

SERVICEMEMBER QUALITY OF LIFE IMPROVEMENT AND NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 8070.

Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD) kindly take the chair.

□ 1225

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. 8070) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. FLOOD (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 12, 2024, amendment No. 36, printed in Part B of House Report 118-551, offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MS. GREENE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12. PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO UKRAINE.

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for assistance to Ukraine.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, my amendment would say that none of the funds available in the NDAA may be used for assistance to Ukraine.

I think this is an important amendment because I strongly support the NDAA. This is a great military funding bill that has many things involved in it that our military needs. It even contains a much-needed pay raise for our troops, and that is something I greatly believe in right now while many of our military members are suffering under this inflation caused by the Biden administration.

I think it is extremely important for Members of Congress to be able to vote separately for funding of foreign wars, and I do not believe that funding for Ukraine should be a part of the NDAA.

The mission statement on the Department of Defense's website says that its purpose and mission are to deter war and to ensure our Nation's security.

Funding a war in Ukraine does not deter war. It funds it. Funding a war in Ukraine does not ensure our Nation's security, it actually puts us at risk for possible further military engagement with another nuclear-armed nation, and that is Russia.

Americans do not support this and neither does the majority of the majority here in Congress, which has voted against funding the war in Ukraine.

To date, Congress has appropriated \$174.2 billion in emergency supplemental funding. That is a lot of Americans' hard-earned tax dollars going to support security for another country's border while our border is being invaded every single day.

Not only is our border being invaded every single day by millions and millions of people from over 160 countries, there is also a war declared on our own country with human trafficking and drugs that are killing Americans every day. On average, there are 300 Americans dying from fentanyl overdoses every day. I believe that should be our focus in the United States Congress.

It is also a war in Ukraine that is not defending democracy. Zelenskyy has canceled elections. He is now a dictator. Zelenskyy canceled free speech. Zelenskyy canceled freedom of religion, and Zelenskyy canceled free press. That is not defending democracy. That is actually attacking democracy.

Americans do not support sending their hard-earned tax dollars to Ukraine. They support paying our military and funding our military, but not funding a war in a foreign country.

□ 1230

Over half of Americans think the United States has already spent too much money in Ukraine, and over 60 percent of Republicans do not support sending additional money to Ukraine. Even one in four Democrats don't support it anymore, according to recent polling.

However, most importantly, the corruption in Ukraine is something that cannot be ignored. There has been report after report after report of money missing. The Pentagon cannot track over \$1 billion, and there have been reports of much corruption. That involves our hard-earned tax dollars.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, my colleague from Georgia will be

pleased to learn that there is nothing in this year's NDAA that authorizes assistance to Ukraine. That money is provided through the supplemental appropriations bills.

The problem with this amendment is it would cut off funds to maintain the deployment of marines to secure our Embassy in Kyiv. It would also cut off the DOD's ability to conduct and use monitoring of weapons systems the U.S. already has provided to Ukraine. We don't want them to fall into bad hands. We need to ensure those weapons stay in our hands. I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN).

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, last week we saw that the allied effort to repeal the Russian invasion of Ukraine is an extension of the battle for freedom in Europe that unfolded on the beaches of Normandy 80 years ago.

This was really crystallized when an American World War II veteran, Melvin Hurwitz, embraced President Zelenskyy and said: "You are the savior of the people. You bring tears to my eyes. You are our hero."

As Speaker JOHNSON himself has said, just like Hitler continued marching when he was not repelled, Vladimir Putin will continue to march through Europe if not repelled. That is one thing the Speaker and I agree on.

Any efforts to undermine our support of our allies in Ukraine should be opposed.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, according to the bill text in the NDAA, the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, the DSCA, is the account of the NDAA that funds Ukraine. The Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative, USAI, which annually appropriates \$300 million in Ukraine, would receive the standard \$300 million authorization again this year, so the funding is in there. That USAI funding is part of the DSCA line item. DSCA is receiving \$2.389 billion in this NDAA, of which the \$300 million for Ukraine is a part, so the money is definitely in there. It has not been taken out.

I will also inform Congress and the American people that a Ukrainian group called Texty recently published a list of Ukrainian enemies that includes almost 400 Americans, including Republican lawmakers. I am on that list, as are Conservative influencers, media groups, and antiwar activists.

The group receives money from the U.S. State Department through a program called TechCamp. While that is not part of the NDAA, our money is going to fund NGOs in Ukraine that have declared U.S. lawmakers and Americans enemies. That is extremely dangerous. None of our hard-earned tax dollars should be funding any sort of group that thinks that we are the enemies while we are funding them.

We also have no idea how many Ukrainians have been killed in this war. We asked for that number and have not heard. I urge Congress to pass my amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, continuing to support the courageous people of Ukraine is not only the morally right thing to do, but it is also best for American families.

War criminal Putin's invasion is a prelude to a conflict which is death to Ukraine, death to Israel, and death to America. We are in a conflict we didn't choose, with dictators and rule of gun opposing democracies with rule of law. The war began with war criminal Putin invading Ukraine on February 24, 2022, and Iranian puppets invading Israel on October 7, 2023.

We should always remember—and I was grateful to be at Normandy last week—that it was President Ronald Reagan in 1984 who stated: "... isolationism never was and never will be an acceptable response to tyrannical governments with an expansionist intent." We know that Putin has claimed that he wants to restore the Soviet Union. He already has invaded Georgia. He has invaded Moldova. He has Russian troops in Armenia. He has threatened Estonia and Poland. We know that he will not stop. We must be successful in Ukraine.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chair, I rise with the strongest possible opposition to this amendment prohibiting assistance to Ukraine. This represents the most extreme and shortsighted position of some of the Members of the House of Representatives, particularly Republicans, with respect to global security. Too many have tried to stop or strip funding from Ukraine whenever they literally have the chance to, and here is yet another example.

This amendment, like others that were considered and failed last year and this year, is misguided and against the will of the American people. Thus, it is against the will of the legislative body. Indeed, in April we overwhelmingly voted to support Ukraine, 311–112–1, not even close, which further proves the very unseriousness and waste of time of this amendment.

What some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle fail to recognize and to appreciate is that not only does the American public support Ukraine, but that supporting Ukraine actually, indeed, helps the American public by

avoiding further instability in Europe just miles from NATO. It, indeed, deters war. This amendment would irreversibly hurt our posture on the world stage. I urge Members to oppose it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Chair, many of my colleagues across the aisle are not content with delaying necessary aid to Ukraine for months at the cost of countless innocent lives, but are once again playing right into Putin's hands and attempting to block all American assistance to Ukraine.

The rest of the world, literally all of our allies, understand that a Ukrainian victory is necessary to prevent further Russian aggression, deter an invasion of Taiwan, and preserve the global democratic order. Republican national security leaders, including the chairs of the Armed Services, Intelligence, and Defense Appropriations Committees understand that this funding is critical to our own defense industrial base. However, instead of working to strengthen our national security, we are once again having an argument that my colleague across the aisle has lost over and over and over again.

My colleague is comfortable handing over Ukraine and the rest of Europe to Putin. The rest of this House, the rest of Congress, and the rest of the world reject it. Enough. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time just to say we need to support Ukraine. Ukraine was brutally invaded by Putin. The only way to make this war stop is to make Ukraine strong enough so that Putin realizes he cannot succeed. Please defeat this amendment and continue to support Ukraine. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 38 will not be offered.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 39 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. GAETZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in part B of House Report 118–551.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 549, after line 15, insert the following new section:

SEC. 10. PROHIBITION ON SALE OR TRANSFER OF CLUSTER MUNITIONS OR MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2025 for the Department of Defense may be made available to furnish cluster munitions, to facilitate any export license for cluster munitions, or to otherwise sell or transfer any cluster munitions or cluster munitions technology.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chair, this amendment creates a prohibition on the transfer of cluster munitions.

I thank my co-lead on this measure, Congresswoman SARA JACOBS, and many of the Members who have been fighting to get rid of cluster munitions as part of modern warfare, including Representatives TITUS, OMAR, and MCGOVERN. I would simply observe, if there is an amendment that is supported by OMAR to GAETZ with JACOBS and MCGOVERN and TITUS in it, it must be a great idea and we ought to probably adopt it.

According to The New York Times, since World War II, cluster munitions have killed an estimated 86,500 civilians. Additionally, Human Rights Watch and the U.N. have reported that cluster munitions in Ukraine have killed or wounded 890 people in 2022, 95 percent of whom were civilians. If Congress continues to flood the battlefield in Ukraine with indiscriminate killing instruments like cluster munitions, the blood of everyone impacted, including children harmed, will indeed be on our hands.

We should halt the transfer of cluster munitions to any country. We stand rarely isolated in the modern world by still sending these things. I mean, we are still demining cluster munitions in Laos, for goodness sake. I hate the notion that American taxpayers are going to have to pay for cluster munitions, a bunch of civilians are going to die, and then years from now, we will be back here paying to demine the very cluster munitions we sent out.

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I begin by yielding 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the committee and my friend.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding. This amendment would have serious consequences to our allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific as they face down China and North Korea.

Former INDOPACOM Commander Admiral Harris highlighted that cluster munitions are essential in a potential conflict with North Korea. I would

point out China and Russia have not banned cluster munitions. We also should not wait until the fighting starts to transfer these weapons.

Deterrence depends on getting real and effective weapons like cluster munitions in place before a potential fight. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chair, I simply observe that North Koreans have nuclear weapons. If we are relying on cluster munitions as the deterrent, it seems to be pretty nonsensical.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS), the co-lead on this measure.

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment with Congressman GAETZ to prohibit the transfer of cluster munitions.

Most U.S. allies, including almost every NATO member, have joined the Convention on Cluster Munitions, but not the United States. That is a grave mistake because these weapons maim and kill civilians indiscriminately and can be lethal indefinitely.

It is reported that up to 40 percent of these weapons don't explode on impact. If they don't explode, they become literal ticking time bombs, scattering tiny bomblets that are more like landmines. Even if the dud rate is far lower than 40 percent, the risk to civilians, to children, to our moral authority is too great.

In 2021, the Landmine and Cluster Munitions Monitor found that over 97 percent of casualties from cluster bomb remnants were civilians, and two-thirds of those were children. That is because these deadly weapons don't look dangerous. In fact, they look interesting to kids. They look like toys. When kids find these weapons in trees, in water, or on the ground, they often try to pick them up and can end up losing a limb or their life.

No amount of guardrails for cluster munitions is enough. No amount of so-called tactical advantage is enough. It isn't enough to say the other side is doing it, so we might as well, too. It is not worth it when civilian lives are at stake. It is not worth it when our reputation is at stake.

Our commitment to our core democratic values, like protecting civilians, abiding by international humanitarian law, and upholding human rights is the foundation of our reputation on the world stage, and it is what allows us to build and maintain international coalitions to make the world a better place and advance our national security goals. That is why we need to ban the transfer of these weapons. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 1245

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I point out that we all care about Ukrainian kids, but do you know who cares about Ukrainian kids the most? Ukrainians.

Ukrainians care about Ukrainian kids. They are the ones asking for

these munitions to use on their own territory. They understand the consequences. They understand the dud rates. They understand the danger.

Most of all, they understand the danger of losing this war to Russia, of having their kids kidnapped, taken away, or killed.

That is why the Ukrainians want these munitions, and that is why we are giving them to them.

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, I would object to the proposition that the House of Representatives has to outsource our thinking on the cluster munitions question to Ukraine. When did we substitute their judgment for ours?

I think that this notion that they are essential to warfighting is belied by the actual casualty numbers. If you believe that 95 percent of the people killed were children, not enemy combatants, which is what The New York Times is telling us, then I think that adoption of the amendment is appropriate.

We should not be in a race to the bottom for the weapons systems that are the least discriminate and most harmful to people who are not engaged in warfare.

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), my friend.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. Prohibiting the transfer of cluster munitions, specifically in the context of Ukraine, would have disastrous impacts on the Ukrainian ability to push back war criminal Putin's barbaric invasion of Ukraine.

Russia is currently using every weapon in its arsenal, including cluster munitions, to murder civilians and hit civilian infrastructure. I have seen firsthand in Bucha, Ukraine, where families were forced from their homes, their hands tied behind their backs, and then the Putin troops shot members of the family in the head and buried them in the yard. We must fight back.

Additionally, in the Indo-Pacific, it has been reported by Admiral Harry Harris that this is a deterrent to the dictatorship of Kim Jong-un of North Korea, and we know that is the largest artillery complex in the world facing the people of Seoul, Korea.

We are in a conflict we did not choose with dictators with rule of gun invading democracies with rule of law, threatening civilians, and it has always been clear that Ukraine is the first invasion of this current conflict.

With further promises by Putin to restore the Soviet Union by invading Georgia and Moldova, threatening Armenia, Estonia, and Poland, we know that we must support Ukraine. It is existential for Ukraine, and it is existential for the United States.

We can see that today, as Putin has sent nuclear warships to Cuba, 90 miles away from our border. We must stand together with the people of Ukraine and provide them the best equipment to stop the war criminal Putin.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, I sure hope we don't have to rely on cluster munitions to deter submarines off the coast of Florida. Not being a munitions expert, I would suggest that probably wouldn't be too effective because I think the submarines are in the water.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close. May I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, I have great appreciation for the bipartisan consensus around this. I really miss when the Democratic Party was the anti-war party. Now, we are going to see probably on this vote a majority of Democrats vote for cluster munitions that are killing civilians, that will cost taxpayer money, and that are not even the best deterrent. There are just defense contractors that make them and a country that wants them, so we are willing to accommodate that death.

I hope this debate illuminates the foolishness of the United States exporting cluster munitions and that we will have a more responsible consciousness moving forward.

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, we support this bill. We are opposed to this amendment because we want this war to end. We want to bring this war to a conclusion. The Ukrainians need these munitions to fight for their freedom.

No one wants to be in this position of having to argue in favor of cluster munitions, but this is the reality on the ground for Ukraine today. It is also the reality on the ground that the Russians are using far more cluster munitions with far higher dud rates.

Don't think for a second that Ukraine doesn't understand they are going to have cluster munitions on the ground that need to be cleaned up. They are mostly going to be Russian munitions.

The longer this war goes on, the longer it takes to push Russia back in this criminal war started by war criminal Vladimir Putin, the more unexploded cluster munitions from Russia are going to be on the ground.

We have to stand by Ukraine so that Putin doesn't continue this war not only to take over Ukraine but to take over Europe. We have to stand by Ukraine to prevent American boys and girls from going to fight. That is why we are in the position we are in today.

Let's defeat this amendment, and let's end this war.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Gaetz-Jacobs amendment to prohibit the transfer of cluster munitions.

Given their impact on civilians during and after a conflict and the dangers they pose to children and vulnerable populations, it is a matter of principle to limit or prohibit the transfer, export, sale, and production of these weapons.

Since 2001, U.S. policy, law or both have prohibited the sales, exports and transfers of cluster munitions that have a failure rate exceeding 1 percent.

Regrettably, the Pentagon insists that the U.S. should have the ability to use millions of stockpiled cluster munitions that have estimated failure rates of 5 to 20 percent. This was supposed to end in 2018, but it didn't.

I believe strongly that the United States should be an international leader in ending the terrible toll on civilians caused by the high failure rate of these weapons, including those we are currently providing to Ukraine for its defense against Russian aggression.

There will always be those who will argue against such changes in military policy and practice, who will say this can't be done.

If those voices had their way, we would still be using mustard gas and chemical weapons.

Even during this time of great conflict, we can make sure that U.S. cluster munitions have less than a 1 percent failure rate. In fact, it would be better for Ukraine and its people if we did.

Until the Pentagon assures us those are the only weapons being transferred, Congress must act and prohibit any further transfers of this devastating weapon.

I urge my colleagues to support the Gaetz-Jacobs amendment.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title XI of division A the following:

SEC. 11. LIMITATION ON ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION POSITIONS; HIRING FREEZE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on January 1, 2025, the Secretary of Defense may not—

(1) establish any new positions within the Department of Defense with responsibility

for matters relating to diversity, equity, and inclusion; or

(2) fill any vacancies in positions in the Department with responsibility for such matters.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prevent the Secretary from reducing the number of positions relating to diversity, equity, and inclusion or from eliminating specific positions relating to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

This amendment would prevent the Secretary of Defense from creating any new DEI positions or filling any vacant DEI positions within the Department of Defense. Over the last few years, the DEI bureaucracy across the Department of Defense has infiltrated every unit, command, and school.

Even as much of the country recognizes that the ideology of DEI is opposed to a society based on merit, the Department of Defense has dug in its heels. From transgender Pride patches on military uniforms to DEI steering committees at DODEA schools and a record \$162 million dedicated to DEI activities in the President's FY25 budget, these activities continue to indoctrinate and divide.

Elevating immutable characteristics like race and color over all other factors is blatantly discriminatory. It harms public confidence in our military and makes us a less lethal fighting force.

For our national security, we must uphold the ideals of our country and put merit, hard work, dedication, and service above all. To do this, we must eliminate the DEI apparatus.

Mr. Chair, I urge all Members to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. Chair, the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion works to ensure the Department of Defense and our Armed Forces reflect the face of the Nation that they defend, which they have not always done.

The office promotes a DOD culture of dignity and respect that values diversity and inclusion as a readiness imperative because the character of warfare is changing.

With the rapidly evolving threat landscape and in unprecedented times of facing unique challenges from global pandemics to the escalating climate crisis, the DOD and our Armed Forces need diverse perspectives, experience, and skill sets to remain a global leader to deter war and keep our Nation safe.

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is an incredibly important issue in the bill this year. We have several amendments that go after diversity, equity, and inclusion in the military, and it could not be more misguided.

We need a diverse military. We need to recruit from all across the country, regardless of race, creed, color, religion, and gender. We need to make sure that we are taking advantage of the talent of all in America. Sadly, we haven't really historically done that. We still have a major challenge.

Just to give one example, when you look at the promotions within the military, the statistics have come out, and this is from 2023, not 20 years ago: Every single ethnicity gender is promoted at a lower rate than White men.

Now, is it the case that White men are just naturally better at this than anybody else? Absolutely not. Why do we have this disproportionate level of promotion? I don't know for sure, but I think it is worth it to have somebody at the Pentagon trying to answer that question. If you are a Black person, if you are a woman, if you are a Hispanic person, if you are a gay or trans person and you are looking at this and saying, should I sign up for the military, one central question you are going to have is: Am I going to get a fair shot?

Historically, all of those groups that I just mentioned have not gotten a fair shot. I challenge anybody on the floor to dispute that fundamental fact. Let's have at least some people at the Pentagon who are trying to make sure that they do and that we are able to recruit a diverse population and bring them in.

Two final points on this.

One, there is such a thing as bad diversity, equity, and inclusion. I have seen it. I have witnessed it. I have seen efforts that throw out actual standards in favor of a rather narrow-minded racial agenda. That is wrong and shouldn't happen. That is not what is happening in the United States military. If the folks on the other side of the aisle wanted to go after that, I would be happy to work with them, but that is not what they are doing. They are eliminating all diversity, equity, and inclusion in the military, an enormous mistake that will cost us an enormous amount of talent.

The second point is the only way this makes any sense is if you buy into this argument that we are past all of that, that racism doesn't happen anymore, that it is just not out there, and that it is not something we need to worry about.

I may need an additional 30 seconds, but I want to read you something from

David French, who is a conservative columnist who adopted a 2-year-old Ethiopian.

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, he is a conservative, but he happened to adopt a 2-year-old Ethiopian. He is not a fan of Trump, so people started turning on him in his own church and his own community.

He said: "The racism was grotesque. One church member asked my wife why we couldn't adopt from Norway rather than Ethiopia." Shout-out to the former President for that one.

"A teacher at the school asked my son if we had purchased his sister for a 'loaf of bread.' We later learned that there were coaches and teachers who used racial slurs to describe the few Black students at the school. There were terrible incidents of peer racism, including a student telling my daughter that slavery was good!"

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington.—"slavery was good for Black people because it taught them how to live in America. Another told her that she couldn't come to our house to play because 'my dad said Black people are dangerous.'"

Let's deal with this rationally and intelligently, not just throw everything out. Please preserve diversity and inclusion in our military and oppose this amendment.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I find it amazing that people feel your viewpoint in life is based on where your ancestors came from 100 years ago or 200 years ago.

This amendment ensures the Department of Defense can uphold our Nation's values that no matter your race, color, sex, political beliefs, or ethnicity, you may excel.

This amendment sends not just a message to the Department that this form of racism is intolerable, but it also stops the excessive growth of an industry within the DOD that has wasted resources and which has no benefits for our national security.

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, diversity recognizes that a wide variety of opinions and people that reflect the diversity of the country that our Armed Forces defend is important.

Equity ensures that 400 years of the impact of slavery and Jim Crow, that didn't go away with a magic wand when laws changed, are addressed.

Inclusion ensures that everyone in our Armed Forces is treated with the dignity and respect that they deserve, given the sacrifice they are making.

These efforts to undermine DEI in our Armed Forces are counter-

productive, dangerous, and will not help with readiness, preparedness, recruitment, or retention.

That is why this amendment, as well as the next series of amendments that we will debate, should and must be defeated.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1300

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FERGUSON). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 42 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5. ELIMINATION OF OFFICES OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION AND PERSONNEL OF SUCH OFFICES.

Every office of the Armed Forces and of the Department of Defense established to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion is eliminated and the employment of all personnel of each such office is terminated.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, the numbers of those willing to serve in the military are now down over 30 percent. The military's sole purpose is to provide for the defense of our great Nation. Our military's focus should be the protection of the American people and our freedoms, not liberals' feelings.

Therefore, my amendment would eliminate any offices of DEI, diversity, equity, and inclusion, in the Armed Forces and in the DOD. We should focus on diversity of ideas and opinions, not races and genders.

DEI programs tend to be ineffective and cost the taxpayers more money, and it has been a very real detriment to the recruitment of our military.

In short order, a woke military is a weak military. Woke ideology undermines military readiness in various ways. It undermines the cohesiveness by emphasizing differences based on race, ethnicity, and sex. It undermines leadership authority by introducing questions about whether a promotion

is based on merit or quota requirements. It leads to military personnel serving in specialties and areas for which they are not qualified nor are they ready. It takes time and resources away from training activities and weapons development that contribute to readiness.

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Chair, as a proud member of the House Armed Services Committee, I take seriously my responsibility to ensure that our servicemembers get the support they need to keep our Nation safe. Once again, Republicans are pushing poison pill amendments into our bipartisan Defense bill focusing more on culture wars and division than on our national security.

This radical amendment would eliminate diversity, equity, and inclusion offices at the Department of Defense and all personnel in those offices.

I shouldn't have to remind my Republican colleagues that diversity is our strength as a Nation. Inclusion is proven to be beneficial for military effectiveness, military readiness, and ultimately, our national security, yet my colleagues continue to fight our military leadership as they work to strengthen our Armed Forces.

In the midst of our military recruitment shortfalls, Republicans are focused on the wrong thing. They are busy telling our servicemembers and potential recruits that Congress does not value their background or lived experiences than recruiting the best and brightest to defend our country. This is not only harmful, but it is also hurtful. It is hurtful that our military recruitment, preparedness, and cohesiveness is at jeopardy and at stake. Our national security and our national defense deserves better.

Again this year, I am disappointed that we are considering amendments that poison legislation which would otherwise be bipartisan. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and let's get back to the business of being truly bipartisan when it comes to our National Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I agree with my friend across the aisle. We shouldn't even be dealing with this, to be honest with you. The fact that money is going to fund this—you don't go to politicians to find out what is wrong with your car. You go to the mechanic. I am in the real estate business. We build houses. If I have trouble with a house, I go to my carpenters.

I would remind my friends on the other side of the aisle that last year 160 retired flag officers wrote a letter to

the Armed Services Committee Chairman ROGERS about the dangers of DEI and their opposition to it in the military. Mr. Chair, 160 retired flag officers—and I am sure it would be far more than this if you talked to the people that are serving—have pointed out why this is so detrimental.

The officers wrote this:

We respectfully request that Congress take legislative action to remove all diversity, equity, and inclusion programs from the DOD.

Secondly, our military must be laser focused on one mission: readiness, undiminished by culture wars engulfing our country.

Thirdly, the domestic cultural threat has an innocuous name of diversity, equity, and inclusion, but in reality, DEI is dividing, it is not uniting our military service, nor our society.

DEI principles are derived from critical race theory which is rooted in cultural Marxism where people are grouped into identity classes, typically by race, labeled as oppressed or oppressors and victims and pitted against each other.

Under the guise of DEI, some people are selected for career-enhancing opportunities and advancement based on preferences given to identity groups based on race, gender, ethnic background, sexual orientation, et cetera.

It is unbelievable we are even talking about this or funding it. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I do talk to people in the military all the time, and our military is doing just fine.

Now, there will always be people who are opposed to greater inclusion. We have seen this throughout the military in a wide variety of areas. Way back when, it was opposition to Black people serving in the military. Then there was a lot of opposition to gay people serving in the military. Every single time you had some people in the military saying this is going to destroy us, unit cohesion will fall apart, we can't possibly treat people fairly and function, they have all been proven wrong every single time.

The people I talk to in the military say things are going just fine, that they are, in fact, being more inclusive, and the military is as strong as it has ever been.

It is completely wrong for a right-wing political agenda to denigrate our military to try to make the point that there is some kind of excessive wokeism going on. That is not what the overwhelming majority of people in the military are telling me and others.

What they are saying is that inclusion does matter. People need to be treated fairly. The idea that if the military goes like this and says that we don't see color, we don't see gender, we don't see any of this, that it will all just go away and everything will be fine is absurd. Reasonable diversity, equity, and inclusion works. That is what the military is doing. Please let them continue to do it.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I would just add that I think if you took a really diverse group and got opinions on the military, if it were doing so well, why are they 30 percent down in recruitment? Why are people not coming into it?

Less than a month after the appointment by President Biden of Secretary of Defense Lloyd Austin, he directed commanding officers and supervisors at all levels to schedule a day to discuss extremism.

What do you think our foreign adversaries are doing upon hearing this? They are laughing their heads off.

I would just say that we need to support this amendment. Get DEI out of the military. Let's focus on building ships, focus on building airplanes, focus on building missions, not DEI and extremism that my friends on the other side of the aisle want to try to continue to highlight.

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, to respond to the issue of why recruitment is down, there are actually three reasons why recruitment is down.

Number one is the pandemic, when they were restricted in their ability to recruit for a year and a half.

Number two is because we have very low unemployment. Recruitment is always down when we have low unemployment.

Number three is because the right-wing has decided to demonize the military as some sort of woke place that no one should serve in.

Yes, some people do listen to that message. I have spoken to Members and others who are pushing that message who say, well, it is not really a problem. They say, well, it is out there. It is out there because you all are putting it out there and creating this level of division that doesn't need to be created.

Recruitment can be just fine with diversity. In fact, it would be better.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, can I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I would just add, I don't know how long my friends on the other side of the aisle are going to keep mentioning the pandemic, COVID, but it is over with, and the shortage still exists.

The fact that, again, we are funding this, devoting a day to discuss it, we ought to be having a day devoted to how to fight and arm our brave men and women who are serving in the military.

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, the strength of our military is the people,

and the people bring with them the sum of their life experiences and perspectives and what they know.

In my family, I had several uncles born between 1918 and 1938 who served during World War II in the Navy in a segregated unit where they were not allowed to fight. They were only allowed to cook because of the color of their skin. The stories that they told their children about the indignity they suffered from their fellow servicemembers and superior officers, do you think any of their children wanted to serve in the military? There are countless stories like that.

As we see people who lived under Jim Crow dying off and those stories are not being told, people don't understand that a legacy of 300 years of slavery and Jim Crow did not go away with the wave of a magic wand.

When people show up and see people from different backgrounds, different colors, different religions for the first time in the military, which still does happen, they bring their life experiences and what they know and sometimes have trouble understanding and respecting the different life experiences of other people.

DEI programs are designed to help bridge that gap to help increase recruitment by making the descendants of people who were discriminated against when they served in the military actually want to join. It makes sure that everyone who does join is treated with the dignity and respect they deserve as people who are putting their lives on the line for every American.

This amendment should be defeated. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In subtitle A of title IX, add at the end the following:

SEC. 9. ELIMINATION OF THE CHIEF DIVERSITY OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) REPEAL OF POSITION.—Section 147 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 913 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116–283; 8 U.S.C. 147 note) is repealed.

(c) PROHIBITION ON ESTABLISHMENT OF SIMILAR POSITIONS.—No Federal funds may be obligated or expended to establish a position within the Department of Defense that is the same as or substantially similar to—

(1) the position of Chief Diversity Officer, as described in section 147 of title 10, United States Code, as such section was in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) the position of Senior Advisor for Diversity and Inclusion, as described in section 913(b) of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116–283; 10 U.S.C. 147 note), as such section was in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

□ 1315

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, in a hearing earlier this year before the Oversight Committee, we had a young American, a squared-away young man, a former Army Ranger, who spoke on what it truly means to become a soldier. He told us: “Training in the United States Army is meant to melt away the effects of civilian life and to forge Americans into soldiers.”

I concur with that young man, Mr. Chair. Our military was never intended to be and should not be a platform to advance social agendas.

Our Nation’s military prowess not only keeps our homeland safe but a strong American military projects strength worldwide, deterring conflicts and pushing back against human suffering across the world.

While we remain the strongest fighting force in the world—this is true—we are waning, and the distractions that we experience within our own ranks must be addressed.

My amendment would eliminate the position of chief diversity officer of the Department of Defense or any substantially similar position. I appreciate that my colleagues, JEFF DUNCAN, CLAUDIA TENNEY, and JIM BAIRD, are cosponsoring my amendment.

The adoption of this provision will be a strong step in advancing a military that focuses on lethality and elevates excellence and performance, the values that made our Armed Forces great and indomitable worldwide.

This strength in that position worldwide, Mr. Chair, is indeed threatened by this cultural agenda, perhaps driven by good intentions, let me say, reflective of our journey as a nation as we have learned and evolved and grown into a better, stronger nation with regards to diversity, equity, and inclusion. No doubt, my colleagues’ intentions to force that agenda within the parameters of our Department of Defense were well-intentioned, but it is injuring our military.

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting Chair. The gentlewoman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chair, once again, diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives are not designed to force a social agenda down anybody’s throat. What they are designed to do is to recognize that people aren’t perfect, that the people who make up our military bring with them the sum total of their life experiences and what they know, and that from the beginning of our military, the right to serve was limited to a very few people.

Our Army turns 249 years old this week. My ancestors weren’t allowed to join. A year after, when the Declaration of Independence was written and said that all men were created equal, they didn’t include the men in my family, and they certainly didn’t include me.

When the Constitution was written, creating a government by, of, and for we the people, it didn’t include me. My ancestors were three-fifths of a person, yet many tried to fight anyway. Many who were allowed in foreign wars and wars on this soil, when they came home, faced violence and discrimination because of the color of their skin.

Those stories were told in my family, but they weren’t taught in history books. When I became a State legislator in Virginia, I recognized that there were a lot of people to whom those stories weren’t told, and therefore, they may not understand why something they say or something they do or a policy they put in place perpetuates the impact of 400 years of slavery and Jim Crow.

DEI is designed to recognize that now our military is open to more than just the limited few people who could join 249 years ago and that maybe we need to make sure that everybody who serves together respects one another and can be cohesive. That is what it is designed to do.

