

law. I encourage the House to take up the Students Over Special Interests bill.

JOYCE CLINE, PENN BRAD OIL MUSEUM YELLOW DOG WINNER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor this year's Penn Brad Oil Museum's annual Yellow Dog Winner, Joyce Cline.

Joyce has provided exceptional service to the cause of preserving the oil and gas heritage of the Bradford, Pennsylvania, region. She has been a dedicated member of the community who has given her time and leadership to many organizations.

Joyce graduated from Lawrence Park High School in 1959 and was a teacher with the Bradford Area School District for 19 years.

In 1974, she married Bill Cline. He owned a small oil-producing company, and Joyce began her journey in the oil industry. In 1982, she joined the Derrick Club of Bradford, where she served in various roles, including president in 1983 and 1984.

Joyce and Bill became members of the Pennsylvania Independent Petroleum Producers Association in 1986, 1 year after the organization was formed. This turned into a lifelong commitment for the Clines. In 2012, Joyce and Bill were honored with the Gary Hovis Memorial Award for their service.

Mr. Speaker, throughout her life, Joyce has shown her dedication to the industry. I wholeheartedly congratulate her on this outstanding achievement.

CONGRATULATING THE 2018 GRADUATES FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the recent graduates of the University of the Virgin Islands. Unfortunately, I could not attend the graduations last week due to the bad weather up here and the debate on the farm bill.

Despite two hurricanes, no power, damaged classrooms, personal tragedies galore, revised class schedules, et cetera, UVI graduates lived up to their names. On St. Thomas, they were known as the Ambitious, Resilient and Hardworking Class of 2018; and on St. Croix, they were known as the Enriched, Elite and Educated Class of 2018.

During the ceremony, honorary degrees were also awarded to former local elected officials and radio personalities, Holland Redfield II and Addie Ottley.

The class of 2018 is made up of a diverse group of students. Whatever their

individual plans, as a class, these UVI graduates have proven that they can take on anything life and nature have to offer. I commend the 2018 UVI graduates for their hard work.

Additionally, I would like to commend Briana Winslow and Jermaine Ferguson, who are shadowing me today as young adults in the national foster youth care program. Their lives, their stories are an inspiration to us all, and I commend them for what they are going to be doing in the future.

U.S. WITHDRAWAL FROM THE IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL WAS THE RIGHT CHOICE

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, President Trump and his foreign policy team made the right choice to withdraw from the nuclear agreement with the dishonest Iranian regime. This Iran deal was flawed from its inception, freeing up billions of U.S. dollars and relaxing sanctions in exchange for weak restrictions and little enforcement.

Iran has taken advantage of this deal. In 2016, German intelligence found that Iran was secretly pursuing nuclear technology and equipment from German companies, violating the agreement less than a year after it was finalized.

That same year, Reuters reported that secret exemptions had been created for Iran after the talks were over, allowing them to evade some restrictions and get relief from our sanctions even faster.

Months after, another loophole in the agreement was exploited when Iran planned to buy 950 tons of uranium to make nuclear fuel since the agreement never placed a limit on how much uranium they could have.

All of this more than demonstrates the ineffectiveness of this deal and the potentially catastrophic effects of trusting Iran, which has a long and detailed history of blatantly being dishonest.

This is a bad deal for this country.

THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD GET A WARRANT TO ACCESS PRIVATE EMAIL ACCOUNTS

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act, which would add the full text of my bill, H.R. 387, the Email Privacy Act.

I want to remind my colleagues that this bill has been passed twice by the House, once on April 27, 2016, by a roll call of 419-0, and again by voice vote, unanimously, in the House on February 6, 2017.

My legislation has a simple concept behind it: if the government wants access to content stored in our private email accounts, they should get a warrant.

Currently, agencies can receive the stored email content of a user's cloud email account by sending an administrative subpoena directly to the service provider. This creates a double standard, where paper communication has greater Fourth Amendment protections than electronic copies.

This standard is outdated, as the law governing this issue has not been updated since 1986. Now our whole lives are in the cloud and stored online.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for accepting my amendment and Chairman GOODLATTE of the Judiciary Committee, and I urge all those in this process, House and Senate, to maintain the House-passed language in the final version of the NDAA that we send to the President's desk.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5515, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 25, 2018, THROUGH JUNE 4, 2018

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 908 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 908

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5515) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 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.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution. (b) Each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. (c) All points of order against the further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed

of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment pursuant to this resolution the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 5. On any legislative day during the period from May 25, 2018, through June 4, 2018 -- (a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and (b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 6. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 7. Each day during the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day of continuous session for purposes of section 1017(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 688(b)).

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 908 provides for complete consideration of H.R. 5515, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.

The rule makes in order 168 amendments to go along with the previous 103 amendments made in order by yesterday's rule.

That means the full House will consider 271 amendments to this year's NDAA. When you add in the 317 amendments considered in the Armed Services Committee, that means a total of 588 amendments to the NDAA will be considered this year.

Mr. Speaker, for this year's NDAA, a record number of amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee.

I want to thank both the majority and the minority Rules Committee

staff, our Rules associates, and the staff of the Armed Services Committee for the many hours they put into this open and deliberative process.

As a member of both the Rules Committee and the Armed Services Committee, I have spent my fair share of time working on this piece of legislation.

Like years past, I want to again highlight the bipartisan nature of our work. This year's NDAA passed out of the Armed Services Committee on a bipartisan 60-1 vote.

That bipartisanship will continue here on the floor, where 176 of the amendments made in order are minority or bipartisan amendments.

The theme of this year's NDAA is to reform and rebuild our Nation's military. The bill supports an increase in top-line funding for the military, as we continue working to reverse the readiness crisis we faced for at least the last decade.

Any organization, including the military, is only as good as its people, and this NDAA authorizes a 2.6 percent pay raise for our troops, the largest increase in 9 years. This will help us retain and recruit the best and the brightest.

The bill also calls for increases in the size of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Naval and Air Reserves, as well as the Air Guard.

As vice chairman of the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee, I am pleased the bill authorizes construction of 13 new Navy ships. This is a much-needed step, as we continue building towards a 355-ship Navy.

I am especially proud that this year's NDAA includes many provisions important to my home State of Alabama. From Redstone Arsenal in Huntsville to the Anniston Army Depot to Fort Rucker in the Wiregrass to Maxwell-Gunter in Montgomery to the Austal Shipyard in Mobile, this bill ensures that Alabama will continue playing a leading role in supplying, training, and supporting our Nation's military.

Sadly, we have lost far too many servicemembers to training accidents over the last year. The bill ensures improvements to military training and safety programs to help protect our servicemen and -women.

These efforts include repairing outdated equipment and ensuring the procurement of new first-class capabilities. This includes additional Stryker A1 combat vehicles, Army armored brigade combat team vehicles, F/A-18E/F Super Hornets, C-130 Super Hercules aircraft, E-2D Advanced Hawkeye aircraft, F-35 Joint Strike Fighters, UH-60M Black Hawk helicopters, and advanced missiles.

The bill continues to build on Chairman THORNBERRY's priority of reforming the Pentagon bureaucracy to make it more efficient and effective. This includes streamlining buying practices.

From Russia to Iran to China to North Korea, the bill makes investments to ensure we are keeping up

with our adversaries. The United States must stand ready to confront aggression around the globe, whether it is from major state actors or rogue terrorist organizations.

Importantly, this year's NDAA includes much-needed investment in our nuclear deterrent and authorizations for the Missile Defense Agency.

It authorizes funding for codevelopment and coproduction of missile defense and weapons systems with our key ally, Israel.

All told, I am confident that this bill includes the reforms and funding levels necessary to rebuild and empower the greatest fighting force in the world.

With this NDAA, we can hopefully continue to embody the strategy of peace through strength and support our servicemembers.

