they do? Where could they commit a strike? Against which groups? It was a very lengthy process to go back through and try to figure out whether or not it was under the law allowed.

So if we change this, the lawyers on both sides are going to go bananas saying that this new language proves that you can't do that or it is too broad.

Now, all of that is not to say that we shouldn't do it. We should. But I just want people to understand the difficulty of it and for our House to actually be willing—and the Senate—to do the work we should do.

Don't kid yourself that this is something, well, gosh, we could just do it, it would be easy, and if everyone understands it, we are just ducking it for no good reason.

It is going to be really, really hard. It is going to take bipartisan, bicameral cooperation. But it is way past time for us to do it. Yeah, when we do it, lawyers will interpret it, and there will be some uncertainty. But there is uncertainty now as they try to, as the chairman described, bootstrap the 2001 AUMF on to a whole bunch of other things. We have an obligation to do this even if it is difficult.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend both the chairman and the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee for their approach to this problem. It is well known in this body that probably the House Armed Services Committee is the most bipartisan committee that we have. The fact that you have tried in the past and the fact that you are willing to work with us here today is deeply appreciated.

I also thank my friend from Massachusetts, and I want to associate myself with his frustration. He has every right to be frustrated. My friend, the ranking member, is correct. This is a difficult job. It will require bipartisan cooperation and bicameral cooperation.

But isn't that what war is about, to achieve a national consensus?

I think that is exactly what Secretary Mattis was asking for: We will go do any mission that you as the Congress and the administration ask us to do, but give us a clear mission and give us your absolute support in carrying that through.

If we have this debate, there will undoubtedly be dissenting views. That is what democracy is supposed to be about, too. So my friends that would oppose the use of force, for instance, in Afghanistan, that voice ought to be heard and that case ought to be made. Frankly, those of us who are supportive of what we are trying to accomplish against ISIS need to make our case and persuade the majority of this House and of the United States Senate to move forward.

So I take this as the first step on a road. Like my friend, it is a baby step. I would agree with his characterization, but at least it is a step. This couldn't have happened without the cooperation of our leadership in the House and certainly without the help of the chairman and the ranking member of the committee. But, also, it couldn't have happened without the persistence of my friend from Massachusetts. We have worked together, and, believe me, that is unusual. We don't agree on a lot of issues, but we respect one another.

This is also a question of congressional authority. I think it is a profoundly important constitutional issue, and I do believe we have inadvertently—because of the difficulty of the task—allowed war-making power to slip away from us. That needs to stop. We are responsible to the American people. The Constitution is very clear about where war-making power lies.

Frankly, it ought to be difficult to go to war. It ought to demand a lot of cooperation. It ought to be something that we think is worth setting aside our differences, working together, because we are asking men and women to risk their lives. We are putting them in harm's way, and they deserve to know that we are 100 percent supporting them.

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cole amendment. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his work in pushing Congress to have a debate on an AUMF.

I had offered an amendment as well to the defense bill, along with Mr. SANFORD and Mr. MOULTON, that would put in place a new consolidated AUMF, and I wanted to describe it.

I know there has been considerable debate over whether this is the right bill for an amendment of this nature. But what we have tried to do in this language is avoid the red lines that both parties seem to have in this debate. As I perceive those red lines, my friends on the Republican side of the aisle are reluctant to—in what would be considered too restrictive a way—tie the hands of the Commander in Chief by putting limits on geography or the introduction of ground troops.

On the Democratic side, we are resistant to the idea of giving the Commander in Chief too much of a blank check.

The way that we have sought to navigate the distance between these two red lines is a resolution that would repeal the old authorizations which no longer really apply to our current situation, replace it with an authorization of use of force against al-Qaida, ISIS, the Taliban, and their associated forces.

It would place no geographic limits and no limits on the introduction of ground forces, but it would have these necessary safeguards. First, it would have a sunset date of 3 years so that we don't again get to a 15-year period where we can't get a vote on an authorization and it goes on beyond its intended life.

But it would also provide that, if a President decided to introduce ground troops in a combat mission, a privileged motion would be in order that any Member could trigger where within a discrete period of time set up by the War Powers Act you could compel a vote to either approve or modify or repeal the existing authority.

That would, of course, not prevent us from taking a vote at any other time, but it would at least allow a vote and some accountability.

So I commend it for people's consideration as a way that we might navigate the distance between the parties. I appreciate, again, my colleague from Oklahoma's efforts to get us to weigh in and consider and live up to our constitutional responsibility.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to advise my friend that I am prepared to close, although, believe me, I could talk about this a long time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I always enjoy hearing the gentleman talk about this. When we agree on things, it is always pleasant. I commend the gen-

tleman from Oklahoma for this amendment because I think it is important that we move forward, even if it is a small step forward.

As I said initially, I am frustrated. I know Mr. SCHIFF is frustrated, and a lot of other people are frustrated who had amendments that were perfectly germane to this bill that I think should have been debated and that many of us think they are long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, 16 years in Afghanistan is an awful long time. Some of us fear that these wars are becoming endless. They are essentially on automatic pilot. We don't give the attention that I think is appropriate to what is happening, especially given the fact that so many brave men and women have their lives on the line on behalf of our country.

But beyond that, this AUMF in Afghanistan that has now been going on for 16 years has also been used to justify what we are doing in Syria, what we are doing in Iraq, in Somalia, and I could go on and on. This is ludicrous.

□ 1815

As the gentleman from Oklahoma knows, before we began to get sucked in militarily in Syria, some of us tried to have a debate on an AUMF in Syria, because we thought the time to debate an AUMF, the time to debate military action, actually should be before we get involved.

Once we are involved, it is a lot harder to have these debates and to raise the questions that are so important as to whether or not some of these interventions are actually the right thing to do. But we skirted that issue, and we continue to put this on the back burner.

As I said, I have no objection to this amendment. I support this amendment. I just think we are at a point where we should be doing much more. We are much further along than to just require a report or to mandate hearings. I am concerned that after these reports and these hearings are done, then what? The gentleman's amendment doesn't require that Congress take up an AUMF or that we actually have to have a vote in so many days or so many months.

So I look forward to working with the gentleman to make sure that not only are these reports and these hearings conducted as we all want them to be, but to continue to press this leadership to do the right thing: to not give away Congress' constitutional responsibilities and to do what is right by the men and women who sacrifice so much for our country.

There are only a small group of people who are directly impacted by these wars, and that is the men and women who are fighting and their families. The rest of us are asked to do basically nothing. I think that Congress has shirked its responsibility. We can't tolerate that.

I hope there is a big, strong bipartisan, if not unanimous vote, for the

gentleman's amendment, but this is just the first teeny step in what we need to do. I promise him that he has my cooperation in any efforts to get it to the point where we actually debate these wars and develop AUMFs where people, as he said, can vote for them or against them.

My view of what we should be doing, I know, is very different from the gentleman from Oklahoma, and perhaps even different from the gentleman from California, but that is the kind of genius and the wonder of this place. We can all have different points of view, and we can even differ, but at the end of the day, the majority decides.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Cole amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by associating myself very much with the remarks of my good friend from Massachusetts.

Frankly, this is an area where we have found common ground because I think we both deeply revere this institution and, frankly, respect the Constitution of the United States.

When he says that we have shirked our duty, in my view, we have. I think it is absolutely a fair statement to make. I think the gentleman from Washington is also correct that it is hard. This is a very complex, difficult kind of war. It is a new kind of war, its enemies morphing into different forms and different places.

All that is true, but it doesn't excuse us from the obligation to do our job and give those men and women the assurance that they are acting at the direct request and order of the American people in fulfilling the responsibility we have asked them to take.

It doesn't directly relate to this issue, but I felt very much the same way as my friend did at the time about Libya. We stretched the NATO alliances so far to get involved in a country where, in my view, we should have never been involved. More importantly, Libya didn't attack NATO. It really didn't make a lot of sense to use that kind of instrument to justify a war.

I aim this at no particular President, either the last one or current one, but, frankly, Presidents don't like Congress very much to tell them what they have to do. They want to be able to do it. Well, I am sorry; the Constitution is very clear about that.

One of the reasons we have a Constitution is because we didn't want to live under a system where it is a monarchy as opposed to a Presidency. It is part of our duty to keep a check on the extraordinary power that we place in the hands of the Chief Executive of the United States, regardless of who that person is, regardless of what party they represent.

My friend makes a good point when he says sometimes we don't trust one another, or we don't want to give the President too much power. We also

don't want to take too much responsibility ourselves, sometimes. For that, we ought to look in the mirror. We ought to be willing to take that awesome responsibility that the Constitution entrusts us with and make the tough decisions that the American people send us here to make. I actually think going through this process will be very good for this institution.

My friend is correct, it is a baby step, and I share his frustration. But I think the current administration deserves a chance to be heard and to present a justification, not just inherit an ongoing conflict.

I think the committee of jurisdiction, the Foreign Affairs Committee, deserves the opportunity to hear this.

My friend expresses a concern which, quite frankly, I share, that we will have a hearing and not much more. That would not be where I would propose that we end. I would hope and would work with my friend to make sure that is not where we end.

I think at the end of the day, whatever the deliberation is, whatever the recommendation is for a new AUMF, it needs to come to this floor, and it needs to be open for full debate. If we can't muster a majority to approve that, then we shouldn't be fighting in the places we are fighting if we are not willing to actually vote and use that.

So I am going to pledge to continue to work with my friend and urge the administration, assuming this actually gets in the final bill, to take it as an opportunity to establish a very clear set of objectives, a very clear strategy, a very clear estimate of the budgetary cost, and a very clear analysis of the legal framework under which they are operating.

I think they, and we, owe that to the country. We certainly owe it to the men and women that we have asked to go and do difficult things and risk their lives on our behalf. They do it willingly. Again, the Secretary of Defense said this would be helpful. This kind of debate would make a difference.

I, again, thank my friends for their cooperation in this. I thank particularly the chairman and the ranking member for allowing us to use this particular vehicle to express it. I thank the leadership of the House for being willing to grapple with this issue. I thank my friend from Massachusetts for his persistent efforts; and my friend from California, Ms. LEE, who has also worked on this. A lot of people on our side of the aisle feel exactly the same way.

This is a debate about the future of a conflict, but it is also a debate about the appropriate constitutional authority of the Congress of the United States and a willingness by the Members to embrace this.

So it is actually, I think, a good day, even though it is the first step in a long journey.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. FRANKS OF ARIZONA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 115-217.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 12. STRATEGIC ASSESSMENTS OF THE USE OF VIOLENT OR UNORTHODOX ISLAMIC RELIGIOUS DOCTRINE TO SUPPORT EXTREMIST OR TERRORIST MESSAGING AND JUSTIFICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall conduct two concurrent strategic assessments of the use of violent or unorthodox Islamic religious doctrine to support extremist or terrorist messaging and justification and submit the results of the assessments to the appropriate congressional committees. These concurrent assessments shall be carried out by the following:

(1) A team of United States government employees, from relevant departments and agencies with appropriate background and expertise to contribute to such an assessment.

(2) A team of non-governmental experts from academia, industry, or other entities not currently a part of the United States Government, with appropriate background and expertise to contribute to such an assessment.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessments required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) Identification of major or significant identifiable Islamic religious doctrines, concepts, or schools of thought used by various extremist groups for specific purposes, such as recruitment, radicalization, financing, or propaganda.