Mr. Chair, this amendment should be defeated, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, in 1988, I joined the Army. I went through boot camp and AIT in 1989 as Private Higgins, an enlisted man. Going through the military police academy in 1989 was quite grueling, and we lost a lot of people. We excluded many young soldiers, men and women. We excluded them because they couldn’t perform.

The United States military requires exclusion based on performance. That is all we ever cared about.

We never had problems with recruiting in the United States Army. We missed by 40 percent last year. Do you know why, Mr. Chair? It is because families like mine that historically have served are not advising our young

men and women to join the military now because of this insanity they have to go through and because it is weakness that has become embedded and woven within our DOD and forced upon our young soldiers.

You are injuring and you are setting your sons and daughters up for slaughter because war is brutal, and nobody in uniform cares about the gender or the sexual orientation or the skin color of the soldier next to them. All we care about is that they can perform.

This is the brotherhood that we forge. It requires discrimination. We discriminate against those young Americans who cannot make it. If they can’t make the cut to earn a slot in our unit, then we exclude them from our unit. They go do something else in life. That is fine, but they can’t be in the military.

So, good Lord, please support my amendment.

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, it is actually not true that people were only excluded in the military because of performance. I have already recounted some of that history, and if the gentleman thinks it is just history, then I invite him to speak to some of the men and women of color and the women in general who are serving now and ask them about some of the discrimination they continue to face.

Mr. Chair, you have already heard today some of the reasons why recruitment is down, and I do talk to some of the servicemembers whom I represent, including in my family. Part of it is pay, part of it is the inability to afford childcare and housing, and part of it is a question about whether they are respected as individuals.

I am not going to focus just on our fighting men and women. The Department of Defense is one of the largest employers in the country, and having a diverse workforce that is not out in battle is also important so that they can work together to keep our Armed Forces ready.

When our servicemembers go overseas, they are going to meet and see people from different backgrounds and work with people of different backgrounds, colors, races, and religions, and they probably need some help in bridging those divides. That is part of what DEI does.

In an effort to say that we are just going to pretend racism doesn’t exist, sexism doesn’t exist, homophobia doesn’t exist, Islamophobia doesn’t exist, and that anti-Semitism doesn’t exist, and that we are going to ignore it and maybe it will go away, it won’t.

We are going to ignore the fact that a disproportionate number of officers are one sex and one race. That is not based on merit. That is not based on performance. This amendment should be defeated.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. CLYDE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. RELOCATION OF RECONCILIATION MEMORIAL TO ORIGINAL LOCATION IN ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY.

The Secretary of the Army shall relocate the Reconciliation Memorial, also known as the Reconciliation Monument, to its original location in Arlington National Cemetery. The Reconciliation Memorial shall not be given any designation or name other than "Reconciliation Memorial" or "Reconciliation Monument" upon its relocation to Arlington National Cemetery.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment which relocates the reconciliation monument, sometimes referred to as the Reconciliation Memorial, back to its original location in Arlington National Cemetery. I am very grateful for the support of Chairman ROGERS on this amendment.

Under the direction of President Biden, the Reconciliation Memorial was removed on December 18, 2023. This monument in Arlington was a powerful symbol of the healing and unification of our Nation after the deep divisions of the Civil War.

American leaders like President Abraham Lincoln and Union General Ulysses Grant knew that a divided nation could not stand, and they tirelessly worked on promoting reconciliation.

In 1898, following the end of the Mexican-American War, President McKinley undertook a process to create greater national unity. In 1906, President McKinley authorized the construction of the Reconciliation Memorial. Unveiled in 1914 by President Woodrow Wilson, this monument, designed by a Jewish-American sculptor, features a woman crowned with an olive wreath symbolizing peace.

For over a century, Presidents of both parties have understood the purpose of this memorial of reconciliation and have honored it by sending wreaths

to the monument. This tradition showing national unity and respect has been carried on regardless of the party or politics of the sitting President. Even President Obama understood the reconciliation monument in the context of what it stands for, unity not division, when he continued the Presidential tradition of sending a wreath to the monument. In doing so, Presidents have continued to emphasize the message of this monument, reconciliation and unity, not division.

Former Democrat Senator Jim Webb, a highly decorated Marine Corps officer and former Secretary of the Navy, has strongly supported the preservation of the Reconciliation Memorial because the monument is one of the most potent symbols of healing in our Nation and across the globe.

Democratic Senator Webb has said that the statue's removal would signify the desire of "a deteriorating society willing to erase the generosity of its past, in favor of bitterness and misunderstanding conjured up by those who do not understand the history they seem bent on destroying."

Now, I would like to share a little of this monument's history.

When this monument was originally dedicated back in 1914, Reverend Dr. McKim pronounced these words within his invocation:

And as the blue and the gray mingle their dust on this consecrated hill, may the men of the North and the men of the South join hands and hearts in the labors and sacrifices which must be undertaken in the years to come for the honor, the happiness, and the glory of our country.

Grant also, O Lord, that this monument may stand as a perpetual memorial of the reconciliation between the people of the States once arrayed against each other in deadly conflict.

Men who once met in wrath on the field of battle meet here today as friends and brothers in the great enterprises of peace.

Henceforth, we pray and labor for the good and the glory of our reunited country. We have beat our swords into ploughshares, and our spears into pruning hooks. Ours it shall be to strive in fraternal emulation with our northern brothers, in all undertakings for the common weal.

□ 1330

Meaning the common prosperity.

President Woodrow Wilson, a Democrat, had these words to say at the ceremony: "I assure you that I am profoundly aware of the solemn significance of the thing that has now taken place." Meaning the dedication of the Reconciliation monument.

It was suggested by a President of the United States, who had himself been a distinguished officer of the Union Army. It was authorized by an act of Congress of the United States.

The corner-stone of the monument was laid by a President of the United States elevated to his position by the votes of the party which had chiefly prided itself upon sustaining the war for the Union, and who, while Secretary of War, had himself given authority to erect it. And, now, it has fallen to my lot to accept in the name of the great government, which I am privileged for the time to represent, this emblem of a reunited people.

Again, I say: "... this emblem of a reunited people."

Last year, I led a similar amendment, which passed the House floor by voice with no opposition prior to the removal of the monument. I ask that all Members support the adoption of my amendment to return the Reconciliation Memorial to the grounds of Arlington National Cemetery. In doing so, we can maintain a critical piece of our national unity and fill the empty spot that now exists in Arlington.

Let us unite against the destruction of our history. Let us fight for the principles of healing and unity, which is exactly what this memorial was created to accomplish.

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in firm opposition to this retrograde, revisionist amendment. Today is not the 1920s. It is not the 1950s. It is so disheartening to see a lost-cause amendment come before the House in the year 2024.

Mr. CLYDE has proposed today that we return a monument to treason to our national cemetery without any accompanying context or education.

The monument in question is a basic ode to the Confederacy, to romanticize the lost cause. More troubling than that is that it also glorifies slavery. It is not an emblem of a reconciled people.

An enslaved woman is depicted as a mammy. She is holding the infant child of a White officer, and an enslaved man is following his owner to war. It is very difficult to see how the humiliating portrayal of a slave woman and a slave man represents reconciliation.

The Arlington National Cemetery, on Congress' orders, not President Biden's orders, removed this monument on December 22, 2023. This amendment is four, if not four score, years too late. The NDAA for 2021 required that Arlington National Cemetery remove the Confederate States of America monument.

I think it is important to remember why we removed the memorial in the first place, because treason in defense of slavery is no virtue.

This is a monument to a cause that killed hundreds of thousands of American servicemen in a doomed attempt to tear this country asunder to preserve the practice of keeping our fellow humans in bondage. The cause of the Confederacy is no more honorable today than when Lee surrendered at Appomattox. Let it lose today as it did then: With a whimper.

The monument has been handled responsibly and respectfully according to

the National Historic Preservation Act. This would also be a horrible waste of taxpayer money, and in no way does it support our national defense. It would only make the families and visitors to the Arlington National Cemetery, including our current servicemembers, rightfully uncomfortable or hurt by the association of the monument.

This NDAA should be focused on supporting the servicemembers currently dedicating their lives to this country, not those who came closest to destroying it. I urge Members to vote “no” if they believe they represent the United States of America, not the Confederate States of America, and if they oppose glorifying slavery and treason.

Ms. McCLELLAN. Madam Chair, in closing, I rise to oppose this amendment, as well. After the Civil War ended, Robert E. Lee himself argued against the erection of monuments to the Confederacy. I invite Members to read what he said about proposed monuments in Gettysburg, proposed monuments to Stonewall Jackson. He said they would more likely retard the reunion and bonding and reconciliation of the North and South than help it.

Many of these monuments, including this one, weren't put up right after the Civil War. They were put up after Reconstruction ended. During Reconstruction, formerly enslaved people, for the first time, began to gain social, political, and economic power.

When Reconstruction ended and the old Confederate power structure came back in the South, three things happened. Through the use of voter suppression, racial terror, and propaganda, efforts were made to say to Black Americans, who finally started to gain in the promise of our founding documents: Stay in your place.

The lost-cause narrative was a part of that. Many of these monuments were a part of that. They were put up in response to Reconstruction, in response to the gains of the civil rights movement, and we are in that backlash, frankly, right now.

When this monument was placed, the gentleman said it was for reconciliation, but for who? Not for the Black Americans who saw that monument then, and even today, and see the images of a mammy and a loyal slave following his master into battle. They know what that means. It conjures up the stereotypes that were used to help build the lie of White supremacy, and the stereotypes that were used to help convince Black people to stay in their place.

That is part of why the commission said this monument should come down and why this amendment should be defeated.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. HAGEMAN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

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

Ms. McCLELLAN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. WILLIAMS OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8. PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR COVERED ENTITIES AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS OR OTHER ENTITIES THAT ENGAGE IN COVERED BEHAVIOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2025 may be used to contract with or grant awards to—

(1) a covered entity; or
(2) a nonprofit organization or other entity that engages in covered behavior.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “covered entity” means—
(A) NewsGuard Technologies, Inc. (doing business as “NewsGuard”); or

(B) Disinformation Index, Inc., Disinformation Index, Ltd., or Global Disinformation Index gUG (collectively doing business as “Global Disinformation Index”).

(2) The term “covered behavior” means operations, activities, or products, the function of which is to demonize or rate the credibility of a domestic entity (including news and information outlets) based on lawful speech of such domestic entity under the stated function of “fact-checking” misinformation, disinformation, or malinformation.

(3) The term “nonprofit organization” means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of amendment No. 45.

Small businesses are the lifeblood of America. Their contribution to the success and security of the country cannot be overstated. Simply put, they are the driving force behind America's dominance in the world.

The men and women who start small businesses take calculating risks to compete in the marketplace. It is one that is supposed to allow the best products and services to rise to the top, through spirited competition free from government influence.

At least this is how it is supposed to be here in America. That is why it is appalling that an investigation led by

the Committee on Small Business uncovered that the Federal Government is actively silencing entrepreneurs and driving them out of business simply because they exercise their right to free speech.

Under the guise of misinformation and disinformation, the Biden administration is funding third-party entities, such as NewsGuard, to label entrepreneurs' free speech as dangerous and prevent them from doing business online.

In a country that was founded on the free flow of ideas, it is unconscionable that the government would seek to interfere with an individual's ability to make a living over the internet because of their beliefs.

NewsGuard and similar companies receive funds from the Department of Defense, the State Department's Global Engagement Center, and other Federal agencies to actively suppress and demonize small businesses by labeling certain speech as untrustworthy, using partisan tactics and skewed determinations of fact.

This has resulted in massive revenue losses and businesses having to completely change their operations, including downsizing. Worst of all, these efforts have been paid for by American taxpayer dollars. Make no mistake: This is a direct effort by the government to skirt the Constitution and force a single viewpoint on America.

Some will have you believe that government-forced censorship and demonization of small businesses who spread supposed misinformation is the only way to protect America. The reality is that those same people simply label speech they dislike as misinformation. That is why one of America's founding principles is that more information, not the suppression of it, brings out the truth.

My amendment is just the first step in cutting off the head of the snake that threatens the God-given rights afforded all Americans. This amendment would prevent any Federal funds from going to any organization that looks to demonize businesses based on lawful speech. Too often, we have seen the self-proclaimed fact checkers get it wrong, and these determinations should not be deciding which businesses survive online.

That is why this amendment is so critical to an open marketplace where small businesses can compete. The government should never seek to demonize or censor American businesses, whether directly or indirectly, as it has done through NewsGuard and similar entities.

No small business owner should ever fear that their government will actively fund efforts to threaten their livelihoods and put them out of business. Unfortunately, if we continue exporting what is considered truth to outside organizations, this will not be the case.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides to support this amendment so

that we can preserve free speech, free enterprise, and put an end to this attack on small business.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. For what purpose does the gentleman from Washington seek recognition?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DELUZIO).

Mr. DELUZIO. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member for yielding time.

Madam Chair, I am opposed to this amendment. Put simply, I think it does some pretty bad things, among them making it impossible for the Department of Defense to contract with any organization that might try to identify propaganda from our adversaries.

For instance, if a nonprofit wants to say and identify something as Communist Chinese propaganda, under this amendment, the Department of Defense cannot work with that organization in identifying something as propaganda from our adversary.

I cannot imagine that is the purpose of this amendment, yet that is exactly what the legislative text does. It goes on to apply, beyond the organizations the gentleman from Texas recognized or acknowledged, to include any entity, any nonprofit that does any of these categories listed in the amendment.

It includes fact-checking, rating the credibility of that entity. Again, not banning it, not silencing it, but identifying it. The mere fact of an adversary of ours having propaganda in this country and an organization identifying that propaganda, this amendment would bar the Pentagon from working with it.

Now, if my colleagues on the other side want to offer a soft on Communist China amendment, have at it. We are not going to support it. I cannot imagine that is the purpose of this amendment, yet that is exactly what it does.

Madam Chair, I urge a more narrow redrafting of this amendment. As it is drafted, it makes it very difficult even to do something as simple as identifying propaganda from our adversaries. This is foolish. It is not drafted appropriately, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle ought to withdraw it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA).

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, I support this amendment. The Department of Defense should not be giving money to

propaganda machines. In fact, the only money that should be going from the Department of Defense anywhere is to lethality, not organizations ticked off that a conservative from Ohio might be calling out different branches for their focus on DEI or CRT or a movement that is basically alienating conservatives and pushing conservatives out-side of its ranks.

I think there are a lot of Members who speak on these bills who are not servicemembers or have no experience with the Department of Defense. Honestly, we in this governing body are not going to allow a wokification of the Department of Defense.

Frankly, with the near-peer threat that we have in the future, I think that it is increasingly important that we focus again on lethality and not woke nonsense. It has no business in the NDAA.

□ 1345

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chair, what is at dispute here is fact-checking. It is not true that businesses or anyone in America can say whatever they want. Facts do matter.

I mean, if the U.S. Government is doing business with a company that says that their product will let you live to 200 years and cure cancer, they don't have the freedom to do that. I would hope that someone with the administration would check that and say that is not somebody we want to do business with.

This amendment basically is saying facts do not matter and basically saying that they don't exist, that everyone says what they want to say, and we just go along with it. That is completely wrong. You should do fact-checking.

Now, I completely agree with the gentleman that facts are not as black and white as a lot of times people say they are. We should have robust disputes about what actually happened, what the information is out there.

This amendment does not allow for that. This amendment says anything goes. Any effort whatsoever to check the accuracy of what is being said and done by people we are doing business with is going to be strictly prohibited.

I understand where this is coming from. A lot of this is coming from disputes conservatives have, but you can't just say whatever you want to say. The people who tried to overturn the 2020 election are learning that. We have heard about the attack on this Capitol on January 6. We have heard people say that it didn't happen or that it was antifa, an inside job, the government.

All of these things are wrong. It is not: You say this; I say that. Wrong. Facts do exist, even if some of them turn out to be wrong. This amendment says: No, we are giving up. We are not

even trying to figure out what is true. Anything goes. Have fun with it.

I don't think that is a good idea in general, but it is a particularly bad idea in our national security environment that we are in right now because Russia and China love that approach. They regularly feed the disinformation battles in the U.S. on both the right and left.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

They find stories that agitated people on the right or agitated people on the left, and they amplified them. We are seeing this all over the place with the Ukraine war as Russia has spread story after story that is picked up by people here.

It is in our national security interests to check those facts and not spread propaganda damaging to this country. Dispute it. Sometimes they get it wrong. Let's have that debate, but please let's not pass this amendment that basically says there are no facts, that whatever you say is true just because you said it.

That is not correct. Please defeat this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, here is the bottom line: We can have all this dialogue, but it is not DOD's job to police speech.

This amendment will prevent the government from funding organizations that tip the scales against certain businesses from succeeding online.

Competition is what makes this country great. A business should try to gain market share by having the best product, lower prices, or better service than other businesses, and I personally deal with that every single day.

When the government gives money to third parties to decide which entities are allowed to take part in this exercise, it is simply un-American.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, what this amendment says, as the gentleman just said, is that it is not the government's job to figure out what is true. That is a shocking statement.

What would be accurate is the government needs to be careful when they are trying to figure out what is true. I don't disagree with that. If they mess that up or get something wrong, let's talk about it, but please, let's not have the United States Congress say that the government should have no interest whatsoever in what is true or what is not true. You all just go have fun, say whatever you want to say, and we

will keep giving you money for whatever.

Let's try to get an accurate picture of what is going on. As difficult and challenging as that can be at times, the alternative of saying that facts don't exist and truth doesn't exist, so say whatever you want, is not an alternative we should embrace.

Please defeat this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. STEUBE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

Mr. STEUBE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN MATERIALS IN SCHOOLS OPERATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY.

(a) PROHIBITION ON PORNOGRAPHY AND RADICAL GENDER IDEOLOGY.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2025 or any fiscal year thereafter for the Department of Defense Education Activity may be obligated or expended to purchase, maintain, or display in a school library or classroom—

(1) any material that contains, depicts, or otherwise includes pornographic content; or

(2) any material that espouses, advocates, or promotes radical gender ideology.

(b) DEADLINE FOR REMOVAL.—The Director of the Department of Defense Education Activity shall ensure that any material described in subsection (a) that this is in a library or classroom of a school operated by the Activity is removed not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “pornographic content” means any virtual-reality technology, video, image, drawing, sound, instruction, reading material, writing material, presented via any medium in a classroom, school library, on school grounds, or as part of a school-sponsored or school-affiliated event that depicts, describes, or presents, in whole or in part—

(A) nudity, sex organs, or sexual acts;

(B) obscenity;

(C) indecent material (as defined by the Secretary of Defense taking into consideration applicable Federal regulations); or

(D) lewd or sexual acts in a manner intended to cause sexual arousal.

(2) The term “radical gender ideology” means any concept, teaching, instruction, or curriculum that—

(A) states or suggests biological sex is a social construct;

(B) states or suggests biological sex is fluid, interchangeable, or exists beyond the binary of male and female;

(C) states or suggests that an individual can be trapped in the wrong body or have a different identity than that of their biological sex;

(D) encourages, promotes, or advocates the use of personal pronouns unaligned with an individual's biological sex; or

(E) encourages, promotes, or advocates hormone replacement, puberty blockers, or gender reassignment surgery as a safe, necessary, or optional treatment for an individual.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment that would restrict radical gender ideology and pornographic content from entering the libraries and classrooms of schools operated by the Department of Defense.

These morally corrupting materials have no place in an educational setting and could seriously harm the educational and psychological development of school children belonging to our servicemembers.

Oftentimes, DOD schools are the only option that servicemembers have to educate their children, and we must ensure they have the resources to prepare them for success in their future careers and society.

Yet, radical leftists desire to use schools as a tool to indoctrinate our children as soon as they enter kindergarten. I wish they were all just theatrical, but there exists a litany of examples of inappropriate and pornographic material that is available in DOD schools.

Much of the material is far too graphic for me to read verbatim here on the House floor, but one example includes the book “Gender Queer,” which includes explicit imagery of explicit acts.

In some DOD middle schools, young children are able to access a book called “Middle School's a Drag,” which is a story about a 12-year-old boy who starts a talent agency for child drag queen performers.

In elementary school libraries, students can read many books about radical gender ideology, like “When Aidan Became a Brother,” which tells the story of a girl who believes she is a transgender boy.

This material has no place in our schools, and Congress has the power to put a stop to it in DOD schools. The DOD school system serves over 66,000 children across the world, and we owe it to our servicemembers to provide their children with a topnotch education. That education should include lessons about reading, writing, and arithmetic, not explicit pornography and radical transgender propaganda.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to join me in protecting the children entrusted to DOD schools by our men and women in uniform.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TOKUDA. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, as the mother of two teenage boys in public schools, I understand and can appreciate the need for age-appropriate content to ensure our schools remain nurturing environments for our kids, but the kinds of content that make it into these curricula and classrooms are decisions best left to professional educators working together with parents to determine what is best for our students.

As a mom, it is important that our children see themselves and the situations they face in the books they read and the curriculum they are taught. This amendment is yet another attempt to broadly ban entire categories of books, forcing educators to second-guess and censor themselves.

Engaging with novel and challenging topics is essential to how kids grow as students and individuals. They need to be able to confront ideas and topics that may not always be comfortable to them.

This amendment is simply terrible policy in terms of providing our kids with the education they need to succeed in a complex and rapidly evolving world.

Ultimately, at its core, this is a discriminatory and offensive amendment in its targeting of our LGBTQ+ people. It separates the military children attending DODEA schools, some of which identify as LGBTQ+ themselves, from their peers in other school systems in the United States, isolating them and depriving their education of perspectives critical to their own self-identification, growth, and development.

This amendment makes it harder for DODEA teachers and counselors to support students with the materials they need if they question their gender identities or sexual orientation. This is an unwelcome intrusion on the trust between students and their teachers and counselors, who can play important roles for military children often moving from place to place at formative times in their lives, eliminating the ability for educators to provide resources and guides to help our military youth with complicated decisions and feelings that they have. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I have had conversations with young people back home who shared serious concerns about the impact of censorship of LGBTQ+ content in their schools and the mental health of themselves and their peers. This amendment would further that sense of isolation and lead to increased rates of depression and, tragically, as we have seen, suicidal ideation.

This amendment also sends a deeply hurtful and wrong message to LGBTQ+ servicemembers, some of whom may have children attending DODEA schools, about what this Congress and our government think about them and their loved ones. This amendment dishonors their service and commitment to our country.

We know that the people most hurt by book bans are ultimately students and kids, and this amendment undermines the quality of education and experience that military children receive at our DODEA schools.

It is reckless, discriminatory, and an attack on our LGBTQ+ students and servicemembers. As a mom, I think that all of our children deserve to feel supported, included, and seen in our educational system.

Madam Chair, for these reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEUBE. Madam Chair, these decisions are not best left to educators. In my opinion, it is best left to the parents to decide how they want to teach their kids.

Our schools should be about teaching for the success of our children in mathematics and arithmetic and writing, not in gender ideology and pornography. What is an unwelcome intrusion is teaching our kids pornography and transgender ideology.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TOKUDA. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS).

Ms. JACOBS. Madam Chair, as Americans, we pride ourselves on freedom, freedom to receive information and ideas from anyone and anywhere, to think freely, to speak freely, but this amendment is nothing more than censorship and a violation of our First Amendment rights, all in an effort to erase the existence of transgender and intersex people.

This amendment would reinforce the negativity, hostility, discrimination, and misunderstanding that many transgender and intersex youth already experience. In 2021, 68 percent of all LGBTQ+ students surveyed by GLSEN reported feeling unsafe in their school environment due to their perceived sexual orientation, gender identity, or expression. More than three-quarters of LGBTQ+ students report experiencing in-person verbal harassment based on their sexual orientation, gender expression, or gender at some point in the past year.

Here is the fact: Attempts to erase transgender and intersex people from schools will exacerbate these challenges and increase their isolation, but it won't erase the existence of transgender and intersex people, much to some of my colleagues' dismay.

Parents across the country want their children to learn in safe and affirming environments, but this amendment is an answer to a problem we

don't have. It would set a dangerous precedent that politicians can censor a range of school content based on a politician's political ideologies.

It is so broad that it would ban schools from teaching about a range of animals, including, for instance, clownfish, which can change their sex. So, no more "Finding Nemo" in DODEA schools, I guess.

Schools should be focused on creating environments that support all students, including transgender and intersex students, not censoring content.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Hawaii has 15 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 2½ minutes remaining.

□ 1400

Mr. STEUBE. I just think that the purpose, especially having been a military servicemember and been on bases that have schools for our children, one of which was actually in Hawaii when I served at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii, the purpose of our DOD institutions and the education that our kids are getting there should not involve gender ideology, transgender propaganda, and radical sexualized ideology that just, quite frankly, shouldn't be taught to elementary school kids or middle school kids.

Middle school children have access to some of these things that are very explicit pornography in these types of books. My belief is that our education system should be focused on teaching our children the types of things to make them successful as students, not sexual content.

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, the problem with this is that many think that a radical gender ideology is that trans and gay people exist. We heard a Member on the floor earlier today on the Republican side of the aisle say trans people don't exist. So that is not a radical ideology. This would ban that. We have seen this happen. You are not allowed to acknowledge that gay or transgender people exist. That is deeply damaging. It is not a radical ideology and it shouldn't be banned.

Mr. Chair, I urge defeat of this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. OGLES). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE).

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MRS. LUNA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. PROHIBITION ON PROMOTION OF CRITICAL RACE THEORY AND ASSOCIATED RACE-BASED THEORIES.

(a) PROTECTION FROM CRITICAL RACE THEORY INDOCTRINATION.—No employee of the Department of Defense or member of the Armed Forces acting in their official capacity may promote, endorse, or advocate for critical race theory or associated race-based theories described in subsection (b) or may compel or train any member of the Armed Forces or employee of the Department of Defense to believe or profess belief in such theories.

(b) ASSOCIATED RACE-BASED THEORIES DESCRIBED.—In this section, the term "associated race-based theories" includes the following principles:

(1) That any race, ethnicity, color, or national origin is inherently superior or inferior to any other race, ethnicity, color, or national origin.

(2) That the United States is a fundamentally racist country.

(3) That the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, or the Federalist Papers are fundamentally racist documents.

(4) That an individual's moral character or worth is determined by the individual's race, ethnicity, color, or national origin.

(5) That an individual, by virtue of the individual's race, is inherently racist or oppressive, whether consciously or unconsciously.

(6) That an individual, by virtue of race, bears collective guilt and is inherently responsible for actions committed in the past by other members of the individual's race, ethnicity, color, or national origin.

(7) That an individual, by virtue of the individual's race, should be discriminated against or receive adverse treatment to achieve diversity, equity, or inclusion.

(8) That an individual should feel discomfort, guilt, or any other form of psychological distress on account of the individual's race, color, or national origin.

(9) That virtues such as merit, excellence, hard work, fairness, neutrality, objectivity, and racial colorblindness are racist or in any way discriminatory, or were created by members of a particular race, color, or national origin to oppress members of another race, color, or national origin.

(10) That to be "antiracist" requires explicitly or implicitly promoting racial discrimination to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Chair, my amendment would prohibit CRT training for employees of the Department of Defense or members of the Air Force.

The primary focus of our military should be mission readiness and lethality. Unfortunately, many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have continued to push for diversity, equity, and inclusion to the deficit of our servicemen and -women.

Divisive ideologies like CRT have no place in our military. Our servicemembers should be learning the critical and often lifesaving skills that help them and their fellow servicemembers stay alive when they are deployed rather than having training hours diverted to forced CRT and race-based training.

As a veteran, I know firsthand that our servicemembers are not concerned about CRT training or DEI in the military. In fact, our servicemembers care about the skills and qualifications that prepare them for war.

When servicemembers are wounded, they do not care about how diverse their medics are; they care that the medics responding to them in their time of need are qualified and trained with the skills to keep them alive.

It is beyond time we stop prioritizing CRT and other divisive ideologies that are weakening our military and putting our Nation's security at risk.

We will gut CRT from our Nation's military with this NDAA. We are one Nation, one people, and this majority body believes in unity over division and merit over identity.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, there is actually quite a bit in this amendment that I do agree with. I think ideologies that are explicitly racist are problematic, and I certainly have seen that done. There are examples of the teaching of critical race theory and promotion of critical race theory that I personally disagree with, but there are two reasons to oppose this amendment.

Number one, that is not happening in the United States military. We had a great debate earlier about why recruitment is down. Part of it is because of the fundamental dishonesty that the rightwing is saying about the military in terms of what is going on.

They are not promoting critical race theory. It is a theory they do talk about, just like they talked about communism and fascism and a whole wide variety of other things that they don't agree with. To suggest, as this amendment does, that our military is promoting any of this ideology is completely wrong.

The second problem I have with this amendment is that it does sort of push in the other direction, to want to sort of suggest, as we have seen in Florida and other States, that racism isn't really a thing.

There was a famous example where it was said: What we ought to be teaching people is that, in fact, slavery had its upside. So there are problems with taking that approach.

In particular, there is something in here about whether or not the Declaration of Independence is a racist document. That is a debate, I think, certainly we should have, but a document that basically enshrines—actually, it is the Declaration of Independence. I guess the Constitution is in there, too—enshrines the fact that if you are a Black person, you cannot vote and you count as three-fifths of a person. I think it would kind of be interesting to debate whether or not that was racist because I think it kind of was. To ignore the history of our country, both good or bad, is a mistake.

This amendment pushes us toward ignoring any of the history that is racist, that has promoted white supremacy, which has promoted slavery and Jim Crow. To say that the people being educated in our military schools should ignore that history, I think, is a great weakness.

The military does not promote CRT. They should have a robust discussion about various ideologies and also the history of racism in this country. Ignoring it will do a disservice to the men and women who serve in the military and to the country.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Chair, to say that the military isn't actively doing this is misleading.

In fact, I personally have seen training that our servicemembers, including my husband, have had to go through.

To put it in perspective, my husband, before he got out of the military, was made to write down the top five people he associated with, writing down their race, sexual orientation, and gender. If those people were not diverse enough, he was then racist.

Well, I have news for my colleagues across the aisle. When you have men and women deploying around the country, serving with Black and Brown people, because that is apparently what we are going to talk about in regards to color around the world, and you are telling them that they are racist, even though they have laid down their lives for these people, I think that just shows how out of touch this governing body is.

To say that our military is not being forced to do that is misleading. They absolutely are. When I talk to men and women, both enlisted and at the officer level, I can tell you that they are more concerned about what is happening in the Pacific and what is happening in Russia than the infighting and the constant name-calling and also the wokification of our military.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. TOKUDA).

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Chair, once again, it appears my colleagues fail to understand what critical race theory is.

Critical race theory helps us understand the past, while DEI, as they have often been against, helps us chart the path forward to acknowledge and rectify the systemic racism that still shapes the present. Let's not conflate or confuse the two.

Let me reiterate: Critical race theory is simply an academic and legal framework to recognize that systemic racism is part of our Nation's history. Yes, that is hard to hear, but sadly that is absolutely the fact and the case.

Systemic racism continues, quite frankly, to affect our society and individuals in it to this very day. These are hard truths for my colleagues that cannot bear to hear it.

However, there is no other way to explain the compromise enshrined for almost 80 years in our Constitution that count slaves as three-fifths of a person to determine matters like the number of seats allotted to States for this very body, the House of Representatives.