Mr. Speaker, if you ever need a pick-me-up or a shot in the arm, I encourage you to spend some time visiting with our servicemen and -women. These individuals come from all different walks of life and backgrounds. They all play different roles and have different jobs, but they are united by the common goal of defending and protecting the United States of America.

I distinctly remember a conversation I had with a group of sailors from my home State of Alabama aboard the USS *John C. Stennis* a few years ago.

After hearing about their various paths that led them to the Navy, I asked what I could do for them. One response was straightforward, but very poignant. She asked me to make sure the American people knew what they did and that we supported them.

That is exactly what we do with this bill. We bring together Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, from different parts of the country, and we unite behind the common goal of supporting the men and women in uniform who protect the United States of America.

With this bill, we can send a clear message to our sailors, soldiers, airmen and marines that the United States Congress has their back, that we are committed to the mission, and we will ensure that they have the right policies and the right resources to get the job done.

This bill also sends a message to our friends and our adversaries that America is back, and that while we prefer peace, we will not hesitate to do what is necessary to defend our country and protect our interests.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 908, and for the 58th year in a row, let's pass a bipartisan NDAA.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. (Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the National Defense Authorization Act is one of the most

important items Congress considers. It is among the few authorizing bills we take up, and the only authorizing bill considered by the House every year.

It is legislation designed to meet some of our most important obligations: increasing our military's readiness, supporting our troops, and safeguarding our national security.

But as critical as this measure is, the base bill is rarely perfect. That is why hundreds of amendments are submitted to the Rules Committee every year by Members on both sides of the aisle. Our meetings on this bill are usually the longest the committee holds all year because so many Members bring forward so many ideas.

That is how the committee is supposed to function. And debating those ideas on this floor, even amendments we disagree with, is how the House of Representatives is supposed to work. That kind of process should not be the exception. It should be the norm.

I know this may seem like a radical idea to the majority, but the world's greatest deliberative body should regularly debate.

Instead, this majority has developed a pattern: Every now and then they make a bunch of amendments in order on larger bills like this. But most of the time, they don't allow any amendments on most bills.

Roughly 55 percent of all the rules that the majority has implemented this Congress have been closed. So Members cannot do their job offering amendments here on the House floor to address the biggest issues we face.

Under a closed rule, I will remind my colleagues, you can't even fix a typo in a bill.

Now, I know my Republican friends want to be congratulated for not considering this bill under yet another closed rule. After all, they broke their own record for closed rules this week, a sad milestone that makes this Congress the most closed Congress in history.

This is the most closed Congress ever in the history of the United States of America.

In fact, Speaker RYAN is the only Speaker in the history of our country to never have a truly open rule.

But I think the American people hold the majority of this House to a higher standard. Just consider what Republicans have blocked from even getting a debate under this rule.

The majority on the Rules Committee decided to block the bipartisan McGovern-Jones-Lee-Garamendi-Kildee-Welch amendment. Now, this is a straightforward measure. It says that if the President and the Pentagon want to escalate the number of U.S. troops deployed in Afghanistan in the next fiscal year, they need to send a report to Congress. We would then have 30 days to either disapprove of this escalation or allow it to move forward.

It is simple, because all it asks is for this Congress to do its job, to stop abdicating its responsibility. It has been

17 years since Congress last passed an AUMF. We have been told year after year, Congress after Congress, that this is not the time to debate our role abroad.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when is the time?

We submitted this amendment to the Rules Committee last year during the FY 2018 defense authorization. But rather than making it in order, the majority moved forward with an alternative amendment that called for a report from the administration on our Afghanistan policy.

The President signed that NDAA into law with that amendment. And guess what? Congress never got the report. It is more than 70 days past due.

Clearly, asking for a study isn't working. In fact, the President is ignoring it altogether. And over the last year, the administration decided to increase the number of U.S. troops in Afghanistan by more than 4,000 additional servicemembers. That is on top of the more than 8,400 troops that are already there. The response from this majority has either been silence or to ask for a study.

Mr. Speaker, I don't need some study to tell me that this Congress needs to do its job. Issues of war and peace are among the toughest we consider, but we must take them up all the same. It is why we were sent here and it is what our men and women in uniform expect.

Why is the majority afraid of a fair fight? Let's debate whether President Trump should increase our engagement in Afghanistan even further.

□ 1245

I am tired of being told that this is not the time for that vote because I believe it is past time. I have stood here year after year, Congress after Congress, as Speaker after Speaker told us to hurry up and wait.

I remember when Speaker Boehner said it wasn't right for the 113th Congress to be voting on an AUMF. We are now in the 115th Congress and another Speaker has told us the same thing. But again this year, a vote on an AUMF has been blocked.

The majority also blocked debating amendments under this rule on other important issues, like striking the provision in this bill allowing for the transfer of machine guns between contractors and a separate measure to strike the provision here giving the President leeway to avoid implementing Russian sanctions.

That is disappointing, and it is a disservice to this institution and to the people we represent. For all of the talk from the majority about how many amendments are included here, let's not forget what is being blocked.

This bill is incredibly important. It authorizes money for more than half of the Nation's discretionary budget. That is about 54 cents of every tax dollar that pays for government programs other than entitlements. We should be having a robust debate on these issues here and now.

Yes, we appreciate quantity; that is important. We want a lot of amendments made in order, but we would like quantity and quality. So substantive amendments like the issues that I just mentioned ought to be made in order.

When it comes to our national defense, when it comes to debating the issues that are important to the American people, I want to let my colleagues know we Democrats aren't cheap dates. We want to have our ideas presented and debated. And the American people aren't cheap dates either. They can't understand for the life of themselves why on issues of war and peace, on issues like our involvement in Afghanistan, which is now the longest war in history, why we don't think it is important enough to debate that issue. We have men and women deployed in harm's way, but we can't be bothered on the House floor.

We have roadblocks thrown in front of us so we can't bring these amendments to the floor. We have a thousand excuses about why we can't deal with some of these issues, why this is not the time. Enough. I mean, this is what we are here for. If you don't want to talk about these issues, if you don't want to debate these issues, leave, go into another business, but don't take up space here in Congress spending all of your time trying to block these amendments from being brought to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I know a more open process is a foreign concept to the majority, but they should try it once in a while. This is the most closed Congress ever. Let's let the sunlight in. Let's have a process that is more accommodating.

And on this defense bill, yes, there are a lot of amendments that have been made in order, but there were a lot of important, vital amendments that have been blocked, and I find that very disappointing.

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

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

Let's compare the records of the Republicans and the Democrats and who has the most open Congress.

As of May 23 of this year, Republicans in this Congress have provided for consideration of over 1,130 amendments on the House floor. Over 520 of those, or 46 percent, were Democratic amendments; 430, or 38 percent, were Republican; and 170, or 16 percent, were bipartisan. In the 114th Congress, the GOP majority allowed over 1,700 amendments. In the 113th Congress, the GOP majority allowed over 1,500 amendments.

In the entire 111th Congress, when the Democrats were in control, Speaker PELOSI, the Democrats, allowed less than 1,000 amendments to be considered on the floor.

Who is more open? Democrats have highlighted the number of amendments not made in order in this Congress. However, in the 111th Congress when

they controlled, their majority blocked nearly 3,000 amendments, with roughly 2,400 of those occurring in the very first sessions.

Unlike our Democratic colleagues who shut the doors and refused to accept the late amendments from Members, Chairman SESSIONS of the Rules Committee has made it a point to ensure that every single Member has the opportunity to submit their amendments and come to the committee to share their thoughts and concerns, oftentimes late at night.

Under this model of transparency and openness, the committee has spent countless hours listening and considering Member testimony. In fact, we have welcomed over 225 Members to testify at this Congress roughly 493 times and made in order over 1,130 amendments, including 521 from the Democrats, as I said. So I am glad to compare our record of openness with theirs.

