United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 13, 2017 No. 118

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 13, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL M. DONOVAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

CONGRESSIONAL HISPANIC CAUCUS MEETS WITH SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Secretary of Homeland Security John Kelly met with members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

We asked him about veterans who are being deported. We asked him why American citizens were increasingly having their families broken up by deportation. We asked him about the 800,000 young people who signed up for DACA and the hundreds of thousands of long-term residents of the U.S. who have temporary protected status. He really had no answers.

We know he is on board with Trump's agenda to deport millions and millions of people or he would not have been appointed to his position. But, honestly, he seemed not to understand what his own agency does, the statutory powers he has as Secretary of Homeland Security under current law, or, for that matter, even how Congress works—so naive.

Let me give Members some examples.

Number one, Francisca Lino lives in Chicago, and her husband and six children are U.S. citizens. For nearly a decade, she stayed out of trouble and reported every year to immigration authorities.

Now people who work for the Secretary decided she must leave the country and leave her American citizen children and her American citizen husband this August. Why? What changed, Mr. Secretary? Absolutely nothing, except you.

The same goes for Jesus Lara in Ohio. He has four American citizen children who have lived their entire lives here but their family is being broken up by their own government.

According to the Secretary, the courts are deporting them, not he or his agency. He denied any responsibility and said he can't do anything about it. But we all know the Secretary of Homeland Security has extraordinary powers to spare families from deportation, especially when doing so would not be in our national interest.

I told him he could just pick up the phone and stop the deportation of Ms. Lino and Mr. Lara and spare the American people the cruelty and the hardship. But he is hiding behind the old ''it is out of my hands'' bureaucratic dodge and the old ''I am just following orders'' defense—the general following orders.

But, General, that is completely invalid because we know you have the power to do the right thing.

On TPS, a program that currently allows hundreds of thousands of people to live and work here legally, the Secretary has almost unilateral power to extend it. But the Secretary was like: Well, I don't know what I'm gonna do. They have been here a long time. I don't know what I'm gonna do. I have to decide.

What kind of answer is that, Mr. Secretary?

To me this means that hundreds of thousands of people's lives, the lives that have been built in the United States, are about to be turned upside down. He wants to take hundreds of thousands of legally documented immigrants and make them undocumented and then go after them and their families. How does that make America great?

Then there is DACA, the program where 800,000 children and young adults came forward and registered with the government, went through a background check and were rechecked periodically. Now Secretary Kelly says he thinks DACA is illegal, and, once again, it is out of his hands—and up to whom? Do you know whom he says it is up to? Attorney General Jeff Sessions—only America's number one opponent of immigration of any kind.

So to me this is our call to action. The way we rose up to support women and Planned Parenthood, we have to do that again and again. The way lawyers and patriotic Americans stood at airports to protect refugees and religious freedom, well, now it is time to protect TPS, DREAMers, and other families in the crosshairs.

We are going to have to organize, mobilize, and stand with our allies to protect families, to protect American citizens in those families, and to defend

Printed on recycled paper.

communities because these guys are serious. They want to deport millions of people, and they are coming after the DREAMers and those with deep, long-term lives in the U.S.

This is our call to action. We must resist. We must rise up and stand up for American values. Whether the President, the Secretary, or the Attorney General likes it or not, we need to make it clear that immigrants and immigration are here to stay.

Last May, the Secretary of Homeland Security set an edict. He told over 55,000 Haitians: You have got 6 months. Get your paperwork ready. You are leaving the country.

Then he is going to come after hundreds of thousands of Central Americans that are here legally in this country and have been here for 10, 15, and 20 years. He is telling them also: Get your affairs in order. You are going to be deported from the United States. I am eliminating your legal status.

When it comes to DREAMers, I want to make it absolutely clear to everyone today that he is going to end the program, and he is going to begin that process this September. He says: Oh, I like them. They are nice people, but there is nothing I can do. I am just going to talk to my buddy, General Jeff Sessions.