(2) How key elements of these doctrines, concepts, or schools of thought are incorporated into extremist or terrorist messaging and justification.

(3) Identification of major or significant identifiable Islamic religious doctrines, concepts, or schools of thought that can be used to counter the threads identified in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(4) Recommendations for identifying key thought leaders or proponents for these major or significant identifiable Islamic religious doctrines, concepts, or schools of thought in paragraphs (1) through (3).

(5) Recommendations for technological capability, training improvements, or process developments to speed the identification of harmful or destabilizing Islamic religious doctrines, concepts, or schools of thought used by extremist groups.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Relations, Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 440, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, it has been 15 years and 10 months since the attacks on September 11, which killed nearly 3,000 people and wounded nearly 6,000 others.

Since then, America has fought five operations in eight countries, prosecuting wars against those responsible, their allies, and sympathizers, and the foundational ideology that fomented it. And 5,400 American heroes have given the last full measure of devotion in service to their country to combat this vile enemy.

Yet, in spite of all of this, there are those who continue to oppose any attempts to study the ideological roots of this enemy. Their zealous commitment not to understand our enemies' motivations would almost be impressive if it weren't so harmful.

As my friends across the aisle were so eager to point out, this is not a war which can be won with bombs and bullets alone. Despite the peerless capability of our warrior class, we cannot kill our way out of this problem, nor is this a war which can be won by increasing the State Department's budget for providing "jobs programs" for jihadists.

It has to be noted by even the most intransigent of those who would oppose my amendment today that so many of the young men who buy into this destructive movement come from families who are more than comfortable financially.

Osama bin Laden's family was not going hungry when he declared war on America, twice. Many of the significant leaders of the various groups and factions are men with postdoctorate degrees in Islamic studies from some of those most prestigious universities in the Muslim world.

Yet we are told by countless talking heads and politicians that men and women who carry out these terrible attacks and cry, Allahu Akbar, in that moment when they detonate bombs in the midst of the crowds of innocent men, women, and children, have nothing to do with Islamist ideology.

Mr. Chairman, to embrace that flagrant fallacy means we will never be able to address this evil on a strategic level, and our noble men and women in uniform will be forced to combat it on a tactical level only.

This present struggle against the vast majority of terrorism in the world is fundamentally one of ideas, and it will be won on the battlefield in the hearts and minds of human beings.

Mr. Chairman, I know that there are many brands of violent extremism, and I eagerly would join my colleagues in any effort to combat them all. If the FBI does not have enough resources to combat neo-Nazis or White supremacists, then I want to know about that,

and I want to help. There is no desire in my heart whatsoever to single out any group of innocent people or denigrate their faith in any way.

However, the reality remains that there is one spectrum of Islamic ideology whose variants are responsible for the 9/11 attacks, feeling the insurgency in Iraq, the countless attacks on civilians in Europe, and the boundless evil of the Islamic State.

In 2017 alone, there have been 1,134 attacks in 49 countries, in which more than 8,000 people have been killed and 8,000 more were injured.

Our allies across the world, including in the Muslim world, have now begun to study and analyze the ideology that foments Islamic terrorism so they can begin to resist it on a strategic ideological level.

If we in America do not also address this on a strategic level, this underlying ideology that catalyzes the evil of jihadist terrorism across the world, then its list of victims will only grow longer.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will help us to categorize those perpetrating violence in the name of Islam and help us to identify our allies within the Muslim world who can assist in countering the Islamic message of global jihad. Those who would oppose this amendment choose to continue the status quo, that is to say, no strategy at all.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would just implore the Members of this body to pass this amendment and join this sincere effort in finally identifying our enemies, empowering our friends, and ending this evil destructive ideology once and for all.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am a Marine Corps infantryman. When I was fighting door-to-door in Iraq, some of the bravest marines in my unit, men of valor and patriotism, were Muslims. They stood with the Iraqis to risk their lives and endangered loved ones to help us.

At this very moment, marines are still fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. Many of them are Muslim. They still rely on the steadfast support of our Muslim allies. That is why I find this amendment so troubling.

□ 1830

Mr. Chairman, at a time when American forces are deployed across the Muslim world and depend on the support of Muslim governments, the Franks amendment will send exactly the wrong message to our friends and adversaries alike.

By singling out a faith tradition for a strange and unprecedented study by our military, we are sending a dan-

gerous message and signal that America is at war with Islam. America is not ever going to be at war with a single religion.

It is our task as Members of Congress who care about our military and about the American values that our service-members risk their lives for to defend it and to reaffirm those values, and we can do that by defeating this misguided amendment.

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chair, how much time remains on this side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 15 seconds remaining.

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, if the Congress of the United States were to direct the Department of Defense to study and examine and scrutinize your religion to list leaders in that religion and teachers, to decide what was orthodox and unorthodox, you would be among—I don't know—the Christian community, the Jewish community, Buddhists, Hindus, and Muslims.

But only Islam is selected out in the Franks amendment, only one religion is done so. Mr. Chair, if you select out one religion for particular scrutiny, to scrutinize their doctrine, to declare to the government what is orthodox and unorthodox, and to identify teachers of it, you have simply abridged the free exercise of that religion. That is unconstitutional.

Nobody is saying you can't study terrorism. You can study what motivates people to commit acts of terrorism; and we should, but we don't, not equally. The fact is that this amendment singled out and stigmatizes one religious group. It is wrong, and it should be voted down.

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this dangerous and divisive amendment that is the latest attempt to criminalize the religious beliefs of Muslims in this country.

Let me remind my colleague from Arizona that our country was founded on the principle of religious liberty, and the First Amendment guarantees that right.

In calling for a strategic assessment, this amendment tramples on our Constitution's separation of religion and State, singles out the Muslim religion, its practices and leaders, and it does nothing to keep our Nation safe. In fact, fear-mongering undermines trust and national security, and pits neighbor against neighbor, community against community, and is an insult to our American Muslim communities.

This amendment doesn't even apply its arbitrary surveillance equally, be-

cause if it did, it would include assessments of White supremacist terrorism or terrorism committed against abortion clinics and doctors.

Mr. Chairman, our fight against terrorism is not against any religion. It is against the acts that are committed and those who commit the acts. It violates our Constitution and runs counter to who we are as a nation.

Frankly, it is horrifying, and I urge my colleagues to resoundingly oppose it.

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment, which selectively requires the military to identify Islamic religious doctrines, concepts, or schools of thought used by various extremist groups and how they have been incorporated into terrorist messaging.

The problem, of course, is that terrorist killers have used religious doctrines and concepts from every major religion on earth, including not just Islam, but Christianity, Judaism, Mormonism, Hinduism, Buddhism, for homicidal purposes. Because religion is based on faith and not reason, and because religious texts are not self-explanatory, good people will invoke scripture for good causes and evil people will invoke scripture for evil causes.

We don't need a big government study to teach us something so commonsensical, which the Founders taught us a long time ago. If we want to study the exploitation of religion for terrorism, let's study it universally.

Focusing on one religion not only vastly understates the problem, but exacerbates the problem by fomenting the myth that religious fanaticism and terrorism are unique to the charlatans and predators of Islam when they are common to the charlatans and predators of nearly every religious faith and identification.

Constitutionally, we do not single out particular religions for governmental inspection and suspicion under the First Amendment.

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have available?

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I think what we need to remember is there is some commonality here; and I am reminded of this almost every weekend, especially when I stay here in Washington, D.C. I go to section 60 of Arlington National Cemetery to visit my friends that died in the war in Iraq. In every headstone there, you will see a lot of different symbols of religions, whether it is the Jewish star, whether it is the Islamic symbol or the Christian symbol, or the nonbeliever, no symbols whatsoever.

The one thing they all have in common is they are all sharing the same ground. They are all sharing the same sacred ground of Arlington National Cemetery because they all died for the same American values. That American value says that we will not ostracize somebody else for their religion, for who they believe or who they don't believe. Any steps towards that is dangerous.

If we want to continue to reaffirm the values that those men and women have died for that are now sitting in section 60, we need to defeat this amendment and do it because we know it is the right thing to do, and it reaffirms those American values that those men and women have died for.

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will empower America to identify those heroes within the Muslim world who are working so bravely to counter the odious violent ideology which continues to use Islam to justify the murder of tens of thousands of innocent men, women, and children. It will save American lives, it will save Muslim lives, it will save lives across the world, and I would encourage my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. CHENEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 115-217.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 1673. PROHIBITION ON REDUCTION OF THE INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided by subsection (b), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Defense shall be obligated or expended for—

(1) reducing, or preparing to reduce, the responsiveness or alert level of the intercontinental ballistic missiles of the United States; or

(2) reducing, or preparing to reduce, the quantity of deployed intercontinental bal-

listic missiles of the United States to a number less than 400.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any of the following activities:

(1) The maintenance or sustainment of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

(2) Ensuring the safety, security, or reliability of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

(3) Reduction in the number of deployed intercontinental ballistic missiles that are carried out in compliance with—

(A) the limitations of the New START Treaty (as defined in section 494(a)(2)(D) of title 10, United States Code); and

(B) section 1644 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3651; 10 U.S.C. 494 note).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 440, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an amendment that will help ensure the strength of our nuclear deterrent by preventing further reductions to our deployed ICBM fleet below 400 missiles.

At this point, our deployed fleet at 400 missiles is at the basic level necessary to maintain a strong and effective nuclear deterrence. Mr. Chair, our ICBMs are a critical leg of our triad as they provide our commanders with a responsive, flexible, and survivable military response ready 24/7, 365 days a year.

Our ICBM leg of the triad also adds significantly to our deterrence capability by increasing the number of targets our adversaries must hold at risk.

My amendment is a safeguard that prevents any unilateral disarmament that would leave our Nation vulnerable to attack. My amendment does not impact our compliance with the New START, and it does not change our current alert level or require the deployment of any additional ICBMs at this point.

The amendment simply reaffirms to our adversaries and our allies that our nuclear deterrence will remain strong.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simply not necessary, as it is a solution in search of a problem.

Now, the budget request for fiscal year 2018 has no funding for reducing the level or reducing the number of deployed ICBMs below 400, and there are no plans to do so in the future.

It also presupposes the completion of the nuclear posture review, which is currently ongoing and is expected at

the end of this year. So instead of jumping the gun and acting precipitously, we should allow the administration time to finish the review and base our actions on its findings.

This is particularly true because it may be that reducing the number of ICBMs and reducing alert levels could, in fact, be beneficial to enhance strategic stability. Preventing such a reduction also disregards the crucial and fundamental role of our Nation's submarines, which provide an assured, survivable second-strike capability, and which dissuades an adversary from thinking they could launch a disarming attack against the United States.

ICBMs can be seen as destabilizing in that they would force a very rapid decision by the President and are use-or-lose nuclear weapons. History has shown us concerns about the potential for a rushed decision in response to a false alarm that none of us wish to see repeated.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to talk about keeping ICBMs, it should be done in a meaningful, informed discussion based on the findings of the Nuclear Posture Review instead of yet another annual amendment driven by what seems like a parochial interest, which does not consider the other legs of the nuclear deterrent.