There is no other way to explain the Chinese Exclusion Act or the Asian Exclusion Act, which banned immigration of Asian people to this country for decades. Nor is there any other way to justify the grave historical injustices of Executive Order 9066 that interned over 100,000 Japanese Americans during the Second World War, including my great-grandfather, who was locked up against his will in Santa Fe, New Mexico, while my grandfather, his son, served in the military intelligence service for a country who saw and treated him and his loved ones as the enemy.

Systemic racism is a part of the history of our military, the Department of Defense, and this country. There is no other way to explain the fact that, even though they served bravely in the Revolutionary War, Black men were formally excluded from military service after the war until the Civil War.

Meanwhile, Filipino veterans of World War II waited for over four decades for the citizenship and benefits promised to them for their service under our flag and are still waiting to this day.

If my Republican colleagues believe we can compete with our adversaries across the globe by avoiding these truths, they are sadly mistaken.

While our adversaries will seek to whitewash and erase histories like that of the Ukrainians, the Tibetans, and the Uyghurs, we must do better. We should be better because this speaks to who we are as a Nation.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BENTZ). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Chair, having our servicemembers learn about systemic racism and think critically about the role it continues to play in our society may make some of them uncomfortable, but it is not going to make them

hate America. It will, however, help them understand why inequities persist in our country, including in the ranks of our military.

I hope it will remind them how far we have come and how much further we must go toward a more equitable future, one in which they, regardless of their background, can achieve their fullest potential.

We need to understand critical race theory for what it is, an opportunity for us to confront our past and work toward a better future.

Mr. Chair, for that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLS).

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chair, I will start out by saying that I really admire and love my colleague from Hawaii. We have had many conversations together on the strengthening of our military, especially when it comes to Schofield Barracks and the rest, and the same is true with the ranking member, my colleague, ADAM SMITH.

I will say, however, for the record, I served in the United States military. As an Army combat veteran, I proudly served with people from Hawaii, people from Puerto Rico, and people from the Virgin Islands. I have seen the diversity which exists, and I think that the utilization of DEI and CRT is what has led to the creation of the recruitment deficit of 41,000 that we see today.

Our military is not supposed to be prioritizing the ideas of critical race theory or diversity, equity, inclusion. It should be about increased lethality, readiness, and being properly equipped. This is how we defeat our enemies. It is not through the ideas of trying to create division, and it is not through the ideas of pronoun training, where I can guarantee you that we cannot pronoun all of our enemies, but the he/him, they/them, and she/her is not going to make us a stronger military.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support Mrs. ANNA PAULINA LUNA's amendment, and I ask that we understand that we are here to strengthen our military, not to divide it.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I think we have concluded our remarks as well. For all the reasons stated, I urge opposition, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1415

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 17. PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR THE COUNTERING EXTREMIST ACTIVITY WORKING GROUP.

No Federal funds are authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Countering Extremist Activity Working Group or to implement any recommendations of such group.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in favor of my amendment, which would prohibit Federal funding for the Countering Extremist Activity Working Group or implement any recommendations from the group.

In 2021, Democrats and the Biden regime unjustly used January 6 to prop up this woke working group to provide cover for unjustly targeting members of our military. The so-called Countering Extremist Activity Working Group has been weaponized and implemented to almost exclusively target Republicans, Conservatives, and Libertarians serving in the military. Yet, by its own metrics, it has been a massive waste of money and time.

The Defense Department continues to spend large amounts of time and money to combat extremism, yet its own analysis of the situation shows that it is entirely unnecessary. In fact, fewer than 100 servicemembers have been subject to discipline due to engagement in extremist activities. That is only 0.005 percent of the approximately 2.1 million Active and Reserve personnel. Clearly, extremism is not the problem that my colleagues on the left and media outlets made it out to be.

The United States military is tasked with one mission: maintaining mission critical readiness to protect the American homeland. Sowing our Armed Forces with divisive rhetoric designed to pit races and genders against one another is not only morally wrong, it poses a very real threat to our national security.

Under the Biden regime, DEI instruction and management has reached new heights that threaten to weaken the bond between America's Armed Forces

and its civilian leadership and undermine our military effectiveness and readiness.

All of our men and women in uniform deserve to have the best tools needed to carry out their mission to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. Unfortunately, liberal ideology undermines this mission. In order to stand up to China, Russia, and terrorists, our military needs to project strength, not cultural wokeness. My amendment does exactly that.

I urge the adoption of this amendment, Mr. Chair, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume. To be clear, January 6 was an attack on America, our democracy, and this institution, which we have all taken an oath to serve. This shouldn't be controversial. Servicemembers who swear an oath to the Constitution should not try to overthrow the United States Government.

Yet, the latest report from the Department of Defense inspector general found that 78 servicemembers were alleged to have advocated for the overthrow of the government in the past year alone. That is likely an undercount given reported challenges in gathering and compiling data across the military departments.

Clearly, extremism in the military remains a persistent and serious issue, one that we should not take lightly, again, given the January 6 insurrection in which we know some servicemembers and veterans participated. This fact alone should be deeply concerning to every single one of us in this Chamber.

Instead of taking this problem seriously, this amendment prohibits the Department of Defense from implementing recommendations designed to counter extremist activity in our military. This undermines unit cohesion, the readiness of our forces, and ultimately public trust in our military.

My colleagues allege that the Department's efforts to counter extremist activities unfairly targets conservatives. There is nothing in the Countering Extremist Activity Working Group's final report to substantiate that allegation because violent extremism, regardless of its political or partisan leaning, is a danger to all of us and to this democracy.

There can be no denial that far-right extremism is surging across the country at a much higher level than that of leftwing extremism. A recent study showed that violent extremist acts in the United States were far more likely to be associated with far-right ideologies like white supremacy than with any far-left alternative. In fact, the level of violence perpetrated by

rightwing extremists in this country is on par with, if not higher than, that of Islamist extremists.

In our country, where servicemembers have access to critical national security information and assets, individuals motivated by extremist ideologies can pose an outside threat to our national security when they move beyond fair and legal expression of contentious issues and into subversive or even violent actions.

Tackling extremism in our military is not about promoting wokeness, which my colleagues continue to be obsessed about. It is about protecting our people and our country. That, sadly, also means preventing domestic terrorism and addressing the serious and persistent threat to our homeland. It is also about restoring public confidence and trust in one of the most important institutions in our history and society.

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

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I just want to reiterate quickly that this is fewer than 100 servicemembers who have been targeted here, and that is only 0.005 percent of the approximately 2.1 million Active and Reserve personnel serving. Ultimately, wokeness weakens our military.

Violent leftwing extremists stormed the field yesterday at the Congressional Baseball Game. In 2020 they burned down our cities. They say that we are obsessed with wokeness. They are obsessed with January 6, which their Speaker admitted that she did not have our facility properly secured.

Mr. Chair, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLS).

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chair, I just point out once again, as a United States Army combat veteran, I served with people from different races, creeds, and genders. None of that mattered; we all bled green. When we went to Iraq and Afghanistan, when we were sitting in Kosovo, not once did we talk about who did you vote for, what religion do you follow, what gender do you identify as. We were a cohesive unit that believed in service.

I think that the DEI, which was actually passed in last year's NDAA in the House, should actually show that we are ready to close this because it has caused division, not inclusion. When you talk about the 41,000 deficit that we are seeing today, I think that we were a much stronger military with greater recruitment efforts when we were prioritizing the ideas of coming together, fighting a common enemy, training as one.

This is what matters to our United States military when we strengthen ourselves; not the idea of trying to identify ourselves as being something different, but as being one. That is the military that I served in. That is the military I believe in. We need to stop allowing our military to only think about serving political agendas and get

back to what they are supposed to do, which is serving our country.

I have seen nothing but division through DEI. One of those examples that we talk about is that we want to try to make sure everyone has a right to their own opinions. The reality is that Tyler Bowyer had a Turning Point event where military members were actually refused attendance because of being conservatives.

We need to be a stronger military. I support this amendment. I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. BOEBERT. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

First of all, let's be clear here. As we previously heard, we are not talking about DEI, which, once again, this is an obsession of the far right in this particular body. I will agree with you, though, in the same context of that conversation, I think we are in agreement. This is about how we should serve as one united Nation. How do we serve as a United States of America as a whole?

The bottom line is, when we take a look at the kind of extremist activity that is happening within our military that was found by the Countering Extremist Activity Working Group, this is not bringing our country together. This is not allowing us to stand under one common flag.

A 2020 Military Times poll found that more than half of minority servicemembers, servicemembers of color, say they have personally witnessed examples of white nationalism or ideologically driven racism within the ranks.

As we can recall, in June 2020, a servicemember of the 173rd Airborne Brigade with white supremacist leanings led classified troop movements to facilitate an attack on his own unit while deployed to Türkiye.

Let's be clear here. The recommendations of the Countering Extremist Activity Working Group are not controversial, and they include: Enhancing insider threat analysis and response, developing comprehensive training and education for departmental leadership, providing notice to personnel on prohibited activities, and improving internal information sharing and coordination.

I think we can all agree in this body, no matter what side of the aisle you sit on, this is good for us if we are truly trying to stand up to China, to Russia, and to North Korea. How do we make ourselves truly a United States Department of Defense, not one that is currently divided by internal risks, internal extremism that, sadly, we are seeing too often in the field and in our ranks.

Mr. Chair, I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to vote against this amendment and to make sure that we can, in fact, be a strong united presence standing against our adversaries across the globe. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. MILLS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. ELIMINATION OF DISCRETION OF MILITARY CHAIN OF COMMAND AND SENIOR CIVILIAN LEADERSHIP WITH RESPECT TO DISPLAY OF FLAGS.

Section 1052(d)(1)(N) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (Public Law 118-31; 10 U.S.C. 2661 note) is amended by striking subparagraph (N).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chair, tomorrow is Flag Day. The Second Continental Congress of June 14, 1777, adopted the flag of the United States some 247 years ago. This was in the midst of our struggle to become a free and independent Nation and to become a constitutional Republic. Now, that flag changed over time as new States were added and the country expanded, but our dedication must be unyielding. They saw fit to honor the flag then, and we must honor the flag now and forever.

We start each legislative day here with the Pledge of Allegiance. That flag that sits behind you right now is a symbol of this great country. We don't make that pledge to a party. We pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands. It is a simple but solemn part of the day, and it is done to remind us that we are one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Those stars and those stripes mean a lot to me, Mr. Speaker. It is a flag that I saluted as a soldier and a combat veteran, and a flag that I have seen many times draped over the coffins of those I had served with. I hope we never lose sight of the importance of it.

What my amendment does is simple, Mr. Speaker. It honors our flag. We can do this again by asserting the legislative powers, as they did in 1777. Currently, no flag other than the approved flag should be displayed in any workplace, common area place, or public

area at the Department of Defense, which we decided in fiscal year 2024 in the NDAA. Approved flags include the American flag, the State flags, military service flags, and even our POW/MIA flag, as well as others, for 13 types in total.

There is, however, a provision that concerns me that allows “a flag approved at the discretion of a military chain of command or civilian leadership, as appropriate,” and this is what my amendment would strike. It would strike the ability from it being a legislative priority that we are abdicating over and bring it back as it was supposed to under Article I. This is about Congress determining the flags that can be displayed at military installations, and we have already agreed to 13 of them. If a Member of Congress or the Department of Defense wants to add to that list, then come and make the argument and the debate here on the floor and have a vote.

Don't just give our Article I powers away to the executive branch. It is our responsibility as a legislative body in this country to make these determinations in this Chamber. I also want to be clear that under current law, a building or an area that primarily serves as a place of residence is exempt, and servicemembers can do as they choose, not denying them their rights that they fight for. There are also exemptions for museum exhibits, license plates, gravesites, memorials, educational displays, and more that were decided here by Congress.

I am here today, Mr. Chair, to say: Honor our flag and protect our legislative powers. I hope all my colleagues will join me in doing so.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FULCHER). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chair, the maker of this amendment is correct. This is an issue that we have litigated before the House already. I forget how many years ago it was now, but controversy arose over different flags being flown at different military institutions.

We attempted to resolve that issue, and we did resolve that issue. We resolved the issue by saying there would be these approved flags.

The other piece of it is that if the local leadership agrees, they may fly a flag as well because there are a whole lot of flags out there in the world, and we didn't want to contemplate absolutely all of them. If somebody is a Dallas Cowboys fan and wants to fly a Dallas Cowboys flag somewhere, the commander or civilian leadership can rightly decide whether or not it is appropriate within that unit.

I am with him on the initial part about how much he loves the U.S. flag.

I love the U.S. flag, as well. Let's be clear: This amendment has absolutely nothing to do with the U.S. flag. The U.S. flag can be flown, as it well should be, and we appreciate it. This is about commanders and civilian leadership at local military installations being able to decide whether or not they want to fly other flags. That was part of the compromise that we agreed to. There is no necessity for banning this.

If you rise to be the person who is in charge of a military installation, I am going to trust you to be able to make this decision. It is not something that Congress needs to insert itself into. We don't need to decide on whether every single flag should go up or go down. We litigated this issue. We resolved it in the NDAA. We do not need to reopen it.

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

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chair, I have great respect for my colleague, Mr. SMITH, and I have served proudly with him on the Armed Services Committee. I remind him that it is our responsibility. As our Founding Fathers established in 1777, it is Congress under Article I that has the rights and authorities to be able to designate which flags are flown over military installations.

We are not talking about outside of their barracks. We are not talking about what they fly outside of their own rooms or even the buildings that they occupy. We are talking about the military installation as a whole.

The one thing that Congress has gotten very good at is abdicating our responsibilities the same way that we abdicate Article I, Section 8, Clauses 11 through 13 of our war powers authority within the actual AUMF, Authorization for Use of Military Force. I ask my colleagues to explain why.

In 1777, we deemed this as a congressional authority, but we now say that any command—and there are good commands; there are bad commands—has the right to overrule what has actually been done here in the body.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues, once again, to explain why we continue to abdicate our roles and responsibilities within this Chamber only to complain about them further later.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I would say Congress has decided. We decided on 13 flags, and we decided to trust the military installation commanders to make other decisions. We did decide. We have done this two or three times. They want us to decide something different. That is not violating anything. That is just going at what they think Congress ought to decide to do.

We have exercised the law and the right that was laid out. We exercised it in the way we did. We approved it in this body, the Senate, and the conference report. It does not need to be reopened.

Mr. Chair, I urge us to defeat this amendment, and I yield 1 minute to the

gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN).

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I find it really interesting that in a Congress that took 15 votes and several days to elect a Speaker and then 3 weeks to elect another Speaker, and every must-pass bill has been bogged down with culture war amendments or partisan infighting that has taken us to the brink, that in a Congress that has passed very little legislation compared to other Congresses, we now want Congress to micromanage a local military base.

For example, if Fort Gregg-Adams in Prince George, for example, has a festival and they want to fly a flag related to that festival, they have to come to Congress to ask for a bill to be passed and signed by the President of the United States. That is ridiculous. That is utterly ridiculous.

That is why, in a wide variety of bills passed by Congress, we delegate some of that minutiae to the people on the ground who know, in that given situation, they can exercise their judgment.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chair, I remind the gentlewoman that the purpose of Congress is not to try to pass as many bills as you can possibly pass. Actually, it was the opposite of that. It was actually trying to make it very difficult.

The reason that we are so big on wanting to try to gauge the metrics by how many bills we pass is because we don't even enforce the existing laws that we have on the books, and we think that is somehow a metric of success.

The reality is that we are not supposed to be involved in day-to-day lives, which is why, in 1777, they made it very clear: Here are the authorized flags we can fly.

I can tell you that if there were a tremendous amount of MAGA flags flying over military installations, you would hear an absolute outcry by the left that would come in and tell you that these are not authorized and approved flags, so how dare they do this, it is a complete atrocity, and J6 is a result of this.

The funny thing is that it is only a great argument when it is to their own benefit, but the reality is this: Why can't it be simple? The simplest thing is that our military installations and our military servicemembers, myself as an actual armed services member—not sure that my colleagues have actually served in the Army—we wore an American flag on our uniform. Why? Because that is what our American country represented, that flag.

Mr. Chair, I ask that my colleagues support this and that we get back to supporting and honoring our flag.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time. It is ironic, the gentleman arguing about how Congress doesn't need to pass a bunch of laws while he is urging us to pass another one. He is the one

who is actually proposing and having us pass something else that would place a restriction after we have already dealt with that.

This is not an issue that needs to be revisited. We worked it out. We have a bunch of approved flags for everybody. We allow the local commanders to make local decisions.

Congress certainly should exercise our authority of oversight over the Department of Defense, and there are a wide variety of different areas where we need to do this. Micromanaging what flag is flown at every single installation in the United States of America and beyond is not a place I think we need to insert ourselves.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment and urge the body to do so. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. WALTZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title V, insert the following new section:

SEC. 5. EXPANSIONS OF INCREASED FITNESS STANDARDS FOR ARMY CLOSE COMBAT FORCE MILITARY OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTIES.

Section 577 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (Public Law 118-31; 10 U.S.C. 7013 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall implement increased minimum fitness standards as part of the Army Combat Fitness Test” and inserting “Not later than 14 months after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2025, the Secretary of the Army shall implement sex-neutral fitness standards that are enhanced in each test category”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(21) 25C assigned to infantry, cavalry, and engineer line companies or troops in brigade combat teams and infantry battalions.

“(22) 68W assigned to infantry, cavalry, and engineer line companies or troops in brigade combat teams and infantry battalions.”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “Not later than 365 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army” and inserting “Not later than 13 months after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2025, the Secretary of the Army shall”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman

from Florida (Mr. WALTZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WALTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to require the United States Army to establish gender-neutral fitness standards for its combat fitness test.

Last year’s defense bill contained my provision that required the Army to create gender-neutral fitness standards for combat military occupational specialties. While I am pleased that the conference adopted increased fitness standards for combat arms in the FY24 NDAA, it removed the provisions requiring these standards to be gender-neutral. This amendment would restore the House’s previous language.

To be clear, Mr. Chairman, I fully support all Americans, regardless of race, religion, or gender, to serve in any capacity in our uniformed services. We need them, and in the middle of this recruiting crisis, we need all of them. This amendment and conversation are about standards and establishing the standards we need to be successful in combat.

I can tell you firsthand that our enemies’ bullets do not discriminate between Black, White, or Brown. They don’t discriminate between men and women. We are all in the foxhole together, so we need to establish what those standards are to be successful. If you hit them and achieve them, then you are in that combat unit. If you don’t, there are other ways to serve.

I like to talk about the first female to successfully graduate from the U.S. Army Ranger School. Her name is Kristen Geist. She had to achieve the standards that it takes to be a Ranger and went on to command her infantry platoon, but she now has a lower physical standard than the men she is charged to lead.

I think that does her a disservice. I think that does the women who achieve these incredibly difficult elite units within our military a disservice. Frankly, it lowers the readiness of the units that they are joining.

In her op-ed, she said: “First, reverting to gender-based scoring could drastically reduce the performance and effectiveness of combat arms units,” particularly as more women join these units, with the opening of combat arms.

She also goes on to say: “Reverting to gender-based scoring and reducing the minimum standard for combat arms will also hurt the women in those branches. Under a gender-based system, women in combat arms have to fight every day to dispel the notion that their presence inherently weakens these previously all-male units.” These are her words.

“Lower female standards also reinforce the belief that women cannot perform the same job as men, therefore making it difficult for women to earn the trust and confidence of their teammates.”

Mr. Chairman, you are going to hear that we don’t have data, that we don’t know. We have 20 years of combat in the Middle East. We know what it takes to move a 200-pound soldier to that helicopter, to move that medevac up to the top of the building, to move that artillery round. None of those things discriminate based on what gender you are—none of them. Certainly, our enemies don’t.

At the end of the day, the standard it takes to be successful in infantry should be different than to be a cyber warrior, a supply officer, or a pilot. Let’s make the standards according to the job and not according to anything else, and that is what this amendment would do.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment. It is just the latest in a long series of attempts by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to drum women out of combat roles in which they are currently serving.

It is dressed up as protecting women, as a step aimed at preserving military readiness, but make no mistake, it is about a deeply held belief that women shouldn’t fight.

When I served in the Navy, I was part of the first class of women eligible for most combat roles, and I know firsthand what women bring to the table in combat roles.

This fight is to ensure that women can serve in combat roles. It is one that I have already fought and has impacted my entire career in the Navy. It has also impacted the careers of our first female commanding officer of an aircraft carrier, our first woman Chief of Naval Operations, our first female superintendent of the Naval Academy.

Make no mistake, I had to pass numerous physical tests during my time in the Navy. Some, such as the physical readiness test, were simply basic measures of fitness based on my age and gender. Some, such as the helicopter dunker, the platform dive, and SERE/POW training school, were gender- and age-neutral and based on the ability I needed to have to serve in a certain role—namely, a Navy helicopter pilot who flew over water, often at night.

The military determined this, not Congress. Congress should not be telling the military what standards they should be implementing for physical fitness standards. The services have long had the ability to make these decisions based on their expert knowledge on what is actually needed for servicemembers.

Congress should not intervene, especially when it could lead to the prevention of qualified women in combat

roles and especially not as a cheap political ploy to score points in a culture war.

By all means, we don't need to take my word for it. Let's see what the Army has to say. It is redundant. Per Secretary Wormuth, the Army already has sex-neutral fitness standards that apply to every single combat arms military occupational specialty.

It is duplicative. Per Secretary Warmoth, the Army is already pursuing increased standards to close combat force MOSes to comply with last year's bill.

It is counterproductive. Under this amendment, the Army would lack empirically defensible data to set the standards. Instead, per Secretary Warmoth, the Army would be forced to rely on this amendment's conclusion that sex-neutral minimum standards are scientifically justifiable without the science.

□ 1445

Mr. Chair, once again, this body is considering amendments that serve one goal: cheap shots at women as part of a MAGA culture war.

Our military readiness is an incredibly important thing that should be treated with careful deliberation. It should not be subject to the whims of a single Member of this House who has willfully disregarded the input of experts from the Army and of the House Armed Services Committee which rejected this very amendment.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. WALTZ. Mr. Chair, I found that, frankly, incredibly insulting and somewhat disappointing coming from a colleague and a fellow veteran.

At the end of the day, those who are fighting for women to serve in all combat roles—which I will state again, despite the aspersions or projecting of motives here—cannot then say, well, they should have a lower standard in combat. Combat doesn't present a lower standard. It is one: life or death. When you are in a foxhole with fellow Americans, that is all that matters.

Number two, I think to equate an experience as a helicopter pilot with what this amendment actually addresses—which are combat roles in the Army, not in the Navy, not in the Air Force, not with support roles, not with other specialties that, again, all Americans are welcome and should be welcome to serve in—either we haven't read the amendment or we have our own motives in place. It is hard to tell.

At the end of the day, what we are seeing in Ukraine, what we are seeing in Gaza, and what we have seen in our experience in the Middle East is that combat on the ground in urban environments is brutally up close, dangerous, lethal, and at the end of the day regardless of race, religion, gender or anything else, you need to be able to hit the standards and training to be successful in a combat environment.

Again, I would support my colleagues setting aside their political, I guess, biases and support this amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I will point out, as I am sure the gentleman recognizes, there are helicopter pilots in the Army and there are helicopter pilots who are in combat, so it is perfectly appropriate to have a helicopter pilot talk about what it is like to serve in a combat role, and I think the gentleman would agree with me on that.

There is one other aspect of this amendment that has always troubled me. We talk about combat MOSes, but the actual substance of the amendment would set a gender-neutral standard to be in the Army, period, and that is what is concerning because there are a lot of different jobs within the Army. There is combat, which you described, absolutely. We also need intel officers, we need linguistic experts, and we need a whole lot of people who will have a different set of qualifications.

What the Army was concerned about with this last year, how we came to a compromise—which you have decided you didn't like, apparently, even though you guys are in the majority, and we passed this last year—was that they were concerned that if you required this you would be booting a ton of women out of the military now who aren't in combat roles. The breadth of this amendment is what concerns me.

In addition, like I said, last year we did this, and the Army is tasked with coming back to us with new fitness standards for the broad Army and also for the very specific combat MOSes to make sure that they meet the standards, that the gentleman is quite correct must be there, for certain jobs, but it depends on the job.

It also is something that is not said on this floor, and I love the fact that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have you believe that the military has always been this completely unbiased, unbigoted place, and no one has anything to worry about. We are just going to treat everybody perfectly equally, and everything will be fine.

I confess, I have not served in the military, and maybe someone who has served in the military will say, oh, no, we have never done that. I would think you were being dishonest if you said that because bias and bigotry have been a problem. It has been a particular problem for women serving in the military, as any woman, Republican or Democrat, who has served in the military in the last 40 years can tell you. Efforts to make sure that women know that they will be included and given a fair shot are important. This amendment undermines that.

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION OF REQUIREMENT IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO WEAR A MASK TO STOP THE SPREAD OF COVID-19.

The Secretary of Defense may not require an individual to wear a mask while on a military installation in the United States to prevent the spread of COVID-19.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, my amendment prohibits the Secretary of Defense from requiring individuals to wear masks to prevent the spread of COVID-19 on any military installation in the United States. I was proud to introduce a similar amendment last year, and I am happy to do so again.

Policies involving mandatory mask implementation are not about science or safety but control.

Tom Jefferson, not to be confused with Thomas Jefferson, a leading epidemiologist who coauthored what The New York Times Opinion section called: "The most rigorous and comprehensive analysis of scientific studies conducted on the efficacy of masks for reducing the spread of respiratory illness, including COVID-19" found that there was no evidence that masks made a difference.

It found that wearing a mask in public places probably makes little or no difference in the number of infections, and Dr. Fauci has recently admitted as much.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I will be brief. I don't fundamentally disagree with the idea that we learned a lot about the relative effectiveness of masks. I am not a huge fan of them myself. The main reason they tend not to be effective is people don't wear them or they don't wear them correctly.

I think what we have learned is that there are some circumstances in which masks could conceivably be helpful.

I don't like the way the scientists in this country presented the mask information to the American public. I think they undermined a lot of credibility in the way they did it by not explaining it in an honest way, and I think they were wrong in a number of different areas.

This amendment says there is never any time ever when a mask mandate makes sense, and that is just further than even I am willing to go. I don't know when that time is going to be. I have not done an exhaustive study of the science. I have read a few New Yorker articles in other places that raised some of the concerns.

To have an amendment that says under no circumstances can our medical professionals within the military conclude that this is a good idea goes too far.

I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for his words.

Again, to my colleague's point, this really is about following the science and the lessons we have learned that this information, the requirement, the mandatory implementation of mask wearing, which was not presented honestly to the American people, has created distrust within the very institutions that we should trust when such said things happen.

That being said, I think this is important to lay the groundwork and the framework that you can't just mandate masks because you feel that you have to do something.

Fauci has acknowledged that he was winging it, that the 6-foot margin was made up. We now know the efficacy of masks didn't work, and, yes, obviously not wearing a mask could or could not have an impact.

The efficacy studies were on the masks themselves, on N95 masks. This isn't about not wearing a mask; this is about the fact that N95 masks did not work against COVID. We should not have a mandatory mask allowance for our military because of control.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I actually don't have any more arguments on this point other than what I have said.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, again, I will just emphasize this amendment is based off of what we now know about COVID. We know the masks didn't work. There is no need for the Secretary of Defense to urge or mandate our military to wear masks on military installations.

This is about freedom.

This is about liberty.

This is about science.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. ROSENDALE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In subtitle A of title VII, add at the end the following:

SEC. 714. PROHIBITION ON COVERAGE OF CERTAIN GENDER TRANSITION PROCEDURES AND RELATED SERVICES UNDER TRICARE PROGRAM.

Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1076f the following new section (and conforming the table of sections at the beginning of such chapter accordingly):

“§1076g. TRICARE program: prohibition on coverage and furnishment of certain gender transition surgeries and related services

“(a) PROHIBITION.—The medical care to which individuals are entitled to under this chapter does not include the services described in subsection (b) and the Secretary of Defense may not furnish any such service.

“(b) SERVICES DESCRIBED.—The services described in this subsection are the following:

“(1) Gender transition surgeries furnished for the purpose of the gender alteration of an individual who identifies as transgender.

“(2) Hormone treatments furnished for the purpose of the gender alteration of an individual who identifies as transgender.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, President Joe Biden has tried to turn our United States military into a dangerous leftwing social experiment.

At the Malmstrom Air Force Base in my district there has been an inappropriate drag show and explicit library books on display for children.

The Department of Defense is paying for travel expenses and is offering up to 21 days of leave for soldiers and their dependents to get abortions.

This does nothing to help our troops continue to be the most effective fighting force on Earth and is nothing but a distraction and a waste of valuable taxpayer dollars.

My amendment No. 52 would prohibit TRICARE from covering gender reassignment surgeries and hormone treatment for individuals who identify as transgender.

The government has no business funding these procedures on the taxpayers' dime, and, quite frankly, if you don't know if you are a man or a woman, you shouldn't have your hand on the button that launches missiles.

The Department of Defense still spent millions of dollars on these surgeries, and they do nothing to help our servicemembers. The follow-up medications and counseling are even more costly.

The question that must be asked is whether having people who identify as trans in the military makes our military a more effective, lethal fighting force. The answer is a clear and resounding no.

A report commissioned by General Mattis found that servicemembers with claims of gender dysphoria are eight times more likely to attempt suicide than other servicemembers. It also found that these individuals are nine times more likely to have negative mental health episodes than other servicemembers.

As former Lieutenant General Thomas Spoeher aptly put it: “If those with gender dysphoria are at a much higher risk of suicide, crippling anxiety, or other mental breakdowns than their peers, those serving next to them will be reluctant to rely on them. Permitting them to serve also violates the principle of not placing individuals at greater risk of injury in harm's way.”

Allowing this radical trans agenda to infiltrate our military will put our servicemembers in harm's way and will make our country more vulnerable than it has ever been in modern history.

My commonsense amendment would save the taxpayers millions of dollars and help protect our servicemembers and our country.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS).

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Chair, gender-affirming care is safe, effective, and medically necessary. It is supported by every major medical association in the United States representing more than 1.3 million U.S. doctors.

That is why I find it incredibly concerning that many of my colleagues across the aisle choose to demonize the transgender community, but I don't think they have ever met someone who is trans. Many of them seek to restrict, deny, and disparage gender-affirming care but have never met anyone who has actually received it.

Forgive me if I am not convinced by their naive talking points when this is something I know about personally.

□ 1500

Earlier this year, my trans brother, Dylan, received gender-affirming surgery after consultations with his doctor. He will tell you, Mr. Chair, that it was life-changing, and that is the case for so many in the trans community. He will tell you, Mr. Chair, contrary to my colleague's remarks, that he knows who he is. His body just doesn't match that.

Prohibiting gender-affirming care for our servicemembers not only compromises our national security, but it also hinders our recruitment and retention efforts.

Trans people are about twice as likely as all adults in the U.S. to serve in the Armed Forces. Why would we want to alienate this patriotic, selfless community from serving?

When servicemembers get the medical care they need, then they can focus on their mission without distraction. However, by denying servicemembers this medically necessary care, this amendment will hurt our military readiness and likely lead to servicemembers leaving the military. Our efforts to recruit would be severely weakened.

This amendment isn't only bigoted, it is shortsighted and would hurt our national security.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to listen to someone who actually knows something about the trans community and gender-affirming care and oppose this amendment.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, this is not rhetoric. These are simply the facts.