Jeff Sessions has never liked the program when he was a U.S. Senator, and now he is the Attorney General. They will eliminate the program, putting 800,000 people in the crosshairs of deportation.

We have the moment to rise up.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

It is the moment to resist, they are coming to destroy our communities, they are coming to deport dreamers. Let's stand up! Get organized and resist.

Es el momento de resistir, vienen a destruir nuestra comunidad, vienen a deportar a los soñadores. Parecen, organizasen y resistan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois will provide a translation of his remarks to the Clerk.

THANKING SUSAN GUREKOVICH FOR HER SERVICE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the wonderful career of Susan Gurekovich, the office manager and academy coordinator caseworker in my Bellefonte district office. After nearly 40 years of service to the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which spanned the terms of three separate Members of the House, Susan will retire on Friday, July 14.

She will certainly be missed by all.

Mr. Speaker, Susan began her career on February 19, 1979. She began working for Congressman Bill Clinger of Warren County, Pennsylvania. She would spend the following 18 years providing top-notch constituent services to the people of Pennsylvania.

Susan said she was blessed to work for Congressman Clinger and to learn from his experienced staff, especially her mentor, Becky Mills. Susan has seen a lot through her 38 years of service, and her smile, friendliness, and can-do attitude has only grown larger over the years.

Susan, herself, has mentored countless interns and employees during her tenure. It was decades ago that a young intern named Rick Santorum spent time in the office during his tenure at Penn State University. Later Susan would watch his career progress as he eventually found himself in the House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

When Congressman Clinger retired and Congressman John Peterson was sworn in, he welcomed Susan's experience as he took office in 1997. Susan continued her role, which included overseeing the Military Service Academy Board. Susan also worked to help nominate the best and the brightest young men and women in the congressional district for our U.S. service academies.

She has seen scores of young, optimistic, patriotic students walk through her door with the hope of attending one of our great academies. These same students have been fortunate to work with a true civil servant like Susan. She is someone who is not only dedicated to her job, but enthusiastic about it day in and day out.

When Congressman Peterson retired in 2008 and I was elected in 2009, it was an easy fit to retain Susan on my district staff as a caseworker and office manager. Her dedication to the people of the Fifth Congressional District knows no bounds. She is always in search of an answer and works diligently to navigate our Federal agencies to resolve issues and problems for our constituents.

To say we will miss Susan is an understatement. Her warm welcome to all who cross her path will not be forgotten or easily replaced. Everyone who has the pleasure of interacting with her can see her passion.

Susan is a hometown girl and a self-described country girl at heart. She graduated from South Hills School of Business Technology and supplemented her degree with courses at Penn State University.

I know she looks forward to spending more time with her husband, John, and they plan to travel and visit with family and friends. Susan said she will take a more active role in her church as a deacon to continue her life of service.

And that is exactly what Susan has done for the past 38 years for the people of central and north central Pennsylvania: serve. She has helped and assisted so many. When you meet with Susan, you will always be greeted with a welcoming smile, a listening ear, and a caring heart.

I thank Susan for her dedication, for serving the American people, and for helping select so many bright young minds to serve in our military academies.

On behalf of the Congress of the United States, I thank Susan for more than four decades of service to the people's House. She embodies the character of this institution and has been a steadfast advocate for countless constituents, three Members of the House, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On behalf of my family and her second family, the staff in Pennsylvania and here in Washington, we wish Susan the best for a well-deserved retirement.

PASS GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I stood up on this floor and called for action to stop gun violence. My request was simple: before we recess this summer, let us pass lifesaving gun safety legislation. This is something that has bipartisan support. It is something that urban, suburban, and rural communities have cried out for help on.

Universal background checks are something 74 percent of NRA members support. Put in context, just 16 percent of Americans want the majority's healthcare bill, and yet you have attempted to pass it three times in the past 2 months. Nearly 8 in 10 Americans want background checks on gun sales, but we have not had one vote.