Let's talk about the escalation in Afghanistan. There is a clear AUMF that authorizes what we are doing in Afghanistan. Under that AUMF, the military doesn't have to come back to the Congress to say: Pretty please, can we put more soldiers into that country?

I trust General Mattis. He knows what he is doing. He has a clear, legal authorization to do it, and I don't think it makes any sense for him to have to come back to us.

On the issue of the AUMF, which I know we will have more debate on during this rule debate, let me say one thing and say it clearly: I have cosponsored at least two AUMF bills, and those are in the Foreign Affairs Committee, not in the Armed Services Committee. We don't have jurisdiction over that. I wish we did. In fact, I have cosponsored a bill with a Democratic colleague to put jurisdiction in the Armed Services Committee so we can get something done. So I would dearly love for the Foreign Affairs Committee to come forward with a bill, and I am happy to work with the gentleman to see that that takes place.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), the newest member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to join the House Armed Services Committee in time to participate in the review and markup of the fiscal year 2019 national defense authorization bill. I am pleased to participate in the investments this bill makes in our national defense.

I would agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: They are not a cheap date. In fact, some of the amendments that my colleague mentioned were debated in committee and were defeated in committee. Apparently, we want to go through them multiple times; and unless they get everything they want, somehow they are going to protest. At some point in

time, the process is what it is. The amendment is lost.

I am pleased to participate in investments in defense, and in particular, the Stryker combat vehicle, a program that has a tremendous impact on combat readiness and capability of our Army.

The Stryker brigade combat teams are some of the most frequently deployed units in the Army, and it exponentially increases the protection and lethality of our Nation's soldiers.

The most modern version of the vehicle, the Stryker A1, includes a double-V hull that has already proven to protect soldiers from the most violent IED and mine blasts, as well as other upgrades to improve their mobility and communication capabilities.

I am pleased with the House Armed Services Committee for seeing the wisdom of authorizing a total \$360 million for the Stryker upgrades this fiscal year. That effort supports Army Chief of Staff General Milley's plan to provide Stryker A1s to all brigade combat teams by 2025.

I look forward to working with the chairman and over 250 Members of my House colleagues—across the aisle, by the way—who join me in a letter supporting the Stryker program and its continued efforts of development.

Our soldiers who so often are deployed in harm's way deserve every protection they can get, and we should provide that for them.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter to the Secretary of the Army, Mark Esper.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, April 12, 2018.

DEAR SECRETARY ESPER: Thank you for your service to our nation and your robust efforts to increase the readiness and modernization budget of the U.S. Army. While you may have just begun, you are making remarkable progress on behalf of the American soldier and our national security.

However, we would like to bring to your attention the continued budgetary challenges of the Stryker combat vehicle program. The Stryker vehicle is the Army's most deployed and versatile combat vehicle and represents what may be the most successful Army acquisition program in recent memory from initial acquisition to the most recent upgrades. Yet there appears to be a disconnect between these facts and the Army's FY19 budget request which once again neglects much needed Stryker procurement and modernization.

In recent years, Congress has stepped in and ensured that the Army's lack of budgetary commitment to Stryker did not prevent our soldiers in the field from receiving the safety and lethality upgrades necessary against the threats of today's global environment. Congress has strongly supported both the conversion of flat bottomed Strykers to the more survivable Double-V Hull (DVH) Stryker A1 version and the Stryker lethality (ICV) upgrade which adds a powerful 30mm cannon to the Stryker infantry variant.

While we are pleased that the Army's FY 19 modernization budget was increased by more than 14% from FY 18, we are perplexed why the Stryker program did not seem to benefit from this growth in investment funding, especially since it is our understanding that the Army has an operational require-

ment for additional brigades of improved Stryker (DVH) A1s. How can the Stryker fleet represent 30% of Army combat vehicles yet receive just 6% of the Army's combat vehicle budget in FY 19?

Congress has continually demonstrated our long-standing support for Stryker production and we request that you do the same by working with us in the FY19 defense budget process to develop a plan to sustain the Stryker program.

Sincerely,

Mike Rogers, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, Sander M. Levin, Richard Hudson, Paul Mitchell, Debbie Dingell, Lou Barletta, Tom Graves, Vern Buchanan, Andre Carson, Collin C. Peterson, Pete Sessions, Harry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Peter Roskam, Patrick Meehan, Walter Jones, Stephen Palazzo, Bill Shuster, Tom Marino, Joyce Beatty, Alan Lowenthal, Bradley Byrne, Mimi Walters, Robert Pittenger, Robert B. Aderholt, Eric Swalwell, Will Hurd, James B. Renacci, Gary Palmer.

Michael T. McCaul, Jim Jordan, Charles W. Dent, David E. Price, Brian Mast, Henry Cuellar, Vicki Hartzler, Adam Kinzinger, Scott DesJarlais, Don Young, Emanuel Cleaver, II, Rob Wittman, Gerald E. Conolly, Patrick McHenry, Bruce Westerman, Glenn "GT" Thompson, Ted Budd, Josh Gottheimer, Barbara Comstock, Ted W. Lieu, Elise M. Stefanik, A. Donald McEachin, Peter T. King, Martha Rayb.

Robert A. Brady, Paul Gosar, Mike Simpson, John Carter, Terri Sewell, Bill Huizenga, David B. McKinley, PE, Betty McCollum, Peter Welch, Sean P. Duffy, Marcia Fudge, Leonard Lance, Thomas J. Rooney, Ann McLane Kuster, Tom O'Halloran, Francis Rooney, John R. Moolenaar, Alma S. Adams, John H. Rutherford, Michael Doyle, Jody Hice, Ryan A. Costello, Charlie Crist, Denny Heck.

Mark E. Amodei, Ann Wagner, Rick W. Allen, Ralph Abraham, MD, Ted S. Yoho, DVM, Tom MacArthur, (duplicate signature), Mike Gallagher, Steve Stivers, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kevin Brady, George Holding, Scott Peters, Sam Graves, Keith J. Rothfus, Paul Cook, Nanette Diaz Barragan, Darin LaHood, Doug Collins, Don Bacon, Carol Shea-Porter, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Juan Vargas, Norma J. Torres, Kyrsten Sinema, David G. Valadao, Rodney Davis, Dwight Evans, Jim Langevin, Ken Calvert, Chellie Pingree.

Earl L. "Buddy" Carter, Michael D. Bishop, Colleen Hanabusa, Tom Garrett, Brian Fitzpatrick, Martha McSally, Warren Davidson, Devin Nunes, Steve Knight, Matthew Cartwright, Cheri Bustos, Chris Collins, Tim Ryan, Scott Perry, Karen C. Handel, French Hill, Carlos Curbelo, Joe Wilson, Anthony G. Brown, Derek Kilmer, Grace F. Napolitano, John Faso, Andy Biggs, Trent Kelly, Mark Walker, Marc Veasey, Jim Himes, James P. McGovern, G.K. Butterfield, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Virginia Foxx.

David Rouzer, Cedric L. Richmond, Jackie Walorski, Jim Banks, Lloyd Smucker, Matt Gaetz, Larry Bucshon, MD, Julia Brownley, Mark Meadows, A. Drew Ferguson, IV, DMD, Jamie Herrera Beutler, Donald Beyer, Brendan F. Boyle, Brenda L. Lawrence, Ruben Gallego, Grace Meng, Seth Moulton, Mike Bost, Kathleen M. Rice, Dave Loebsack, Evan H. Jenkins, John M. Katko, Bill Johnson, Dave Trott, Donald Norcross, Michael Capuano, Pete Aguilar, Barry Loudermilk, John Culbertson, Fred Upton, H. Morgan Griffith.