Instead, we should focus on increasing accountability and ensuring that we are improving the morale and culture inside the Air Force with regard to nuclear weapons so that some of the serious and embarrassing problems that have plagued the ICBM missileers and security forces in recent years may be properly addressed.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chair, there is nothing in my amendment that has any negative impact on our submarine fleet. In fact, I support strongly, as does the NDAA, the importance of the triad, as have administrations of both parties over many years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for offering this amendment. A provision nearly identical to this has been in the final version of the last two NDAAs, and it should be in the final version of this year's NDAA.

As chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, I understand that the responsiveness and distributive nature of our ICBMs are the most critical features. Without ICBMs, an adversary would need to strike less than 10 targets to disarm our nuclear forces. But with ICBMs, an adversary needs to strike hundreds of hardened targets deep in America's homeland. That is a much more difficult proposition and is at the very heart of our deterrence.

During his confirmation hearing, Secretary of Defense Mattis agreed

with this assessment, noting: “The ICBM force provides a cost-imposing strategy on our adversaries.”

We should confirm this policy once more. It is vital that our ICBM force remain robust and responsive. I urge a “yes” vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this amendment basically unnecessarily ties the hands of our administration in terms of choosing how best to spend Defense dollars.

Now, the gentlewoman mentions that this does not say anything about reducing our submarine force or reducing our bomber force. It does, however, lock in a certain amount of ICBMs that we have to have, and, in that sense, it does impact all other choices in terms of our Defense policy not just within the nuclear framework.

But within the nuclear framework, there is, as I keep emphasizing and people keep resisting, a finite amount of resources available to fund the Department of Defense. In fact, that is the central problem with this whole bill, as I have mentioned.

We don't have a budget resolution. This is \$72 billion over-the-budget caps that the House has shown no willingness to vote to lift. So here we have \$72 billion that we are just kind of hoping is going to be there. So at some point we are going to have to make some choices. I keep saying that. We keep delaying it—doing CRs. We even shut down the government once.

We continue to sort of stumble forward with no clear plan, but amendments like this are just another example of how we lock in a lack of flexibility in terms of how we spend our money.

What is the best approach to our national security?

Now, it has been mentioned and I keep harping on the fact that we don't have a national security plan yet. And it has been mentioned, well, Presidents usually take awhile to deliver them. And okay, fine, we will, you know, sometime in the next year hopefully get that plan. But amendments like this trap that plan, restrict the ability of the President to deal with a finite amount of resources to come with what is the best approach.

□ 1845

And there are a lot of arguments that ICBMs are not the best approach to nuclear deterrence. Do we need an absolute fixed amount? I don't think so. I think we need greater flexibility, particularly as we await the findings of the Nuclear Posture Review to figure out what our best strategy going forward is.

So we have all these little parochial pieces where we make sure that the piece that is closest to us, you can't touch that. We have to have exactly the same number. That is not in the best interests of a comprehensive National Security Strategy.

We need flexibility in this budget. We are not going to have as much money as everybody seems to think that we are going to have. That is just the fact. We are \$20 trillion in debt, running up deficits of \$700 billion a year. We have the budget caps. At some point, we are going to have to start making choices. This amendment does not help in that.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. As I like to quote: “Gentlemen, we are out of money; it is time to think.”

We are, in fact, running out of money—that is a Winston Churchill quote, by the way—but we appear to not be willing to do the thinking part about making choices on where we should not and should spend our money.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wyoming has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON), a retired brigadier general and the former commander of Offutt Air Force Base.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chair, I just want to point out, when I came to the Air Force in 1985, we have since then reduced our ICBM force by 60 percent. Enough is enough. Four hundred is the level we should not go below.

Our strategic nuclear force enterprise is America's force of last resort and has, for decades, asserted peace through strength for the United States and its allies around the world.

I would like to remind my colleagues that every one of us in the House and the many millions of Americans we represent have lived and prospered in peace precisely because we have made the conscious decision as a nation many years ago to keep a strong, responsive, and resilient nuclear deterrent.

The ICBM leg of the nuclear triad is, by design, the largest, safest, and most responsive part of our central strategic forces. It is the very foundation of our nuclear deterrent, and we must preserve the longstanding bipartisan consensus that our ICBMs be kept at high levels of alert and at sufficient numbers to ensure our nuclear deterrent stays credible.

As we continue down to a new START level, a treaty level of 400 ICBMs, it is essential that we go no lower. When we say “promote the common defense,” this is what those words mean.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I believe, as I said before, this amendment is an unnecessary amendment. It does not meaningfully address the three legs of the nuclear triad. Let's wait until the Nuclear Posture Review is done and base our decision then on facts and not on speculation.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, we have seen over the years many misguided efforts to unilaterally cut our strategic forces and to do so in a way that has been really based on a notion that somehow if we reduce the level of weapons in our inventory, that our adversaries will do the same. We know that is simply not the case.

This amendment is crucial to ensure that we maintain the kind of deterrent that is necessary in a world in which we are facing increasing threats.

Our ability to deter against the threats of our adversaries depends in large part both upon their understanding of our will to use our forces as well as their belief in our capability, and the last thing we should be doing is reducing below a safe and secure number.

Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment, my intention is very much to say, look, our obligation as Members of the House of Representatives is to provide for the common defense and to ensure that, while we are overseeing activities by the executive branch, we are not allowing the kind of irresponsible cuts that could put us at risk.

So I urge the adoption of my amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 115-217.

Mr. LAMBORN. 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 681, line 15, insert “(a) INTEGRATION OF PATRIOT MISSILES INTO INTEGRATED MASTER TEST PLAN.—” before “Not later than”.

Page 682, after line 5, insert the following new subsection:

(b) NORMALIZING OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION.—

(1) CONDITION FOR PROCEEDING BEYOND LOW-RATE INITIAL PRODUCTION.—Section 2399(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “or a covered designated major subprogram” and inserting “a covered designated major subprogram, or an element of the ballistic missile defense system”.

(2) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 1662 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 10 U.S.C. 2431 note) is repealed.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 440, the gentleman

from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

The goal of this amendment is simple: given the rising nuclear and ballistic missile threat from North Korea and Iran, we have a renewed urgency to do everything we can to make sure that the Missile Defense Agency goes as fast and as far as possible. This includes cutting unnecessary bureaucracy.

This amendment would normalize the operational test and evaluation process for our ballistic missile defense system, simply treating it like every other major weapons system that we have.

This amendment fixes an outdated bureaucratic requirement which requires the Secretary of Defense, himself, to guarantee in advance a system will work before it can even be bought. This is such a high bar, we don't use it anywhere else.

Under this amendment, we will still have a robust, rigorous testing program, without the Secretary of Defense needing to get personally involved. The Director of OT&E, which is the Pentagon's testing office, would still be required by law to evaluate and approve testing plans, analyze and evaluate testing results, and publish an annual public report with this information. Congress and the Secretary of Defense will still have the power to say no. The difference is MDA won't have needless obstacles to prevent them from moving forward.

Let's free the Missile Defense Agency and unshackle it so it can better do its vital job of protecting us from missile attack.

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

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

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I regret that my good friend from Colorado has offered this amendment. It was not voted on in either subcommittee or in full committee. It should be rejected by this House, and rejected overwhelmingly.

Why? We need to make sure that our missile defense works. This is not a vote on whether we are for or against missile defense. I am strongly for missile defense. I just want to make sure that it works. In the National Defense Authorization Act of 2015, there is a strong section in that act that requires that it work.

The gentleman's amendment is not supported by the Missile Defense Agency, it is not supported by the Pentagon.

What it is is a vendor's dream, what it is is a defense contractor's dream, because it would enable them to sell

stuff to us, the American taxpayer and to the citizens of this country, promising national defense, but not proving it.

We need to fly it before we buy it. We need to test it before we invest in it. We need to make sure that it works before we fork over the dough.

If this loophole were to be established into law, allowing missiles to be flown through this loophole, it would delight the defense contractor industry. This is an amazing breach of what really, I think, has been American law for 150 years.

Back during the Civil War, there was a law passed called the Lincoln Law. And because so many Americans were outraged that the bullets sold to the Union soldiers did not work and the cannonballs did not work and the boots didn't last in the rain, they passed one of the toughest laws ever passed by this Congress, to penalize defense contractors who sold us stuff that did not work.

We need to make sure these missiles work. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The threat from North Korea is real, the threat one day from Iran could be real. We need to make sure these missiles work. And to short-circuit, to obviate a testing requirement would be an appalling thing for us to do.

This has been law since 2015. It is working, it works fine, the Missile Defense Agency is all for it. Let's keep it. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

And to allow contractors to sell us stuff that is unproven, that is not tested, that has not flown before we buy it, oh, my gosh, I wouldn't want to be on that side of that transaction.

So the gentleman is an outstanding Member, he does great work. As I say, this was not voted on in either subcommittee or full committee. It would be a mistake for the full House to support this amendment at this time.

So I would urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, if there is any evidence that MDA or DOD does not favor this amendment, I sure haven't seen it, and I would like to see that produced so I could see that.

At this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his amendment.

This committee has been trying to seek out and remove impediments to speedy acquisition for years. Section 1662 of fiscal year 2015 NDAA is just such an impediment. I don't understand why Congress believed it was prudent to let DOD's testers prevent the Secretary of Defense from deploying military capability.

Further, I do not agree with the contention that this amendment will fur-

ther reduce oversight of the testing of missile defense capabilities. In fact, the plain language of the amendment inserts ballistic missile defense systems into the existing title 10 DOD OT&E testing requirement, just like every other DOD acquisition program.

This is literally where the so-called "fly before you buy" term comes from.

Every year, we already receive another report from DOD OT&E on the testing of ballistic missile defense, and then there is the Integrated Master Test Program that MDA and DOD OT&E collaborate on. And then, finally, the GAO does a report, also, that helps Congress oversee BMD programs.

How many reports do we need to do the same thing? Especially when North Korea is making unprecedented progress on its ballistic missile capability, we should be making MDA more efficient and nimble, and I think removing redundant reporting requirements and impediments on the deployment of proven capabilities is a commonsense step.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, this Congress in 2015 passed this requirement because it made sense.

Institutional memory can be short. The MDA is already exempt from normal Pentagon acquisition processes. No one in this body should think that MDA is subjected to the DOD 5000 regular acquisition rules.

What this amendment would do would be to short-circuit that process. And which Member of this House in either party would want to admit to the constituency that they represent that they voted to allow missiles to be purchased by this country before we knew they would work?

The threat is real, and we need to be prepared for that threat and we need defense missiles that work. Already the shot doctrine is several to one. We have to shoot up four missiles and hope that we can stop the one from coming over. We need things that actually work better than that. We need to make sure this equipment that the U.S. taxpayer is buying functions correctly.

We have already expedited the acquisition process for the MDA. Let's not expedite it further. If our missile defenses don't work, we are all in trouble. The Congress decided wisely and rightly in 2015.

The MDA, as I say, does not support this amendment. They have had ample opportunity to come to us and say that they want more flexibility, more freedom, they want things that work too. This House should want things that work. So I urge my colleagues to support what works and oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. How much time does each side have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Tennessee has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, as my colleagues know, just one successful ballistic missile attack on U.S. territory

or forward deployed forces or allies would carry an enormous cost of life and treasure. I am pleased that we are finally making some real progress in this bill at funding missile defense programs that have been underfunded for years. General John Hyten, who is in charge of missile defense, said recently: "What really worries me the most is I'm worried that our Nation won't be able to go fast enough to keep up with our adversaries anymore." He argues that we need to empower our engineers with the authority and responsibility so they can go faster.