Again, a report commissioned by General Mattis found that servicemembers with claims of gender dysphoria are eight times more likely to attempt suicide than other servicemembers.

Mr. Chair, \$8 million roughly was spent on transgender care, including about \$5.8 million on psychotherapy, demonstrating that the vast majority of the investment associated with these gender surgeries is for psychotherapy thereafter.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN.)

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, have you ever wondered why transgender individuals are more likely to have mental health issues or commit suicide or attempt to commit suicide?

It is not just our servicemembers. It is also their dependents.

Maybe the reason is the harassment and demonization that they have faced for generations from the far right.

Maybe it is for the same reason a student whom I represented who identified as transgender wanted to commit suicide because on a daily basis in their school they received texts and threats from friends who said: "You should kill yourself" solely because they identified as transgender.

Maybe it is because the vitriol that we have heard in committee and on this floor against the transgender community tells them: You are not valuable as a human being.

That is why this amendment is so cruel.

What this amendment does is to say that in the same body, from the same party who has made arguments about individual freedom and decried what they see as people trying to impose their views on other people, this is an amendment that says that they are going to impose their views on what transgender people should or should not do when making their own healthcare decisions.

In doing so, it is so broadly written that it leaves it up to I don't know who to decide what the purpose of the hormone treatment that someone who identifies as transgender is because not every transgendered woman gets surgery. A woman who identifies as a man may not get surgery and continue to have ovaries, and when she reaches menopause, she may need hormonal therapy.

Now some bureaucrat is going to have to sit and say: What is the purpose of this? Is this part of your effort now to be surgically or hormonally transitioned?

This amendment is ridiculous and cruel, and it should be defeated.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, the pressures of war are extreme, and if you are so troubled during peacetime that you don't know if you are a man or a woman, then I can't imagine what the pressures of war would do to you.

There were about 160 transgender surgeries that have taken place in the military, and they included 23,000 psychotherapy visits.

Again, Mr. Chair, if you don't understand if you are a man or a woman, then you should not have your hand on the button that is launching missiles.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to close, as well.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Montana has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, again, it is very simple.

First of all, the taxpayers should not be bound by paying the expenses that are associated with these transgender surgeries for the military.

The next thing is, and this is the larger question: Should these people who are so confused they don't understand whether they are a man or a woman even be allowed into the military?

This is putting lives at risk, this is putting their colleagues at risk, and this has been something that has been hurting the recruitment efforts for the military that we have seen be down since the Biden administration has taken over.

Quite frankly, taxpayers should not be bound by these obligations, and the people who are serving in the military shouldn't be exposed to this additional risk.

Mr. Chair, I request that my colleagues please support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, two quick points: The United States Congress shouldn't be making medical decisions, and that is what this amendment is. It is telling

the military what medical services they should provide. That, I think, is a huge mistake regardless of the context.

Second, trans people have served in the military for a long time, even before it was officially allowed, and, certainly, now they are continuing to serve with the same honor and dignity as everybody else who has served. To imply otherwise is completely wrong.

Various people throughout the military need healthcare. We spend money on a lot of different healthcare provisions. There is a favorite stat about how much money the United States spends on Viagra for people who serve in the military. There are different purposes.

This amendment is wrong for two reasons: One, it is bigoted and discriminatory against trans people who serve and serve in the military very effectively.

Number two, it has Congress making medical decisions that should be left up to medical professionals and their patients.

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5. PROHIBITIONS ON PROVISION OF GENDER TRANSITION SERVICES THROUGH AN EXCEPTIONAL FAMILY MEMBER PROGRAM OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No gender transition procedures, including surgery or medication, may be provided to a minor dependent child through an EFMP.

(b) REFERRALS.—No referral for procedures described in subsection (a) may be provided to a minor dependent child through an EFMP.

(c) REASSIGNMENT.—No change of duty station may be approved through an EFMP for the purpose of providing a minor dependent child with access to procedures described in subsection (a).

(d) EFMP DEFINED.—In this section, the term "EFMP" means the program referred to as the Exceptional Family Member Program under section 1781c(d)(4)(I) of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman

from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits the provision of gender transition procedures, including surgery or medication, through an Exceptional Family Member Program.

I think I have heard it all, when my good friend on the other side mentioned that the medical profession was for the surgery. That is like saying the owners of a gas station or a petroleum company are for gasoline production. It is a given.

Everything has got a price tag up here, and when I hear Viagra, I hope and pray that Viagra is not included in what the other side is wanting to do. That is not the place for that, particularly now.

The Exceptional Family Member Program provides resources to military families with special needs. This program is designed for military spouses, children, or other dependent family members who require ongoing medical or educational services such as individuals with asthma, autism, chronic respiratory illness, intellectual disabilities, and much more.

The military has tried to politicize this valuable program in order to get transgender procedures passed. For example, the Air Force suggested using the Exceptional Family Member Program for families who want to help their child transition.

I would just say the other side is taking—and I will list some of the other things that are included in this that already exist that they are paying for—money away from the things I will mention, and I think that is unheard of.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume before I yield to Ms. JACOBS.

I will say, just on the comment about doctors being like gas station owners, of course, a doctor is going to want to operate whenever you show up, that is not the way the medical profession works.

I have been through a number of operations myself. I don't always agree with decisions the doctors make, but I will stand up for the medical profession and say they are not selling a product to the point where the more of it they sell the happier they are. They are not just going to operate on anyone who walks in.

It is the purpose of a medical doctor to make a medical determination about what the proper treatment is, not to sell as much of it as is humanly possible.

I stand by what I said earlier: Congress should not be telling doctors

what medical decisions they should make.

Mr. Chair, if you have got a doctor out there who is passing out treatment like he is at a gas station, then please report him, and let's make sure that that license is taken away.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS).

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, I think we can all agree we want our military dependents to be safe and healthy. In fact, that is a crucial part of our national security. If our servicemembers are worried about their families, then they are not going to be focused on the mission that we need them to do.

That is why military dependents should have access to gender-affirming care, which is safe, essential, medically necessary care that promotes the health and well-being of transgender people.

Now, I highly doubt my colleagues who support this amendment know someone who has personally received gender-affirming care, let alone talked to them about their experience and about what it was like with the doctor and about how hard or easy it was to receive that care. I have.

Earlier this year, my transgender brother had gender-affirming care surgery. He will tell you it has been life-changing, and it has improved his relationship with his body, his life, and his society. He will also tell you, Mr. Chair, it wasn't easy to get.

That confidence and happiness that my brother has is what I want for everyone, especially those in the LGBTQ+ community who are, too often, misunderstood, judged, discriminated against, and have to hear the hateful things coming from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

However, by denying servicemembers the ability to provide medically necessary care for their children, this amendment will lead servicemembers to leave the military, and it will weaken efforts to recruit other people with trans family members to join the military.

We have already seen this happen where servicemembers have had to dramatically alter their career or leave the service altogether in order to support their trans dependents.

The bottom line is this: The Federal Government should not get in the middle of medical decisions, period.

This amendment will be unconstitutional and will likely lead to costly litigation. We have already seen similar laws struck down in the courts for violating the equal protection clause, by denying transgender adolescents the same care that is provided to cisgender adolescents, and the bans would violate the fundamental due process rights of parents to provide best practice medical care for their children.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I will just add to some comments made about medical doctors.

The medical doctors are making money on this. Gas stations make money. The free enterprise system does that, and for them to be in favor of it, they are doing the surgery, and they are getting paid for it.

The military is meant to defend this country, and it has gotten away from that. That is what the American people are so sick of.

In another amendment, I brought up the fact that 168 generals and people active in the military are saying that that is why the recruitment is down 30 percent. It is for just what the other side is trying to oppose.

On my particular amendment, you have to realize this program was meant to help families with special needs.

Now, Mr. Chair, if you don't know whether you are a man or a woman, that is fine, go figure it out, and you pay for it, not the government from money we don't have.

Mr. Chair, let me just name you some of the things that are included now but by providing transgender surgery that will take away from these programs.

I guarantee you, Mr. Chair, you can ask and do a poll of everyone in the balcony: Do you want to do away with funds for life-threatening conditions or chronic conditions for transgender surgery?

Do you want to take away asthma and respiratory-related diagnoses for transgender surgery?

Do you want to delay intellectual development by taking the dollars away for that for transgender surgery?

Attention deficit disorder and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders, do you want to take that away?

How about chronic conditions that require adaptive equipment and assistive technology or environmental or architectural considerations?

That is everything that is included.

What the other side wants to do is take money for somebody who doesn't know whether they are a man or a woman. It didn't make sense then, and it doesn't make sense now.

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

□ 1515

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to follow that last train of logic.

Basically, if a trans person receives medical care, it is, by definition, taking medical care away from somebody else. I guess, if a cancer patient is receiving medical care, that is taking it away from somebody else.

That is simply not true. That is not the choice here. If you need healthcare, you should get healthcare. There will be a robust debate within the medical community about what is appropriate, certainly, but, in this case, we are talking about trans children of people who are serving in the military being denied healthcare that they need.

I don't feel that we should be denying healthcare to children whose medical professionals say they need it, and it is

not a choice of taking it away from somebody else. It is not the way our healthcare system works.

What this amendment would do is clearly take healthcare away from families and spouses of servicemembers that a medical doctor has determined that they need.

I come back to this argument that somehow our military is being destroyed by wokeness. This is completely and totally untrue. Number one, as we stand here today on the floor, we have the best military in the world. They are serving ably all across the world. It is incredibly talented and incredibly effective. I am offended that the other side of the aisle seems to want to continue to denigrate our military because of a rightwing agenda to wage a culture war.

That is not what is going on in the United States military. Recruitment is a problem primarily because of how good the economy is. Again, for a period of time, they weren't able to recruit because of COVID. Recruitment is also a problem, in small part due to the rightwing bashing on the military 24-7.

Are there some people in the military who long for the days when gay people and trans people and women and even people of color weren't in a position to compete with them? I am quite certain that there are. I am also quite certain that it is a relatively small number.

All we are trying to do is make sure that we have equal access in the military.

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

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, in closing, what my colleagues are trying to do goes against what the intent for this program was, and I am offended that the gentleman wants to take dollars away from that cancer patient. If my colleague is telling me the cancer patient goes behind somebody who doesn't know whether they are a man or a woman, the gentleman and I just have a basic world view difference.

The price tag for individual gender-affirming surgical procedures and other medical treatments can range from \$8,000 to \$100,000. I am offended that the gentleman wants to take that from somebody who has a disability.

Mr. Chairman, the fact that we are having to debate this is amazing, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. BRECHEEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 17 — LIMITATION ON FUNDING ACTIVITIES PERFORMED BY PERSONS IN DRAG.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for a drag show, drag queen story hour, or similar event.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRECHEEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRECHEEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit drag shows and drag queen story hours at U.S. military bases and installations. This measure is essential to ensure that our military remains focused on its core mission.

President Biden and his Department of Defense have hosted multiple drag show events as the left continues to push a sexual agenda on servicemembers, showing total disregard for our troops who signed up to protect this country, not to be subjected to far-left policies.

This agenda doesn't stop at our men and women in uniform. The Biden administration is also targeting young children in an effort to spread its views, its sexual agenda.

In 2022, a military base in Virginia hosted a kid-friendly diversity, equity, and inclusion summer festival—and I use air quotes, kid-friendly—featuring “Harpy Daniels—the Navy Drag Queen,” where children were encouraged to attend. That same summer, another base scheduled a drag queen story hour for children.

Our country depends on a lethal military capable of rising to any occasion, just as the Allied forces did 80 years ago when they stormed the beaches of Normandy. They exemplified patriotism and courage.

It seems the Biden administration and its DOD is more focused on promoting drag queens, waving the rainbow flag in a cultural war, preparing them for the cultural battle versus preparing a real fighting force advancing the red, white, and blue on a real battlefield.

This is nothing short of an insult to our troops. It is a mockery to history and those who died fighting for this country. What would General Eisenhower and General MacArthur say? I believe they would encourage a return to thousands of years of history of soci-

etal norms, not the current sexual fad that is in tandem with our armed services not being able to meet their recruitment goals, being down 30 percent during the Biden administration.

Young men who make up the bulk of our fighting forces are inspired by GI Joe. They are not inspired by: Be a Barbie girl in a Barbie world.

Although the DOD indicated it would stop hosting drag queen events last year, this informal decision lacks the force of law and was only made after significant public backlash. We have every reason to believe the DOD would resume these events tomorrow if they felt they could get away with it. We should codify this and not give them that option.

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

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the LGBTQ families, gay people who serve in our country, and, frankly, anyone who just likes to have fun, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Now, we know there are a lot of threats to the health and well-being of our servicemembers: poisoned water on military bases, toxic mold in military housing, PTSD and suicide. I am stunned to see that a top Republican idea to protect our troops is actually to ban drag shows.

Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues want us to believe that gays are trying to murder us. They want to believe that drag is harmful or immoral or wrong. This is completely ridiculous.

I hate to break it to my Republican colleagues, but LGBTQ people have fought and died for this country since the American Revolution, even if they were forced to hide their true selves.

We can document and celebrate drag shows on military bases, and they have been celebrated since the 1800s and through both world wars. The USO and Red Cross hosted drag shows during World War II. The army that defeated Hitler and saved the world included drag queens. Ronald Reagan starred in a movie called “This is the Army,” a movie about World War II that featured four drag performances. He is not the only Republican President who knew that drag can be fun and sometimes silly.

Mr. Chairman, drag is art, drag is culture, and drag is a form of comedy. Drag is not a crime, and it is not pornography.

Now, real obscenity is when one of our colleagues, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE), shows literal photos of revenge porn in our Oversight Committee. If we want to end porn in government facilities, let's ban that.

We know that inclusion in our military is good for our country. We want to welcome anyone who wants to serve,

and I would invite my Republican colleagues to join me at a drag show in the future. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will see that drag is not a threat to anyone, and I am convinced that some of the majority would really enjoy it.

It is my deep concern that this amendment is legitimatizing an extremist narrative that drag performances are now harmful or threatening. Drag is art.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should sashay away. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRECHEEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply codifies what the DOD stated last year that, “holding these type of events in federally funded facilities is not suitable use of DOD resources.”

I remind my colleagues that the language in this amendment passed in last year’s NDAA, which almost all Republicans and some Democrats voted for, Americans’ tax dollars should not be paying for or be used to prop up paying for men to dress up as women in sexualized performances.

I take exception to the comment that this is something that was occurring during the Greatest Generation. What may be referenced is something totally different than something now that is designed to sexualize this culture.

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

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Chairman, I remind my colleagues that art should be celebrated in this country. There are all forms of art. Whether it is going to a live theater performance, whether they are seeing something in a gallery, whether they are enjoying a sculpture, whether they are seeing a live music performance, or whether they are seeing a drag show, it is all a form of art. It is also an American art form that has been around our country for hundreds of years and has been on military bases since the USO was performing these similar types of shows.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a culture-war stunt that does nothing to make our troops safer. It politicizes our military and silences servicemembers who just want to be themselves. It is Big Government telling our troops they aren’t smart enough to decide if they want to attend a particular type of entertainment and that Congress knows best in what is funny or may not be funny.

We should respect drag artists for the talent that they are and for the artists that they are. We should focus on real solutions to make life better for our troops and for our country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MS. VAN DUYN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 55 printed in part B of House Report 118-551.

Ms. VAN DUYN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in subtitle A of title VII, insert the following:

SEC. 7. PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT AND REIMBURSEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OF EXPENSES RELATING TO ABORTION SERVICES.

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

(1) consistent with section 1093 of title 10, United States Code, the Department of Defense may not use any funds for abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in a case in which the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest;

(2) the Secretary of Defense has no legal authority to implement any policies in which funds are to be used for such purpose; and

(3) the Department of Defense Memorandum titled “Ensuring Access to Reproductive Health Care”, dated October 20, 2022, is therefore unlawful and must be rescinded.

(b) REPEAL OF MEMORANDUM.—

(1) REPEAL.—The Department of Defense memorandum titled “Ensuring Access to Reproductive Health Care”, dated October 20, 2022, shall have no force or effect.

(2) PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS TO CARRY OUT MEMORANDUM.—No funds may be obligated or expended to carry out the memorandum specified in paragraph (1) or any successor to such memorandum.

(c) PROHIBITION.—Section 1093 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT OR REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN FEES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may not pay for or reimburse any fees or expenses, including travel expenses, relating to a health-care professional gaining a license in a State if the purpose of gaining such license is to provide abortion services.

“(2) In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘health-care professional’ means a member of the armed forces, civilian employee of the Department of Defense, personal services contractor under section 1091 of this title, or other individual who provides health care at a military medical treatment facility.

“(B) The term ‘license’ has the meaning given that term in section 1094 of this title.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. VAN DUYN. Mr. Chairman, in 2022, President Biden issued new Department of Defense policy using taxpayer dollars to fund time off, lodging, and travel expenses for elective abortions. My amendment will stop this unlawful practice and return to the high protections codified in law.

In recent years, President Biden and many of my Democratic colleagues have embraced a radical, pro-abortion stance, going so far as to push to federally legalize abortion for any reason up until the moment of birth.

I am not sure why we have gone from wanting abortions to be safe, legal, and rare to encouraging taxpayer-funded abortion on demand, but here we are. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle can’t define a single limitation that my colleagues would support on elective abortions.

Republicans are offering solutions that support women throughout their pregnancy while my colleagues on the other side are taking the antiwoman stance of incentivizing abortions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to not only follow the law and enforce the law, but to do so while protecting the most vulnerable, the unborn.

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

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN), my friend and partner in this fight and the ranking member of the House Armed Services Quality of Life Panel.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, it truly saddens me to be here yet again having the same conversation we had last year, yet again standing before this Chamber as a woman, yet again a woman who has actually served and actually worn a uniform and actually was a mother in uniform. Here I am yet again defending our servicewomen’s and -men’s rights to seek the medical care that they need when they are serving our country.

□ 1530

I am sick and tired of Members who have never served telling servicemembers, the same servicemembers that they are proud to publicly express their purported support for, that they don’t deserve the financial or otherwise freedom to seek the medical care that they and their family members deserve and need when they need it.

To those who have served in uniform, and most of them are men who are here on this floor, and still don’t wish to afford servicemembers the ability to seek reproductive care, I am enormously disappointed with them, as well.

We all know how difficult military life is. If a woman in uniform or member of a family who is in uniform says it is not the right time, perhaps, to start a family, or she has a medical reason or otherwise, it is her—

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

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to my colleague.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chair, it is her decision alone on what to do here. That is why I introduced the MARCH for Servicemembers Act, which would, in

fact, expand access to abortion services at military treatment facilities.

We should be supporting our family servicemembers, not hindering them.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge a “no” vote on this amendment and the overall bill if it passes.

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Chair, the language in this bill is very straightforward. It would simply roll back Biden’s illegal DOD abortion travel policy issued under the October 22 memorandum, returning DOD to the practice in place for decades, under which both Democratic and Republican administrations have agreed.

This amendment has absolutely nothing to do with preventing people from getting medical care. Abortion is not medical care for the baby. It is a brutal procedure that ends the lives of unborn children through suction, dismemberment, or chemical poisoning.

The Biden administration has made taxpayer funding available for abortion at any stage of pregnancy, even for late-term abortions that inflict excruciating pain and suffering on the child. This human rights abuse should not be paid for or encouraged by the U.S. Government.

Abortion is also not medical care for the mother. Abortion can lead to significant physical complications for women and has serious mental health risks. A recent study found that over 60 percent of women who have had abortions report high levels of pressure.

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

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

Mr. Chair, I am vehemently opposed to this amendment. I wish I could say that I am surprised by the situation in which we find ourselves where, once again, House Republicans are trying to take rights away from servicewomen and military families, but I am not.

I am not surprised because it is their third attempt to get this policy repealed in the last year alone. They tried in last year’s NDAA. They tried via Senator TUBERVILLE as he waged his culture war with no concern for how he was impacting military readiness and setting back the careers of many talented officers.

This year, instead of having an actual debate about the best policies regarding vital reproductive healthcare for servicewomen and military families, they are once again hiding behind the Rules Committee and only putting forward their standard regressive, backward policies that continue to fail.

Preventing military women from traveling for care when they are stationed in States with draconian abortion laws isn’t pro-life. It is not pro-life to force women to risk their lives and their careers with nonviable pregnancies. It is not pro-life to make it harder for women to access basic healthcare. It is not pro-life to do it at the expense of women who already risk their lives in service of their country.

I wish we could treat this issue with the seriousness it deserves. I wish we

could have a real debate about reproductive healthcare for servicemembers, but we can’t. Why? Because this majority would rather score cheap points in their MAGA culture wars than have a serious discussion about their antiwomen policies.

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

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Chair, when we talk about wanting to be concerned about the safety of women, I would say that when we are looking at statistics, if you look at actually far more accurate studies and complete data on pregnancy outcomes, including abortion and childcare, study after study show that a woman is almost four times more likely to die from abortion than from childbirth.

What we are trying to do is actually support women who are pregnant and found themselves in a difficult situation. All we are simply doing in this is going back to the law. We are enforcing the law of not having taxpayer-funded abortions. This has nothing to do with limiting healthcare. This has everything to do with following the law.

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

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). The gentlewoman from New Jersey has 2 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Chair, amendments like this cheapen the National Defense Authorization Act. They make America look weak. They demean this body. This isn’t the only one.

Once again, this majority has chosen not to treat matters of national security with the seriousness they deserve to be treated, and they are choosing to use the National Defense Authorization Act to shove their extremist culture war agenda down the throats of the American people.

Homophobia? Check. Racism? Check. Misogyny? Check. Serious policy amendments that will strengthen our national security? Far less important to this majority.

These ludicrous amendments are why, later today, I will be offering a motion to recommit, not to start the process all over but to give our servicemembers and our Nation the serious, policy-focused National Defense Authorization Act that we passed out of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and support a clean, policy-centered National Defense Authorization Act.

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

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Chair, this is about taxpayer-funded abortions, something that has been prevented for five decades. In fact, the Hyde amendment was upheld by the Supreme Court even under *Roe v. Wade*.

This is not a change in policy. This is continuing policies that have been sup-

ported by both Democrats and Republicans.

I ask my kind colleagues to tell me, please, how supporting and paying out of DOD funds for a woman to travel across the country to get an abortion has anything to do with protecting our national security.

With already stretched DOD resources, to underwrite abortions through funding for flights and hotels, it is simply pandering to the abortion lobby and does nothing to increase our national security.

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

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Chair, I have the right to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I would argue that this was an amendment that last year passed. It was taken out by the Senate.

It is necessary. All we are asking the Department to do is actually follow the law, which, under executive order currently, Biden is trying to have them surpass.

For years, this has been an adoptive practice by both Democrats and Republicans. What we are seeing is extreme measures taken by Democrats to show us exactly where their abortion stance is.

I was on the floor of this House last session when we voted for a bill that would allow taxpayer-funded dollars to be used for abortions up until the moment of birth. If that is not extreme, I don’t know what is.

Republicans are supporting women who find themselves in these positions. This is a defense bill. It should not be used to kill innocent lives and put women’s lives at unnecessary risk, especially those who are supporting and fighting for this country and our values.

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

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

Mr. Chair, in the advent of the overturning of *Roe*, we have seen a race to the bottom in reproductive healthcare in too many States in the Nation and attempts again and again to implement a nationwide abortion ban by Republicans.

This is really dangerous to our servicewomen, who are given orders to go to certain places. They can’t say that they prefer not to serve in Texas, for example, which is now the 49th worst State in the Nation when it comes to women’s reproductive healthcare, a very fast drop because of the horrible, draconian anti-choice laws that have been implemented.

Our servicewomen are ordered to States like this and don’t have access to basic reproductive healthcare. We see again and again how this culture war agenda has threatened women across the country and certainly servicewomen.

We have over 140,000 servicemembers in Texas right now, and that doesn’t

even include their families. That is why these are dangerous pieces of legislation. That is why we have worked so incredibly hard to find fixes to make sure our servicewomen are protected.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentlewoman’s amendment, which would overturn the illegal DOD abortion travel policy.

Current federal law prevents DOD from paying for elective abortion while permitting it in the case of rape, incest and to save the life of the mother.

But the Biden DOD abortion travel policy forces taxpayers to pay the transportation costs for military members and dependents to travel to procure an abortion, for any reason, right up until the moment of birth.

There is nothing humane or benign about abortion. Abortion is not healthcare, unless one construes the precious life of an unborn child analogous to a tumor to be excised or a disease to be vanquished.

Regrettably, the pro-abortion culture of denial—a modern-day flat earth society—continues to deny, devalue, and disrespect unborn baby girls and boys and trivialize the harm suffered by women.

We must recognize the breathtaking miracle of the newly created life of an unborn child and that women deserve better than abortion.

We need to care for and love them both.

Future generations will someday look back on us and wonder how and why a society that bragged about its commitment to human rights could have legally sanctioned and aggressively promoted child beheadings, dismemberment, and abortion pills that literally starve the child to death.

Don’t force taxpayers to facilitate abortion on demand.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE).

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

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 1287, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 4, 9, 10, 18, 38, 39, 57, 58, 61, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, and 176 printed in part B of House Report 118–551, offered by Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. BOEBERT OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 8. PROHIBITION ON ENTERING INTO CONTRACTS WITH A PERSON ENGAGED IN A BOYCOTT OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL.

The Secretary of Defense may not enter into a contract with a person if such person is engaged in an activity that is politically motivated and is intended to penalize or otherwise limit significant commercial relations specifically with Israel or persons doing business in Israel or in Israeli-controlled territories.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. CURTIS OF UTAH

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

SEC. 6. PROHIBITION ON SALE OF GOODS FROM COMPANIES ENGAGED IN AN ANTI-ISRAEL BOYCOTT.

Subchapter III of chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§2497. Prohibition on sale of goods from companies engaged in an anti-Israel boycott

“(a) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary of Defense may not knowingly permit the sale, at a commissary store or military exchange, of any good, ware, article, or merchandise from any entity that has engaged in or engages in a boycott of the State of Israel.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘boycott action’ means, with respect to a target entity, the refusal to deal with such entity, the termination of business activities with such entity, or the limitation of commercial relations with such entity.

“(2) The term ‘boycott of the State of Israel’ means a boycott action the target of which is—

“(A) the State of Israel; and

“(B)(i) any company or individual doing business in or with the State of Israel; or

“(ii) any company authorized by, licensed by, or organized under the laws of the State of Israel to do business.

“(3) The term ‘company’—

“(A) means a corporation, partnership, limited liability company, or similar entity; and

“(B) includes any wholly-owned subsidiary, majority-owned subsidiary, parent company, or affiliate of an entity described in subparagraph (A).”.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS OF ARIZONA

Add at the end of subtitle B of title XII the following:

SEC. 1214. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ISRAEL.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) since 1948, Israel has been one of the strongest friends and allies of the United States;

(2) Israel is a stable, democratic country in a region often marred by turmoil;

(3) it is essential to the strategic interest of the United States to continue to offer security assistance and related support to Israel; and

(4) such assistance and support is especially vital as Israel confronts a number of potential challenges at the present time, including continuing threats from Iran.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES OF TENNESSEE

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

SEC. 17. PROHIBITION ON DIVERTING FUNDING FROM THE INDO-PACIFIC REGION.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to carry out any provision of law in a manner that would divert away funds previously appropriated as

of the date of the enactment of this Act for assistance for the Indo-Pacific region through September 30, 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12. REPORT AND STRATEGY FOR UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT IN UKRAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, shall develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a strategy for United States involvement in Ukraine.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall—

(1) define the United States national interests at stake with respect to the conflict between the Russian Federation and Ukraine;

(2) identify specific objectives the President believes must be achieved in Ukraine in order to protect the United States national interests defined in paragraph (1), and for each objective—

(A) an estimate of the amount of time required to achieve the objective, with an explanation;

(B) benchmarks to be used by the President to determine whether an objective has been met, is in the progress of being met, or cannot be met in the time estimated to be required in subparagraph (A); and

(C) estimates of the amount of resources, including United States personnel, materiel, and funding, required to achieve the objective; and

(3) list the expected contribution for security assistance made by European member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization within the next fiscal year.

(c) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) BRIEFING.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the submission of the report required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees, and other Members of Congress that wish to participate, a briefing on the United States strategy with respect to Ukraine and plans for the implementation of such strategy.

(e) LIMITATION ON FUNDS.—None of the amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024, or the Ukraine Security Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2024 (division B of Public Law 118–50) may be made available for Ukraine until the report required by subsection (a) is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees and the briefing required by subsection (d) is held.

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

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR OF ARIZONA

At the end of subtitle A of title XVII, add the following new section:

SEC. 17. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR UKRAINE.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for construction of covered military unaccompanied housing (as defined in section

2856 of title 10, United States Code) for fiscal year 2025 or any fiscal year thereafter are authorized to be transferred or otherwise made available to Ukraine or to provide any form of assistance to Ukraine.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. ROSENDALE OF MONTANA

At the end of subtitle E of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY OF ARMED FORCES TO DETAIN CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 1021(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “, other than a citizen of the United States,” after “any person”.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. MCCORMICK OF GEORGIA

Strike section 565 and insert the following:

SEC. 565. TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM: DEPARTMENT OF LABOR EMPLOYMENT NAVIGATOR AND PARTNERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall carry out a pilot program to be known as the “Employment Navigator and Partnership Pilot Program”. The pilot program shall supplement the program under section 1144 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) **ACTIVITIES.**—In carrying out the pilot program under this section, the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall—

(1) seek to enter into contracts with public, private, and nonprofit entities under which such entities provide individualized employment counseling for members of the Armed Forces and their spouses;

(2) prioritize entering into contracts with qualified private entities that have experience providing instruction to members of the Armed Forces eligible for assistance under the pilot program carried out under this section on—

(A) private sector culture, resume writing, career networking, and training on job search technologies;

(B) academic readiness and educational opportunities; or

(C) other relevant topics, as determined by the Secretary;

(3) prioritize entering into a contract with a qualified private entity that is an existing Employment Navigator and Partnership Pilot Program partner with experience integrating members of the Armed Forces into local communities across the entire nation, to:

(A) Lead the program in clause (2) and, following person-to-person interactions and discussions with the individuals seeking assistance, provide referrals to the organizations under contract with the Secretary based on the Armed Forces member or veterans preferences, geographic location, and other factors;

(B) Provide comprehensive wrap-around services to the those individuals receiving assistance under this title, to include services with other matters related to transition, and remain in contact with the individuals through person-to-person engagements throughout the process;

(iii) Provide close coordination with contracted organizations and follow-up commu-

nications with those enrolled in the Employment Navigator and Partnership Pilot Program to ensure a smooth transition;

(iv) Ensure the Secretary is provided with appropriate data on referrals, outcomes, and issues that arise to enable proper oversight of the program;

(4) give a preference to any private entity that—

(A) has a national or international geographical area of service;

(B) provides multiple forms of career assistance and placement services to—

(i) active duty members of the Armed Forces;

(ii) spouses of active duty members of the Armed Forces;

(iii) veterans; and

(iv) spouses of veterans;

(C) provides services to at least 1,000 individuals who are—

(i) active duty members of the Armed Forces;

(ii) spouses of active duty members of the Armed Forces;

(iii) veterans; or

(iv) spouses of veterans;

(D) has continuously, for at least the three-year period immediately preceding the date of the contract, provided services to individuals who are—

(i) active duty members of the Armed Forces;

(ii) spouses of active duty members of the Armed Forces;

(iii) veterans; and

(iv) spouses of veterans; and

(E) has a demonstrated record of success in providing assistance with employment services, as indicated by—

(i) the average wages or earnings of people who receive employment services provided by the entity;

(ii) prior completion of Federal grants or contracts;

(iii) having at least 75 percent of its participants find full-time employment within six months of initially receiving employment services provided by the entity; and

(iv) other employment performance indicators, as determined by the Secretary; and

(5) seek to enter into contracts with not fewer than 10, but not more than 60, private entities under which each such entity is compensated at a rate agreed upon between the Secretary and the entity for each individual who receives employment services provided by the entity and is in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after exit from the program; and

(6) conduct such other activities as may be necessary for the delivery of individualized employment counseling and other employment services under this section.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than October 1 of each year during the term of the pilot program, the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Veterans Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the pilot program under this section, including the employment outcomes for members of the Armed Forces and their spouses who receive employment services under the program on the following indicators of performance—

(1) the percentage of program participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after exit from the program;

(2) the percentage of program participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the fourth quarter after exit from the program; and

(3) the median earnings of program participants who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after exit from the program.