Mario Diaz-Balart, Jack Bergman, Pramila Jayapal, Richard E. Neal, David Scott, Chris Stewart, John K. Delaney, Darren Soto, Al Lawson, Bruce Poliquin, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Gregory W. Meeks, Alcee L. Hastings, Steve Chabot, Kenny Marchant, Sanford Bishop, Austin Scott, Frank LoBiondo,

Duncan Hunter, John Garamendi, Suzan K. DelBene, Bob Gibbs, Bill Long, Tom Cole, Chuck Fleischmann, Rick Crawford, Pete Olson, Susan W. Brooks.

Dennis Ross, Scott Taylor, Mike Johnson, Salud Carbajal, Dan Kildee, Rob Woodall, Mark Pocan, Tulsi Gabbard, Roger Williams, Stephanie Murphy, Dave Reichert, Jeff Duncan, Christopher H. Smith, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Sam Johnson, Steve Womack, C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Kurt Schrader, Tim Walberg, Todd Rokita, Robert E. Latta, Mike Coffman, Mike Quigley, Mo Brooks, Kevin Yoder, Tom Rice, Rick Larsen.

Neal Dunn, MD, Tom Emmer, Stacey Plaskett, Tom Suozzi, Erik Paulsen, Mike Kelly, Andy Barr, Zoe Lofgren, Dan Newhouse, Bobby Scott, Jeff Fortenberry, Daniel Lipinski, Adam B. Schiff, Bob Goodlatte, Ed Royce, Hal Rogers, Brad Wenstrup, K. Michael Conaway, Tom Reed, Bill Flores, Ted Deutch, Ron Estes, Paul Tonko, Doug Lamborn, Randy Hultgren, Albio Sires, David Schweikert.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my colleague from Alabama, I appreciate the fact that he wants to defend what I think is indefensible, this process that the Republicans have implemented to run this House. I would be embarrassed to, but I know he has a job to do, and that is what he is doing.

He talks about all of these amendments that were made in order. What he doesn't tell you about is the over 2,000 amendments that they have blocked this session already, including a lot of Republican amendments that have been blocked, as well.

It is always puzzling to me that the Republicans just kind of go along to get along, and they get shut out of the amendment process and they still vote for a rule. Maybe the day that they stop voting for these rules is a day that maybe we will see some changes.

I also want to point out, and I don't think he really appreciates this point and this is why this has become the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America, that the majority of bills that have been brought to the floor are unamendable. They are totally closed. I can't even offer an amendment to put a punctuation mark in a bill. I can't change a comma. I can't change the spelling of a word.

The majority of bills have been totally closed, shut out to everybody. If that is the process that this majority wants to embrace, fine. I think that is the kind of process that we want to move away from because that is the kind of process that we see in authoritarian regimes, not in deliberative bodies like the United States Congress, not in the United States of America.

The gentleman talks about that he trusts the administration on Afghanistan. Well, I don't trust this President on anything, to be honest with you. I don't know if he has ever been to Afghanistan, but I have, and the troops that I talked to in Afghanistan and those who are returning ask me the same thing over and over, and that is: What the hell are we doing? What is our mission?

Now, if you think the mission is on target and everything is great, fine. Then vote to increase the number of troops there. But we ought to have a debate here on the floor on whether that is the right thing to do.

On AUMFs, I am happy that the gentleman is cosponsoring a number of AUMFs. He says it is not appropriate to talk about it here in a defense authorization bill or a Defense Appropriations bill; that is a Foreign Affairs Committee bill, and we ought to deal with it there.

When is the last time we have had a Foreign Affairs Committee bill that has been brought before us that we could amend to do an AUMF on? I don't know.

Maybe the gentleman may know when this AUMF is coming out of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I haven't seen it. I have been waiting for years. They are in charge. They run this place. They control everything.

So that is just another excuse, and it really is insulting to the men and women who put their lives on the line for this country. I mean, there is always an excuse why we can't debate something.

This has to stop, and I hope it stops soon. If not, maybe the elections will result in a change of leadership here. I hope that, if we have the privilege to take over, you see a much more accommodating process and, certainly, a process where important issues like this get to be debated.

Mr. Speaker, the protests by thousands of teachers across the Nation have exposed not just low wages, but also severely dilapidated facilities. The 2016 State of Our Schools report determined that there is an annual State and local spending gap of \$46 billion on school facilities. These facilities pose significant health and safety threats to more than 50 million students.

In the richest country in the world, it is absolutely shameful that we allow our children to attend schools without heat and with dangerous mold, not to mention the thousands of schools lacking access to the connectivity necessary for digital learning.

For this reason, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Education and the Workforce Committee member BOBBY SCOTT's bill, H.R. 2475, the Rebuild America's Schools Act. This legislation would provide the necessary funding to address critical physical and digital infrastructure needs in our schools, creating over 1.9 million jobs in the process.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to

the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

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

As the Representative of Hampton Roads, Virginia, I support the significant increase in Navy shipbuilding in the NDAA. But while we consider national defense, we must also consider school construction.

Yesterday, U.S. banks reported \$56 billion in first quarter profits. At the same time, our teachers are being forced to go on strike for a living wage and adequate funding for our public schools. But when the majority pushed its tax bill through Congress, it was the banks, not teachers and not the schools, that received the biggest benefit.

H.R. 2475, the Rebuild America's Schools Act, would be a step forward in correcting our priorities by investing desperately needed funding into our public school infrastructure. This \$100 billion proposal, which is barely 5 percent of what was spent on the tax cut for corporations and the wealthiest Americans, would go towards repairing crumbling public school buildings to ensure that every student has access to safe, healthy, and high-quality learning facilities.

Not only would this proposal improve school conditions and student academic outcomes, it would create jobs. Research from the Economic Policy Institute shows that for every \$1 billion invested in school construction, 18,000 jobs are created. Therefore, a \$100 billion Federal investment translates into about 1.8 million new jobs over the next decade. That is many times more than are projected from the \$1.5 trillion tax cut.

Last week, we honored the 64th anniversary of the Supreme Court landmark ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education* that found separate is inherently unequal and ordered public education to integrate to provide equitable learning opportunities for all.

Now, how can we now say that we followed the order in *Brown* when, just this winter, public schools in Baltimore were forced to close because they didn't have heat? And how could we justify handing a massive tax cut to the wealthy and corporations while abandoning students and educators in public schools across the country? The answer is we can't.

The Rebuild America's Schools Act would put us on a path to give students the safe and high-quality education they deserve, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia's comments. He is the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee in the House. I have the privilege of serving with him on that committee.

I spent 8 years on the Alabama State Board of Education, 5 years in the Alabama State senate serving on both of

our education committees, and 2 years as chancellor of postsecondary education for the State of Alabama. I care deeply about education. I know what it can do to better the lives of everybody in America.

I find many of the comments the gentleman made with regard to this bill very interesting, and I hope there will be a time when we can take those up and consider them, but this is not that time. We are here today to talk about the defense of the United States of America.

So, with all respect to the gentleman's comments, I hope that he and I can sit down with others later and talk about that, particularly what is the role of the Federal Government versus what is the role of State and local governments. But today let's talk about the defense of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding me this time. He is one of the great leaders in this Congress, and it is an honor to serve with him.

Mr. Speaker, I have always heard that many government agencies spend roughly 60 percent of their budgets within the first 11 months and then scramble around during the last month trying to spend the rest of their budget so they won't be cut for the next year.

I think we should do what we can to incentivize more government employees to come up with cost-saving ideas. That is why I introduced, along with Mr. POLIS from Colorado and Mr. JONES from North Carolina, an amendment to the NDAA which will do just that. It will give all military personnel even more reasons to be creative in how to save costs.

I am pleased that my amendment, which has been made in order en bloc, directs the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on the military's existing incentive programs for cost-saving ideas. This amendment will also include a report on how the Secretary plans to expand and streamline those existing programs to better reward military personnel who help the Department of Defense to be more efficient.

We need to be good stewards of the taxpayers' money and should do everything we can to ensure that our military's funding is used wisely and used where it is needed most.