We have the greatest minds at the Missile Defense Agency. They are motivated people that serve our country every day when they come into work. We just need to let them do their job. But we must not let outdated, duplicative bureaucratic requirements keep us from defending ourselves from ballistic missile threats.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which would free the Missile Defense Agency to move faster to defend us from future threats.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I know this amendment comes late in the process and my colleagues are tired of hearing all these National Defense Authorization Act amendments, but this one is really important. Already the North Koreans threaten the United States. Other countries could do so. We need to make sure that our missile defense works, and our constituents will not accept excuses.

Now, as I say, defense contractors love this approach if they can sell us something that is not proven to work, but this equipment must work.

□ 1900

This Congress got it right in 2015. The MDA is on board with the testing that they have to do. The process now works. Let's not change it, and this amendment would change it for the worse. It would be a defense contractor's dream.

Let's not cave in to the lobbyists, let's not give away the American taxpayers' money, and let's make sure that the defense equipment we buy works. By stopping this amendment, we will do so. This amendment would be a giveaway to the defense contracting industry.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER), my colleague. He is very sincere in what he says.

I believe we have so many checks and balances that we will not be buying things that don't work. But, we need to unshackle MDA so they can get their job done faster and better than they can right now.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, Admiral Syring has been a great leader of MDA. He did not request this change. Admiral Syring has done a great job. Let's follow his lead, and let's reject this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. COOPER. 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.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 440, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 2, 8, 9, 11, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35 printed in House Report 115-217, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle C of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 1. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR THE ENHANCED MULTI MISSION PARACHUTE SYSTEM.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 for the enhanced multi mission parachute system may be used to enter into, or to prepare to enter into, a contract for the procurement of such parachute system until the date on which the Secretary of the Navy submits to the congressional defense committees the certification described in subsection (b) and the report described in subsection (c).

(b) **CERTIFICATION.**—The certification described in this subsection is a certification by the Secretary of the Navy that—

(1) neither the Marine Corps' currently fielded enhanced multi mission parachute system nor the Army's RA-1 parachute system meet the Marine Corps requirements;

(2) the Marine Corps' PARIS, Special Application Parachute does not meet the Marine Corps requirements;

(3) the testing plan for the enhanced multi mission parachute system meets all regulatory requirements; and

(4) the Department of the Navy has performed an analysis and determined that a high glide canopy parachute system is not more prone to malfunctions than the currently fielded free fall parachute systems.

(c) **REPORT.**—The report described in this subsection is a report that includes—

(1) an explanation of the rationale for using the Parachute Industry Association specification normally used for sports parachutes that are employed from relatively slow flying civilian aircraft at altitudes below 10,000 feet for a military parachute;

(2) an inventory and cost estimate for any new equipment and training that the Marine Corps will have to be acquire in order to employ a high glide parachute;

(3) an explanation of why the Department of the Navy is conducting a paper down select and not conducting any testing until first article testing; and

(4) a discussion of the risk assessment for high glide canopies, and specifically how the Department of the Navy is mitigating the risk for malfunctions experienced in other high glide canopy programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK OF COLORADO

Page 375, after line 8, insert the following:
SEC. 1039. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO DESIGNATE OR EXPAND FEDERAL NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to designate or expand any Federal National Heritage Area in any of Baca, Bent, Crowley Huerfano, Kiowa, Las Animas, Otero, Prowers, or Pueblo counties, Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

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

SEC. 1040. REQUIREMENT RELATING TO TRANSFER OF EXCESS DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EQUIPMENT TO FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES.

Section 2576a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) **PREFERENCE FOR BORDER SECURITY PURPOSES.**—(1) In transferring the items of personal property described in paragraph (2) under this section, the Secretary of Defense may give first preference to the Department of Homeland Security and then to Federal and State agencies that agree to use the property primarily for the purpose of strengthening border security along the southern border of the United States.

“(2) The items of personal property described in this paragraph are—

“(A) unmanned aerial vehicles;

“(B) the Aerostat radar system;

“(C) night-vision goggles; and

“(D) high mobility multi-purpose wheel vehicles (commonly known as ‘humvees’).”.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. CHENEY OF WYOMING

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

SEC. 12. PLAN TO ENHANCE THE EXTENDED DETERRENCE AND ASSURANCE CAPABILITIES OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) **FINDING.**—Congress recognizes that North Korea's first successful test of an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) constitutes a grave and imminent threat to United States security and to the security of United States allies and partners in the Asia-Pacific region.

(b) **PLAN.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Commander of the United States Pacific Command and the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to enhance the extended deterrence and assurance capabilities of the United States in the Asia-Pacific region.

(c) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—Such plan shall include consideration of actions that will enhance United States security by strengthening deterrence of North Korean aggression and providing increased assurance to United States allies in the Asia-Pacific region, including the following:

(1) Increased visible presence of key United States military assets, such as missile defenses, long-range strike assets, and intermediate-range strike assets to the region.

(2) Increased military cooperation, exercises, and integration of defenses with allies in the region.

(3) Development and deployment of ground-based intermediate-range missiles, whether by allies or by the United States, if the United States were no longer bound by the limitations of the INF Treaty.

(4) Increased foreign military sales to allies in the region.

(5) Planning for, exercising, or deploying dual-capable aircraft to the region.

(6) Any necessary modifications to the United States nuclear force posture, including re-deployment of submarine-launched nuclear cruise missiles to the region.

(7) Such other actions the Secretary considers appropriate to strengthen extended deterrence and assurance in the region.

(d) FORM.—Such plan shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(e) INF TREATY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “INF Treaty” means the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. POLIQUIN OF MAINE

Page 38, line 10, strike “not fewer than two” and insert “the two”.

Page 38, beginning on line 23, strike “the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) or”.

Page 39, line 2, strike the period and insert “and that was fully funded.”.

Page 39, after line 2, insert the following:

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

(1) destroyers authorized to be appropriated by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) should be configured as Arleigh Burke class Flight IIA guided missile destroyers, as initially authorized in section 123 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1655); and

(2) the Department of the Navy should bear the majority risk associated with the share line on a covered destroyer.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

Strike subsection (d) of section 211 and insert the following:

(d) FORM OF CONTRACTS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT FOR FIXED-PRICE TYPE CONTRACTS.—The contract awarded for the procurement of the unmodified commercial aircraft under the PAR program shall be a fixed price type contract.

(2) ANALYSIS FOR FIXED-PRICE TYPE CONTRACTS.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall work with the contractor and conduct an analysis of risk and explore opportunities to enter into additional fixed price type contracts for engineering and manufacturing development beyond the procurement of the unmodified commercial aircraft as described in paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

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

SEC. 2 . PILOT PROGRAM ON INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES.

The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy, shall conduct a pilot program among defense laboratories

(as defined in section 2199 of title 10, United States Code), national laboratories (as defined in section 188(f) of title 10, United States Code), and private entities to facilitate the licensure, transfer, and commercialization of innovative technologies.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. LOEBSACK OF IOWA

At the end of subtitle B of title II in division A, add the following:

SEC. . STEM(MM) JOBS ACTION PLAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Jobs in science, technology, engineering, and math in addition to maintenance and manufacturing (collectively referred to in this section as “STEM(MM)”) make up a significant portion of the workforce of the Department of Defense.

(2) These jobs exist within the organic industrial base, research, development, and engineering centers, life-cycle management commands, and logistics centers of the Department.

(3) Vital to the continued support of the mission of all of the military services, the Department needs to maintain its STEM(MM) workforce.

(4) It is known that the demographics of personnel of the Department indicate that many of the STEM(MM) personnel of the Department will be eligible to retire in the next few years.

(5) Decisive action is needed to replace STEM(MM) personnel as they retire to ensure that the military does not further suffer a skill and knowledge gap and thus a serious readiness gap.

(b) ASSESSMENTS AND PLAN OF ACTION.—The Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Secretary of each military department, shall —

(1) perform an assessment of the STEM(MM) workforce for organizations within the Department of Defense, including the numbers and types of positions and the expectations for losses due to retirements and voluntary departures;

(2) identify the types and quantities of STEM(MM) jobs needed to support future mission work;

(3) determine the shortfall between lost STEM(MM) personnel and future requirements;

(4) analyze and explain the appropriateness and impact of using reimbursable and working capital fund dollars for new STEM(MM) hires;

(5) identify a plan of action to address the STEM(MM) jobs gap, including hiring strategies and timelines for replacement of STEM(MM) employees; and

(6) deliver to Congress, not later than December 31, 2018, a report specifying such plan of action.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

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

SEC. 2 . APPROPRIATE USE OF AUTHORITY FOR PROTOTYPE PROJECTS.

Section 2371b(d)(1)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or nonprofit research institution” after “defense contractor”.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 2 . JET NOISE REDUCTION PROGRAM OF THE NAVY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Navy, acting through the Director of the Office of Naval Research, may carry out a jet noise reduction program to study the physics of, and reduce, jet noise produced by high-performance military aircraft.

(b) ELEMENTS.—In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Secretary may—

(1) identify material and non-material solutions to reduce jet noise;

(2) develop and transition such solutions to the fleet;

(3) communicate relevant discoveries to the civilian aviation community; and

(4) support the development of theoretical noise models, computational prediction tools, noise control strategies, diagnostic tools, and enhanced source localization.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR.

FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

SEC. 2 . PROCESS FOR COORDINATION OF STUDIES AND ANALYSIS RESEARCH OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

The Secretary of Defense shall implement a Department of Defense-wide process under which the heads of the military departments and Defense Agencies responsible for managing requests for studies and analysis research are required to coordinate annual research requests and ongoing research efforts to minimize duplication and reduce costs.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 104, after line 6, insert the following:

SEC. 337. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COST MODELS USED IN MAKING PERSONNEL DECISIONS.

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of—

(1) the extent to which the Department of Defense has incorporated feedback and lessons learned from cost comparisons of the performance of Department of Defense functions by members of the Armed Forces, Department of Defense employees, and contractor personnel in making workforce decisions;

(2) the extent to which the Department has used such feedback and lessons learned to improve guidance, including DODI 7041.04 and the full cost of manpower tool; and

(3) any other related matter the Comptroller determines appropriate.

(b) REPORT AND BRIEFING.—

(1) BRIEFING.—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Comptroller General shall provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives an interim briefing on the review required by subsection (a).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to such committees a report on such review.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY OF WEST VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 345. INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for Civil Military Programs is hereby increased by \$25,000,000 (to be used in support of the National Guard Youth Challenge Program).

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide is hereby reduced by \$25,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 108, after line 23, insert the following new section:

SEC. 345. REPORT ON MATERNITY UNIFORMS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall issue to the congressional defense committees a report regarding maternity uniforms for pregnant members of the Armed Forces.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under subsection (a) shall address the following:

- (1) The design of maternity uniforms.
- (2) Materials used in the fabrication of maternity uniforms.
- (3) The sizing of maternity uniforms.
- (4) Prices of maternity uniforms.
- (5) The availability of maternity uniforms.
- (6) The quality of maternity uniforms.
- (7) The utility of maternity uniforms.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following:

SEC. 345. STATUS OF COMPLIANCE WITH PROGRESS FOR COMMUNICATING AVAILABILITY OF SURPLUS AMMUNITION.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the status of compliance with section 344 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2084).