(d) **TERMINATION.**—The pilot program shall terminate five years after the date on which the Secretary of Labor begins to carry out the pilot program.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. DONALDS OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle A of title XVII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 17. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REQUIREMENT TO USE “TAIWAN”.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Department of Defense may not use “Chinese Taipei” and shall use “Taiwan”, except—

(1) in historical context explaining the People’s Republic of China’s attempt to control Taiwan through persuasion and coercion; or

(2) in the formal title of a Federal document.

(b) **REQUIREMENT TO UPDATE WEBSITE.**—Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure the website of the Department of Defense meets the requirements of this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 118 OFFERED BY MR. LUTTRELL OF TEXAS

At the appropriate place in title XV, insert the following:

SEC. 15. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE USE OF LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Chief Data and Artificial Intelligence Officer of the Department of Defense, shall coordinate and accelerate the adoption of large language models by the Department of Defense by improving the access and quality of the existing structured and unstructured data of the Department to ensure such data is immediately ready to use in conjunction with machine learning applications being developed, tested, or in production by the Armed Forces.

(b) **DUTIES OF CHIEF DATA AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE OFFICER.**—The Chief Data and Artificial Intelligence Officer shall—

(1) develop a list of large language model use cases for defense and intelligence applications, including cases that have the potential to support personnel and manpower, operations, intelligence, logistics, strategic planning, command and control, joint force development, and force structure, transform business processes, and improve non-mission capable rates;

(2) develop and make available to the Secretary tooling to ingest and transform natural language, and other types of unstructured data, into formats compatible with commercially available large language models; and

(3) provide access to capabilities, such as data preparation, for elements within the Department of Defense that are necessary for use with large language models.

(c) **CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES AND LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chief Data and Artificial Intelligence Officer may enter into contracts with private-sector entities, as appropriate, to carry out the requirements of subsection (b)(2).

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The Chief Data and Artificial Intelligence Officer may coordinate with other elements of the Department of Defense with contracting authority as required to carry out the duties described in subsection (b).

(d) SEMIANNUAL BRIEFINGS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than semi-annually thereafter, the Chief Data and Artificial Intelligence Officer shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the implementation of this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 119 OFFERED BY MR. DONALDS
OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title XVII, add the following:

SEC. 17. DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Secretary of Energy, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, the Chief of Engineers of the Army Corps of Engineers, the Assistant Secretary of the Office of Nuclear Energy of the Department of Energy, the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Reactor Fleet and Advanced Reactor Deployment of the Department of Energy, develop a national strategy to utilize microreactors to assist with natural disaster response efforts.

(b) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive national strategy developed under subsection (a).

(c) CONTENTS OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.—A national strategy developed under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) EVALUATION OF EXISTING DIESEL DEPLOYMENT EFFORTS.—An assessment of the effectiveness of utilizing diesel generators to assist with natural disaster response efforts, which such assessment shall include—

(A) information on the current use of diesel generators to assist with natural disaster response efforts, including—

(i) the prevalence of deploying diesel generators around the United States as the sole power source to assist with natural disaster response efforts;

(ii) the average number of diesel generators deployed in natural disaster response efforts based on the type of natural disaster, the severity of the natural disaster, and the location of the natural disaster;

(iii) where Federal, State, and local governments store diesel generators;

(iv) how diesel generators are transported to areas affected by a natural disaster;

(v) any logistical concerns with refueling diesel generators over an extended period of time;

(vi) the potential to utilize accessory equipment that is traditionally connected to diesel generators to help provide electricity to the area in need; and

(vii) any other information that is necessary to understand the role of diesel generators used to assist with natural disaster response efforts;

(B) how the effect on the environment of utilizing diesel generators to assist with natural disaster response efforts compares to the estimated effect on the environment of utilizing microreactors to assist with the same natural disaster response efforts; and

(C) the concerns to public safety when deploying diesel generators in natural disaster response efforts.

(2) GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES.—A comprehensive, research-based, and long-term discussion of goals, objectives, and priorities for utilizing microreactors instead of diesel generators to assist with natural disaster response efforts.

(3) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ANALYSIS.—An analysis of—

(A) how the efforts of the Department of Defense to develop microreactor technology for operational uses could be used to inform the development of microreactors to assist with natural disaster response efforts, including any recommendations and additional direction that may be necessary for such expedited deployment;

(B) how the Department of Defense can most effectively translate and implement the lessons learned from its operations in the field to assist with natural disaster response efforts, including how operations in the field related to microreactors can be used to answer broad questions for the nuclear industry and for future issues relating to fuel reliability, energy supply chain issues, reducing diesel convoy casualties, and supporting other global humanitarian needs; and

(C) whether a demonstration program for microreactors is needed prior to deploying microreactors for natural disaster response efforts, based on the analysis provided by subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(4) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION.—Recommendations on how the Nuclear Regulatory Commission can work with other Federal agencies to expedite—

(A) the approval of designs for microreactors; and

(B) issuing licenses for the utilization, transportation, and operation of microreactors in rapid deployment scenarios, such as natural disaster response efforts.

(5) UTILIZING FEASIBILITY STUDIES.—An analysis of available academic literature and studies, including site feasibility studies, to identify high risk areas that are prone to natural disasters that should be prioritized during emergency planning.

(6) STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS WHEN DEPLOYING MICROREACTORS.—An assessment of various strategic considerations to improve the efficiency, timeliness, and cost-effectiveness of deploying microreactors to assist with natural disaster response efforts, including—

(A) whether the Department of Defense, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or any other government entity should build, own, or operate microreactors that are used to assist with natural disaster response efforts, including whether it would be viable to lease microreactors from private industry and whether it would be viable to facilitate public-private partnerships to find cost effective options to utilize microreactors for natural disaster response efforts;

(B) the recommended number of individuals charged with the usage, maintenance, and upkeep of the microreactors, including the recommended qualifications, training requirements, availability requirements, and oversight responsibility of such individuals;

(C) the number of microreactors needed, initially and in the long-term, to effectively respond to a natural disaster based on past natural disaster trends and the specific geographic location of the area;

(D) where microreactors used to assist with natural disaster response efforts would be stored, including information on—

(i) how different microreactor storage locations may affect swift and economically feasible natural disaster response efforts;

(ii) the feasibility of utilizing already-built facilities instead of constructing new microreactor storage facilities;

(iii) the cost of constructing new microreactor storage facilities;

(iv) how to properly store the microreactor when not being utilized for natural disaster response efforts; and

(v) potential storage locations, such as—

(I) the Strategic Alliance for FLEX Emergency Response locations in Memphis, Tennessee and Phoenix, Arizona; and

(II) Department of Defense bases;

(E) how to maintain a microreactor and replace, store, and dispose of fuel used by a microreactor, including whether public-private partnerships may be used to assist with such maintenance, replacement, storage, and disposal;

(F) when a diesel generator will suffice in the event of a natural disaster of limited proportions, in comparison to utilizing microreactors to assist with natural disaster response efforts;

(G) which States and territories and possessions of the United States that are prone to natural disasters, such as hurricanes, should be prioritized when initially selecting locations to deploy microreactors to assist with natural disaster response efforts;

(H) the methods, capabilities, and costs associated with transporting microreactors that were or may be impacted by natural disasters, including considerations about transporting new microreactors, in addition to microreactors that have been put to use, and any regulatory or legal issues that may arise during the transportation;

(I) any other strategic considerations that should be taken into account before deploying microreactors to assist with natural disaster response efforts;

(J) how to integrate microreactors into existing electrical grids in emergency situations, including how grid connection points, microgrid limits, site load limits, existing infrastructure, and the standard process for grid interconnections may impact the integration of microreactors into existing electrical grid;

(K) whether microreactors will be susceptible to cyberattacks, including whether autonomous control will impact the microreactor's cyberattack susceptibility and what systems or microreactor designs would be ideal for combating such cyberattacks during a natural disaster response effort; and

(L) how the weight of a microreactor, compared to the weight of a diesel generator, affects deploying microreactors and diesel generators to assist with natural disaster response efforts.

(7) DEPLOYMENT CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS.—An assessment of—

(A) the challenges and barriers to deploying microreactors to assist with natural disaster response efforts; and

(B) solutions to address each such challenge and barrier.

(8) REVIEW OF AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATION.—

(A) REVIEW.—A review of existing law that can be used to ease the burden of utilizing microreactors to assist with natural disaster response efforts, including the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801 et seq.), the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (42 U.S.C. 2215 note), and any other relevant law.

(B) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Recommendations for legislation to—

(i) assist with—

(I) deploying microreactors to assist with natural disaster response efforts;

(II) the maintenance and upkeep of such microreactors; and

(III) the initial and long-term storage of such microreactors; and

(ii) pay for the activities described in subclauses (I) through (III) of clause (i).

(9) PARTNERSHIPS TO ENHANCE NATURAL DISASTER RESPONSE EFFORTS.—An assessment about—

(A) the current status of any collaboration between the National Guard, Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Army

Corps of Engineers during natural disaster response efforts;

(B) the specific roles of each entity specified in subparagraph (A) (disaggregated, in the case of the National Guard, by State and by military department) during a natural disaster response effort, and their respective roles when participating in natural disaster response efforts;

(C) the current emergency responsibilities of the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that relate to deploying microreactors during natural disaster response efforts;

(D) the potential opportunity to set up an annual listening group session or consortium to provide all the necessary information needed to deploy microreactors to assist with natural disaster response efforts and to ensure a smooth transition from the use of diesel generators to the use of microreactors to assist with natural disaster response efforts;

(E) how the Emergency Management Assistance Compact, consented to by Congress in the joint resolution entitled “Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Emergency Management Assistance Compact” (Public Law 104-321), can be utilized to allow States to allocate their unused microreactors to other States that are in need of microreactors to assist with natural disaster response efforts; and

(F) how to improve the collaboration between Federal, State, and local government entities and private entities when deploying microreactors to assist with natural disaster response efforts.

(10) UTILIZING MICROREACTORS TO CHARGE ELECTRIC VEHICLES.—Recommendations on how to utilize microreactors as charging stations for electric vehicles in the event of a mass evacuation resulting from a natural disaster, including recommendations on—

(A) how to deploy microreactors to charge electric vehicles before an evacuation;

(B) the primary transportation corridors that would be used for such a mass evacuation;

(C) how many microreactors would be needed to charge electric vehicles during such a mass evacuation, based on the size and population of the State in which the mass evacuation occurs;

(D) the best placement of microreactors throughout the primary transportation corridors to ensure a smooth electric vehicle charging process and subsequent evacuation;

(E) any potential public-private partnerships that would be useful in utilizing microreactors to charge electric vehicles during a mass evacuation, including an estimate of the costs that would be associated with establishing these partnerships;

(F) how to—

(i) transport microreactors to mass evacuation locations along primary transportation corridors for purposes of charging electric vehicles; and

(ii) pay for such transportation; and

(G) any other topic related to subparagraphs (A) through (F).

(11) DEPLOYING MICROREACTORS TO UNITED STATES TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS.—Recommendations on deploying microreactors to territories and possessions of the United States to assist with natural disaster response efforts.

(12) USING MILITARY EQUIPMENT WITH NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES.—Recommendations on how to, in the event of a natural disaster and when the deployment of a microreactor is not timely or ideal for the circumstance, deploy military equipment of the United States with nuclear capabilities, such as nuclear aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines, to provide temporary electricity to

an area severely impacted by a natural disaster.

(13) BUDGET PRIORITIES.—A multiyear budget plan that identifies the necessary resources to successfully carry out the recommendations and implement any lessons learned from the assessments and other analysis under this subsection.

(14) TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENTS.—An analysis of current and developing ways to leverage existing and innovative technology to improve the effectiveness of efforts to deploy microreactors to assist with natural disaster response efforts.

(15) USING INNOVATIVE TOOLS TO PREDICT NATURAL DISASTERS.—A description of how to utilize innovative technology, such as artificial intelligence and predictive meteorological tools, to prepare for the utilization of microreactors before a natural disaster.

(16) FLOATING NUCLEAR BARGES.—An assessment of how floating nuclear barges compare to using portable microreactors, including—

(A) the advantages and disadvantages of using a portable microreactor compared to a floating nuclear barge; and

(B) an identification of scenarios during which a floating nuclear barge would be preferred over a portable microreactor.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Environment and Public Works, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(2) LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term “local government” has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122).

(3) MICROREACTOR.—The term “microreactor” means a nuclear reactor, including a portable nuclear reactor, that has an electricity generating capacity of not more than 20 megawatts of thermal energy.

(4) NATURAL DISASTER.—The term “natural disaster” has the meaning given the term “Major disaster” in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122), except that the term “natural disaster” does not include a wildfire.

(5) NATURAL DISASTER RESPONSE EFFORT.—The term “natural disaster response effort” means a circumstance in which a State or local government requests assistance under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), including assistance to address the loss of primary electrical capacity as a result of a natural disaster.

(6) STATE.—The term “State” means a State of the United States and the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT NO. 120 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TENNESSEE

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

SEC. 12. GENERAL THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO MEMORIAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM FOR POLISH-AMERICAN DEFENSE COOPERATION.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Commander of United States Army Special Operations Command shall seek to carry out a training program pursuant to section 322 of title 10, United States Code, between special operations

forces under the jurisdiction of the Commander and special forces of the Polish Army. Such program shall be known as the “General Thaddeus Kosciuszko Memorial Exchange Program for Polish-American Defense Cooperation”.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—Officers and enlisted members of such special operations forces may participate in the program under this section.

(c) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commander shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report regarding progress of the Commander in carrying out the program under this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 121 OFFERED BY MR. BILIRAKIS OF FLORIDA

Add at the end of subtitle D of title XII the following:

SEC. 1236. REPORT ON MULTILATERAL EXERCISES IN THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on multilateral exercises in the eastern Mediterranean.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall contain the following elements:

(A) An assessment of the effectiveness of multilateral military exercises hosted by United States allies and partners in the eastern Mediterranean in bolstering maritime energy security and counterterrorism in the region.

(B) Individual assessments of the potential benefits of including the following countries in future exercises and their readiness to participate based on interoperability:

(i) Bahrain.

(ii) Egypt.

(iii) Jordan.

(iv) United Arab Emirates

(v) Saudi Arabia

(b) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be transmitted in an unclassified form and may contain a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 122 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12. STUDY AND REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY MEASURES ON THE BORDER BETWEEN GAZA AND EGYPT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall conduct a study on steps that Israel, Egypt, and the United States can take to enhance international security measures on the border between Gaza and Egypt to ensure Hamas and other actors do not use tunnels or methods via the Mediterranean Sea to smuggle weapons and illicit goods.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the results of the study.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by this subsection shall include a description and map indicating existing tunnels on the border between Gaza and Egypt.

(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 123 OFFERED BY MR. SELF OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle C of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NAMING OF NAVAL VESSEL AFTER LIEUTENANT GENERAL RICHARD E. CAREY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Navy should name the Spearhead-class expeditionary fast transport vessel of the United States Navy that has been ordered (Hull Number T-EPF-16) in honor of Lieutenant General Richard E. Carey for the acts of valor described in subsection (b).

(b) ACTS OF VALOR.—The acts of valor described in this subsection are as follows:

(1) Lieutenant General Richard E. Carey participated in the Inchon Landing, captured communist forces, and led his rifle platoon to Seoul. Three months later, on East Hill at the Chosin Reservoir, Carey hurled grenades at Chinese forces. Carey and his fellow Marines were outnumbered eight to one. They held their ground and broke through the Chinese trap to the sea.

(2) Carey remained in the fight until March 1951. While commanding a platoon of machine gunners, Carey was badly wounded. He continued leading his troops and initially refused to get aid for his injuries. Carey's wounds required hospitalization. During 189 days in Korea, Carey had seven near-death experiences. As a result of his actions in Korea, Carey received the Silver Star, Bronze Star, and Purple Heart.

(3) Returning to the United States, Carey earned a flight training slot and became a fighter pilot. In the early 1960s Carey scouted Marine airfield sites in Vietnam. He returned to Vietnam in the summer of 1967 and served during the Tet offensive. Carey flew 204 combat sorties earning the Distinguished Flying Cross and 16 Air Medals.

AMENDMENT NO. 124 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TENNESSEE

Add at the end of subtitle D of title XV the following:

SEC. 1538. REPORT ON STATE NATIONAL GUARD CYBER UNITS.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the feasibility of establishing a cyber unit in every National Guard of a State to ensure the ability of a State to quickly respond to cyber-attacks in such State.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 OFFERED BY MR. FROST OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 17. INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ANNUAL REPORT ON OVERSIGHT OF FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall submit to Congress and the Comptroller General of the United States, and make publicly available, a report containing, for each fiscal year—

(1) a description of the budget of the Department of Defense, the total amount and dollar value of oversight investigations into fraud, waste, and abuse conducted by the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the total amount and dollar value of oversight investigations into fraud, waste, and abuse conducted by the Inspectors General of each military department;

(2) statistical tables showing—

(A) the total number and dollar value of oversight investigations completed and pending, set forth separately by type of oversight investigation;

(B) the priority given to each type of oversight investigation;

(C) the length of time taken for each type of oversight investigation, from the date of receipt of a qualified incurred cost submission (as such term is defined in section 3842 of title 10, United States Code) and from the date on which the oversight investigation begins;

(D) the aggregate cost of performing oversight investigations, set forth separately by type of oversight investigation; and

(E) the total number and dollar value of oversight investigations that are pending for a period longer than one year at the end of the fiscal year covered by the report, and the fiscal year in which the qualified incurred cost submission was received, set forth separately by type of oversight investigation;

(3) a summary of any recommendations of actions or resources needed to improve the oversight investigation process; and

(4) any other matters the Inspector General considers appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 126 OFFERED BY MS. TENNEY OF NEW YORK

Page 244, insert after line 21 the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 5. CORRECTION OF CERTAIN CITATIONS IN TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO SEXUAL OFFENSES.

Part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 2241(c)—

(A) in the second sentence, by inserting “or an offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice” after “State offense”; and

(B) by striking “either such provision” and inserting “any such provision”;

(2) in section 2251(e), by striking “section 920 of title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under” each place it appears and inserting “the Uniform Code of Military Justice or”;

(3) in section 2252(b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “section 920 of title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under” and inserting “the Uniform Code of Military Justice or”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 920 of title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under” and inserting “the Uniform Code of Military Justice or”;

(4) in section 2252A(b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “section 920 of title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under” and inserting “the Uniform Code of Military Justice or”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 920 of title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under” and inserting “the Uniform Code of Military Justice or”;

(5) in section 2426(b)(1)(B), by inserting “or the Uniform Code of Military Justice” after “State law”; and

(6) in section 3559(e)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “State sex offense” and inserting “State or Military sex offense”; and

(ii) by inserting “or the Uniform Code of Military Justice” after “State law”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “or Military” after “State”.

AMENDMENT NO. 127 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TENNESSEE

Add at the end of subtitle E of title XXVIII the following new section:

SEC. 28. REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN ACCESS TO CATEGORY 3 SUBTERRANEAN TRAINING FACILITY.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN ACCESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Department of Defense maintains access to a covered category 3 subterranean training facility on a continuing basis.

(b) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO LEASE.—The Secretary of Defense may enter into a short-

term lease with a provider of a covered category 3 subterranean training facility for purposes of compliance with subsection (a).

(c) COVERED CATEGORY 3 SUBTERRANEAN TRAINING FACILITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered category 3 subterranean training facility” means a category 3 subterranean training facility (as defined in section 2869 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (Public Law 117-263)) that is—

(1) operational on or before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) deemed safe for use on such date.

AMENDMENT NO. 128 OFFERED BY MR. ROY OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 12. PROHIBITION ON PROVIDING FUNDING TO IRANIAN ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available, directly or indirectly, to—

(1) the Government of Iran;

(2) any person owned or controlled by the Government of Iran;

(3) any person that is on the List of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury and the property and interests in property of which are blocked pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act; or

(4) any person owned or controlled by a person described in paragraph (3).

(b) EXCEPTION FOR INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to activities subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 129 OFFERED BY MR. ROY OF TEXAS

Add at the end of title IV, the following:

Subtitle D—Reports

SEC. 431. ANNUAL DEFENSE MANPOWER PROFILE REPORT: EXPANSION OF JUSTIFICATIONS FOR END STRENGTHS.

Section 115a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Congress” and inserting “to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and furnish to any Member of Congress upon request.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” before “The Secretary”; and

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

“(2) The justification and explanation required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) An assessment of the most important threats facing the United States, disaggregated by geographic combatant command.

“(B) An explanation of how personnel end strength level requests address threats described in subparagraph (A).

“(C) The rationale for recommended increases or decreases in active, reserve, and civilian personnel for each component of the Department of Defense.

“(D) The rationale for recommended increases or decreases in active, reserve, and civilian personnel for each of the geographic combatant commands.

“(E) The primary functions or missions of active, reserve, and civilian personnel in each geographic combatant command.

“(F) An assessment of any areas in which decreases in active, reserve, or civilian personnel would not result in a decrease in readiness.

“(G) The actual end strength number for each armed force for the prior fiscal year, compared to authorized end strength levels.

“(H) The shortfall in recruiting by each armed force as a percentage, as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(I) The number of applicants who were found to be ineligible for service in the Department of Defense during the prior fiscal year as a result of current enlistment standards, disaggregated by armed force and reason for disqualification.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 130 OFFERED BY MS. BUDZINSKI OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8. REGULATIONS APPLICABLE TO COMBAT FOOTWEAR OF MEMBERS OF ALL BRANCHES OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Defense shall issue regulations prohibiting any member of the Armed Forces from wearing optional combat boots as part of a required uniform unless the optional combat boots are entirely manufactured in the United States and entirely made of—

(1) materials grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States; and

(2) components that are manufactured entirely in the United States and entirely made of materials described in paragraph (1).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “optional combat boots”, with respect to a member of the Armed Forces, combat boots not furnished to such member of the Armed Forces by the Secretary of Defense.

(2) The term “required uniform” means a uniform a member of the Armed Forces is required to wear as a member of the Armed Forces.

AMENDMENT NO. 131 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 28. SCREENING AND REGISTRY OF INDIVIDUALS WITH HEALTH CONDITIONS RESULTING FROM UNSAFE HOUSING UNITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter V of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2895. Screening and registry of individuals with health conditions resulting from unsafe housing units

“(a) SCREENING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with appropriate scientific agencies as determined by the Secretary, shall ensure that all military medical treatment facilities screen eligible individuals for covered conditions.

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROCEDURES.—The Secretary may establish procedures through which screening under paragraph (1) may allow an eligible individual to be included in the registry under subsection (b).

“(b) REGISTRY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and maintain a registry of eligible individuals who have a covered condition.

“(2) INCLUSION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall include any information in the registry under paragraph (1) that the Secretary determines necessary to ascertain and monitor the health of eligible individuals and the connection between the health of such individuals and an unsafe housing unit.

“(3) PUBLIC INFORMATION CAMPAIGN.—The Secretary shall develop a public information campaign to inform eligible individuals about the registry under paragraph (1), including how to register and the benefits of registering.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘covered condition’ means a medical condition that is determined by the Secretary of Defense to have resulted from residing in an unsafe housing unit.

“(2) The term ‘eligible individual’ means a member of the armed forces or a family member of a member of the armed forces who has resided in an unsafe housing unit.

“(3) The term ‘unsafe housing unit’ means a dwelling unit that—

“(A) does not meet the housing quality standards established under section 8(o)(8)(B) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(8)(B)); or

“(B) is not free from dangerous air pollution levels from mold.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2894a the following new item:

“2895. Screening and registry of individuals with health conditions resulting from unsafe housing units.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 132 OFFERED BY MS. SALAZAR OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle D of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3. STUDY ON USE AND PRESENCE OF TOXIC CHEMICALS IN PANAMA CANAL ZONE.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—Not later than December 31, 2025, the Armed Forces Pest Management Board shall conduct a study on the use and presence of herbicide agents and toxic chemicals by the Department in the Panama Canal Zone during the period beginning on January 1, 1958, and ending on December 31, 1999.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment to determine the degree to which herbicide agents, including those known as “rainbow herbicides”, and other toxic chemicals were used, tested, stored, or otherwise dispensed within the Panama Canal Zone while members of the United States Armed Forces were stationed there.

(2) An assessment of how many members of the United States Armed Forces may have been affected by the usage of herbicide agents and other toxic chemicals.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “herbicide agent” means a chemical in an herbicide.

(2) The term “rainbow herbicide” means herbicides known as Agent Pink, Agent Purple, Agent Blue, Agent Green, Agent White, and Agent Orange.

(3) The term “toxic chemicals” means persistent organic pollutants, as defined by the Environmental Protection Agency.

AMENDMENT NO. 133 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle C of title XVII, add the following:

SEC. 17. STATEMENT OF POLICY RELATING TO REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF CHINA'S MARITIME SAFETY ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of the United States to reject as a violation of international law and United States sovereignty any attempt by China's Maritime Safety Administration to compel United States vessels to adhere to any reporting requirements listed within China's Maritime Traffic Safety Law, including any requirements to require a vessel to declare—

(1) the vessel's name and number;

(2) the vessel's satellite telephone number;

(3) the vessel's position and recent locations; and

(4) the vessel's cargo.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a) applies to all maritime claims made by the People's Republic of China that the United States has rejected, to include virtually all of China's claims within the Nine-Dash Line.

AMENDMENT NO. 135 OFFERED BY MR. BOWMAN OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle D of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5. IMPROVING OVERSIGHT OF MILITARY RECRUITMENT PRACTICES IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees an annual report on military recruitment practices in public secondary schools during calendar year 2024 and each subsequent calendar year. Each such report shall include, for the year covered by the report—

(1) the zip codes of public secondary schools visited by military recruiters;

(2) the number of recruits from public secondary schools by zip code and local education agency; and

(3) a demographic analysis, including race, ethnicity, and gender, of recruits from public secondary schools by zip code.

AMENDMENT NO. 136 OFFERED BY MR. PAPPAS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

At the end of subtitle F of title VIII, insert the following:

SEC. 8. COLLABORATE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator for the Office of Entrepreneurial Development of the Small Business Administration and the Director of Small Business Programs of the Department of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the memorandum of understanding (referred to in this section as the “MOU”) between the Small Business Administration and the Department of Defense entered into on December 2, 2022. Such report shall include the following:

(1) The status of activities specified in clause (1) of part III of the MOU.

(2) A summary of the lessons learned specified in clause (1)(b) of part III of the MOU.

(3) An analysis of the activities and efficacy of those activities specified in clause (3) of part III of the MOU, including any nexus related to small business certifications and use of contracting authorities at the Department of Defense.

(4) A description of the training and events specified in clause (5) of part III of the MOU.

(5) A summary of how the MOU prevents small business concerns from receiving duplicative assistance or contradictory or confusing information from covered centers.

(6) A discussion of the sufficiency of the MOU to achieve the goals to promote entrepreneurship and small business development nationally and locally and maximize participation in government contracting.

(7) Any recommended changes to existing laws or regulations that would enhance the Parties' ability to reach the MOU's goals.

(8) Any additional information the Parties deem necessary.

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

(1) the Committees on Armed Services and Small Business of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committees on Armed Services and Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 137 OFFERED BY MR. GUEST OF MISSISSIPPI

In subtitle C of title XXVIII, add at the end the following:

SEC. 28 . PROHIBITION ON USE BY AIR FORCE OF CORPORATE STRUCTURE IN CONDUCTING CERTAIN BASING DECISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force may not make any basing decision during the resource allocation plan or program objective memorandum process of the Department of the Air Force (commonly known as a “programmatic basing decision”) through the use of the DAF Corporate Structure set forth under chapters 3.2 and 7.1 of the Department of the Air Force Instruction 10-503, dated June 12, 2023, relating to strategic basing.

(b) UPDATE OF INSTRUCTION AND OTHER POLICY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall update any instruction or other policy of the Department of the Air Force to include the prohibition under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 138 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES OF TENNESSEE

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

SEC. 13 . INVITATION TO TAIWAN TO THE RIM OF THE PACIFIC EXERCISE.

The Secretary of Defense is directed to invite the naval forces of Taiwan to any Rim of the Pacific Exercise that is to take place following the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 139 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES OF TENNESSEE

At the end of subtitle A of title XIII, insert the following:

SEC. 13 . MODIFICATION OF PROHIBITION ON PARTICIPATION OF PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA IN RIM OF THE PACIFIC EXERCISES.

Section 1259(a)(1) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (10 U.S.C. 321 note) is amended—

- (1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and”;
- (2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;
- (3) by adding at the end the following: “(E) held an internationally recognized free and fair presidential election.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 140 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF NEVADA

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

SEC. 7 . REPORT ON EMERGENCY AND TRAUMA CARE FOR CIVILIANS AT MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITIES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Director of the Defense Health Agency, in collaboration with military treatment facilities engaged in emergency and trauma care to civilian patients, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes the following:

(1) A summary of any challenges that military treatment facilities have encountered in providing emergency and trauma care to civilian patients, including challenges related to the transportation of such patients to and from such facilities, and steps the Director has taken to overcome such challenges.

(2) An assessment of the effectiveness of the coordination of military treatment facilities with local emergency medical services and any barrier faced by such facilities and services related to providing timely emergency medical care to civilians, including any barrier caused by installation access.

(3) A summary of efforts the Director has taken to address the issues identified in the

report of the Comptroller General of the United States titled “Defense Health Care: Actions Needed to Improve Billing and Collection of Debt for Civilian Emergency Care”, published on July 7, 2022 (GAO-22-104770), including such issues related to inconsistent use of financial relief for civilian emergency patients and the lack of guidance to ensure accurate accounting of billing and collections efforts.

(4) Any recommendations to improve civilian emergency care at Department of Defense medical treatment facilities, including any recommendations for additional legislation.

AMENDMENT NO. 141 OFFERED BY MR. HIMES OF CONNECTICUT

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

SEC. 16 . REPORT ON CAPABILITIES IN CISLUNAR SPACE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that there is a need for comprehensive cislunar space domain awareness capabilities to ensure the safety of flight of civil and commercial missions in cislunar space.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief of Space Operations shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes a description of—

- (1) requirements for cislunar space domain awareness capabilities;
- (2) the plan of Department of Defense for researching and developing technologies for cislunar space domain awareness; and
- (3) the progress of the Department in coordinating with the Cislunar Technology Strategy Interagency Working Group to achieve the objectives set forth in the publication of the Working Group titled “National Cislunar Science and Technology Strategy” and dated November 2022.