I introduced a bill several times many years ago to give Federal employees bonuses for half of any money that their agency or their department can save. This amendment hopefully will move us in that direction.

On a side note, I do want to say that I believe the American people are really sick and tired of our spending hundreds of billions on a very unnecessary, no-win war in Afghanistan now 17 years old. I am disappointed that this bill continues that funding instead of bringing our troops back home.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 23, 2018, at 9:54 a.m.:

That the Senate agrees to return the papers to the House of Representatives at their request. H.R. 4743.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our ranking member for yielding and for his tremendous leadership on defense issues and so many other issues that are critical to our national and domestic security.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to H.R. 5515, which is the 2019 National Defense Authorization Act. This bill authorizes \$717 billion in defense spending. Yet we know that there is at least \$150 billion in waste, fraud, and abuse currently over at the Pentagon. Now we are giving them more money. Shame on us. This is an already out-of-control, bloated Pentagon budget.

It would also increase funding to \$69 billion for wars that Congress has never debated or voted on. Once again, my Republican colleagues have used off-the-books spending gimmicks to further expand the bloated Pentagon budget.

Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker. Instead of writing blank checks to the Pentagon, Congress needs to live up to its constitutional obligation to debate matters of war and peace. Yesterday I offered an amendment to sunset the 2001 and 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force after 8 months of enactment. Congress would have 8 months to debate and vote on a new AUMF before the repeal. Eight months is plenty of time. Mr. Speaker, we passed the 2001 AUMF within 3 days, mind you.

Last week, of course, Speaker Ryan—and I say at the orders of Donald Trump—undemocratically stripped our bipartisan 2001 sunset amendment when the Defense Appropriations bill came before us.

When in the world will this body have the backbone to debate the costs and consequences of these wars? Our brave troops deserve better. We need to do our job.

I am pleased, though, that some of my amendments and others passed last night—which are very important amendments. They include clarifying that nothing in this bill can be construed as authorizing force against North Korea—that is the use of military force.

Also we included reporting requirements for auditing the Pentagon. We need the Pentagon audited so that taxpayers will really begin to know where their hard-earned tax dollars are going and what weapons systems they are contributing to in terms of the building of weapons systems which probably will never be used, a report and update on the United States-Kabul compact, and also overseas contingency operations reporting requirements.

Can you believe we are spending all this money on a slush fund through OCO, and we don't know what is going on with that account?

The underlying bill is still a disgrace. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In conclusion, I just want to reiterate that authorizing wars with no end, no debate, and no vote is unconstitutional, and it is wrong.

I call on Speaker RYAN to bring forth an authorization because every step of the way, we are trying in a bipartisan fashion to do this, and it is the Speaker's call. He should do that so that we can debate and vote up or down on these wars.

So this rule and this bill should not be passed just based on the amount of money that we are giving to the Pentagon to do more than ensure our national security and fight terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" on the rule and the underlying bill and reject this shameful bill.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the gentlewoman's comments, and she probably is unaware of the fact that we are presently undergoing for the first time in the history of the Department of Defense a full Department-wide audit. We are already getting some of the things that they have determined from that audit back. That audit is going to give us information we need to make some further changes in the management performance of the Pentagon. She probably didn't know we are already underway with that, but that is going to be completed in early fall of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), who is my colleague from both the Rules Committee and the Armed Services Committee.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. BYRNE, for his tremendous work on this issue on the Rules Committee as well as on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule and the bipartisan

work of the House Armed Services Committee that has gone into crafting the underlying bill. This year's NDAA authorizes programs that are absolutely crucial, Mr. Speaker, to the defense of this Nation.

The bill authorizes funding at levels that will begin to restore our readiness, replacing aging equipment and weapons, and developing the next generation of military technology.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would clearly like to divert attention from these issues. They would like to try to discuss everything under the sun, it seems, except funding for our men and women in uniform who are on the front lines defending the freedom that allows us to have the debate that we are having today in this very Chamber.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that, without the funding authorized in this bill, our adversaries will continue to close capability gaps and further erode our military superiority.

Mr. Speaker, while passage of this rule and the underlying NDAA are vital, our work will not be done. We must appropriate the funds authorized here, and we must finally, Mr. Speaker, repeal the Budget Control Act.

For the last decade, this body has routinely forced the Department of Defense to operate under continuing resolutions. In plain English, this means we are asking our men and women in uniform to stay on their posts and put their lives on the line to defend all of us while at the same time depriving them of the resources they need to do that job.

The situation, Mr. Speaker, was exacerbated in 2011 with the arbitrary budget caps and sequestration of the Budget Control Act. This has devastated military readiness and enabled our adversaries to make significant gains that threaten our security and our military superiority.

In testimony earlier this year, Secretary of Defense Mattis described the severity of the situation and congressional responsibility for the situation this way: "As hard as the last 16 years of war have been, no enemy in the field has done as much to harm the readiness of the U.S. military than the combined impact of the Budget Control Act's defense spending caps, worsened by operating for 10 of the last 11 years under continuing resolutions of varied and unpredictable duration."

In a world in which we face the most complex and severe threat environment we have faced since the end of World War II, this situation is simply shameful. The men and women who put their lives on the line for all of us are sick and tired—as my colleague said, that is absolutely true—but they are sick and tired, Mr. Speaker, of being held hostage to a range of Democratic pet programs and politics that are often played by those on the other side of the aisle in this Chamber.

Year after year, Mr. Speaker, we have completed our work in this body

on the Defense Appropriations bill, and we have done it on time. Unfortunately, the same is not true of our colleagues in the Senate. Rules over in the Senate have allowed Democrats in that body to hold critical funding for our military hostage in an effort to advance unrelated issues.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle join me in the belief that no member of our military—no mother or father or wife or husband or child of any servicemember—should have to continue to pay the price for the dysfunction of the United States Congress' budget process.

I fully expect that this House will complete our work, once again, Mr. Speaker, to fund our military in a timely manner this year. I call on my colleagues, the Democrats in this body and in the Senate, to join us in fulfilling our most important constitutional obligation. We must avoid another continuing resolution for the Department of Defense, and we must pass the funding authorized under this bill required to provide for the common defense.

The first step in that overall process is the work we are doing here this week. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule so we can complete our work on the underlying bill. I urge passage of the NDAA, and I urge my colleagues to join us in putting the resources in place our troops need, to stop holding our troops hostage, and to work with us to break the cycle of continuing resolutions that have only served to undermine military readiness.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my Rules Committee colleague that I agree with her that this place is pretty dysfunctional. But I just want to point out, in case she has forgotten, that the White House is controlled by Republicans, the House is controlled by Republicans, and the Senate is controlled by Republicans. So the gentlewoman can blame everybody she wants, but the Republicans are in charge of everything.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) to respond to Mr. BYRNE.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to respond to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and say that I know exactly what is going on over at the Pentagon in terms of their auditing requirements and what they are doing. But I have to say the Pentagon—and the gentleman should know this—has never been audited, I know, for the last 50 years.

The public understands it needs to be audited because they see each and every day the wasteful spending of the Pentagon when you just look at, for example, CEO compensation of millions and millions and millions of dollars that are being paid to defense contractor executives on the taxpayers' dime.

So, yes, I know what is going on; and, yes, it has not been audited in 50 years.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a May 22 letter signed by 32 former Republican and Democratic defense and foreign policy officials rejecting the building and use of low-yield nuclear warheads and opposing their authorization and their funding.

MAY 22, 2018.

Hon. JIM MCGOVERN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCGOVERN: We write to respectfully request that Congress reject the Trump administration's request for new, more usable, "low-yield" nuclear warheads for Trident missiles. There is no need for such weapons and building them would make the United States less safe. These so-called "low-yield" weapons are a gateway to nuclear catastrophe and should not be pursued.