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 115, line 21, strike “10” and insert “4.8”.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MS. HERRERA BEUTLER OF WASHINGTON

Page 126, after line 12, insert the following:

SEC. 516. CONFIDENTIAL REVIEW OF CHARACTERIZATION OF TERMS OF DISCHARGE OF MEMBERS WHO ARE SURVIVORS OF SEX-RELATED OFFENSES.

(a) **CODIFICATION OF CURRENT CONFIDENTIAL PROCESS.**—

(1) **CODIFICATION.**—Chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1554a a new section 1554b consisting of—

(A) a heading as follows:

“§ 1554b. Confidential review of characterization of terms of discharge of members of the armed forces who are survivors of sex-related offenses”; and

(B) a text consisting of the text of section 547 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (10 U.S.C. 1553 note, Public Law 113-291).

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 79 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1554a the following new item:

“1554b. Confidential review of characterization of terms of discharge of members of the armed forces who are survivors of sex-related offenses.”

(3) **CONFORMING REPEAL.**—Section 547 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (10 U.S.C. 1553 note, Public Law 113-291) is repealed.

(b) **CLARIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY TO INDIVIDUALS WHO ALLEGE SEX-RELATED OFFENSES DURING MILITARY SERVICE.**—Subsection (a) of section 1554b of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, is amended by striking “sex-related offense” and inserting the following: “sex-related offense, or alleges that the indi-

vidual was the survivor of a sex-related offense.”

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 1554b of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), is further amended—

(1) by striking “Armed Forces” each place it appears in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting “armed forces”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “boards for the correction of military records of the military department concerned” and inserting “boards of the military department concerned established in accordance with this chapter”; and

(B) by striking “such an offense” and inserting “a sex-related offense”;

(3) in subsection (b), striking “boards for the correction of military records” in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting “boards of the military department concerned established in accordance with this chapter”; and

(4) in subsection (e), as redesignated by subsection (d)(1)—

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “title 10, United States Code” and inserting “this title”; and

(C) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by striking “such title” and inserting “this title”.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MRS. WATSON COLEMAN OF NEW JERSEY

Page 146, after line 16, insert the following:

SEC. 531. SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE.

(a) **ARMY.**—The Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Chiefs of the National Guard Bureau and the Army Reserve shall—

(1) conduct an evaluation of staffing approaches used to administer the sexual assault prevention and response program in the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. In conducting such evaluation, the Secretary consider opportunities to leverage resources across all Army components and shall conduct an assessment of the number and allocation of full-time and collateral-duty personnel, the fill rates for program positions, and the types of positions used; and

(2) direct the Chief of the Army Reserve to develop and implement an expedited line-of-duty determination process for Army Reserve sexual assault victims, along with a method for tracking the length of time to make the determinations, that ensure members of the Armed Forces who wish to file a confidential or restricted report are able to go through the determination process without disclosing their circumstances to the chain of command.

(b) **SHARP PROGRAM OFFICE.**—The Director of the SHARP Program Office of the Army National Guard shall—

(1) communicate and disseminate its guidance on budget development and execution for the SHARP program to all full-time SHARP program personnel;

(2) develop clear guidance on budget development and execution for the SHARP program and disseminate this guidance to its full-time SHARP program personnel; and

(3) expand the scope of the midyear review to include monitoring and providing oversight of SHARP program expenditures at the Army National Guard state and Army Reserve command level.

(c) **NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.**—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau, in collaboration with the Secretaries of the military departments concerned, shall reassess the Office of Complex Administrative Investigation’s timeliness and resources to determine how to improve the timeliness of processing sexual assault investigations involving members of the Army National Guard and identify the resources needed to improve the timeliness of such investigations.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. JENKINS OF WEST VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR NATIONAL GUARD COUNTER-DRUG PROGRAMS.

(a) **INCREASE.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 1403 for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4501, for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, Defense-wide, is hereby increased by \$10,000,000 (to be used in support of the National Guard counter-drug programs).

(b) **OFFSET.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for Operational System Development, Global Command and Control System, Line 210, is hereby reduced by \$10,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. GOWDY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 116, line 1, after “Representatives” insert the following: “and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives”.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD OF ARKANSAS

Page 125, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 505. DESIGNATING THE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL CORPS AS A BASIC BRANCH OF THE ARMY.

Section 3063(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) in paragraph (12), by striking “and”;
- (2) by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (14); and
- (3) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph (13):
 - “(13) Explosive Ordnance Disposal Corps; and”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 440, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), a combat veteran.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Chairman, I rise today because veteran suicide is an epidemic. Nearly every week, I hear from a veteran who is thinking about taking their own life—maybe walking into their garage, turning on their car, and never coming out.

That is why I introduced the Oath of Exit, and why I urge you to pass this bill as a part of the National Defense Authorization Act. The bill creates a voluntary operation oath for members of the Armed Forces with a specific aim of reducing veteran suicide.

The idea for this bill came from friends of mine who have struggled with suicidal thoughts since leaving the military—people like my friend Boone; people who have actually been there on the edge.

I think we all know that, throughout our lives, the most important commitments that we make are spoken—

whether it is an oath upon joining the military, the vows at our wedding, or saying the Pledge of Allegiance—and this verbal commitment to reach out to a brother- or sister-in-arms is important, as well.

Mr. Chairman, integrity is more than a word to a servicemember. So, if we commit that we will reach out to a brother or a sister because we need help, then we will do it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. SMITH for including my amendment en bloc and for allowing me to speak on it today.

Mr. Chairman, among the amendments under consideration in this en bloc measure is one that I have authored to address various challenges to the Army, National Guard, and Army Reserve sexual assault prevention and response programs.

While sexual assault among our Active Duty forces has been a frequent topic of discussion, I rise today to draw attention to the same issue that remains just as prevalent within our Reserve component forces.

More than half a million members currently serve in the Army Guard and Reserve. Hundreds of incidents of sexual assault are reported each year, and it is estimated that several hundred more go unreported.

The Reserve components of the Army continue to suffer from staffing imbalances, poor budget management, and slow investigations that delay access to care for hundreds of sexual assault victims. My amendment directs the Department of Defense to take steps to address these issues.

Sexual violence is a criminal behavior, and it has no place in our military.

We must regain the trust of the servicemembers, who have been brave enough to come forward to report those crimes, by bettering our military justice system.

Congress has a responsibility to protect the servicemembers who make immeasurable sacrifices to serve and protect our country. We must foster a system that encourages servicemembers to seek help and care, and that protects the very people who keep our Nation safe.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Texas for their leadership, making their way through a very important action on behalf of the American people, and that is the defense authorization. I thank them for the amendments that were made en bloc, and I hope to speak quickly about these important amendments.

I am very grateful. Over the years, I have consistently introduced the triple negative breast cancer amendment because of the many women in the United States military who benefit from the research necessary.

My amendment authorizes and encourages increased collaboration between the DOD and the National Institutes of Health regarding combating triple negative breast cancer.

It has a particular impact on African-American women, but it impacts White women, Hispanic women, and others, as well. This is a serious illness that affects between 10 to 17 percent of female breast cancer patients and is more likely to cause death.

My amendment would help to save lives. I am delighted because this would impact Active-Duty women, as well as veterans; but, in particular, Active-Duty women with testing. It affects women under 50 years of age, and, therefore, women who would be in the United States military.

I am very grateful for the acceptance of the South Sudan amendment. My amendment directs the Department of Defense to prepare contingency plans to assist relief organizations and delivery of humanitarian assistance efforts in South Sudan and to engage in consultation with South Sudan military counterparts to deescalate conflict.

Famine in South Sudan has been created by conflict. On February 20, 2017, famine was declared formally in two counties of Unity State. 100,000 people will be in jeopardy of dying from famine. It has come about between the conflicts between the President and his former Chief of Staff, or his former Vice President.

We need to have the engagement to save lives, and I thank the support for this amendment.

Likewise, the North Korean ICBMs. As I was in Europe, during the Fourth of July, my amendment, in particular, supports upholding the goals of the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water; addresses the fact that our Nation should take the next step in preparing for a nuclear North Korea; and establishes that the stakes may be far greater.

We have all been discussing the question of North Korea and ICBMs. We have to be studious in assessing it.

Let me also say, however, that I am disappointed that the amendment dealing with the AUMF on North Korea did not get in. I believe it is an important issue that we must be concerned about.

I want to continue to work with the committee on PTSD and ensuring that, even though authorized, more funding can come. I had asked for \$2.5 million.

And then I want to indicate the importance of recognizing, in light of the large footprint that Russia now has in its effort to undermine the democracy in this country, that we be very concerned about recruitment of college students by foreign agents.

I had an amendment for us to be concerned about that. I look forward to

working with the committee. I plan to introduce this as legislation because a young man by the name of Glenn Shriver, an outstanding college student, majoring in international relations at a college in Michigan, while doing a study abroad in China, developed an interest in Chinese culture, and he was sought after by the Chinese.

I also want to work with the committee on addressing the question of elections for our soldiers.

And, finally, I want to make sure that we stop cyber attacks by foreign entities into our elections.

But, I am asking support for my amendment on the Korea ICBMs, the Triple-Negative Breast Cancer, and the support of helping humanitarian aid get to South Sudan.

Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member and chairman, and I ask support for my amendments.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

I especially wish to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for including Jackson Lee Amendment No. 56 in the Chairman's En Bloc Amendment to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2018.

This Jackson Lee Amendment authorizes and encourages increased collaboration between the DOD and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to combat Triple Negative Breast Cancer.

"Triple Negative Breast Cancer" is a term used to describe breast cancers whose cells do not have estrogen receptors and progesterone receptors, and do not have an excess of the "HER2" protein on their cell membrane of tumor cells.

This makes commonly used test and methods to detect breast cancer not as effective.

This is a serious illness that effects between 10–17 percent of female breast cancer patients and this condition is more likely to cause death than the most common form of breast cancer.

Seventy percent of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will help to save lives.

TNBC disproportionately impacts younger women, African American women, Hispanic/Latina women, and women with a "BRCA1C genetic mutation, which is also prevalent in Jewish women.

TNBC usually affects women under 50 years of age and makes up more than 30 percent of all breast cancer diagnoses in African American.

African American women are far more susceptible to this dangerous subtype than white or Hispanic women.

The collaboration between the Department of Defense and NIH to combat Triple Negative Breast Cancer can support the development of multiple targeted therapies for this devastating disease.

A Triple negative breast cancer is a specific strain of breast cancer for which no targeted treatment is available.

The American Cancer Society calls this particular strain of breast cancer "an aggressive subtype associated with lower survival rates."

Triple negative breast cancer is a term used to describe breast cancers whose cells do not have estrogen receptors and progesterone receptors, and do not have an excess of the HER2 protein on their cell membrane of tumor cells.

In 2011, the Centers for Disease Control predicted that year 26,840 black women would be diagnosed with TNBC.

The overall incidence rate of breast cancer is 10 percent lower in African American women than white women.

African American women have a five year survival rate of 78 percent after diagnosis as compared to 90 percent for white women.

The incidence rate of breast cancer among women under 45 is higher for African American women compared to white women.