AMENDMENT NO. 142 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS OF ARIZONA

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

SEC. 10 . DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SPENDING REDUCTIONS IN ABSENCE OF SUBMITTED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OR FAILURE TO ACHIEVE UNQUALIFIED OR QUALIFIED INDEPENDENT AUDIT OPINION.

(a) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), this section applies to the Department of Defense, including military departments and Defense Agencies thereof.

(2) SEPARATE APPLICABILITY.—If a military department or Defense Agency is identified by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget as required to have its own audited financial statement under section 3515 of title 31, United States Code, that military department and Defense Agency shall be treated separately from the Department of Defense for purposes of application of this section.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The terms “financial statement” and “external independent auditor” have the meanings given those terms in section 3521(e) of title 31, United States Code.

(3) The term “unqualified”, with respect to the audit status of a financial statement, includes the characterizations clean and unmodified.

(2) The term “qualified”, with respect to the audit status of a financial statement, includes the characterization modified.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS FOR FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On March 2 of each fiscal year, the discretionary budget authority available for the Department of Defense (or a military department or Defense Agency covered by subsection (a)(2)) for such fiscal year

shall be adjusted as provided in paragraph (2).

(2) ADJUSTMENT.—If the Department of Defense (or a military department or Defense Agency covered by subsection (a)(2)) has not submitted a financial statement for the previous fiscal year, or if such financial statement has not received either an unqualified or a qualified audit opinion by an independent external auditor, the discretionary budget authority available for the Department of Defense, the military department, or the Defense Agency (as the case may be) shall be reduced by .5 percent, with the reduction applied proportionately to each account (other than an account listed in subsection (d) or an account for which a waiver is made under subsection (e)).

(3) MINIMIZES NATIONAL SECURITY EFFECTS.—Consistent with applicable laws, the Secretary of Defense may make any reduction under paragraph (2) in a manner that minimizes any effect on national security.

(4) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—An amount equal to the total amount of any reduction under paragraph (2) shall be retained in the general fund of the Treasury for the purposes of deficit reduction.

(d) ACCOUNTS EXCLUDED.—The following accounts are excluded from any reductions referred to in subsection (c)(2):

(1) Military personnel, reserve personnel, and National Guard personnel accounts of the Department of Defense.

(2) The Defense Health Program account of the Department of Defense.

(e) WAIVER.—The President may waive subsection (c)(2) with respect to an account if the President certifies that applying the subsection to that account would harm national security or members of the Armed Forces who are deployed in combat zones.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after an adjustment under subsection (c), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress a report describing the amount and account of each adjustment.

AMENDMENT NO. 143 OFFERED BY MR. WENSTRUP OF OHIO

At the appropriate place in subtitle C of title VII, insert the following:

SEC. 7 . STUDY ON BLOOD WORK OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES REGARDING COVID-19.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—Not later than September 30, 2025, the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study to test the blood of members of the Armed Forces relating to relating to COVID-19.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study under this section shall include the following elements:

(1) Testing to detect nucleocapsid protein immunoglobulin-G antibodies relating to COVID-19.

(2) Testing to detect T-cell immune response to COVID-19.

(3) An assessment of the efficacy of each vaccine for COVID-19 in comparison to—

- (A) each other such vaccine; and
- (B) infection-acquired immunity.

(4) An accounting of adverse events (including hyperimmune response), disaggregated by—

- (A) each vaccine described in paragraph (3); and
- (B) history of infection.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after completing the study, the Secretary shall submit a report on such study to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 144 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS OF ARIZONA

Add at the end of subtitle B of title XII the following:

SEC. 1214. REPORT ON AGREEMENTS MADE BY THE UNITED STATES WITH THE TALIBAN.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGREEMENTS MADE WITH THE TALIBAN.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the following:

(1) Any agreement made and entered into by the United States and the Taliban. Submission thereof shall occur not later than 30 days prior to entry absent notification to the appropriate congressional committees, in which case submission thereof shall occur not later than 10 days prior to taking effect.

(2) Any agreement made and entered into by third parties and the Taliban or notice of any such agreement. Submission of any such agreement or notice thereof shall occur not later than 30 days after custody by the United States.

(b) REPORT ON PRIOR AGREEMENTS WITH THE TALIBAN.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees any agreements made and entered into by the United States or third parties and the Taliban from August 1, 2021, until such date of enactment.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGREEMENT.—The term “agreement” includes memoranda of understanding and other manifestations of mutual assent.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(3) THIRD PARTIES.—The term “third parties” means organizations or entities in receipt of United States Government funding, including sub-recipients thereof.

AMENDMENT NO. 145 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES OF TENNESSEE

Page 599, line 15, insert “classified or” before “unclassified”.

AMENDMENT NO. 146 OFFERED BY MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

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

SEC. 1. REQUIREMENT FOR MINIMUM NUMBER OF AIR LOGISTICS COMPLEXES.

Section 9062 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 154(a)(3) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(m) The Secretary of the Air Force shall continuously operate not fewer than three air logistics complexes. For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘air logistics complex’ means an air logistics complex operated by the Air Force as of January 1, 2024.”

AMENDMENT NO. 147 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

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

SEC. 2. DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR PERSONS PERFORMING RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—Section 4001 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—Whenever issuing a statement, press release, request for proposals, bid solicitation, or other document describing a project or program

that is funded in whole or in part with Federal funding, a person performing a research or development project under paragraph (1) or (5) of subsection (b) shall clearly state the following:

“(1) The percentage of the total costs of the program or project financed with Federal funding.

“(2) The dollar amount of Federal funds obligated for the project or program.

“(3) The percentage and dollar amount of the total costs of the project or program that will be financed from nongovernmental sources.”

(b) COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS UNDER STEVENSON-WYDLER TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION ACT OF 1980.—Section 4026 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary of Defense” and inserting the following:

“(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense”;

(2) in subsection (a), as designated by paragraph (1), in the second sentence, by striking “Technology may” and inserting the following:

“(b) TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.—Technology may”;

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

“(c) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—Whenever issuing a statement, press release, request for proposals, bid solicitation, or other document describing a project or program that is funded in whole or in part with Federal funding, a person performing a research or development project pursuant to a cooperative research and development agreement entered into under subsection (a) shall clearly state the following:

“(1) The percentage of the total costs of the program or project financed with Federal funding.

“(2) The dollar amount of Federal funds obligated for the project or program.

“(3) The percentage and dollar amount of the total costs of the project or program that will be financed from nongovernmental sources.”

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should direct the operating divisions of the Department of Defense to design and implement processes to manage and administer grantees’ compliance with the requirements added by this section, including determining to what extent to provide guidance to grantees on calculations.

AMENDMENT NO. 148 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle I of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION FOR AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO JAMES CAPERS, JR. FOR ACTS OF VALOR AS A MEMBER OF THE MARINE CORPS DURING THE VIETNAM WAR.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding the time limitations specified in sections 8298(a) and 8300 of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation with respect to the awarding of certain medals to persons who served in the Armed Forces, the President is authorized to award the Medal of Honor, under section 8291 of such title, to James Capers, Jr. for the acts of valor described in subsection (b).

(b) ACTS OF VALOR DESCRIBED.—The acts of valor described in this subsection are the actions of James Capers, Jr., as a member of the Marine Corps, during the period of March 31 through April 3, 1967, during the Vietnam War, for which he was previously awarded the Silver Star.

AMENDMENT NO. 149 OFFERED BY MR. ADERHOLT OF ALABAMA

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8. UPDATED GUIDANCE ON PLANNING FOR GLOBAL DEMAND.

(a) PROGRAM GUIDANCE ON PLANNING FOR GLOBAL DEMAND.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment shall ensure that the program guidance for major defense acquisition programs (as defined in section 4201 of title 10, United States Code), and for acquisition programs and projects that are carried out using the rapid fielding or rapid prototyping acquisition pathway under section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 10 U.S.C. 3201 note prec.), is revised to integrate planning for global demand under foreign military sales, direct commercial sales, and other relevant transfer authorities to capture and plan for international demand under section 25 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2765), including—

(1) for major defense acquisition programs, an assessment of such programs to identify global demand; and

(2) for technologies under an acquisition program or project carried out using the rapid fielding or rapid prototyping acquisition pathway that are transitioned to a major capability acquisition program, an assessment of potential global demand needs of such technologies not later than one year after the date of such transition.

(b) ASSESSMENT OF GLOBAL DEMAND.—The Under Secretary shall consult with the heads of relevant Federal agencies and existing databases, including any databases administered by the Directorate of Defense Trade Controls of the Department of State, to issue the guidance required under subsection (a).

(c) REVISION OF GUIDANCE FOR PROGRAM PROTECTION PLANS.—Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall revise the guidance for program protection plans to integrate a requirement to determine global demand for the programs covered by such plans.

AMENDMENT NO. 150 OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL OF NEW JERSEY

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

SEC. 7. STUDY ON LIFTING OUTPATIENT REHABILITATION THERAPY MAXIMUMS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study to analyze the feasibility of lifting outpatient rehabilitation therapy maximums for active-duty members of covered armed forces who are TRICARE beneficiaries and have suffered a brain injury in the course of performing active duty. The study shall also examine a range of therapy services such as restorative therapies and therapies intended to improve cognitive and functional capabilities.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth the findings and conclusions of the study conducted pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) COVERED ARMED FORCES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered Armed Forces” means the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Space Force.

AMENDMENT NO. 151 OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL OF NEW JERSEY

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

SEC. 7. REPORT ON APPROVING CERTAIN TRANSITIONAL AND RESIDENTIAL BRAIN INJURY TREATMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study to analyze the feasibility of recognizing transitional and residential

brain injury treatment programs that are approved by non-governmental accreditation bodies solely to provide services to members of covered Armed Forces who sustained a brain injury in the course of performing active duty.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the findings and conclusions of the study conducted pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) **COVERED ARMED FORCES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered Armed Forces” means the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Space Force.

AMENDMENT NO. 152 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

Add at the end of subtitle B of title XVII the following:

SEC. 17. GAO REPORT ON SETTLEMENTS IN MEDICAL MALPRACTICE CLAIMS BY MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the rates at which Department of Defense awards settlements in medical malpractice claims by members of the uniformed services under part 45 of title 32, Code of Federal Regulations, including—

(1) a comparison of such rates to the rates at which settlements are awarded in similar civilian medical malpractice claims;

(2) recommendations for improvements to the system for medical malpractice claims by members of the uniformed services.

AMENDMENT NO. 153 OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL OF NEW JERSEY

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

SEC. 7. TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY OVERSIGHT STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN.

(a) **STRATEGY AND PLAN REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall develop and implement a Traumatic Brain Injury Oversight Strategy and Action Plan that includes at a minimum the following:

(1) Standardized monitoring, treatment, and referral guidelines for Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) programs across all covered armed forces.

(2) A review and update of the current brain injury diagnostic tools used by such programs.

(3) Standardized, 72-hour follow-up requirements for all TBI patients, including protocols for the treatment and observation during such follow-up appointments.

(4) Oversight and documentation standards to aid in identification, treatment, tracking, and data collection.

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE.**—The oversight strategy and action plan required by subsection (a) shall be completed and in use not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the findings and conclusions of a full review and update on the implementation of the Brain Injury Oversight Strategy and Action Plan required by subsection (a).

(d) **COVERED ARMED FORCES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered Armed Forces” means the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Space Force.

AMENDMENT NO. 154 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle C of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NAMING OF NAVAL VESSEL AFTER MAJOR JAMES CAPERS, JR..

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Navy should name a vessel of the United States Navy the “U.S.S. Major James Capers Jr.” in honor of Major James Capers, Jr., for the acts of valor described in subsection (b).

(b) **ACTS OF VALOR DESCRIBED.**—The acts of valor described in this subsection are the actions of James Capers, Jr., as a member of the Marine Corps, during the period of March 31 through April 3, 1967, during the Vietnam War, for which he was previously awarded the Silver Star.

AMENDMENT NO. 155 OFFERED BY MRS. RODGERS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle J of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MILITARY SERVICE BY INDIVIDUALS WITH AMPUTATIONS.

It is the sense of Congress that increasing geopolitical threats, combined with recruitment challenges experienced by the Armed Forces, are a threat to the national security interests of the United States, therefore, the Secretary of Defense should issue medical waivers to an individual seeking to serve in the Armed Forces who is precluded from serving solely because of a non-service-connected amputation.

AMENDMENT NO. 156 OFFERED BY MRS. RODGERS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following new section:

SEC. 6. ELIMINATION OF CAP ON ADDITIONAL RETIRED PAY FOR EXTRAORDINARY HEROISM FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE WHO SERVED DURING THE VIETNAM ERA.

Title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1402(f)(2), by striking “The amount” and inserting “Except in the case of a member who served during the Vietnam Era (as that term is defined in section 12731 of this title), the amount”;

(2) in section 7361(a)(2), by inserting “(except in the case of a member who served during the Vietnam Era, as that term is defined in section 12731 of this title)” after “based”;

(3) in section 9361(a)(2), by inserting “(except in the case of a member who served during the Vietnam Era, as that term is defined in section 12731 of this title)” after “based”.

AMENDMENT NO. 157 OFFERED BY MR. CURTIS OF UTAH

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12. MODIFICATION OF REPORT ON THE MILITARY CAPABILITIES OF IRAN AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.

Section 1227 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 (Public Law 117–81) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “all branches of” before “the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps”;

(II) by inserting “including” before “the Quds Force”;

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “, and technologies as described in the Missile Technology Control Regime” before “, including”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by adding at the end before the period the following: “, and on the proliferation, procurement, and production networks of Iran’s drone program”;

(ii) in subparagraph (F), by adding at the end before the period the following: “, and the effect of its expiration on these Iranian proliferation activities”;

(iii) in subparagraph (H)—

(I) in clause (ii), by inserting “, and any of their precursors,” after “narcotics”;

(II) in clause (iv), by inserting “and the Ministry of Intelligence and Security (MOIS)” after “IRGC”; and

(III) in clause (v), by adding at the end before the period the following: “and MOIS”;

and

(iv) in subparagraph (I)—

(I) by inserting “and MOIS agents” after “operatives”; and

(II) by adding at the end before the period the following: “, including disinformation operations, recruitment of local assets, and targeting United States nationals and foreign dissidents”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting “and annually thereafter for a period not to exceed 4 years” after “2024”; and

(B) by striking “in June 2022” inserting “on the day after the previous report was submitted”.

AMENDMENT NO. 158 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS OF LOUISIANA

Add at the end of subtitle A of title VIII the following:

SEC. 8. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING WITH SHIPYARDS CONTROLLED BY A FOREIGN ADVERSARY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense may not enter into any contract or other agreement with a shipyard controlled by a foreign adversary.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “controlled by a foreign adversary” means, with respect to a shipyard, that such shipyard is—

(A) a foreign person that is domiciled in, is headquartered in, has its principal place of business in, or is organized under the laws of a foreign adversary country;

(B) an entity with respect to which a foreign person or combination of foreign persons described in subparagraph (A) directly or indirectly own at least a 20 percent stake; or

(C) a person subject to the direction or control of a foreign person or entity described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(2) The term “foreign adversary country” means a country specified in section 4872(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 159 OFFERED BY MR. CASTEN OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, insert the following:

SEC. 7. STUDY AND REPORT ON MENTAL HEALTH CARE FOR PILOTS AND AVIATORS.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall collaborate on a study on the barriers to mental health care for military pilots, aviators, and military air traffic controllers. The study shall include the development of a set of recommendations to ensure that pilots and aviators who need mental health care have—

(1) no more barriers to care;

(2) no more consequences for seeking care; and

(3) no less scientifically-robust bases for being treated and re-cleared for duty than pilots and aviators who need physical health care.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall jointly submit to Congress a report that contains the results of the study required under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 160 OFFERED BY MRS. RADEWAGEN OF AMERICAN SAMOA

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5. FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A UNIT OF THE NATIONAL GUARD IN AMERICAN SAMOA AND IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.

(a) **DETERMINATION REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall determine the feasibility of establishing—

(1) a unit of the National Guard in American Samoa; and

(2) a unit of the National Guard in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(b) **FORCE STRUCTURE ELEMENTS.**—In making the feasibility determination under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall consider the following:

(1) The allocation of National Guard force structure and manpower to American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in the event of the establishment of a unit of the National Guard in American Samoa and in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the impact of this allocation on existing National Guard units in the 50 States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia.

(2) The Federal funding that would be required to support pay, benefits, training operations, and missions of members of a unit of the National Guard in American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, based on the allocation derived from paragraph (1), and the equipment, including maintenance, required to support such force structure.

(3) The presence of existing infrastructure to support a unit of the National Guard in American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the requirement for additional infrastructure, including information technology infrastructure, to support such force structure, based on the allocation derived from paragraph (1).

(4) How a unit of the National Guard in American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Island would accommodate the National Guard Bureau's "Essential Ten" homeland defense capabilities (i.e., aviation, engineering, civil support teams, security, medical, transportation, maintenance, logistics, joint force headquarters, and communications) and reflect regional needs.

(5) The manpower cadre, both military personnel and fulltime support, including National Guard technicians, required to establish, maintain, and sustain a unit of the National Guard in American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the ability of American Samoa and of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to support demographically a unit of the National Guard at each location.

(6) The ability of a unit of the National Guard in American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to maintain unit readiness and the logistical challenges associated with transportation, communications, supply/resupply, and training operations and missions.

(c) **SUBMISSION OF CONCLUSION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees of the results of the feasibility determination made under subsection (a). If the Secretary determines that establishment of a unit of the National Guard in American Samoa or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (or both) is feasible, the Secretary shall include in the notification the following:

(1) A determination of whether the executive branch of American Samoa and of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Is-

lands has enacted and implemented statutory authorization for an organized militia as a prerequisite for establishing a unit of the National Guard, and a description of any other steps that such executive branches must take to request and carry out the establishment of a National Guard unit.

(2) A list of any amendments to titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, that would have to be enacted by Congress to provide for the establishment of a unit of the National Guard in American Samoa and in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(3) A description of any required Department of Defense actions to establish a unit of the National Guard in American Samoa and in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(4) A suggested timeline for completion of the steps and actions described in the preceding paragraphs.

AMENDMENT NO. 161 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 6. ADOPTION OR GUARDIANSHIP ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.

Section 1052 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "qualifying adoption expenses" each place it appears and inserting "qualifying expenses";

(2) by striking the section heading and inserting "Adoption or guardianship expenses";

(3) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the heading, by striking "TO REIMBURSE";

(B) by striking "carry out a program under which a member of the armed forces may be reimbursed" and inserting "pay"; and

(C) by striking "adoption of a child" and inserting "adoption or guardianship of a child";

(4) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the heading, by inserting "AND GUARDIANSHIPS" after "ADOPTIONS";

(B) by striking "adoption" each place it appears and inserting "adoption or guardianship"; and

(C) by striking "reimbursed" and inserting "paid";

(5) in subsection (d), by striking "adoption benefits" and inserting "adoption or guardianship";

(6) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "\$2,000" and inserting "\$5,000"; and

(ii) by striking "adoption of a child" and inserting "adoption or guardianship of a child"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking "\$5,000" and inserting "\$10,000"; and

(ii) by striking "adoptions" and inserting "adoptions or guardianships";

(7) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "adoption" each place it appears and inserting "adoption or guardianship";

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking "adoption" each place it appears and inserting "adoption or guardianship";

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking "adoption" each place it appears and inserting "adoption or guardianship"; and

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

"(4) The term 'guardianship' means a legal guardianship, as such term is defined in section 475 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 675)."; and

(8) by striking subsection (c) and redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

AMENDMENT NO. 162 OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 7. STUDY ON TOOLS TO DIAGNOSE TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY IN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **STUDY REQUIRED; ELEMENTS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study of commercially available diagnostic tools that screen for traumatic brain injury (in this section referred to as "TBI") and may be used by forward-deployed units and in combat zones. Such study shall include the following elements:

(1) Whether such tools can distinguish mild traumatic brain injury from moderate or severe TBI.

(2) How such tools could be used with other approved diagnostics (including neuroimaging biomarkers used in computed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging, blood-based biomarkers, electrophysiological biomarkers, oculomotor tracking systems, and integrated measures of physiological deficits), to enhance the health, survival, and long-term conditions of members and former members of the Armed Forces.

(3) How such tools would improve military readiness and address concerns regarding the growing medical burden of TBI.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the following:

(1) The results of the study.

(2) Determinations of the Secretary regarding whether to procure and use such tools in addition to other tools already used in the Department of Defense to screen for TBI.

(3) Recommendations of the Secretary regarding legislation that may be necessary to action regarding such tools.

AMENDMENT NO. 163 OFFERED BY MR. STAUBER OF MINNESOTA

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

SEC. 2. FUNDING FOR DEMONSTRATION OF HIGH-PRESSURE WATERJET CUT AND CAPTURE SYSTEM TO DEMILITARIZE UNDERWATER MUNITIONS.

(a) **INCREASE.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test and evaluation, Army, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for advanced component development and prototypes, environmental quality technology—DEM/VAL, line 060 (PE 0603779A) is hereby increased by \$5,000,000 (to be available for the demonstration of high-pressure waterjet cut and capture system to demilitarize underwater munitions).

(b) **OFFSET.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test and evaluation, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for basic research, defense research sciences, line 002 (PE 0601101E) is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 164 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 7. STUDY ON USE OF ROUTINE NEUROIMAGING MODALITIES IN DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT, AND PREVENTION OF BRAIN INJURY DUE TO BLAST PRESSURE EXPOSURE DURING COMBAT AND TRAINING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on the feasibility and effectiveness of the use of routine

neuroimaging modalities in the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of brain injury among members of the Armed Forces due to one or more blast pressure exposures during combat and training.

(b) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **INTERIM REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives an interim report on the methods and action plan for the study under subsection (a).

(2) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than two years after the date on which the Secretary begins the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the results of such study.

AMENDMENT NO. 165 OFFERED BY MR. ALFORD OF MISSOURI

At the end of subtitle F of title VIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8. MODIFICATION TO INITIATIVES TO SUPPORT SMALL BUSINESSES IN THE NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL BASE.

Section 861 of William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (10 U.S.C. 4901 note; Public Law 116-283; 134 Stat. 3775) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “the Secretary of Defense” before “shall update”; and

(ii) by inserting “, the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate” after “congressional defense committees”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) by striking “biennially” and inserting “annually”; and

(ii) by inserting “, the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate” after “congressional defense committees”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(3) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than October 1, 2025, and annually thereafter, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Industrial Base Policy shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate a report that includes the following for the year covered by the report:

“(A) A description of activities undertaken pursuant to this section.

“(B) An analysis of effect on the participation of small businesses in Department of Defense contracts as a result of implementation of the small business strategy required under section 4901 of title 10, United States Code.

“(C) A description of efforts by the Secretary of Defense to increase participation of small businesses in Department of Defense contracts through the small business strategy.

“(4) **SMALL BUSINESS STRATEGY REPORT.**—Beginning with the report due October 1, 2029, and every four years thereafter, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Industrial Base Policy shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate a report on overall efficacy of the small business strategy required under such section 4901, including trends and data analysis for the period covered by the report relating to implementation and outcomes of the strategy.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 166 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN OF WISCONSIN

At the end of title XI, insert the following new section:

SEC. 11. EXPAND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that, to the extent practicable, each commercial position in the Department of Defense or an element of the Department is—

(1) filled by a civilian employee of the Department; or

(2) performed by a contractor of the Department.

(b) **COMMERCIAL POSITION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “commercial position” means a position the functions of which are determined by the Department of Defense to be commercial pursuant to Department of Defense Instruction 1100.22 (or any successor instruction).

AMENDMENT NO. 167 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 8. IMPLEMENTATION OF GAO RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO SPARE PARTS IN GLOBAL SPARES POOL RELATING TO F-35 PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment, shall take such actions as may be necessary to implement the recommendations of the Comptroller General of the United States contained in the report entitled, “F-35 Program: DOD Needs Better Accountability for Global Spare Parts and Reporting of Losses Worth Millions”.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the progress of the implementation required by subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 168 OFFERED BY MR. CARTER OF GEORGIA

At the end of subtitle E of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CUT SERVICES PROVIDED AT CERTAIN COMBAT TRAINING READINESS CENTERS.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2025 may be used to cut any service provided by a combat training readiness center operated by the Air Force National Guard at any of the following locations:

- (1) Savannah, Georgia.
- (2) Gulfport, Mississippi.
- (3) Alpena, Michigan.
- (4) Volk Field, Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT NO. 169 OFFERED BY MR. MAST OF FLORIDA

At the appropriate place in title VII, insert the following:

SEC. 7. CLARIFICATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING THE INTEGRATED DISABILITY EVALUATION SYSTEM.

(a) **CLARIFICATION.**—Subsection (h) of section 1073c of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “SECRETARIES CONCERNED AND MEDICAL EVALUATION BOARDS” and inserting “AUTHORITY OVER MEMBERS”; and

(2) by inserting “(1)” before “Nothing”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(2) Notwithstanding the responsibilities and authorities of the Defense Health Agency with respect to the administration of military medical treatment facilities as set

forth in this section (including medical evaluations of members of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the military department concerned), the Secretary of each military department shall maintain personnel authority over, and responsibility for, any member of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the military department concerned while the member is being considered by a medical evaluation board or is otherwise subject to the integrated disability evaluation system. Such responsibility shall include the following:

“(A) Responsibility for administering the morale and welfare of the member.

“(B) Responsibility for determinations of fitness for duty of the member under chapter 61 of this title.

“(3) Notwithstanding the responsibilities and authorities of the Defense Health Agency with respect to the administration of the integrated disability evaluation system, a commander shall, at all times, maintain absolute responsibility for, and authority over, a member of the armed forces referred to the integrated disability evaluation system. Such responsibility and authority include the following:

“(A) The authority to pause any process of the integrated disability evaluation system regarding the member.

“(B) The authority to withdraw the member from the integrated disability evaluation system if the commander determines that any policy, procedure, regulation, or other guidance has not been followed in the member’s case.

“(4) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a member referred to the integrated disability evaluation system may file an appeal of such referral with the Secretary of the military department concerned. Such an appeal—

“(A) shall be in addition to any appeals process established as part of the integrated disability evaluation system;

“(B) shall include a hearing before an officer who may convene a general court-martial and who is in the chain of command of the member; and

“(C) shall be adjudicated not later than 90 days after such filing.”.

(b) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to carry out paragraphs (2) through (4) of such subsection, as added by this section, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **BRIEFING.**—Not later than February 1, 2025, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a briefing on the implementation of such paragraphs.

AMENDMENT NO. 170 OFFERED BY MR. STANTON OF ARIZONA

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8. STUDY ON USE OF OFF-THE-SHELF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PRODUCTS FROM FOREIGN ADVERSARY COUNTRIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a study on the use by the Department of Defense of off-the-shelf information technology products that were manufactured, produced, or assembled by a covered company, including goods used by the Department that contain such an off-the-shelf information technology product.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the study required by subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “commercially available off-the-shelf item” has the meaning given such term in section 104 of title 41, United States Code.

(2) The term “covered company” means—

(A) an entity that is organized under the laws of or located in a foreign adversary country;

(B) a parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of an entity described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) an entity otherwise directly or indirectly owned by or subject to the control of an entity described in subparagraph (A) or (B), as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

(3) The term “foreign adversary country” has the meaning given the term “covered nation” in section 4872(d) of title 10, United States Code.

(4) The term “off-the-shelf information technology product” means a commercially available off-the-shelf item that can process, store, or transmit digital data.

AMENDMENT NO. 171 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle F of title VIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8. BOOTS TO BUSINESS PROGRAM.

Section 32 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) BOOTS TO BUSINESS PROGRAM.—

“(1) COVERED INDIVIDUAL DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘covered individual’ means—

“(A) a member of the Armed Forces, including the National Guard or Reserves;

“(B) an individual who is participating in the Transition Assistance Program established under section 1144 of title 10, United States Code;

“(C) an individual who—

“(i) served on active duty in any branch of the Armed Forces, including the National Guard or Reserves; and

“(ii) was discharged or released from such service under conditions other than dishonorable; and

“(D) a spouse or dependent of an individual described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—During the period beginning on the date of enactment of this subsection and ending on September 30, 2028, the Administrator shall carry out a program to be known as the ‘Boots to Business Program’ to provide entrepreneurship training to covered individuals.

“(3) GOALS.—The goals of the Boots to Business Program are to—

“(A) provide assistance and in-depth training to covered individuals interested in business ownership; and

“(B) provide covered individuals with the tools, skills, and knowledge necessary to identify a business opportunity, draft a business plan, identify sources of capital, connect with local resources for small business concerns, and start up a small business concern.

“(4) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Boots to Business Program may include—

“(i) a presentation providing exposure to the considerations involved in self-employment and ownership of a small business concern;

“(ii) an online, self-study course focused on the basic skills of entrepreneurship, the language of business, and the considerations involved in self-employment and ownership of a small business concern;

“(iii) an in-person classroom instruction component providing an introduction to the foundations of self employment and ownership of a small business concern; and

“(iv) in-depth training delivered through online instruction, including an online

course that leads to the creation of a business plan.

“(B) COLLABORATION.—The Administrator may—

“(i) collaborate with public and private entities to develop course curricula for the Boots to Business Program; and

“(ii) modify program components in coordination with entities participating in a Warriors in Transition program, as defined in section 738(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (10 U.S.C. 1071 note).

“(C) USE OF RESOURCE PARTNERS AND DISTRICT OFFICES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall—

“(I) ensure that Veteran Business Outreach Centers regularly participate, on a nationwide basis, in the Boots to Business Program; and

“(II) to the maximum extent practicable, use district offices of the Administration and a variety of other resource partners and entities in administering the Boots to Business Program.

“(ii) GRANT AUTHORITY.—In carrying out clause (i), the Administrator may make grants, subject to the availability of appropriations in advance, to Veteran Business Outreach Centers, other resource partners, or other entities to carry out components of the Boots to Business Program.

“(D) AVAILABILITY TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.—The Administrator shall make available to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Labor information regarding the Boots to Business Program, including all course materials and outreach materials related to the Boots to Business Program, for inclusion on the websites of the Department of Defense and the Department of Labor relating to the Transition Assistance Program, in the Transition Assistance Program manual, and in other relevant materials available for distribution from the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Labor.

“(E) AVAILABILITY TO DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—In consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Administrator shall make available for distribution and display on the website of the Department of Veterans Affairs and at local facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs outreach materials regarding the Boots to Business Program, which shall, at a minimum—

“(i) describe the Boots to Business Program and the services provided; and

“(ii) include eligibility requirements for participating in the Boots to Business Program.

“(F) AVAILABILITY TO OTHER PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—The Administrator shall ensure information regarding the Boots to Business program, including all course materials and outreach materials related to the Boots to Business Program, is made available to other participating agencies in the Transition Assistance Program and upon request of other agencies.

“(5) COMPETITIVE BIDDING PROCEDURES.—The Administration shall use relevant competitive bidding procedures with respect to any contract or cooperative agreement executed by the Administration under the Boots to Business Program.