To justify this dangerous proposal, the Trump administration is promoting a false narrative that the United States has a "gap" in its ability to deter the use of nuclear weapons by Russia. Officials allege that Moscow believes that an American president would not respond to Russian use of "tactical," or lower yield, nuclear weapons if his only options include "strategic," or high-yield, ones. The president, they argue, would be "self-deterred."

To plug this supposed "deterrence gap," the Trump administration wants to develop and deploy new low-yield nuclear warheads on Trident II D5 missiles on Ohio-class submarines. The administration is asking Congress for \$88 million in FY2019 for this new warhead, in a program that would be completed in that fiscal year under the aegis of the W76 Life Extension Program. Yet this justification for new Trident warheads fails on many levels:

1. There is no "deterrence gap." The United States has a massive nuclear arsenal of some 4,000 warheads, half of which are deployed on land-based missiles, submarines, and bombers. The administration is in the process of rebuilding this arsenal at an estimated cost of \$1.7 trillion, with inflation, over the next 30 years. While this immense program is excessive, adds to a new arms race with Russia, and should be scaled back, Russia cannot doubt that the United States is serious about maintaining an unambiguously strong nuclear deterrent.

2. The United States already has many low-yield nuclear weapons. As part of that massive arsenal, the United States already has about 1,000 nuclear weapons with low-yield options, which are being modernized at great expense. If the president ever needed to use a low-yield nuclear weapon, he has many options.

3. Nuclear war cannot be controlled. Perhaps the biggest fallacy in the whole argument is the mistaken and dangerous belief that a "small" nuclear war would remain small. There is no basis for the dubious theory that, if Russia used a "low-yield" nuclear weapon and the United States responded in kind, the conflict could stay at that level.

Indeed, it is unlikely that there is such a thing as a limited nuclear war; preparing for one is folly. As George Shultz, Secretary of State for President Ronald Reagan, recently noted, "A nuclear weapon is a nuclear weapon. You use a small one, then you go to a bigger one. I think nuclear weapons are nuclear weapons and we need to draw the line there." Secretary of Defense James Mattis similarly declared, "I don't think there's any such thing as a tactical nuclear weapon. Any

nuclear weapon used at any time is a strategic game changer.”

Ultimately, the greatest concern about the proposed low-yield Trident warhead is that the president might feel less restrained about using it in a crisis. When it comes to using a nuclear weapon, restraint is a good thing. The proposed “low-yield” Trident warhead is dangerous, unjustified, and redundant. Congress has the power to stop the administration from starting down this slippery slope to nuclear war. We call on Congress to exercise that authority without delay.

Sincerely,

The Hon. George P. Shultz, Former U.S. Secretary of State; The Hon. William J. Perry, Former U.S. Secretary of Defense; The Hon. Richard G. Lugar, United States Senator (Ret.), Former Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee; The Hon. Byron Dorgan, United States Senator (Ret.), Former Chairman, Energy & Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee, Senate Appropriations Committee; The Hon. Gary Hart, United States Senator (Ret.), Former member, Senate Armed Services Committee; The Hon. Mark Udall, United States Senator (Ret.), Former member, Senate Armed Services Committee.

The Hon. Jerry Brown, Former Governor of California; The Hon. Barney Frank, U.S. House of Representatives (Ret.); The Hon. John Tierney, U.S. House of Representatives (Ret.), Former Chairman, House Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs, Government Oversight and Reform Committee; General James Cartwright (USMC, Ret.), Former Vice Chair, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Lt. General Robert G. Gard (USA, Ret.), Former President, National Defense University; The Hon. John Holdren, Former Chief Science Advisor to the President; The Hon. Thomas Countryman, Former Assistant Secretary of State for International Security and Nonproliferation.

The Hon. Andrew Weber, Former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs; The Hon. Thomas Graham Jr., Former Special Representative of the President for Arms Control, Non-proliferation and Disarmament; The Hon. Susan F. Burk, Former Special Representative of the President, Nuclear Nonproliferation; The Hon. Laura Kennedy, Former US Permanent Representative to the Conference on Disarmament; The Hon. Steven Pifer, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State and Ambassador to Ukraine; The Hon. Anne M. Harrington, Former Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, U.S. Department of Energy National Nuclear Security Administration.

Ben Chang, Former Director for Press & Communications and Deputy Spokesman at the National Security Council; Philip E. Coyle, Former Associate Director for National Security and International Affairs, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy; Steve Fetter, Former Principal Assistant Director for National Security and International Affairs, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy; Colin Kahl, Former Deputy Assistant to the President and National Security Advisor to the Vice President; Richard Nephew, Former Director for Iran for the National Security Council; Ned Price, Former Special Assistant to President Obama and Spokesperson for the National Security Council.

Ben Rhodes, Former Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Communications, The White House; Frank von Hippel, Former Assistant Director for National Security, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy; Jon Wolfsthal, Former Special Assistant to the President for National Security and Senior Director for Non-

proliferation and Arms Control at the National Security Council; Alexandra Bell, Former Director of Strategic Outreach in the Office of the Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security; Bishop Garrison, Former adviser and Executive Director, Homeland Security Science & Technology Advisory Committee; Morton Halperin, Former Director of the Policy Planning Staff, Department of State; Newell Highsmith, Former Deputy Legal Adviser, Department of State.

□ 1315

Mr. MCGOVERN. This letter is co-led by former Reagan Secretary of State George Shultz and former Clinton Secretary of Defense William Perry.

Mr. Speaker, as the letter states, “there is no such thing as a limited nuclear war and preparing for one is folly.”

George Shultz, Secretary of State for President Ronald Reagan, recently noted: “A nuclear weapon is a nuclear weapon. You use a small one, then you go to a bigger one.”

Secretary of Defense James Mattis also recently declared: “I don’t think there’s any such thing as a tactical nuclear weapon. Any nuclear weapon used at any time is a strategic game changer.”

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill, for all of its many positive developments, is seriously deficient in this particular area. It authorizes funding for new low-yield nuclear weapons.

The U.S. already possesses low-yield nuclear weapons. If these weapons are not effective deterrents, we should examine why before building and deploying a new generation of weapons.

We should listen to our seasoned elder statesmen and -women and stop walking down a road that begins a nuclear war that can rapidly escalate. Any use of a nuclear weapon is a catastrophe. We should be destroying nuclear weapons, not building new ones.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work together and make sure this funding is not included in the final version of the FY19 NDAA.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill authorizes what it authorizes with regard to these smaller nuclear weapons because we find our adversaries developing such nuclear weapons.

We are not developing them because we want to use them. We want to develop them because the mere fact that we have got them, we believe, is a deterrent to our adversaries using the very same weapons they have in their arsenal themselves.

So we are simply making sure that we don’t have one hand tied behind our back if we get into one of these types of conflicts.

I understand what the gentleman is saying. No one ever wants to use a nuclear weapon. But to see your adversary have such a weapon and do nothing is not what we should do to defend the people of the United States.

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

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

I would say to the gentleman that we already have low-yield nuclear weapons. I don’t know why we need more.

We heard the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), talk about the amendment he would like to see made in order to help reinforce our schools. I think most people watching also appreciate the fact that our national defense includes things like the quality of life for people here in this country, including the quality of our schools, whether people have jobs, whether people have good healthcare.

We are shortchanging all these domestic investments, and I think the concern we have is when you start investing in more nuclear weapons, not only is it not a good use of our taxpayer dollars, but it also increases insecurity for the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America. Let me repeat that. This is the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America.

The majority is very proud of this rule. They have made a bunch of amendments in order on a handful of bills to run up their numbers, but let’s remember one thing: On most bills, the majority of the legislation that comes to this floor, they do not allow a single amendment. Not one. On most bills that come to the floor, no Member of this House, Democratic or Republican, can offer an amendment.

This rule before us today is not closed, but let me highlight a few germane amendments from the 281 amendments that this rule blocks.