Triple Negative Breast Cancer cells account for between 13 percent and 25 percent of all breast cancer in the United States and are usually of a higher grade and size, are more aggressive and more likely to metastasize, and onset at a much younger age.

Currently, 70 percent of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

African American women are 3 times more likely to develop triple-negative breast cancer than white women.

African-American women have prevalence TNBC of 26 percent versus 16 percent in non-African-Americans women.

African-American women are more likely to be diagnosed with larger tumors and more advanced stages of breast cancer.

Currently there is no targeted treatment for TNBC exists.

Breast cancers with specific, targeted treatment methods, such as hormone and gene based strains, have higher survival rates than the triple negative subtype, highlighting the need for a targeted treatment.

Because there continues to be a need for research funding for biomarker selection, drug discovery, and clinical trial designs that will lead to the early detection of TNBC and to the development of multiple targeted therapies to treat this awful disease, the Jackson Lee Amendment is essential to paving a way for advancements in these areas.

That is why I am pleased that Jackson Lee Amendment No. 56 has been included in the Chairman's En Bloc Amendment and I urge all Members to join me in voting for its adoption.

I also wish to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for including Jackson Lee Amendment No. 168 in the Chairman's En Bloc Amendment to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2018.

This Jackson Lee Amendment directs the Department of Defense to prepare contingency plans to assist relief organizations in delivery of humanitarian assistance efforts in South Sudan and to engage in consultation with South Sudan military counterparts to de-escalate conflict.

As a member of the South Sudan Caucus, and the sponsor of H.R. 48, the "Equal Rights and Access for the Women of South Sudan Act," I have long advocated and supported

emergency assistance to South Sudan, the world's newest nation, located in the center of Africa and bordered by six countries.

Such emergency assistance is desperately needed now to respond to the famine in South Sudan.

On February 20, 2017 famine was declared formally in two counties of Unity State, which is located in the northern region of South Sudan.

The United Nations currently estimates that more than 100,000 people in two Unity State counties are directly affected by the famine.

In addition, food security experts are concerned that famine will spread.

According to expert analyses, in the absence of urgent humanitarian action, as many as 4.9 million South Sudanese, about 40 percent of the country's population, face the grim and certain prospect of starvation.

In 1998 the region suffered from a famine spurred by civil war and approximately 70,000 to several hundred thousand people died during that famine.

Although South Sudan has previously experienced widespread food insecurity, the present famine crisis is different because it is almost entirely man-made.

South Sudan is rich in oil, but following decades of civil war it is also one of the least developed regions on earth—only 15 percent of its citizens own a mobile phone and there are very few tarmac roads in an area larger in land mass than Spain and Portugal combined.

This makes the Nile River, which flows through regional centers, an important transport and trade route.

Since South Sudan overwhelmingly voted to break away from Sudan in 2011, the government's main concern has been to get oil flowing following disagreements with the regime in Khartoum.

There have been a few small armed rebellions, border clashes and deadly cattle feuds but these have all taken place far from the capital city of Juba.

Signs of friction within the governing party, Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM), came when President Salva Kiir, an ethnic Dinka, the country's largest group, fired his deputy Riek Machar, who is from the second largest tribe, the Nuer.

President Kiir believes Mr. Machar was behind a coup plot to oust him and seize power.

Mr. Machar denies the accusations, but has publicly criticized Mr. Kiir for failing to tackle corruption and vowed to challenge President Kiir for leadership of the SPLM.

It is not clear what led to the breach in their relationship but what started out as a political squabble has escalated into ethnic violence.

The loyalties of the South Sudan army are divided with each of the principals commanding significant military support and forces loyal to each man have clashed around the country.

And some of the most intense fighting has taken place in areas where famine is most severe.

Compounding matters, South Sudan is awash with guns after decades of conflict and

there is a history of ethnic tension for politicians to exploit if they believe that could help them gain, or remain in, power.

Complicating this situation is the fact that while the Government of South Sudan has reportedly promised access to the most at-risk areas, humanitarian organizations remain unable to provide vital food, water and shelter in many locations.

The actions of South Sudan Government in prohibiting humanitarian assistance from getting to starving communities has undermined the most proactive attempts by the United States and others to address what has now become a famine.

The Jackson Lee Amendment directs the Department of Defense to prepare contingency plans to assist relief organizations delivering humanitarian assistance and consult with South Sudan's military leaders to deescalate intra-party conflict, put petty disputes aside, and to put the well-being of the South Sudan people first.

Mr. Chair, let me conclude by observing that while bringing an end to the civil war and humanitarian relief the famine-stricken in South Sudan must be our first order of business, it is also very important to note that all of us who worked to secure its independence want the country to succeed and become a productive and constructive member of the community of nations.

That is why I have reintroduced the "Equal Rights and Access for the Women of South Sudan Act" (H.R. 48), which promotes the human rights of women in South Sudan as the country transitions to a long-term government and to ensure women enjoy the right to participate fully in the political and economic life of the country.

Despite its newly won independence women in South Sudan continue to face brutal violations of their human rights.

A lack of infrastructure as well as gender inequality has the potential to regress much of the progress that has been made in South Sudan.

Such a lack of human development factors only furthers the marginalization of women in South Sudan.

The "Equal Rights and Access for the Women of South Sudan Act" puts equal rights and access for the women of South Sudan at the forefront by:

1. Encouraging the appointment of women to high level positions within Republic of South Sudan Government;

2. Ensuring that a significant portion of United States development, humanitarian, and relief assistance is channeled to local and United States-based South Sudanese organizations, particularly South Sudanese women's organizations;

3. Providing long-term financial assistance for primary, secondary, higher, nontraditional, and vocational education for South Sudanese girls, women, boys, and men;

4. Providing financial assistance to build health infrastructure and deliver

high-quality comprehensive health care programs, including primary, maternal, child, reproductive, and mental health care;

5. Requiring military training regarding the protection, rights, and particular needs of women and emphasizing that violations of women's rights are intolerable and should be prosecuted; and

6. Taking all necessary steps to ensure that internally displaced South Sudanese women are directly receiving food aid, shelter, relief supplies, and other services from United States-sponsored programs.

Mr. Chair, as a nation, we should support the Republic of South Sudan in its efforts to become a freer, more equitable society that respects, supports, and endorses the rights of women.

That is why I am pleased that Jackson Lee Amendment No. 168 has been included in the Chairman's En Bloc Amendment and I urge all Members to join me in voting for its adoption.

Mr. Chair, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to explain the Jackson Lee Amendment No. 83, as designated by the Rule governing debate on H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2018.

This Jackson Lee Amendment directs the Secretary of Defense to develop measures to defend against deployment of nuclear ICBMs by North Korea to protect against damage or destruction of satellites critical to U.S. national defense and global communications, International Space Station, and other vital assets.

I request the support of my colleagues for this Jackson Lee Amendment because it: upholds the goals of the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater; addresses the fact that our nation should take the next step in preparing for a nuclear North Korea; establishes that the stakes may be far greater than a nuclear North Korea when they may have the capacity to launch a device using an ICBM, because of our nation's dependence on the global telecommunications infrastructure that includes Geo-stationary satellites as well as its implications for Space Stations and our space program; and may have serious consequences for a range of environmental factors that are critical to the health and wellbeing of our planet.

On July 4th, our nation's Independence Day, the U.S. confirmed that North Korea had achieved a major step toward its objective of delivering a nuclear weapon as far as U.S. shores.

This test represents a new escalation of the threat that a nuclear North Korea poses to the United States and our interest.

The launch of Hwasong-14 missile reached a range of approximately 4160 miles, a distance capable of reaching Alaska, according to experts.

The timing of this test launch was confirmed as a calculated insult when North Korean Leader Kim Jung-Un stated that the missile was a "gift to Americans for the July 4th Anniversary."

The United States must attempt to manage this situation and retain the peace in the region.

We understand the end to the Korean War was a Armistice Agreement signed in 1953, that put into place a cease fire.

North Korea still views itself as being at war with the United States.

Otto Warmbier, an American college student who died days following his release from a North Korean prison was held as a prisoner of war.

Given the unstable nature of the North Korean government, which has political purges in recent years that included members of North Korean President's Kim Jongun's family we can hold little hope for cooperation that is essential to avoid unintended conflicts and reduce tensions with its neighbors.

A nuclear-armed North Korea does not mean that country will be able to shoulder the burden of managing a responsible nuclear weapons program, given their single minded pursuit of a nuclear armed ICBM.

Nuclear arms programs are not always safe or easy for the nation attempting to develop weapons.

The United States had its share of near disasters.

For example, in 1961, a B-52 Stratofortress carrying two 4-megaton Mark 39 nuclear bombs broke up in mid-air, dropping its nuclear payload in the process over North Carolina.

Fortunately, neither bomb detonated averting a catastrophic nuclear incident at our own hands.

North Korea's program poses a danger to the entire Korean Peninsula, Japan, and the Asia Pacific region because it insists on using the world as its nuclear testing ground.

Even if an unarmed ICBM should land in a populated area, this could trigger a conflict.

If North Korea decides to test nuclear weapons on its ICBM rockets this poses serious problems for peace and stability not only that region of the world, but the United States as well.

Since the entry of the space age, America has lead and we now rely on the fruits of our investments in manned and unmanned missions to support a global telecommunications infrastructure; a permanent research presence in the International Space Station; plans for going much further.

A nuclear North Korea armed with ICBMs can put all of that in jeopardy.

We also have interest in the environment within our atmosphere, but also the physical environment that envelopes the earth.

One component of the earth's space environment that protects against solar radiation is called the Van Allen Belts.

The Van Allen belts present another factor to be considered when talking about North Korea's nuclear program.

The Van Allen belts may respond to incoming solar radiation and is known to change size.

The primary benefit to people on earth is they protect us from solar radiation.

Should North Korea's tests of ICBM include nuclear devices of significant size this could pose risks to not only our satellites, space stations, but extend to the Van Allen Belts.

This Jackson Lee amendment allows for a deliberative approach to addressing the potential for a nuclear North Korea.

This amendment works to develop plans to develop effective countermeasures to the threat that North Korea's nuclear program presents.

I ask that my Colleagues join me in support of this Amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my bipartisan amendment, introduced with Representative GOTTHEIMER and Representative SINEMA.

This amendment would expand opportunities for Active-Duty military men and women to learn career skills and provide education that would assist them as they transition back to civilian life.

The current United Services Military Apprenticeship Program is an effective program that provides this employer specific training. But, that program is only offered to the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, which is less than half of our uniformed services personnel.

This amendment expands the program to offer it to any member of U.S. uniformed services—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Public Health Service.

We should make it easier for these brave men and women who have served to transition to civilian life with a steady job, and, at the same time, infuse our workforce with the strong leadership skills that the military can provide.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for my amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act.

Our men and women in uniform are not immune from the epidemic of opioid addiction, an abuse that is ravaging our country. In fact, the National Institutes of Health reports opioid misuse are higher among servicemembers than among civilians, due to the use of these drugs to treat the symptoms of PTSD and chronic pain.

Our brave servicemembers have earned our gratitude and deserve our highest quality of care. We need to do all we can to ensure our military doctors are equipped with the most up-to-

date, best practices to help fight back against this disease.