“(6) PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF FUNDING OPPORTUNITY.—Not later than 30 days before the deadline for submitting applications for any funding opportunity under the Boots to Business Program, the Administration shall publish a notice of the funding opportunity.

“(7) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to the Com-

mittee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on the performance and effectiveness of the Boots to Business Program, which—

“(A) may be included as part of another report submitted to such committees by the Administrator related to the Office of Veterans Business Development; and

“(B) shall summarize available information relating to—

“(i) grants awarded under paragraph (4)(C);

“(ii) the total cost of the Boots to Business Program;

“(iii) the number of program participants using each component of the Boots to Business Program;

“(iv) the completion rates for each component of the Boots to Business Program;

“(v) to the extent possible—

“(I) the demographics of program participants, to include gender, age, race, ethnicity, and relationship to military;

“(II) the number of program participants that connect with a district office of the Administration, a Veteran Business Outreach Center, or another resource partner of the Administration;

“(III) the number of program participants that start a small business concern;

“(IV) the results of the Boots to Business and Boots to Business Reboot course quality surveys conducted by the Office of Veterans Business Development before and after attending each of those courses, including a summary of any comments received from program participants;

“(V) the results of the Boots to Business Program outcome surveys conducted by the Office of Veterans Business Development, including a summary of any comments received from program participants; and

“(VI) the results of other germane participant satisfaction surveys;

“(C) an evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the Boots to Business Program based on each geographic region covered by the Administration during the most recent fiscal year;

“(D) an assessment of additional performance outcome measures for the Boots to Business Program, as identified by the Administrator;

“(E) any recommendations of the Administrator for improvement of the Boots to Business Program, which may include expansion of the types of individuals who are covered individuals;

“(F) an explanation of how the Boots to Business Program has been integrated with other transition programs and related resources of the Administration and other Federal agencies; and

“(G) any additional information the Administrator determines necessary.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 172 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

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

SEC. 5. INSTRUCTION IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND MACHINE LEARNING IN SCHOOLS OPERATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Director of the Department of Defense Education Activity, shall require that each student of a high school operated by the Activity receives instruction in artificial intelligence and machine learning, including instruction in—

(1) the foundational concepts of artificial intelligence and machine learning;

(2) definitions of artificial intelligence and machine learning;

(3) the responsible and ethical use of artificial intelligence and machine learning applications; and

(4) such other topics relating to artificial intelligence and machine learning as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(b) **FORM OF INSTRUCTION.**—The instruction required under subsection (a) may be incorporated into one or more existing courses taught at high schools operated by the Department of Defense Education Activity.

(c) **APPLICABILITY.**—The requirement to provide the instruction described in subsection (a) shall apply beginning with the first school year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the term “high school” has the meaning given that term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

AMENDMENT NO. 173 OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle C of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NAMING A NAVAL VESSEL AFTER WILLIAM B. GOULD.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Navy should name a commissioned naval vessel after formerly enslaved sailor and Civil War veteran, William B. Gould, to honor his strength of character and faithful service to the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 174 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle C of title II, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. MODIFICATION TO ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE EDUCATION STRATEGY.

Section 256 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (Public Law 116-92; 133 Stat. 1290) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND MACHINE LEARNING EDUCATION PLATFORMS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2025, each Secretary of a military department shall provide personnel in that Secretary’s department with distance education courses on—

“(A) the foundational concepts of artificial intelligence and machine learning; and

“(B) the responsible and ethical use of artificial intelligence and machine learning applications.

“(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the progress of the Secretaries of the military departments in implementing paragraph (1).”

AMENDMENT NO. 175 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle C of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3. INVESTMENT PLAN FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPOTS AND INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES.

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

(1) the current state of Department of Defense depots and industrial facilities is concerning;

(2) charged with maintaining critical equipment and complex weapons systems, these Government-owned, Government-operated installations are vital to supporting military readiness and conflict deterrence;

(3) robust funding should be provided for sustained facilities modernization; and

(4) facilities and equipment modernization will cost hundreds of billions and require

sustained management attention over many years.

(b) **INVESTMENT PLAN.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of each of the military departments, shall submit to the congressional defense committees an investment plan that includes detailed information about the minimum annual investment in Department of Defense depots and industrial facilities that is needed to prevent further infrastructure deterioration. The minimum investment level included in the plan shall reflect a percentage of the 3-year rolling average of maintenance, repair, and overhaul workload funded at all Department depots and industrial facilities. Modernization efforts addressed in the plan shall account for future technological demands, labor needs, and threats to facility security including those posed by extreme weather and natural disasters.

AMENDMENT NO. 176 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In subtitle J of title V, add at the end the following:

SEC. 599C. REPORT ON NATIONAL GUARD SEXUAL ASSAULT AND RESPONSE PREVENTION TRAINING.

The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives containing the number of national guard members, aggregated by State, that received sexual assault and response prevention training in the preceding calendar year—

(1) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) annually, beginning in 2026, by not later than March 30 of each year.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, my amendment really should be called the define the mission act for Ukraine or the define the mission amendment.

We voted on this last summer as part of the National Defense Authorization Act, and 129 of our colleagues agreed that the administration should define the mission.

Before this, this might have been summarized as the Powell doctrine for years. Before we get into a war, we should decide what we are trying to achieve with the war. The administration has gotten by in Ukraine since the inception by saying as much as it takes, as long as it takes.

We searched for that phrase and found it back in 2004 when the administration at that time decided that we were going to shift from going after the terrorists that bombed the United States on 9/11, or used airplanes to target our citizens, to rebuilding Afghanistan. The phrase they used was “as much as it takes, as long as it takes.” That was used to keep the mission going all the way until the Biden administration left in the most disastrous way possible by taking the mili-

tary out first and leaving civilians behind and getting them out.

That was on August 31, 2021. The very next day, on September 1, 2021, the Biden administration entered into a strategic partnership agreement with Ukraine to support their membership in the European Union and NATO. This led to an escalation, and the Biden administration, rather than using leverage to create a peaceful resolution and prevent a war in Ukraine, fostered that war.

Nothing excuses Putin’s invasion of Ukraine. The question is, what are we going to do about it? To this date, apparently, we are just going to keep cutting checks. For the American people, a lot of times people say of course, and what they really mean is to get the Russians out of Ukraine. Why not state that that is the objective? Why not state whether it is to get all the Russians out of Ukraine, including Crimea, or not?

Mr. Chair, you have seen the State Department say variations on that. In fact, you have seen Under Secretary Nuland say that the actual mission is that we get war crimes tribunals for Vladimir Putin and regime change in Russia. Is that the mission?

Recently, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, a Republican, said that the mission is actually about rare earth minerals that Ukraine has. In that sense, if it is about minerals, does this really go back to when Yanukovich in November 2013 said that he is going to do a trade deal with Russia instead of a trade deal with the European Union?

Shortly after that, there was a coup, a regime change, and an actual insurrection that resulted in a new government in Ukraine.

None of this excuses what Vladimir Putin has done. We should be rightly rejecting what Putin has done in Ukraine.

So far, the United States has spent more than \$170 billion on the war, but we still haven’t defined the mission. You can’t really hold the administration accountable for success or, in this sense, potentially for failure.

The reality is that if we keep cutting checks, Ukraine does not have the resources, the manpower, the skill to deploy all the weapons it will take to extract all the Russians from Ukraine. They just don’t.

□ 1545

We want them to be able to do that, but we have also taken off the table a path to a peaceful resolution.

In the spring of 2022, in the early days of the war, the Biden administration scuttled peace negotiations. Well, presumably, because they had a mission that they were actually trying to achieve in mind.

I have sent questions to them. I finally got a response, and I wanted them to define what it is.

They came up with something, finally, that says the United States’ goal is an independent, democratic, and economically stable Ukraine, governed by

the rule of law and integrated into Euro-Atlantic institutions. That is an answer, but they could give us a classified answer.

The point of this bill is to say: Tell us exactly what you are trying to do. That is not something you can have that you can hold accountable.

In fact, I asked former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Milley this in the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I said: General, does this qualify as a mission statement in the military? He said: Absolutely not. You would want more precision on that.

All I am asking is the same thing that our military already knows how to do: define the mission. Do it in a classified setting, by all means, but do it in a way where we can hold you accountable for the results.

That is the point of amendment No. 38. I encourage all of our colleagues to support it. I thank the chairman and the committee for their support in this en bloc, and I thank the chairman for this time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chair, there is so much completely wrong about what the gentleman just said about that amendment that it really needs to be corrected.

First of all, just on the last point about what Chairman Milley had to say about this, the United States military is not fighting in Ukraine. We have not sent the United States military to accomplish a mission, and the specificity is an entirely different place.

Second, there has been a clear mission from day one that the Biden administration has articulated on two points: Number one, preserve a sovereign, democratic Ukraine; number two, don't get into a war with Russia.

They have said that from day one over and over and over again. I have heard people who don't want to support Ukraine continually generate this excuse: Oh, it is not clear. We don't know what we are doing there.

We have known what we were doing there from day one. We are trying to stop Russia from destroying Ukraine. We could not possibly be more clear. That is what we are trying to do. The resources that we provided Ukraine have helped make that possible. Ukraine still exists as a sovereign, democratic country.

There was also all throughout that speech all kinds of Russian propaganda that is untrue. Neither the United States nor any NATO allies blocked this mythical peace deal that existed in April 2022. Putin never agreed to any such peace deal and neither did Zelenskyy. We didn't block it. Our strategy in Ukraine is crystal clear: stop Russia from destroying it.

Now, in an ideal world, we would like Russia completely out of all of Ukraine as it existed post-1991. That is not the stated goal or stated strategy.

The stated goal and stated strategy are to preserve a sovereign, democratic

Ukraine. I hope everybody on this floor recognizes, number one, that that is a really important goal. It is worth fighting for. To make sure that Russia can't simply destroy a sovereign, democratic nation because if they destroy one, they will be sorely tempted to destroy more, and Ukraine is worth preserving.

Number two, for the 2-plus years we have been engaged in this, we have been pushing that strategy effectively against tall odds. We seem to have forgotten now that in the immediate days after the Russian invasion, the assumption of everyone was Ukraine was finished. They were gone. They were done. There was no way they could stand up to Russia. Yet for 2-plus years they have, and they are capable of continuing to do that if we don't back off on our support for them.

Now, the amendment that is in the en bloc, I am not thrilled about. It asks for a strategy. My opinion is the strategy already exists, so that has been met. The administration is, once again, going to send up their strategy in the next couple of months, which will meet the requirements and concerns of this amendment and will stop us from cutting off our support for Ukraine.

Please don't believe every piece of anti-American, anti-Ukraine, pro-Russian propaganda that gets put out there about what is going on. It is really rather simple.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. Chair, Putin wants Ukraine. He has said over and over again that Ukraine should not exist as a country, that it should be part of Russia. We are helping Ukraine stop him from doing that.

At the end of the day, that is what is happening. It is not complicated, and we ought to support that effort.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to require the Department of Defense and HHS to examine barriers to access for military pilots and air traffic controllers seeking mental health care.

Today, when military and civilian aviators report that they have sought mental health care, they are faced with delays, confusion, and overbroad regulations in the process of returning to work.

What that means practically is that even minor mental health concerns can derail careers for safe, well-trained pilots and air traffic controllers who just want to get better. That has created a culture of silence and has disincentivized aviators from seeking care and ultimately made our skies less safe.

In May, the Air Force took a good first step forward by allowing these pilots and air traffic controllers to receive an extra 60 days of treatment without losing their wings. My bipar-

tisan amendment builds on that to help destigmatize mental health care and ensure that those who seek care face no more consequence nor any less scientifically robust standards for being re-cleared for duty than they would if they were seeking physical healthcare.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting access for mental health care for pilots and protecting the health and readiness of our Armed Forces and keeping our skies safe.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF), my friend and colleague.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chair, today, I rise in support of my amendment, which would name a Spearhead-class expeditionary fast transport vessel after Lieutenant General Richard E. Carey, U.S. Marine Corps.

During General Carey's 38-year military career, he served during World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. He rose from enlisted man to lieutenant by the age of 20.

Carey participated in the Inchon landing, captured communist forces, and led his rifle platoon to Seoul. Three months later at the infamous Chosin Reservoir, Carey and his fellow marines were outnumbered 8-1 but they held their ground and broke through the Chinese trap.

While in Korea, Carey was badly wounded. Over his decorated career, General Carey became a pilot, flew 204 combat sorties, received 41 medals, and earned the Distinguished Flying Cross.

He later commanded the evacuation from Saigon, received promotion to lieutenant general, and was awarded the Defense Superior Service Medal.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this en bloc package to honor General Carey and his service to America.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

Mr. Chair, I forgot to mention one thing about the Ukraine amendment. The gentleman referenced a number of different people, including Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and what he thought the strategy was. I will make sure that people understand that that is the thing about a democracy. We know what Russia's strategy is because Vladimir Putin doesn't let anybody else have an opinion.

In the United States of America, we have got 535 Members of Congress. If you ask all 535 Members of Congress, I don't doubt that you would get a wide variety of different answers as to what our strategy is in Ukraine. Again, that is living in a democracy, where people are free to have their own opinions. If you ask the administration what our policy is, it has been consistent and clear: A sovereign, democratic Ukraine must be preserved and don't stumble into a war with Russia.

It is not an easy policy to implement, but they have successfully done it for 2-plus years now. That is clear. Don't be confused by a whole bunch of other

opinions from independent contractors who absolutely have a right to their opinion about what the strategy ought to be, but that is different than what the strategy is.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I thank my good colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chair, my colleagues are about to ram through yet another record-breaking military budget, nearly a trillion dollars, packed with bullets, bombs, and giveaways to defense contractors. They also had time to sprinkle in some antiwomen policies.

Mr. Chair, 2023 marks the sixth year in a row that the Pentagon has failed its audit. My colleagues continue to approve record-breaking military budgets, but the Pentagon literally cannot pass an audit. It is absurd. The Navy's LCS ships, with a lifetime cost of \$100 billion, Mr. Chair, are literally broken down and rusting in the harbor.

Meanwhile, my residents are worried. They are worried that there is lead in the water they are drinking and toxic chemicals in the air they breathe, all issues that my colleagues claim there isn't enough funding to solve.

On top of that, it is incredibly disturbing that many of my colleagues in this Chamber are actively profiting financially, directly, personally when they vote to pass more funding for weapons in war because they personally own stock in war manufacturing.

Enough is enough. I am proud to oppose this wasteful bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FONG), the newest Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FONG. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of Mr. OBERNOLTE's amendment to the fiscal year 2025 National Defense Authorization Act.

From Navy missile systems to Air Force aircraft, the might of the American warfighter can often be traced to the testing and development that occurs in my congressional district. The last thing that the remarkable individuals at Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake and Edwards Air Force Base need to worry about is whether the hospital doors supporting these communities remain open.

In Ridgecrest in the Indian Wells Valley, a hospital that supports China Lake and the Ridgecrest community is struggling financially.

At Edwards Air Force Base, significant growth is anticipated, but it is unclear whether the installation has the supporting healthcare system in place.

This amendment would require the Secretary of Defense to explore this critical healthcare issue for the installations within the R-2508 airspace in the Western United States and report back to Congress. This would ensure that we have the information needed so that we can best support this critical endeavor.

We need to ensure that we have a stable healthcare system so that the workforce at these legendary installations remain open to the creativity and the innovative spirit that has kept America safe for generations.

Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. OBERNOLTE for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, our servicemembers deserve the best medical care and often they get world-class care, but sometimes military doctors fail our servicemembers, making grave errors.

In the civilian world, patients can file malpractice claims in court against doctors and have a jury hear their claims, but military doctors are immune from that scrutiny.

Instead, several years ago, Congress and the DOD developed a process for evaluating servicemember malpractice claims, but that process is clearly broken.

We all have constituents who have been victims of military medical malpractice, and we need to hold DOD and its doctors accountable.

That is why I cosponsored Congressman ISSA's HERO Act and that is why we need this amendment. We need an independent, objective analysis of how military medicine is failing our servicemembers.

My bipartisan amendment would address servicemember traumatic brain injury stemming from blast pressure in combat and in training.

Brain injuries among servicemembers are on the rise. Just last month, there were reports that artillery soldiers are also suffering these career-altering injuries. Whether injuries are the result of training or combat, our servicemembers and their families need the best healthcare we can offer. That is what this amendment does by requiring the DOD to explore new technologies for the treatment and prevention of brain injuries.

Last year, this amendment passed the House with bipartisan support. We must do it again because it was not included in the final legislation with the Senate.

Mr. Chair, I urge my House colleagues to pass it again and my Senate colleagues not to delay this important amendment.

Too often, our servicemembers rely on decades-old equipment that can't be updated at a fair price. Open system interfaces solve that problem. These systems are already in our daily lives. They are in our phones and in our cars. They have been embraced by some defense programs because open systems promise faster and cheaper upgrades. That is because they allow the government to embrace competition for new parts and software that make equipment more effective.

For small and innovative companies to offer their solutions to the Pen-

tagon, they need to know what standards the government is using.

This amendment will give businesses access to the information they need to compete. My amendment would grow small businesses and give our servicemembers the tools they need to win.

□ 1600

Mr. Chair, I rise to support our military families. Military child development centers are a lifeline for our servicemembers who move frequently and often work long hours, past when childcare centers are open.

Serving more than 20,000 children, the military has offered childcare on its bases for decades. Yet, like many families, military families struggle to find childcare. A shortage of providers has left roughly 9,000 children waiting months for a spot at a military childcare center.

Childcare is a quality-of-life concern for Active-Duty servicemembers, including those in my district at Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach. My amendment would provide a strategy to construct an adequate number of child development centers to support our military families as they tirelessly serve our country.

Mr. Chair, I urge Members to support this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this en bloc package, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc 2 offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

The en bloc amendments 2 were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 1287, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 3 consisting of amendment Nos. 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, and 234, printed in part B of House Report 118-551, offered by Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:

AMENDMENT NO. 177 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8. OPEN INTERFACE STANDARDS FOR CONTRACTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall make publicly available the open interface standards for contracts awarded by the Secretary, unless the service acquisition executive (as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code) with respect to a specific contract submits to the

Secretary a request to not disclose such standards.

AMENDMENT NO. 178 OFFERED BY MR. WALTZ OF FLORIDA

Page 448, after line 17, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8. ASSESSMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH GLOBAL HOUSEHOLD GOODS CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Commander of the United States Transportation Command shall carry out an assessment of the performance of contractors under the Global Household Goods Contract in meeting the applicable requirements for capacity and quality in such contract during the period beginning on May 1, 2025, and ending on August 31, 2025.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 11 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Commander of the United States Transportation Command shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the assessment required under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 179 OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 2. MODIFICATION TO INNOVATORS INFORMATION REPOSITORY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

Section 220 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232; 10 U.S.C. 2364 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “Chief Digital and Artificial Intelligence Office, Defense Innovation Unit, and” before “Defense Technical Information Center”;

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting “in accordance with subsection (e)” before the period at the end;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) be coordinated across the Department of Defense enterprise to focus on small business innovators that are small, independent United States businesses, including—

“(A) those participating in the Small Business Innovation Research program or the Small Business Technology Transfer program;

“(B) those participating in the Pilot Program to Accelerate the Procurement and Fielding of Innovative Technologies and the Rapid Defense Enterprise Research program; and

“(C) nontraditional defense companies that are working with research, innovation, and advanced project entities;”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(E) the date of the initial award to the participant from the Department of Defense; and

“(F) the dates of any additional awards made to the participant, including the dates of any contracts or other agreements entered into between the participant the Department of Defense; and”;

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

“(e) **UPDATES REQUIRED.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not less frequently than once each fiscal quarter, the head of the Defense Technical Information Center, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, shall update the innovators information repository established under this section.

“(2) **NOTICE TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days after making an update to the innovators information repository under paragraph (1), the head of the Defense Technical Information Center shall submit to the congressional defense committees notice of such update together with instructions for electronically accessing the updated repository.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 180 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle F of title X, insert the following new section:

SEC. 10. REPORT ON TRAINING AND SAFETY PROGRAM FOR OPERATION OF ASSAULT AMPHIBIOUS VEHICLES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the feasibility, advisability, and potential benefits of establishing a training and safety program for the operation of assault amphibious vehicles.

AMENDMENT NO. 181 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO OF NEW YORK

Add at the end of subtitle B of title I the following:

SEC. 113. REPORT ON BLACK HAWK HELICOPTER PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the budget of the President for fiscal year 2026 is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on Modernization of the Black Hawk helicopter program of the Army.

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

(1) Identification of the program elements and level of funding requested for the Black Hawk Modernization program for the period of fiscal years 2026 through 2030 set forth separately by fiscal year and appropriations account.

(2) Requirements for the program that are sufficient to ensure the Black Hawk helicopters of the Army are systematically modernized to address obsolescence, improve performance, and provide capabilities that ensure relevance in the joint all domain operational environment.

(3) A program acquisition strategy for Black Hawk Modernization.

AMENDMENT NO. 182 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 10. UPDATES TO NATIONAL BIODEFENSE STRATEGY.

(a) **UPDATES REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall revise and update the most recent version of the national biodefense strategy and associated implementation plan required under section 1086 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 6 U.S.C. 104). In revising and updating the strategy and implementation plan, the Secretaries shall address—

(1) current and potential biological threats against the United States, both naturally occurring and man-made, either accidental or deliberate;

(2) the potential for catastrophic biological threats; and

(3) such other matters as the Secretaries determine appropriate.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional de-

fense committees the updated strategy and implementation plan required under subsection (a).

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” has the meaning given that term in section 1086(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 6 U.S.C. 104).

AMENDMENT NO. 183 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle D of title V, insert the following new section:

SEC. 5. EXPANSION OF REPORT ON FUTURE SERVICEMEMBER PREPARATORY COURSE.

Section 546(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (Public Law 118–31; 10 U.S.C. 520 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(2) by inserting, after paragraph (3), the following new paragraphs:

“(4) The determination of the Secretary regarding the effectiveness of the preparatory course.

“(5) Recommendations of the Secretary regarding—

“(A) how to improve the preparatory course;

“(B) whether to expand the preparatory course.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 184 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 2. REPORT ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE WORKFORCE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes—

(1) an assessment of the effectiveness of the artificial intelligence workforce of the Department of Defense;

(2) identification of any gaps in the skills and training of such workforce; and

(3) a description of any actions that may be carried out to preserve and enhance such workforce to ensure the global technological competitiveness of the United States.

(b) **ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE WORKFORCE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “artificial intelligence workforce” means members of the Armed Forces and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense with responsibilities relating to the research, development, procurement, or operational use of artificial intelligence technology.

AMENDMENT NO. 185 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5. TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION REGARDING MEMBER'S OPIOID USE DISORDER TO DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Section 1142(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “TRANSMITTAL” and inserting “TRANSMISSION”;

(2) by inserting “(1)” before “In the case”; and

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

“(2) In the case of a member whom the Secretary concerned knows has a history of opioid use disorder, such Secretary concerned shall notify the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of such history within 60 days of the separation, retirement, or discharge of such member.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 186 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 7. STUDY ON ACCESSIBILITY OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS AND SERVICES FOR ACTIVE DUTY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study determine whether and to what extent members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty have adequate access to mental health care providers and services.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 187 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INCREASE TO THE FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should raise the family separation allowance to the maximum allowable amount of \$400 per month as authorized under section 427 of title 37, United States Code (as amended by section 626 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (Public Law 118-31; 137 Stat. 294)).

AMENDMENT NO. 188 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 7. REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN PRESCRIPTION DROP BOXES AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each military installation under the jurisdiction of the Secretary has one or more prescription drop boxes to facilitate the safe disposal of unused prescription drugs, including opioids.

AMENDMENT NO. 189 OFFERED BY MR. JAMES OF MICHIGAN

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

SEC. 1. PLAN FOR PROVIDING CERTAIN AIRCRAFT TO THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for providing the aircraft described in subsection (b) to relevant aviation units of the Army National Guard in a manner that is concurrent with and in proportion to the manner in which such aircraft are provided to active duty Army aviation units.

(b) **AIRCRAFT DESCRIBED.**—The aircraft described in this subsection are the following:

- (1) AH-64E aircraft.
- (2) MQ-1C M25 aircraft.
- (3) CH-47 aircraft.
- (4) UH-60M aircraft.
- (5) Future Long-Range Assault Aircraft.

AMENDMENT NO. 191 OFFERED BY MR. RESCHENTHALER OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

SEC. 17. REPORT ON SECURITY COOPERATION WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House Representatives a report on security cooperation with the Government of the Turks

and Caicos Islands and the treatment of detained Americans on Turks and Caicos Islands, including—

(1) the efforts of such Departments to counter threats from transnational criminal organizations, violent extremist organizations, and malign regional and external state actors in cooperation with the Government of the Turks and Caicos Islands;

(2) United States taxpayer assistance made available for the Turks and Caicos Islands since October 1, 2014; and

(3) efforts by such Departments to address the treatment of and human rights abuses committed against United States individuals and others detained by the Government of the Turks and Caicos Islands and to advocate for changes in policy related to their detention of Americans, during fiscal years 2022 through 2024.

AMENDMENT NO. 192 OFFERED BY MR. CASAR OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle H of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5. GAO STUDY ON CHILD CARE SERVICES PROVIDED OR PAID FOR BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study to assess the child care programs of the Department of Defense, including military child development centers, family home day care, Military Child Care in Your Neighborhood, and Child Care in Your Home.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the results of the study under subsection (a). Such report shall include the following information, disaggregated by covered Armed Force:

(1) The period of time military families in each priority category are on a waiting list from the time of submitting a request on militarychildcare.com until the time of final approval.

(2) The percentage of military families that submitted a request for child care services through militarychildcare.com and did not receive an offer within three months of the date requested.

(3) The average percentage of annual income a military family spends on child care per child.

(4) The percentage of military families that require more than one such child care program to meet child care needs.

(5) The current amount allocated to each covered Armed Force for the Military Child Care in Your Neighborhood and Child Care in Your Home programs.

(6) How much of the amount described in paragraph (5) is spent on—

- (A) administration;
- (B) child care services for military families.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “covered Armed Force” means the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Space Force.

(2) The terms “military child development center” and “family home day care” have the meanings given such terms in section 1800 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 193 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN OF WISCONSIN

At the end of subtitle E of title XXVIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. . QUARTERLY REPORT ON INFILTRATIONS OF CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROPERTY BY FOREIGN ACTORS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not less frequently than quarterly, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on instances of infiltra-

tion, or attempted infiltration, of a military installation, facility, or real property under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense by a foreign actor during the period covered by the report.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a summary of each instance of infiltration or attempted infiltration;

(2) an identification of the foreign actor the Secretary determines is responsible for such infiltration or attempted infiltration; and

(3) with respect to each foreign actor included in such report, an statement of—

- (A) immigration status, if any;
- (B) country of origin;
- (C) method and date of entry into the United States, if known;
- (D) criminal background, if known; and
- (E) any other information obtained during the applicable Department of Defense investigation that the Secretary of Defense determines appropriate.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Relations of the Senate;

(F) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(G) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(H) the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term “foreign actor” means an individual who is not a citizen or national of the United States.

(3) The term “infiltration” includes, with respect to a military installation, facility, or real property under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, unauthorized photo or video recording.

AMENDMENT NO. 194 OFFERED BY MS. JACOBS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 571, after line 11, insert the following:

SEC. 12. ASSESSMENT, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.

Section 383(d)(1)(B) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, including a description of challenges in executing the program,” after “lessons learned”.

AMENDMENT NO. 195 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 803, line 9, insert “(including in-person, remote, and hybrid fellowships)” after “fellowships”.

AMENDMENT NO. 196 OFFERED BY MRS. SPARTZ OF INDIANA

Add at the end of subtitle D of title XII the following:

SEC. 1236. REPORT ON CERTAIN ASSISTANCE TO UKRAINE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall submit to Congress a report reconciling all United States assistance to Ukraine, including all normal and supplemental Ukraine appropriations and drawdowns, from January 1, 2022, through the date of such submission. The report shall specifically detail the countries, entities, and individuals who received such assistance.

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

(1) All contracts awarded to third parties with enumerated amounts, including an identification of each such third party recipient and a specification of the amount awarded to each such third party.

(2) The total of appropriated or authorized amounts that have been obligated or expended, as well as the total amounts of authorized or appropriated funds that have not been so obligated or expended.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 197 OFFERED BY MR. CASE OF HAWAII

At the end of subtitle D of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3. REPORT ON WILDFIRE FIGHTING CAPABILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE IN HAWAII.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report that contains—

(1) an assessment of the wildfire fighting capabilities of the Department of Defense in Hawaii, including any shortfalls in firefighting equipment, facilities, training, plans, or personnel;

(2) a determination of the feasibility of establishing a wildfire training institute on O'ahu;

(3) an identification of any additional authorities or resources required to integrate the capabilities of the Department of Defense with the capabilities of other Federal, State, and local emergency responders; and

(4) an identification of any memoranda or other agreements between the Department and State, local, Federal, or other disaster response organizations regarding wildland fire mitigation, prevention, response, and recovery.

AMENDMENT NO. 198 OFFERED BY MS. CROCKETT OF TEXAS

Add at the end of subtitle C of title XVII of division A the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT ON MILITARY SPOUSE SECURITY CLEARANCE.

Not later than May 1, 2025, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall provide a report to Congress on the technical, operational, human resources, and legal challenges that would result from accelerating security clearance reviews of military spouses by using information, including address verification, from the spousal review of their connected service member's security clearance, as well as the anticipated benefits of such a change.

AMENDMENT NO. 199 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF NEVADA

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

SEC. ____ . DESIGNATION OF CREECH AIR FORCE BASE, NEVADA, AS REMOTE OR ISOLATED INSTALLATION.

The Secretary of Defense shall designate Creech Air Force Base located at Indian Springs Nevada, as a remote or isolated installation.

AMENDMENT NO. 200 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, insert the following new section:

SEC. 6. EXPANSION OF BEREAVEMENT LEAVE.

Section 701(1)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “two weeks” and inserting “12 weeks”.

AMENDMENT NO. 201 OFFERED BY MR. MOSKOWITZ OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 17. ASSESSMENT OF THE ACCURACY OF GAZA MINISTRY OF HEALTH CASUALTY REPORTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report assessing the accuracy of the reporting of the Gaza Ministry of Health regarding—

(1) the total casualty figures reported by the Ministry; and

(2) the information disseminated by the Ministry of casualties grouped by age and gender.

(b) FORM.—The assessment required by paragraph (1) shall be transmitted in an unclassified manner, and any supporting documentation may be transmitted in a classified annex.

(c) BRIEFING.—Not later than 30 days after the submission of the report required by subsection (a), the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency shall brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the contents of the report.

AMENDMENT NO. 202 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle G of title V, insert the following new section:

SEC. 5. REPORT ON THE NUMBER OF VETERANS WHO HAVE THEIR MILITARY ACQUIRED CREDENTIALS RECOGNIZED AT THE STATE-LEVEL FOR THE CIVILIAN WORKFORCE.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Labor, shall submit to Congress a report that builds on the data reported in the “DoD Credentialing Utilization” report from 2018 (3-BB02A16) to better assess the effectiveness of the Credentialing Programs for post-military civilian employment.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the number of veterans who successfully transfer their eligible professional credentials to civilian jobs.