Several bipartisan amendments were blocked, such as an amendment by Representatives DENHAM, FOSTER, CURBELO, and PANETTA which allows Dreamers who grew up in the United States to gain legal status, provided that they serve out the terms of their enlistment honorably.

So we are talking about rewarding people who served in our military. That was the amendment. That was brought before the Rules Committee. That was blocked.

There was another bipartisan amendment from 25 Members, including myself, that expresses the sense of Congress that the lessons of past genocides should be applied to help prevent future war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide.

I say to my colleagues: When did a sense of Congress on the atrocities of genocide become such a controversial topic? But that was blocked.

This rule blocks an amendment by Representative KEATING to test ticks for an increased number of tick-borne diseases. When did fighting tick-borne diseases become too sensitive for the House to debate?

This rule, once again, blocks us from having one of the most important debates we could have. It prevents us

from debating whether or not to send our sons and daughters into harm's way.

The bipartisan amendment by Representatives LEE, JONES, and ELLISON would repeal the 2001 AUMF after 240 days of enactment of the act, giving Congress ample time to debate a new AUMF.

The Constitution of the United States says the Congress has the power to declare war. This is our job, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the gentleman from Alabama saying: Well, the Foreign Affairs Committee deals with that, not us. We hear that every year. Every year that goes by, we don't see any bill from the Foreign Affairs Committee dealing with these topics.

The bottom line, let's be honest, is we don't deal with it because Members in the majority don't want to deal with this difficult issue. I have always said that our failure to act on an AUMF, our failure to debate these issues, represents moral cowardice.

What about our workers? Representatives ELLISON, POCAN, and GRIJALVA had an amendment blocked that would have prohibited Federal contracts with companies that have repeated and willful wage theft violations. Why would we knowingly reward companies that hurt our workers?

The list goes on:

An amendment by Representative LIEU to require a public report on all DOD expenditures to support Presidential visits to entities owned or significantly controlled by the President or a member of his immediate family.

The American people deserve to know if the President and his family are directly profiting off of this Presidency. Blocked. Blocked.

An amendment by Representative VEASEY that would prohibit the deportation of family members of service members on Active Duty. How can we, with a good conscience, deport the family members of brave young men and women putting their lives on the line for all of us and fighting for our safety everyday? Blocked.

An amendment by Representative TORRES, a distinguished member of the Rules Committee, that would have prevented DOD in helping the Department of Homeland Security from deporting spouses, parents, and sons and daughters of certain military personnel, veterans, and enlistees.

Mr. Speaker, I could spend the rest of the week describing the thousands of amendments that this Republican leadership has blocked, but I would much prefer to be debating the ideas that Members from both parties have put forward in good faith.

This is the most closed Congress in history. Dana Milbank recently described it as the most authoritarian Congress in history.

You know, 180 Democratic Members have had an amendment blocked in this Congress alone. That is 180 elected Members.

I would like my Republican friends to listen closely to my next point. This

Congress, 180 Republican Members have also had their amendments blocked this Congress. You are all voting to block your own ideas. Stop it. Read the rules that you are voting on.

The vast majority of Republican Members have had their proposals blocked from even getting a vote. I don't understand why you keep voting to block proposals that you supposedly believe in. Hundreds of Republican amendments have been blocked by the Rules Committee. Most Republicans voted to block them. They are your amendments. I don't understand why it is such a radical idea to debate any of the amendments I just spoke about. We can do so much better.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of amendments that have been made in order. There is a lot of quantity. But a lot of the amendments that really shine in quality and that are important in terms of substance have been blocked. This is nothing new.

Again, the majority of bills that come to this floor are under closed rules. You can't amend them. Nobody can. Take it or leave it. The majority of bills that come to this floor are closed.

I know it is uncomfortable for my Republican friends to hear that they have presided over this closed process, but my hope is they will be so embarrassed and so ashamed that they will want to change things. They can still redeem themselves. We are only in May. They have a long way to go. Whether it is on the defense bill, on an education bill, or whatever bill it is, there are good ideas that are being brought forward.

I will close with this. I met with a group of young students who were engaged in the nationwide protest asking Congress to do something on gun violence. And the most frustrating thing they said to them is the fact that when they were lobbying Members of Congress, it's not even about telling them how to vote on an issue; they are frustrated because you can't get a vote on any of the issues that are related to gun violence. We won't let anything come to the floor. It is wrong.

I just say to my friends, in closing, if this place becomes more accommodating, if the Speaker decides to live up to the words that he enunciated when he became Speaker of the House, to have a more open process, to respect all ideas, let me tell you something; you are going to see a decrease in polarization. You are going to see more bills passed a bipartisan way. You are going to see more good bills going forward. Legislation will be better. If you have a lousy process, you end up with a lousy bill.

Again, I respect all the time and energy that went into crafting this NDAA. I respect the chairman and the ranking member, Democrats and Republicans alike, but there are a lot of important amendments here that are being blocked that are really important and that most of our constituents

would believe deserve a debate and a vote on this floor.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question. Vote "no" on the rule. And I plead with them, let's bring some accommodation and some respect to differing ideas and just regular order to this House, because this is certainly not what I think any of us could possibly believe is the way our government should be run.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I know that some of our Democratic colleagues—not all of them—would like for us today to be talking about a Federal takeover of local education. Some of my Democratic colleagues—not all of them—would like to talk about doing away with the Second Amendment. But that is not what we are about today. We are talking about the defense of the United States of America.

Remember where we were 2 years ago, at the end of the Obama administration. ISIS still controlled vast swaths of western Iraq and eastern Syria. Iran had just gotten its hands on tens of billions of dollars that had been frozen—money that they were able to get because of the deal that President Obama cut with them. We now know that they have taken that money and increased defense spending, military spending, in Iran by 40 percent.

Two years ago, we had cut troop levels down to levels we haven't seen in decades. In fact, we cut the Air Force to the point it had never been since the founding of the Air Force. Our fleet had been cut down to less than 280 ships after it had been to at least 400 under the Clinton administration. Fifty percent of the Navy's jets couldn't fly. Our adversaries didn't fear us and our friends and allies didn't know if they could count on us.

We have begun to turn that around. ISIS is largely gone from Iraq. It is largely gone from Syria. It is obliterated as a conventional force after becoming a conventional terrorist army that controlled a big chunk of the Middle East. Gone. Slipped over into North Africa. We understand that. So we have to continue what we are doing to fight against them in those places. And, yes, we need an AUMF to do that.

We have also done something that is very important in rebuilding our military. We have told our men and women that we value them by giving them pay increases. This bill calls for another pay increase on top of the one we gave them last year. They have gone too long without real pay increases.

We are beginning to give them the equipment they need to do the missions that we have them to do. More ships, more jets, more ammunition, more missiles, more missile defense. We are going to make sure that our jets can fly.

Most importantly, we want to make sure that our men and women in uniform have the training, preparation,

and support they need so we don't have another year that goes by where we have more of our men and women in uniform who lose their lives in training exercises than they do in combat.

□ 1330

We are turning that around. We are leaving the sorry legacy of the Obama administration so that we can put in place a defense strategy for this country that will defend our country and, at the same time, protect the safety of our men and women in uniform. So that is what we are here today to talk about.