This amendment requires medical professionals in the Department of Defense that prescribe opioids for pain management to undertake 12 hours of training every 3 years in order to prevent overprescribing and better identify and treat abuse.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense amendment to ensure that our Active-Duty military get the medical care they truly deserve.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment, which encourages partnerships between the DOD, DOE, and the private sector, to facilitate the licensure, transfer, and commercialization of innovative technologies.

We cannot let groundbreaking research and new technologies in our Nation's Federal laboratories sit idle when they have the potential to reenergize domestic manufacturing, create high-paying jobs, and transform our economy.

It is not government or private sector, it is government and private sector working together to create opportunities that have led to the development of many products in the marketplace today, including batteries powering electric vehicles, internet servers, and GPS.

Both the DOD and DOE have separate programs that support technology transfer to the private sector, but they don't work very well together. My amendment would fix that and ensure that these departments are actively collaborating to support the commercialization of cutting-edge technologies and make them more widely available to American businesses and consumers.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues' support.

□ 1915

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I urge adoption of the amendments en bloc.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, urge adoption of the amendments en bloc, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chair, my amendment is similar to an amendment of mine that passed the House 243–180 in the FY2017 NDAA. This amendment mirrors language that I have introduced called the SEND Act.

While the Department of Homeland Security—not the Department of Defense—is tasked with maintaining the safety of our southern border, it has long received help and assistance from the DOD and our military.

One of the ways the DOD helps the border patrol is through the transfer of equipment it deems “excess” to its needs.

Under current law, the transfer of this “excess” equipment already gives preference to counterdrug, counterterrorism, and border security activities.

My amendment simply takes that preference a step further, giving border security preference for a few specific pieces of equipment which are particularly useful for border security applications: unmanned surveillance vehicles including Aerostat blimps, night-vision goggles, and Humvees.

The border patrol is the first and last line of defense against those criminal gangs.

In my home state of Texas, and in other border states like New Mexico and Arizona, the war against the cartels is an ongoing affair. Cartels are involved in labor and sex slavery.

Just last week in Southern Texas, border patrol agents raided a home to find 37 illegal immigrants, including three children.

These men, women and children were being held by cartel drug runners for ransom.

I've been to the border countless times, Mr. Chair.

I've spoken with the men and women who have sworn to protect the good folks of Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico from the dangerous people who cross the southern border.

A Texas Ranger told me that they are outmanned, outgunned, out-financed and out-equipped by the drug cartels.

I've heard firsthand the need these men and women have for new equipment, specifically the equipment I just listed.

In fact when I recently visited the border in April, I met with the Border Patrol in the Rio Grande sector and they informed me that in areas where they were using Aerostat surveillance blimps, crossings were way down.

When asked what we could do to help the sector, the answer was clear: More Aerostat blimps.

Well, that is what we are trying to do here with this amendment, Mr. Chair.

This idea isn't new. In 2010, with our help, the excess equipment program sent 6 excess military Humvees to Texas Border Sheriffs. Often, before this transfer, the border sheriffs were forced to chase the drug cartels in Crown Victorias.

This amendment mandates that DOD give border security applicants an additional preference for the equipment listed in this amendment.

I've heard from our agents down on the border and this is the equipment they need.

Let's put this “excess” equipment to use on the southern border in the war against the drug cartels and help bring security, peace of mind, and more safety to those Americans living in the area.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MARSHALL). The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 440, I offer additional amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, and 53

printed in House Report 115–217, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

Page 155, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 544. ANNUAL TRAINING REGARDING THE INFLUENCE CAMPAIGN OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

In addition to any currently mandated training, the Secretary of Defense may furnish annual training to all members of the Armed Forces and all civilian employees of the Department of Defense, regarding attempts by the Russian Federation and its proxies and agents to influence and recruit members of the Armed Forces as part of its influence campaign.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF VIRGINIA

Page 155, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 544. PROGRAM TO ASSIST MEMBERS IN OBTAINING PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS.

Section 2015(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “and” and inserting “or”.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. SMUCKER OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 155, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 544. EXPANDING ELIGIBILITY FOR THE UNITED STATES MILITARY APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall expand eligibility for the United Services Military Apprenticeship Program to include any member of the uniformed services.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “uniformed services” has the meaning given such term in section 101 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle E of title V in division A, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ . ENHANCING MILITARY CHILDCARE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) HOURS OF OPERATION OF CHILDCARE DEVELOPMENT CENTERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The hours of operation of each childcare development center (CDC) of the Department of Defense shall, to the extent practicable, be set and maintained in manner that takes into account the demands and circumstances of members of the Armed Forces, including members of the reserve components, who use such center in facilitation of the performance of their military duties.

(2) MATTERS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—The demands and circumstances to be taken into account under paragraph (1) for purposes of setting and maintaining the hours of operation of a childcare development center shall include the following:

(A) Mission requirements of units whose members use such center.

(B) The unpredictability of work schedules, and fluctuations in day-to-day work hours, of such members.

(C) The potential for frequent and prolonged absences of such members for training, operations, and deployments.

(D) The location of such center on the military installation concerned, including the location in connection with duty locations of members and applicable military family housing.

(E) The geographic separation of such members from their extended family.

(F) The extent to which spouses of such members are employed or pursuing educational opportunities, whether on a full-time basis or a part-time basis.

(G) Such other matters as the Secretary of the military department concerned considers appropriate for purposes of this section.

(b) **CHILDCARE COORDINATORS FOR MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.**—

(1) **CHILDCARE COORDINATORS.**—Each Secretary of a military department shall provide for a childcare coordinator at each military installation under the jurisdiction of such Secretary at which are stationed significant numbers of members of the Armed Forces with accompanying dependent children, as determined by such Secretary.

(2) **NATURE OF POSITION.**—The childcare coordinator for a military installation may be an individual appointed to that position on full-time or part-time basis or an individual appointed to another position whose duties in such other position are consistent with the discharge by the person of the duties of childcare coordinator.

(3) **DUTIES.**—Each childcare coordinator for an installation shall carry out the duties as follows:

(A) Act as an advocate for military families at the installation on childcare matters both on-installation and off-installation.

(B) Work with the commander of the installation in order to seek to ensure that the childcare development centers at the installation, together with any other available childcare options on or in the vicinity of the installation—

(i) provide a quality of care (including a caregiver-to-child ratio) commensurate with best practices of private providers of childcare services; and

(ii) are responsive to the childcare needs of members stationed at the installation and their families.

(C) Work with private providers of childcare services in the vicinity of the installation in order to—

(i) track vacancies in the childcare facilities of such providers;

(ii) seek to obtain favorable prices for the use of such services by members stationed at the installation; and

(iii) otherwise ease the use of such services by such members.

(D) Such other duties as the Secretary of the military department concerned shall specify.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle F of title V, insert the following new section:

SEC. 5. AWARD OF VIETNAM SERVICE MEDAL TO VETERANS WHO PARTICIPATED IN MAYAGUEZ RESCUE OPERATION.

(a) **AWARD AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of the military department concerned shall, upon the application by or on behalf of an individual who is an eligible veteran, award that individual the Vietnam Service Medal, notwithstanding any otherwise applicable requirements for the award of that medal. Any such award shall be made in lieu of any Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal awarded the individual for the individual's participation in the Mayaguez rescue operation.

(b) **TREATMENT OF DECEASED VETERANS.**—In the case of a veteran who is deceased, the application described in subsection (a) may be submitted by the next of kin of the veteran.

(c) **ELIGIBLE VETERAN.**—For purposes of this section, the term "eligible veteran" means a veteran of the Armed Forces—

(1) who was awarded the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal for participation in military operations known as the Mayaguez rescue operation of May 12–15, 1975; or

(2) who participated in such operation.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. LANCE OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. AWARD OF MEDALS OR OTHER COMMENDATIONS TO HANDLERS OF MILITARY WORKING DOGS AND MILITARY WORKING DOGS.

(a) **PROGRAM OF AWARD REQUIRED.**—Each Secretary of a military department shall carry out a program to provide for the award of one or more medals or other commendations to handlers of military working dogs, and to military working dogs, under the jurisdiction of such Secretary to recognize valor or meritorious achievement by such handlers and dogs.

(b) **MEDAL AND COMMENDATIONS.**—Any medal or commendation awarded pursuant to a program under subsection (a) shall be of such design, and include such elements, as the Secretary of the military department concerned shall specify.

(c) **REGULATIONS.**—Medals and commendations shall be awarded under programs under subsection (a) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for purposes of this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

Page 170, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 564. ELIGIBILITY OF VETERANS OF OPERATION END SWEEP FOR VIETNAM SERVICE MEDAL.

The Secretary of the military department concerned shall, upon the application of an individual who is a veteran who participated in Operation End Sweep, award that individual the Vietnam Service Medal, notwithstanding any otherwise applicable requirements for the award of that medal.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

Page 170, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 564. EXPEDITED REPLACEMENT OF MILITARY DECORATIONS FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II AND THE KOREAN WAR.

Section 1135 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking "When" and inserting "Subject to subsection (c), when";

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

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

"(c) **RECIPIENTS OF MILITARY DECORATIONS FOR SERVICE IN WORLD WAR II OR THE KOREAN WAR.**—If the recipient was awarded the military decoration for which a replacement is requested for service in World War II or the Korean War, the Secretary concerned shall perform all actions described—

"(1) in subsection (b)(1) in not more than 180 days; and

"(2) in subsection (b)(2) in not more than 60 days."

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

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

SEC. 575. PROOF OF PERIOD OF MILITARY SERVICE FOR PURPOSES OF INTEREST RATE LIMITATION UNDER THE SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

Section 207(b)(1) of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3937(b)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) **PROOF OF MILITARY SERVICE.**—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of a servicemember's termination or release from military service, in

order for an obligation or liability of the servicemember to be subject to the interest rate limitation in subsection (a), the servicemember shall provide to the creditor written notice and a copy of—

"(i) the military orders calling the servicemember to military service and any orders further extending military service; or

"(ii) any other appropriate indicator of military service, including a certified letter from a commanding officer.

"(B) **INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION BY CREDITOR.**—

"(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Regardless of whether a servicemember has provided to a creditor the written notice and documentation under subparagraph (A), the creditor may use, in lieu of such notice and documentation, information retrieved from the Defense Manpower Database Center through the creditor's normal business reviews of the Database Center for purposes of obtaining information indicating that the servicemember is on active duty.

"(ii) **SAFE HARBOR.**—A creditor that uses the information retrieved from the Defense Manpower Database Center under clause (i) with respect to a servicemember has not failed to treat the debt of the servicemember in accordance with subsection (a) if—

"(I) such information indicates that, on the date the creditor retrieves such information, the servicemember is not on active duty; and

"(II) the creditor has not, as of such date, received the written notice and documentation required under subparagraph (A) with respect to the servicemember."

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY OF CONNECTICUT

Page 175, after line 24, insert the following new section:

SEC. 575. REPORT REGARDING POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS TO PROCESSING RETIREMENTS AND MEDICAL DISCHARGES.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall issue a report to the congressional defense committees and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding possible improvements to the transition of members of the Armed Forces to veteran status.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) Feasibility of requiring members of the Armed Forces to apply for benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs before such members complete discharge from the Armed Forces.

(2) Feasibility of requiring members of the Armed Forces to undergo compensation and pension examinations (to be administered by the Secretary of Defense) for purposes of obtaining benefits described in paragraph (1) before such members complete discharge from active duty in the Armed Forces.