(2) An assessment of which certifications were most commonly used for post-military civilian employment, such as airplane mechanics.

(3) An assessment on any other barriers veterans face to transferring military mechanical skills to State certifications.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “applicable licensing authority” means the licensing authority by a State for a given vocation in which the veteran works or would like to work.

(2) The term “eligible professional credential” means a professional credential, including a professional credential in the field of airplane mechanics, obtained using expenses paid pursuant to the program under section 2015 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The term “expenses” has the meaning given such term in such section.

(4) The term “State” means each of the several States and territories and the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT NO. 203 OFFERED BY MR. BARR OF KENTUCKY

At the end of subtitle C of title XVII, insert the following:

SEC. 17. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR BLUE GRASS CHEMICAL AGENT-DESTRUCTION PILOT PLANT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Joint Explanatory Statement to accompany the James M. Inhofe National

Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (Public Law 117-263) directed the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, to conduct a feasibility study to assess potential missions, plants, or industries feasible for Army or Department of Defense needs at the Blue Grass Army Depot following the completion of the mission at the Blue Grass Chemical Agent-Destruction Pilot Plant.

(2) House Report 118-301 to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (Public Law 118-31) directed the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Commanding General, Army Materiel Command and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology to provide a briefing on the costs and estimated funding profile associated with the organic industrial base modernization strategy and the efforts required to support opportunities for augmenting the organic industrial base at Blue Grass Army Depot.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense and the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Commanding General of the Army Materiel Command and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology, should work with Congress and the local community near the Blue Grass Army Depot to build upon the findings of the feasibility study and House Report referred to in subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 204 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle E of title I, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1. MODIFICATION TO MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN CRITICAL MINERALS.

Section 152 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (Public Law 118-31; 137 Stat. 180; 50 U.S.C. 98e-2) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting “STRATEGIC AND” after “DOMESTICALLY PROCESSED”;

(2) in subsection (a), by striking “the procurement of” and all that follows and inserting the following: “the procurement of strategic and critical materials that are mined, processed, or produced in the United States.”;

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “the domestically processed critical minerals” and inserting “the strategic and critical materials”;

(4) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f);

(5) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

“(e) PRIORITY.—In carrying out the activities described in this section, the Secretary may give priority to the procurement of strategic and critical materials that are derived from recycled and reused minerals and metals to the maximum extent practicable, and from terrestrial mines that do not cause harm to the natural or cultural resources of Tribal communities or sovereign nations or result in degraded ground or surface water.”;

and

(6) in subsection (f), as so redesignated—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) The term ‘strategic and critical material’ means a material determined to be a strategic or critical material under section 3(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(a)).”; and

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

“(4) The term ‘produced’ means formed, assembled, manufactured, or systems integrated.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 205 OFFERED BY MRS. SPARTZ
OF INDIANA

Add at the end of subtitle A of title X the following:

SEC. 1004. OVERSIGHT REQUIREMENTS FOR FINANCIAL IMPROVEMENT AND AUDIT REMEDIATION PLAN.

Section 240b(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting “, the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate” after “congressional defense committees”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending the paragraph heading to read as follows: “BRIEFINGS”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) Not later than June 30, 2025, and annually thereafter, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) shall provide to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a briefing on the status of the corrective action plan. Such briefing shall include an assessment of the progress of the Secretary of Defense in achieving an unqualified audit opinion as described in subsection (a)(2)(iv)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 206 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON
OF OHIO

Page 370, insert after line 6 the following:

SEC. 734. WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS FOR FAILURE TO SUBMIT REPORTS ON HEALTH CONDITIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ON ACTIVE DUTY DEVELOPED AFTER ADMINISTRATION OF COVID-19 VACCINE.

(a) WITHHOLDING.—Section 725(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (Public Law 118-31; 137 Stat. 309) is amended—

(1) by striking “Not later than” and inserting “(1) Not later than”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) If the Secretary fails to submit a report required under paragraph (1) prior to the deadline applicable under such paragraph, the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for the next fiscal year which begins after the deadline shall be reduced by 5 percent.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024.

AMENDMENT NO. 207 OFFERED BY MR. WENSTRUP
OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 7. EXPANSION OF RECOGNITION BY THE DEFENSE HEALTH AGENCY OF CERTIFYING BODIES FOR PHYSICIANS.

(a) EXPANSION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Defense Health Agency shall revise the policy of the Defense Health Agency regarding the credentialing and privileging under the military health system to expand the recognition of certifying bodies for physicians under such policy to a wide range of additional board certifications in medical specialties and subspecialties. The following certifying bodies shall be so recognized:

(1) The member boards of the American Board of Medical Specialties.

(2) The Bureau of Osteopathic Specialists of the American Osteopathic Association.

(3) The American Board of Foot and Ankle Surgery.

(4) The American Board of Podiatric Medicine.

(5) The American Board of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery.

(b) STANDARDS FOR RECOGNITION OF OTHER CERTIFYING BODIES.—To be recognized under subsection (a), a certifying body shall—

(1) be an organization described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that Code;

(2) maintain a process to define, periodically review, enforce, and update specific standards regarding knowledge and skills of the specialty or subspecialty;

(3) administer a psychometrically valid assessment to determine whether a physician meets standards for initial certification, recertification, or continuing certification;

(4) establish and enforce a code of professional conduct; and

(5) require that, in order to be considered a board certified specialty physician, a physician must satisfy—

(A) the certifying body’s applicable requirements for initial certification; and

(B) any applicable recertification or continuing certification requirements of the certifying body that granted the initial certification.

AMENDMENT NO. 208 OFFERED BY MR. BARR OF
KENTUCKY

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

SEC. 1. DEVELOPMENT OF REQUIREMENT FOR SHIPPING CONTAINER PRODUCTION FACILITY AT DOMESTIC ARMY INSTALLATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) House Report 118-301 accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (Public Law 118-31) directed the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Commanding General, Army Materiel Command and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology to provide a briefing on the costs and estimated funding profile as it relates to the organic industrial base modernization strategy, and facility efforts required to support opportunities for organic industrial base augmentation at Blue Grass Army Depot in Kentucky.

(2) The briefing was directed to explore Blue Grass Army Depot as a potential site for the production of metal shipping containers.

(3) Limited domestic production, coupled with the concentration of global shipping container manufacturing in and around China, is a strategic deployment and sustainment risk for United States forces.

(4) China produces most shipping containers and the Department of Defense sources nearly all containers from Asia or assembles container kits in the United States from foreign producers.

(5) Establishing a domestic source for metal shipping containers would reduce reliance on foreign sources.

(b) SHIPPING CONTAINER REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of the Army, the Commanding General of the Army Materiel Command, and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology, shall develop a requirement for the establishment of a shipping container production facility within the United States at an Army installation found to meet feasibility and readiness goals.

AMENDMENT NO. 209 OFFERED BY MS. SHERRILL
OF NEW JERSEY

In subtitle G of title V, add at the end the following:

SEC. 5. TRAINING AND INTERNSHIPS FOR TRANSITIONING MEMBERS THROUGH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) SKILLBRIDGE.—The Secretary of Defense may conduct outreach to institutions of higher education in order to enter into more agreements with such institutions of higher education that may provide training or internships to members of the Armed Forces pursuant to the Skillbridge program established under section 1143(e) of title 10, United States Code.

(b) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given such term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

AMENDMENT NO. 210 OFFERED BY MS.

PETTERSEN OF COLORADO

Add at the end of subtitle C of title VII the following:

SEC. 7. HEALTH CARE STRATEGY FOR MEMBERS WHO PERFORM DUTY IN A COLD WEATHER LOCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs shall convene a working group of subject matter experts from the extramural community and military health system to develop a strategy and the medical research and development requirements to deliver pre-hospital, life-saving interventions for members of the Armed Forces who perform duty in cold weather locations. Not later than July 1, 2025, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees such strategy and associated requirements, which shall include the following:

(1) An overarching plan addressing unique pre-hospital lifesaving and sustainment interventions required in cold weather locations and research required to advance medical care in cold weather locations.

(2) A review of laboratory and medical product development capabilities of the Department of Defense to conduct research and development and support the transition and fielding of medical products for cold weather locations.

(3) Identification of and recommendations to amend clinical practice guidelines to treat combat casualties in cold weather locations.

(4) Initial capabilities documents identifying gaps and requirements to support pre-hospital, life-saving interventions during operations in cold weather locations.

(5) A recommended investment plan to address clinical and medical research and development capability gaps identified in initial capabilities documents.

(6) Engagement of academic medical centers and institutions to support public-private partnerships for research and development to address the pre-hospital needs of members following injury in cold weather locations.

(b) COLD WEATHER LOCATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “cold weather location” means a location for which a member may receive special duty pay—

(1) under section 352 of title 37, United States Code; and

(2) pursuant to section 315 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (Public Law 118-31; 37 U.S.C. 352 note).

AMENDMENT NO. 211 OFFERED BY MR. CISCOMANI
OF ARIZONA

Page 915, after line 12, insert the following new section:

SEC. 28. LAND CONVEYANCE, FORT HUACHUCA, SIERRA VISTA, ARIZONA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army may convey, without consideration, to

the City of Sierra Vista, Arizona (in this section referred to as the "City"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 203 acres, comprising a portion of Fort Huachuca, Arizona, for the purpose of compatible development of the municipal airport located in the City.

(2) CONTINUATION OF EXISTING EASEMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND COVENANTS.—The conveyance of the property under paragraph (1) shall be subject to any easement, restriction, or covenant of record applicable to the property and in existence on the date of the enactment of this section.

(b) REVISIONARY INTEREST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary of the Army determines at any time that the real property conveyed under subsection (a) is not being used in accordance with the purpose of the conveyance specified in such subsection, all right, title, and interest in and to the property, including any improvements thereto, may, at the option of the Secretary, revert to and become the property of the United States, and the United States may have the right of immediate entry onto such property.

(2) DETERMINATION.—A determination by the Secretary of the Army under paragraph (1) shall be made on the record after an opportunity for a hearing.

(c) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army shall require the City to cover all costs (except costs for environmental remediation of the property) to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including costs for environmental and real estate due diligence and any other administrative costs related to the conveyance.

(2) REFUND OF EXCESS AMOUNTS.—If amounts collected by the Secretary of the Army from the City under paragraph (1) in advance exceed the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the City.

(d) LIMITATION ON SOURCE OF FUNDS.—The City may not use Federal funds to cover any portion of the costs required to be paid by the City under this section.

(e) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Army may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT TO NO. 212 OFFERED BY MS. PETERSEN OF COLORADO

Page 780, insert after line 7 the following:
SEC. 1818. BRIEFING ON ACCESS OF MEMBERS OF NATIONAL GUARD TO CHILD CARE SERVICES AT MILITARY CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

(a) BRIEFING REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force, shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a briefing regarding the access of members of the Army National Guard and the Air Force National Guard to child care services at military child development centers.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The briefing under this section shall include the following elements:

(1) The number of families in the Army National Guard and the Air Force National Guard with children under 12 years of age.

(2) The number of families in the Army National Guard and the Air Force National Guard with children under 12 years in which both parents are members of either the Army National Guard or the Air Force National Guard.

(3) The number of single parent households in which the parent is a member of the Army National Guard or the Air Force National Guard.

(4) The average number of days during the year in which a member of the Army National Guard or the Air Force National Guard who has a child under 12 years of age is on active duty.

(5) The number of members of the Army National Guard or the Air Force National Guard Number who have a child under 12 years of age who live within the following distance of a military child development center:

- (A) 10 miles.
- (B) 25 miles.
- (C) 50 miles.
- (D) Over 100 miles.

(6) The number of Army National Guard armories and Air Force National Guard armories within the following distance of a military child development center:

- (A) 10 miles.
- (B) 25 miles.
- (C) 50 miles.
- (D) Over 100 miles.

(7) The number of Army National Guard families who have successfully obtained a voucher for child care funding cost assistance through the Childcare Aware and Upwards programs.

(8) The number of Air Force National Guard families who have successfully obtained a voucher for child care funding cost assistance through the Childcare Aware and Upwards programs.

(9) The amount of funds currently spent on vouchers under the Childcare Aware program for Army National Guard families and Air Force National Guard families, and the amount of funds currently spent on vouchers for Army National Guard families and Air Force National Guard families under the Upwards program.

(10) An overview of State laws that affect the ability of military child development centers to provide 24-hour and overnight child care services.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "military child development center" has the meaning given such term in section 1800 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 213 OFFERED BY MR. PFLUGER OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle G of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. PSYCHOLOGICAL PERFORMANCE TRAINING IN PERFORMANCE MINDSET.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that long-term exposure to high-stress environments leaves many individuals in a suboptimal performance state, creating an environment for maladaptive coping mechanisms, compromised performance abilities, and a potential increase in anxiety, depression, suicide, domestic violence, and substance abuse.

(b) REQUIRED TRAINING.—All training provided to a member of the Armed Forces, including at a Service Academy (as defined section 347 of title 10, United States Code), or a school operated under chapter 107 or 108 of title 10, United States Code, shall include training on the development of proactive psychological performance skills and strategies for psychological flexibility and mental strength. Such training shall include each of the following:

(1) Training in scientifically researched and evidence-based mindset skills designed

to prepare members of the Armed Forces for the physical and mental stressors associated with service in the Armed Forces.

(2) Performance mindset training designed to create psychological flexibility and mental strength to reduce the effects of potential trauma.

(3) Interactive and contextualized training provided by specialized training teams with expert knowledge of psychological performance and how to apply the skills covered by the training across the phases of a career of a member of the Armed Forces.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the implementation of this section. Each such report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 214 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title II, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR HIGH-HYPersonic DETONATION PROPULSION RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for RDT&E, Air Force for Aerospace Propulsion, line 008 as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for high-hypersonic detonation propulsion research and technology is hereby increased by \$5,000,000; and

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for O&M, Air Force for Administration, line 410, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for program decrease is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 215 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle J of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5. COMMERCIAL TRANSITION FOR MILITARY AVIATION MECHANICS.

The Secretary of Defense shall create a strategy to support the transition of military aviation mechanics to commercial aviation mechanics after active duty service.

AMENDMENT NO. 216 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title II, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR ADAPTIVE AND INTELLIGENT ADVERSARY-THREAT MODELS.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for RDT&E, Army for Soldier Lethality Technology, line 010 as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for adaptive and intelligent adversary-threat models is hereby increased by \$5,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for O&M, Army for Other Personnel Support, line 470 as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for program decrease is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 217 OFFERED BY MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

At the end of subtitle F of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. REPORT ON MODIFICATIONS OF EXPEDITIONARY TRANSFER DOCK SHIPS.

Not later than March 1, 2025, the Chief of Naval Operations, in consultation with the

Commandant of the Coast Guard, shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on recommended modifications to the Expeditionary Transfer Dock Ships that will best enable at-sea sustainment of Joint Inter-agency Task Force South partner nation patrol vessels and United States Coast Guard Fast Response Cutters.

AMENDMENT NO. 218 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle F of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10. REPORT ON MILITARY AND WEAPONS LOST DURING WITHDRAWAL FROM AFGHANISTAN.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes an accounting of all the military equipment and weapons lost to the Taliban during the withdrawal of the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan.

AMENDMENT NO. 219 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER OF ILLINOIS

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

SEC. 12. BRIEFING ON IRANIAN SUPPORT FOR NON-STATE ACTORS IN NORTH AFRICA.

(a) **BRIEFING REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on—

(1) Iran's material support for non-state actors in North Africa;

(2) threats to the security of United States allies in the region posed by this Iranian support; and

(3) recommendations for actions the United States may take to deter Iran from providing this support.

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

(1) the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 220 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING COOPERATION WITH THE PHILIPPINES ON MARITIME SECURITY.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should remain committed to helping the Philippines maintain the safety and security of the Philippines, including helping the Philippines to defend against threats to such safety and security from China; and

(2) to help the Philippines defend against such threats, the United States should expand cooperation between the United States and the Philippines with respect to maritime security.

AMENDMENT NO. 221 OFFERED BY MR. OBERNOLTE OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 10. ASSESSMENT OF THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM SUPPORTING MILITARY INSTALLATIONS IN THE R-2508 AIRSPACE.

(a) **ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments con-

cerned, shall develop an assessment of the health care system supporting the military installations within the R-2508 Airspace to ensure adequate health care for the civilian and military workforce.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results of the assessment conducted under subsection (a). Such report shall include an explanation of—

(1) any challenges to the health care system covered by the report within the private and public sector—

(A) including any challenges relating to funding and authorization;

(B) including any potential obstacles to access health care services for both civilian and military populations;

(C) whether there exists a provider shortage for emergency care personnel and certain other specialties; and

(D) including consideration of the potential impacts on the mission of the military installations covered by the report;

(2) recommendations with respect to legislative proposals to improve such health care system; and

(3) the plans of the Secretary to address the issues identified under paragraphs (1) through (2).

AMENDMENT NO. 222 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle C of title XVII, add the following:

SEC. 17. REWARDS FOR INFORMATION REGARDING LEADERS OF HAMAS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency and the Secretary of Defense shall advocate in their respective roles on the Foreign Threat Intelligence Committee to request the Rewards for Justice Program to offer \$25,000,000 each in incentives for information regarding Hamas terrorists Yahya Sinwar and Mohammed Deif.

(b) **OTHER REWARDS.**—The Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency and the Secretary of Defense should advocate for significant rewards for information regarding other leaders Iran-backed entities designated as Foreign Terrorist Organizations under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189) or Specially Designated Global Terrorists under section 594.310 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

AMENDMENT NO. 223 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 7. STUDY ON INCREASED TELEHEALTH SERVICES OF THE DEFENSE HEALTH AGENCY.

Not later than September 30, 2025, the Director of the Defense Health Agency shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the results of a study to determine how to increase access of TRICARE beneficiaries to telehealth services of the Defense Health Agency.

AMENDMENT NO. 224 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Add at the end of subtitle F of title X the following:

SEC. 10. GAO REVIEW AND REPORT ON BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS EXPERIMENTS ON AND IN RELATION TO TICKS, TICK-BORNE DISEASE.

(a) **REVIEW.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of research conducted during the period beginning on January 1, 1945, and ending on December 31, 1972, by the Department of Defense, including by the Department of Defense in consultation with the National In-

stitutes of Health, the Department of Agriculture, or any other Federal agency on—

(1) the use of ticks as hosts or delivery mechanisms for biological warfare agents, including experiments involving *Spirochaetales* and *Rickettsiales*; and

(2) any efforts to improve the effectiveness and viability of *Spirochaetales* and *Rickettsiales* as biological weapons through combination with other diseases or viruses.

(b) **LOCATION OF RESEARCH.**—In conducting the review under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall review research conducted at facilities located inside United States and facilities located outside the United States, including laboratories and field work locations.

(c) **INFORMATION TO BE REVIEWED.**—

(1) **CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.**—In conducting the review under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall review any relevant classified information.

(2) **DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW.**—In conducting the review under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall review, among other sources, the following documents:

(A) Technical Reports related to The Summary of Major Events and Problems, US Army Chemical Corps, FY 1951 – FY1969.

(B) Site Holding: CB DT DW 48158 Title: Virus and Rickettsia Waste Disposal Study. Technical Report No. 103, January 1969. Corp Author Name: FORT DETRICK FREDERICK MD Report Number: SMUFD-TR-103 Publish Date: 19690101.

(C) Site Holding: CB DT DW 60538 Title: A Plaque Assay System for Several Species of Rickettsia. Corp Author Name: FORT DETRICK FREDERICK MD Report Number: SMUFD-TM-538 Publish Date: 19690601.

(D) Site Holding: CB DW 531493 Title: Progress Report for Ecology and Epidemiology and Biological Field Test Technology, Third Quarter FY 1967. Corp Author Name: ARMY DUGWAY PROVING GROUND UT Publish Date: 19670508.

(d) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report that includes the following:

(A) The scope of any research described in subsection (a).

(B) Whether any ticks used in such research were released outside of any facility (including any ticks that were released unintentionally).

(C) Whether any records related to such research were destroyed, and whether such destruction was intentional or unintentional.

(2) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 225 OFFERED BY MR. BARR OF KENTUCKY

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

SEC. 10. ASSESSMENT OF INFLUENCE OF CHINA IN PACIFIC ISLAND NATIONS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, and each year thereafter, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency shall publish in the annual China military power report required by section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65), or other relevant publication, an assessment of the following:

(1) Investments and influence of China in Pacific Island nations.

(2) How China's activities have or have not impacted United States military strategy in the Pacific region, as it relates to Pacific Island nations.

AMENDMENT NO. 226 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle B of title XVII, insert the following:

SEC. 17. ANNUAL REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ASSISTANCE TO U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION AND DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY ON NORTHERN BORDER SECURITY.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress an annual report on the assistance the Department of Defense provides to U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the Department of Homeland Security to secure the northern border of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 227 OFFERED BY MS. SLOTKIN OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle G of title VIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8. REPORTS ON NATIONAL SECURITY RISKS.

(a) GAO REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of a study on the national security risks posed by consulting firms who simultaneously contract with the Federal Government and the Chinese government or its proxies or affiliates.

(2) CONTENTS.—In performing the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall—

(A) assess the extent to which Federal agencies collect information on contracts performed on behalf of the Chinese government or its proxies or affiliates by consulting firms that hold or have held contracts with the Federal Government, and whether such information includes specific projects and deliverables of such contracts;

(B) evaluate the extent to which selected Federal agencies, to include at a minimum the Department of Defense and elements of the Intelligence Community, have assessed the risks posed by American consulting firms' work for the Chinese government and its proxies or affiliates, including an assessment of risk of deliberate or inadvertent sharing of Federal Government information that may be used for Chinese economic or military advantage;

(C) identify relevant contract clauses, procedures, and information used by Federal agencies to identify, evaluate and resolve organizational conflicts of interest when awarding consulting contracts;

(D) assess the extent to which agencies experience challenges when identifying, evaluating and resolving organizational conflicts of interest, including determining whether the offeror or potential contractor also performs work for China; and

(E) identify steps federal agencies take to monitor contractor compliance with any contract clauses, terms or conditions intended to resolve identified conflicts of interest.

(b) REPORT ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—The Secretary of Defense shall annually submit to Congress a report on—

(1) the implementation of section 812 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (10 U.S.C. 4501 note prec.); and

(2) how the Department of Defense is defining the term “entities related to the Chinese or Russian governments” and whether, and to what extent, the Secretary is investigating conflicts of interest between prime contractors of the Department of Defense and subsidiary companies of such contractors.

AMENDMENT NO. 229 OFFERED BY MR. BURLISON OF MISSOURI

At the end of subtitle I of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO GREGORY MCMANUS FOR ACTS OF VALOR.

(a) WAIVER OF TIME LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding the time limitations specified in section 7274 of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation with respect to the awarding of certain medals to persons who served in the Armed Forces, the President is authorized to award the Medal of Honor, under section 7271 of such title, to Gregory McManus for the acts of valor described in subsection (b).

(b) ACTS OF VALOR DESCRIBED.—The acts of valor described in this subsection are the following:

(1) Chief Warrant Officer Gregory McManus distinguished himself for his brave acts of valor while serving in the United States Army by risking his life to save the lives of his fellow servicemembers.

(2) Chief Warrant Officer McManus deserves recognition for his acts of valor while serving as the commander of a single helicopter gunship on an important mission north of Chai Duc.

(3) Discovering an envoy of hundreds of enemy troops along the Cambodian border, Chief Warrant Officer McManus attacked the enemy without hesitation.

(4) Chief Warrant Officer McManus disregarded the tracers that rose to meet him, firing rockets the entire length of the convoy, confusing the enemy, and scattering the troop column.

(5) Chief Warrant Officer McManus then attacked an armored vehicle with a mounted machine gun, destroying it and a large artillery piece which it was towing.

(6) Over and over, Chief Warrant Officer McManus flew through heavy automatic weapons and machine gun fire to attack the enemy, only deciding to return when his ordinance was expended, and his ship had taken so much damage that further flight was inadvisable.

(7) With this noble deed, Chief Warrant Officer McManus was able to destroy the enemy unit and scattered the rest in disorder with a single ship.

(8) Disregarding the size and scope of the enemy troop's convoy, Chief Warrant Officer McManus put his own life in danger, all in the service of his country and members of the Armed Forces.

(9) Because of the heroic actions of Chief Warrant Officer McManus, countless American soldier's lives were saved.

(10) These actions of heroism by Chief Warrant Officer McManus deserves recognition and demonstrates this hero of the United States more than deserve the medal of honor.

AMENDMENT NO. 230 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. . MILITARY COOPERATION WITH MOROCCO.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States recognizes the 20th anniversary of the African Lion exercise hosted by Morocco, a key United States ally in Africa and the Middle East.

(2) The African Lion exercise is United States Africa Command's largest annual combined joint exercise.

(3) African Lion builds and maintains interoperability with our African and North Atlantic Treaty Organization partners and improves our ability to meet security related challenges together to address the growing threats from nation states, private military corporations, militias, non-state armed groups and violent extremist organizations, given the increasing presence of malign ac-

tors in Africa, including the Iranian regime and its proxies, particularly in North Africa and the Sahel.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) support strengthening security cooperation with Morocco given increasing instability in Africa and the Middle East and provide for close cooperation between the United States and Morocco in order to contribute to the region's broader security; and

(2) provide for the continuation of the African Lion exercise in future years will support the crucial efforts to address security challenges facing NATO's southern flank.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing how the United States can improve its interoperability and cooperation with Morocco through the African Lion exercise to continue to address the growing threats in Africa, including the Iranian regime and its proxies, particularly in North Africa and the Sahel.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(B) and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 231 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle F of title XVIII, add the following new section:

SEC. . DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PLAN TO CONSTRUCT MEMORIAL AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY IN COMMEMORATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES KILLED IN CERTAIN ATTACK AT HAMID KARZAI INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, KABUL, AFGHANISTAN.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a plan and strategy to construct a memorial in Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, to commemorate the thirteen members of the Armed Forces killed in the attack at Hamid Karzai International Airport in Kabul, Afghanistan, in August of 2021.

AMENDMENT NO. 232 OFFERED BY MR. GOLDEN OF MAINE

At the end of subtitle G of title V, insert the following new section:

SEC. 5. OPT-OUT SHARING OF INFORMATION ON MEMBERS RETIRING OR SEPARATING FROM THE ARMED FORCES WITH COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS AND RELATED ENTITIES.

Section 570F of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (Public Law 116-92; 10 U.S.C. 1142 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “out the form to indicate an email address” and inserting the following: “out the form to indicate—

“(1) an email address; and”; and

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

“(2) if the individual would like to opt-out of the transmittal of the individual's information to and through a State veterans agency as described in subsection (a).”; and

(2) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) OPT-OUT OF INFORMATION SHARING.—Information on an individual shall be transmitted to and through a State veterans agency as described in subsection (a) unless the individual indicates pursuant to subsection (c)(2) that the individual would like to opt out of such transmittal.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 233 OFFERED BY MR.
WESTERMAN OF ARKANSAS

At the end of subtitle D of title XXVIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 28. REMOVAL OF USE CONDITIONS AND CONDITIONS ON REVERSION FOR THE FORMER ARMY AND NAVY GENERAL HOSPITAL, HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK, HOT SPRINGS, ARKANSAS.

(a) REMOVAL OF USE CONDITIONS.—Section 3(a) of Public Law 86-323 (73 Stat. 594; Sept. 21, 1959) is amended by striking “as a vocational rehabilitation center or for other public health or educational purposes” and inserting “for appropriate purposes, as determined by the Governor of the State of Arkansas”.

(b) CONDITIONS ON REVERSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the provisions contained in section 3 of Public Law 86-323 (73 Stat. 594; Sept. 21, 1959) any reversionary interest retained by the United States in the Covered Property may be extinguished by occurrence of the following conditions:

(A) Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Governor of the State of Arkansas submits to the Secretary of the Army a written request to extinguish any reversionary or other future interest in the surface rights held by the United States in the covered property.

(B) The Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Administrator of the General Services Administration and the Secretary of the Interior, concurs in writing with the said request.

(2) QUITCLAIM DEED.—If the conditions described in paragraph (1) are met, the Secretary of the Army shall extinguish by quitclaim deed any reversionary or other future interest in the surface rights held by the United States in the covered property.

(3) RIGHTS AND INTERESTS RESERVED TO THE UNITED STATES.—In exercising the authority under this section, the Secretary of the Army may not convey or extinguish any interests reserved to the United States—

(A) pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 86-323 (73 Stat. 594; Sept. 21, 1959) in—

(i) all mineral rights (including gas and oil), together with necessary rights of ingress, egress, and surface use; or

(ii) thermal waters or other hot waters, together with necessary rights of ingress, egress, and surface use; and

(B) relating to the location, installation, and relocation of utility facilities for such mineral rights, thermal waters, or other hot waters; and

(C) in the conditions set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3) of the Deed of Conveyance.

(4) REVERSION.—If the Governor of the State of Arkansas does not submit a request described in subsection (b)(2) before the deadline in such subsection, all right, title and interest held by the State of Arkansas in the covered property shall revert to the United States in accordance with section 3 of Public Law 86-323 (73 Stat. 594; Sept. 21, 1959).

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section:

(1) The term “covered property” means the real property conveyed by the Deed of Conveyance pursuant to Public Law 86-323 (73 Stat. 594; Sept. 21, 1959).

(2) The term “Deed of Conveyance” means the quitclaim deed between the United States of America and the State of Arkansas dated March 10, 1960, recorded in the land records of the County of Garland, State of Arkansas, at book 480, page 77.

AMENDMENT NO. 234 OFFERED BY MR.
MAGAZINER OF RHODE ISLAND

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

SEC. 7. IMPROVEMENTS TO TRICARE PROVIDER DIRECTORIES.

(a) VERIFICATION; UPDATES.—A managed support contractor that supports TRICARE and maintains a directory of health care providers shall verify and update such directory not less than once every 90 days.

(b) DATABASES.—A managed support contractor described in subsection (a) shall update a database not later than two days after receipt of information that affects such database.

(c) ANNUAL REVIEWS.—The Director of the Defense Health Agency shall review directories described in subsection (a) not less than once each year.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support the en bloc package, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I, too, urge Members to adopt the en bloc package and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc 3 offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

The en bloc amendments 3 were agreed to.

VACATING ORDERING OF RECORDED VOTE ON
AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MRS. LUNA

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 47 be withdrawn to the end that the amendment stand disposed of by the earlier voice vote thereon.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FONG) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8070) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

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

□ 1631

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OWENS) at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

SERVICEMEMBER QUALITY OF LIFE IMPROVEMENT AND NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 8070.

Will the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG) kindly take the chair.

□ 1632

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. 8070) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. ARMSTRONG (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 47 printed in part B of House Report 118-551 offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA) had been withdrawn to the end that the amendment stand adopted.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 118-551 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 37 by Ms. GREENE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 52 by Mr. ROSENDALE of Montana.

Amendment No. 55 by Ms. VAN DUYNE of Texas.

Amendment No. 40 by Mr. GAETZ of Florida.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. GROTHMAN of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 42 by Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 43 by Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 44 by Mr. CLYDE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 45 by Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.

Amendment No. 46 by Mr. STEUBE of Florida.

Amendment No. 48 by Ms. BOEBERT of Colorado.

Amendment No. 49 by Mr. MILLS of Florida.