Because of your inaction, over 100 people were shot and over 10 were killed by gun violence in Chicago over the Fourth of July weekend. Over 100 Americans shot in one weekend and in one city, and still we do nothing.

I would like to call out names of those who have lost their lives:

Martell Sanders-Anderson, 16;
Djuan Williams, 16;
Andre Taylor, 16;
Lucas L. Spicer, Jr., 16;
Pierre Loury, 16;
Davharea Wilson, 16;
Ladarrius Jackson, 15;
Leonardo Betancourt, 13;
Randall Young, 16;
Eddy Brooks, 16;
Nathan Hicks, 16;
Damarcus Williams, 16;
Veronica Lopez, 15;
Fabian Lavinder, 15;
Victor Felix, 16;
Christian Bandemer, 16;
Melvin Cook, 16;
Trevell Parker, 16;
Travon Smith, 15;
Mario Venegas, Jr., 15;
Delance Price, 16;
Malik Causey, 14;
Elijah Sims, 16;
Jaylen Howard, 16;

Demarco Webster, Jr., 14;
Deandre Banks, 16;
Elijah House, 16;
Clarence Coakley, 16;
Javon Wilson, 15;
Diego Alvarado, 16;
Christopher Brandon, 16;
Gregory Livingston, 15;
Malik McNeese, 16;
Bruce Owens, 15;
Diabolique Anderson, 16;
Willie Woodus, 15;
Clavonte Eubanks, 15;
Takiya Holmes, 11;
Lavontay White, Jr., 2;
Deshawn Martin, 15;
Mishawn Green, 16;
Kanari Gentry-Bowers, 12;
Laquan Allen, 14;
Jaquarius Davis, 16;
Julio Cesar Garcia-Lara, 15;
Kahari Stovall, 16;
Diego Villada, 15;
Jesus Escobar, 16;
Alexis Stubbs, 12; and
Jazebel Aleman, 3.

Mr. Speaker, not one of these children was over 16 years old. They should be learning to drive, learning to code, playing with dolls, and enjoying their own summer recess. That will never again be possible because of this Chamber's inaction.

RECOGNIZING MONROE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Monroe County, Michigan's bicentennial celebration.

Founded on July 14, 1817, Monroe County is the second oldest county in Michigan and is named in honor of our Nation's fifth President, James Monroe.

Home to the River Raisin National Battlefield Park, Monroe County takes great pride in preserving local history and telling the story of the War of 1812 and those who fought to secure our freedoms.

□ 1015

Monroe County is blessed with many precious natural resources, wildlife, and outdoor areas for the community to enjoy. Whether it is fishing for walleye on Lake Erie or watching waterfowl in the unique coastal marshes, the outdoor opportunities are the finest in the Nation.

Serving as an important transportation hub, Monroe County features the largest highway gateway into Michigan and the State's only international port on Lake Erie.

Monroe County is also known for its rich agricultural heritage, as well as its strong manufacturing presence, including the headquarters of furniture manufacturer La-Z-Boy.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my gratitude to the many citizens and organizations that comprise the Monroe County Bicentennial Alliance. They generously gave of their time to coordinate a number of special programs and events throughout the year. It is an honor to join with them to commemorate this exciting milestone for Monroe County, a place where the community proudly comes together to make it a special place to visit and call home.

Congratulations, Monroe County, on 200 years. I look forward to celebrating it with you.

HONORING MIKE McGARVIN

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Mr. Mike McGarvin, a role model for one and all, and a gentleman who truly made a difference in his lifetime.

Mike was the beloved founder of the Poverello House, a homeless shelter in Fresno, California, which provides three meals a day, 365 days a year, to those in need, as well as clothing, medical services, and temporary shelter for those who are most vulnerable and have challenges in their life.

For decades, Mike served countless people in the Fresno area using one simple message: ''Listen with compassion; give with a warm heart and a smile.''

Think about that: Listen with compassion and give with a warm heart and a smile.