(3) Possible improvements to the timeliness of the process for transitioning members who undergo medical discharge to care provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. MAST OF FLORIDA

Page 175, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF SEPARATION OATH FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States Armed Forces is the largest, all-volunteer military force in the world, yet less than one percent of the American population serves in the Armed Forces.

(2) Each branch of the Armed Forces (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard) instills in its members a sense of duty and obligation to the United States, their branch of service, and their comrades-in-arms.

(3) The Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that approximately 20 veterans of the Armed Forces commit suicide each day and a veteran's risk of suicide is 21 percent higher compared to an adult who has not served in the Armed Forces.

(4) The Department of Veterans Affairs is aggressively undertaking measures to prevent these tragic outcomes, yet suicide rates among veterans remain unacceptably high.

(5) Upon enlistment or appointment in the Armed Forces, a new member is obligated to take an oath of office or oath of enlistment.

(6) Most members of the Armed Forces view this oath not as an imposition, but as a promise that they are bound to fulfill.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF SEPARATION OATH.—Section 502 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and, in such subsection, by striking “The oath” and inserting “An oath established by this section”; and

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

“(b) SEPARATION OATH.—Prior to retirement or other separation from the armed forces, other than separation pursuant to the sentence of a court-martial, a member of an armed force may take the following oath:

“I, _____, recognizing that my oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, has involved me and my fellow members in experiences that few persons, other than our peers, can understand, do solemnly swear (or affirm) to continue to be the keeper of my brothers- and sisters-in-arms and protector of the United States and the Constitution; to preserve the values I have learned; to maintain my body and my mind; and to not bring harm to myself without speaking to my fellow veterans first. I take this oath freely and without purpose of evasion, so help me God.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of section 502 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 502. Enlistment oath and separation oath: who may administer”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 31 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 502 and inserting the following new item:

“502. Enlistment oath and separation oath: who may administer.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MRS. WATSON COLEMAN OF NEW JERSEY

Page 175, after line 24, insert the following new section:

SEC. 575. EXTENSION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENT REGARDING DIVERSITY IN MILITARY LEADERSHIP.

Section 115a(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”.

Strike section 1051(a)(2) (page 376, lines 4 through 10).

Page 396, after line 4, insert the following: 4

(5) ANNUAL DEFENSE MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS REPORT.—By inserting after paragraph (64), as added by paragraph (4), the following new paragraph:

“(65) Section 115a.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. DONOVAN OF NEW YORK

Page 185, after line 19, insert the following new section:

SEC. 605. REEVALUATION OF BAH FOR THE MILITARY HOUSING AREA INCLUDING STATEN ISLAND.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, using the most recent data available to the Secretary, shall reevaluate the basic housing allowance prescribed under section 403(b) of title 37, United States Code, for the military housing area that includes Staten Island, New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. TROTT OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle B of title VI, insert the following new section:

SEC. 619. IMPROVED EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.

(a) IMPROVED EMPLOYMENT SKILLS VERIFICATION.—Section 1143(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “The Secretary of Defense”; and

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

“(2) In order to improve the accuracy and completeness of a certification or verification of job skills and experience required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy shall—

“(A) establish a database to record all training performed by members of the armed forces that may have application to employment in the civilian sector; and

“(B) make unclassified information regarding such information available to States and other potential employers referred to in subsection (c) so that State and other entities may allow military training to satisfy licensing or certification requirements to engage in a civilian profession.”.

(b) IMPROVED ACCURACY OF CERTIFICATES OF TRAINING AND SKILLS.—Section 1143(a) of title 10, United States Code, is further amended by inserting after paragraph (2), as added by subsection (a), the following new paragraph:

“(3) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy shall ensure that a certification or verification of job skills and experience required by paragraph (1) is rendered in such a way that States and other potential employers can confirm the accuracy and authenticity of the certification or verification.”.

(c) IMPROVED RESPONSIVENESS TO CERTIFICATION REQUESTS.—Section 1143(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “For the purpose”; and

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

“(2) A State may use a certification or verification of job skills and experience provided to a member of the armed forces under subsection (a) and request the Department of Defense or the Coast Guard, as the case may be, to confirm the accuracy and authenticity of the certification or verification. A response confirming or denying the information shall be provided within five business days.”.

(d) IMPROVED NOTICE TO MEMBERS.—Section 1142(b)(4)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, including State-submitted and approved lists of military training and skills that satisfy occupational certifications and licenses”.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY OF CONNECTICUT

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 704. EXPANSION OF SEXUAL TRAUMA COUNSELING AND TREATMENT FOR MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS.

Section 1720D(a)(2)(A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “on active duty”; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “that was suffered by the member while serving on active duty, active duty for training, or inactive duty training.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle B of title VII in division A, add the following:

SEC. —. TRAINING REQUIREMENT FOR HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS PRESCRIBING OPIOIDS FOR TREATMENT OF PAIN IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that to serve as a health care professional in the Department of Defense as an individual who is authorized to prescribe or otherwise dispense opioids for the treatment of pain, the professional (other than a pharmacist) must comply with the 12-hour training requirement of paragraph (2) at least once during each 3-year period or be licensed in a State that requires equivalent (or greater) training described in paragraph (2) with respect to the prescribing or dispensing of opioids for the treatment of pain.

(2) The training requirement of this paragraph is that the professional has completed not less than 12 hours of training (through classroom situations, seminars at professional society meetings, electronic communications, or otherwise) with respect to—

(A) pain management treatment guidelines and best practices;

(B) early detection of opioid addiction; and

(C) the treatment and management of opioid-dependent patients,

that is provided by the American Society of Addiction Medicine, the American Academy of Addiction Psychiatry, the American Medical Association, the American Osteopathic Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Academy of Pain Management, the American Pain Society, the American Academy of Pain Medicine, the American Board of Pain Medicine, the American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians, or any other organization that the Secretary of Defense determines is appropriate for purposes of this subsection.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF TRAINING MODULES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish or support the establishment of one or more training modules to be used to meet the training requirement under subsection (a).

(2) To be eligible to receive support under paragraph (1), an entity shall be—

(A) one of the organizations listed in paragraph (2) of subsection (a); or

(B) any other organization that the Secretary determines is appropriate to provide training under such subsection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 440, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, this en bloc package consists of a variety of amendments from Members from both sides of the aisle. I believe that they deserve the support of the House. I recommend adoption of the en bloc package.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the chairman. I support the en bloc package, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

Mr. THORNBERRY. 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. SMUCKER) having assumed the chair, Mr. MARSHALL, 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. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to address you here from the floor of the House of Representatives in this great deliberative body that has been deliberating all day long in the markup of the National Defense Authorization Act.

The work that is done, especially by the members of the Armed Services Committee, goes deeply into the destiny and the future of America. They have to look at the whole globe and the whole budget, and they have to look at the equipment that is out there and the technology that is developing, and it is a heavy responsibility to present this NDAA authorization bill to the floor.

Often, there are efforts that are made to turn it into a political bill, rather than the bill that can defend America, and ensure that we have the best military that the world has ever seen, and the best equipment for the best military the world has ever seen, and the best standards to uphold the best people, the nobility of the United States military.

So I want to compliment especially the members of the committee and the chairman for his work and the work that has been done here on this floor. They are going to take a deep breath and tomorrow will bring this thing back to the floor for a vote and a potential final passage.

I came to the floor to address a bit different topic, and I may revert back to the NDAA, and I actually intend to do that, Mr. Speaker. But I have want-

ed to come to this floor for some time to discuss the circumstances going on here in the United States of America and an issue that has been very important to me for a long time; and that is the issue of the United States of America getting to the point where we finally declare a language, our English language, as the official language of the United States.

I sat down once, and I went through the—when we had the World Book Encyclopedia, before the internet, more or less, eroded the ubiquitousness—that means everywhere—the World Book Encyclopedia was everywhere in the country and many places in the world.

I looked through—I took a 1979 almanac, and I looked at all the flags for all the countries in the world, and I looked up every single country to find out, do they have an official language, or don't they? And from that 1979 almanac, and some of the countries have changed since then, but every single country in the world had an official language, at least one of them, except for the United States of America.

As I studied this, and it comes to me, the more I look at history, the more I look at the forces that move the world and the people in it, often it is the culture; it is the cultural foundation that moves policy in America, and in every country in the world.

The culture lives in the hearts and minds of its people; and what is in the hearts and minds of its people is, if you are members of a nation state, what binds us together is having a common experience, a common cause, common enemies, perhaps, a common sense of history, a common sense of struggle, a common sense of economic ties, and also, a common language.

A common language is the most powerful unifying force anywhere in the world throughout all of history, even more powerful than religion, and religion is a very powerful unifying force, and sometimes it can be a dividing force.

But of those powerful unifying forces we have, it might be race, it might be ethnicity, it might be national origin, it can be those things. It could be religion, but all of these components go together to make your culture, and the binding force that we have proven in this country over and over and over again is the common language.

Some years ago, just one floor down, out that door, I sat down with several ambassadors to the United States from Israel, and I remarked to them that they had established Hebrew as their official language in 1954. The country was approved by the motion in the United Nations in 1948, and 6 years later, the Israelis established Hebrew as their official language.

I asked them: Why did you do that? Hebrew was a dead language. It was essentially a language only of prayer for 2,000 years. But they resurrected that language and decided we are going to make it the common form of commu-

nications currency in Israel in order to bind the Israelis together. And so they did.

They deployed the Hebrew language in the streets of Israel. In fact, there weren't any streets in Tel Aviv at the time. They created Tel Aviv also as a manufactured city to add to the glory of Israel. But as the people walked in the streets, they decided we are going to embrace this language of Hebrew. So it is today the language of the Israeli people, Hebrew.

Why did you do that? And their answer to me was: We looked at the United States. We knew we were going to be assimilating people from many countries in the world, maybe even all countries in the world, and they would come from all races, all ethnicities, all national origins, coming back because—primarily they were attracted back because they were of Jewish faith, many of them by Jewish blood and heritage; but they came into Israel, and they needed to be bound together as Israelis. And the best way to bind them together—these are smart people—was a common language.

And a common language that was unique was helpful, also. It gave them the distinction and the pride that they would have of the nationalism of being Israelis. And so Hebrew became the official language of the fresh new nation state Israel just 6 years after it was formed.

I was not astonished by that, but I was very impressed by the wisdom that they used to apply the necessity of a common language to bind them together so that they could be one people.

I went there, and I traveled, and I looked at what they were doing. They had brought in several hundred people from Ethiopia to come into the Israeli society, and they get 6 months to study Hebrew and to be assimilated into the broader Israeli economy.

Those who come to Israel that are not literate in their own language, they first had to teach them to read and write in the language that was native to them, their natural language, and then they taught them Hebrew and converted them into being able to read and write and speak in Hebrew. But they got 6 months to do that, and then out into the world they went. That is a pretty fast assimilation process.

But I don't know if there is a country since, other than the United States, that has done a better job of assimilating people from everywhere in the world into one society than has happened in Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that I never, ever hear anybody talk about divisions within Israelis. I don't hear them speaking, well, you are an African Israeli or a German Israeli or a Russian Israeli. There are a lot of them, but they see themselves as Israelis. They have a common language, common culture, and they are pulled together out of a need to have a common defense and a common cause.