I believe that we will vote on this bill, the underlying bill, in a bipartisan fashion because, going back to the Kennedy administration, that is what we have done year after year after year. That is the message that we send to our foes, to our friends abroad, and, yes, to those men and women in uniform: that we come together, this Congress comes together, to make sure that we do what we are supposed to do in our job to defend this country.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 908 and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 908 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 8. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2475) to provide for the long-term improvement of public school facilities, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 9. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2475.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair

will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 189, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 217]

YEAS—222

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

NAYS—189

Adams	Boyle, Brendan F.	Cartwright
Aguilar	Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)
Barragan	Brown (MD)	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Chu, Judy
Bera	Bustos	Ciicilline
Beyer	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Clarke (NY)
Blumenauer	Carbajal	Clay
Blunt Rochester	Cardenas	Cleaver
Bonamici	Carson (IN)	Clyburn
		Cohen

Connolly	Kaptur	Perlmutter	Babin	Graves (LA)	O'Halleran	Garamendi	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Keating	Peters	Bacon	Graves (MO)	Olson	Gomez	Lujan Grisham,	Ruiz
Correa	Kelly (IL)	Peterson	Banks (IN)	Griffith	Palazzo	Gonzalez (TX)	M.	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kennedy	Pingree	Barletta	Grothman	Palmer	Green, Al	Luján, Ben Ray	Rush
Courtney	Khanna	Pocan	Barr	Guthrie	Pocan	Green, Gene	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Crist	Kihuen	Polis	Barton	Handel	Perry	Grijalva	Maloney,	Sánchez
Crowley	Kildee	Price (NC)	Bergman	Harper	Pittenger	Hanabusa	Carolyn B.	Sarbanes
Cuellar	Kilmer	Quigley	Biggs	Harris	Poe (TX)	Hastings	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Cummings	Kind	Raskin	Bilirakis	Hartzler	Poliquin	Heck	Massie	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)	Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Posey	Higgins (NY)	Matsui	Schrader
Davis, Danny	Kuster (NH)	Richmond	Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe	Himes	McColum	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Lamb	Rosen	Blackburn	Hice, Jody B.	Reed	Hoyer	McEachin	Scott, David
DeGette	Langevin	Roybal-Allard	Blum	Hill	Reichert	Huffman	McGovern	Serrano
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz	Bost	Holding	Renacci	Jackson Lee	McNerney	Sewell (AL)
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger	Brady (TX)	Hollingsworth	Rice (SC)	Jayapal	Meeks	Shea-Porter
DelBene	Lawrence	Rush	Brat	Hudson	Roby	Jeffries	Meng	Sherman
Demings	Lawson (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Brooks (AL)	Huizenga	Roe (TN)	Johnson (GA)	Moore	Sires
DeSaulnier	Lee	Sánchez	Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Moulton	Smith (WA)
Deutch	Levin	Sarbanes	Buchanan	Hunter	Rohrabacher	Kaptur	Nadler	Soto
Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky	Buck	Hurd	Rokita	Keating	Napolitano	Suozi
Doggett	Lipinski	Schiff	Bucshon	Issa	Rooney, Thomas	Kelly (IL)	Neal	Swalwell (CA)
Doyle, Michael	Loeb sack	Schneider	Budd	Jenkins (KS)	J.	Kennedy	Nolan	Takano
F.	Lofgren	Schrader	Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen	Khanna	Norcross	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)	Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Roskam	Kihue	O'Rourke	Thompson (MS)
Engel	Lowey	Scott, David	Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Ross	Kildee	Pallone	Titus
Eshoo	Lujan Grisham,	Serrano	Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus	Kilmer	Panetta	Tonko
Espallat	M.	Sewell (AL)	Carter (TX)	Jones	Rouzer	Kind	Pascrell	Torres
Esty (CT)	Luján, Ben Ray	Shea-Porter	Chabot	Jordan	Royce (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Payne	Tsongas
Evans	Lynch	Sherman	Cheney	Joyce (OH)	Russell	Kuster (NH)	Pelosi	Vargas
Foster	Maloney,	Sinema	Coffman	Katko	Rutherford	Langevin	Perlmutter	Veasey
Frankel (FL)	Carolyn B.	Sires	Cole	Kelly (MS)	Sanford	Larsen (WA)	Peters	Vela
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)	Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Scalise	Larson (CT)	Peterson	Velázquez
Gabbard	Matsui	Soto	Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Schneider	Lawrence	Pingree	Visclosky
Gallego	McColum	Suozi	Comer	Schwartz	Schweikert	Lawson (FL)	Pocan	Wasserman
Garamendi	McEachin	Swalwell (CA)	Comstock	Scott, Austin	Scott, Austin	Lee	Polis	Schultz
Gomez	McGovern	Takano	Conaway	Kustoff (TN)	Sensenbrenner	Levin	Price (NC)	Waters, Maxine
Gonzalez (TX)	McNerney	Thompson (CA)	Cook	Labrador	Sessions	Lieu, Ted	Quigley	Watson Coleman
Gottheimer	Meeks	Thompson (MS)	Costello (PA)	LaHood	Shimkus	Lipinski	Raskin	Welch
Green, Al	Meng	Titus	Cramer	LaMalfa	Shuster	Loeb sack	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Green, Gene	Moore	Tonko	Crawford	Lamb	Simpson	Lofgren	Richmond	Yarmuth
Grijalva	Moulton	Torres	Culbertson	Lamborn	Sinema	Smith (MO)	Rosen	
Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)	Tsongas	Curbelo (FL)	Lance	Smith (MO)	Smith (NJ)		
Hanabusa	Nadler	Vargas	Curtis	Latta	Smith (NE)	Smith (TX)		
Hastings	Napolitano	Veasey	Davidson	Lesko	Smith (TX)	Smucker		
Heck	Neal	Vela	Davis, Rodney	Lewis (MN)	Stefanik	Stewart		
Higgins (NY)	Nolan	Velázquez	Denham	LoBiondo	Stewart	Taylor		
Himes	Norcross	Visclosky	DeSantis	Long	Stewart	Tenney		
Hoyer	O'Halleran	Wasserman	DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Stewart	Thompson (PA)		
Huffman	O'Rourke	Schultz	Diaz-Balart	Love	Taylor	Thornberry		
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Waters, Maxine	Duffy	Lucas	Tenney	Tipton		
Jayapal	Panetta	Watson Coleman	Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)	Turner		
Jeffries	Pascrell	Welch	Duncan (TN)	MacArthur	Thornberry	Upton		
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Wilson (FL)	Dunne	Marchant	Thornberry	Valadao		
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Yarmuth	Emmer	Marino	Thornberry	Wagner		

NOT VOTING—16

Bass	Labrador	Stivers
Black	Lewis (GA)	Trott
Donovan	Pearce	Walz
Gosar	Rogers (KY)	Zeldin
Higgins (LA)	Rooney, Francis	
King (NY)	Speler	

□ 1355

Mr. CICCILLINE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ and JACKSON LEE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. RUTHERFORD, COFFMAN, and CULBERSON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 183, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]

AYES—229

Abraham	Allen	Amodei
Aderholt	Amash	Arrington

NOES—183

Adams	Cartwright	DeGette
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	Delaney
Barragan	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Bass	Chu, Judy	DelBene
Beatty	Cielline	Demings
Bera	Clark (MA)	DeSaulnier
Beyer	Clarke (NY)	Deutch
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Dingell
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Doggett
Blunt Rochester	Clyburn	Doyle, Michael
Bonamici	Cohen	F.
Boyle, Brendan	Connolly	Ellison
F.	Cooper	Engel
Brady (PA)	Correa	Eshoo
Brown (MD)	Courtney	Espallat
Brownley (CA)	Crist	Esty (CT)
Bustos	Crowley	Evans
Butterfield	Cuellar	Foster
Capuano	Cummings	Frankel (FL)
Carbajal	Davis (CA)	Fudge
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny	Gabbard
Carson (IN)	DeFazio	Gallego

NOT VOTING—15

Black	King (NY)	Speier
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Stivers
Donovan	Pearce	Trott
Gutiérrez	Rogers (KY)	Walz
Higgins (LA)	Rooney, Francis	Zeldin

□ 1403

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). Pursuant to House Resolution 905 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further reconsideration of the bill, (H.R. 5515).

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1405

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. 5515) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 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. POE of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 22, 2018, amendments en bloc printed in House Report 115-698 offered