The lives of hundreds and thousands of individuals were made better because of Mike's helping hand. He will be remembered by all for his deep compassion and boundless kindness.

Mike was a role model for me and for all who knew him. He leaves a legacy of service and selflessness, both through the Poverello House and in the hearts of those people he touched throughout the years.

I join Mike's family and the supporters of the Poverello House over the years in honoring his life.

CONGRATULATIONS TO VALLEY CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Valley Children's Hospital for their recent recognition as one of the Nation's top 50 children's hospitals in the country, which I represent. I have been there and know of the work they do.

In their annual Best Children's Hospitals report, U.S. News & World Report ranked the hospital in a host of key critical areas as among the top in pediatric orthopedics, pediatric diabetes and endocrinology, and pediatric gastroenterology and GI surgery.

To see these preemies in their beds and these young, little lives being saved as a result of the overall effort of the children's hospital is truly heartwarming.

We in the Valley have known for decades how highly skilled and dedicated the nurses, doctors, and staff are at Valley Children's Hospital. It was founded more than 60 years ago with the mission to provide high-quality, comprehensive medical care to children, regardless of their ability to pay, and to continuously improve upon the health and well-being of these children. That is why, in part, the cuts that are being proposed to Medicaid are so devastating all around the country, but especially among our children who are not in a position to afford this kind of care.

Valley Children's Hospital has grown and is now the second largest children's hospital in California. It has many more patients than any other pediatric hospital north of San Diego. The hospital's emergency room is the only dedicated pediatric emergency room between San Francisco and Los Angeles.

Valley Children's Hospital has been designated as a magnet nursing hospital by the American Nurses Credentialing Center, which is a recognition of true excellence in nursing care. Less than 3 percent of all hospitals in the United States earn this designation.

Once again, I am a regular visitor to this hospital. When you see the staff, who have an incredible heart, and all the loving care they provide, and you see the parents and families with their young babies and young children, you know that something special is going on here.

On behalf of my constituents in the Valley community, I would like to congratulate Valley Children's Hospital for their recent recognition as one of the Nation's top 50 children's hospitals.

I would also like to thank all of the dedicated staff, once again, who are committed to improving the health and well-being of not only the children of our Valley and in California, but across the Nation. We know that all of the nurses and physicians make a difference throughout our country.

MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

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

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the work of the Military Order of the Purple Heart and, specifically, chapter 717.

My friends and neighbors there who serve in this chapter are working to erect a monument on the Treasure Coast of Florida to those who were injured in battle while defending our great Nation. They may have been targeted by a sniper, a victim of an improvised explosive device, or they may have been charging a hill somewhere in Vietnam.

The marker that they have worked to erect at Indian Riverside Park in Martin County will bring awareness and recognition to the true cost of freedom, which is the blood that is shed by selfless men and women who have served across the world in defense of

others because of their sense of duty to America.

I thank all members of the Military Order of the Purple Heart for never forgetting and never for one second taking for granted the price paid by our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and coastguardsman.

May God bless the work they are doing.

ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today so that we think about the over 5 million Americans, including thousands of Floridians and nearly half a million American veterans, who are living with Alzheimer's and dementia.

Alzheimer's is the only one of the top 10 causes of death that cannot be prevented, cannot be cured, and cannot be slowed. As the sixth leading cause of death in Florida, and with so many affected by this incurable disease, we have to continue to stress the importance of early diagnosis and the treatment of Alzheimer's disease and related illnesses.

But awareness is never enough. As a member of the Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease, I am determined to make progress for all those affected. We must act proactively to achieve breakthroughs in prevention and treatment. We also have to act to ensure that those who currently have Alzheimer's have the tools that are needed to manage their symptoms, reduce pain, and increase comfort.

Nearly half of all people with Alzheimer's and other dementias are in hospice care at the time of their passing, but less than half of nursing homes have some sort of palliative care program. For people with advanced dementia, palliative care improves their quality of life, controls costs, and enhances both patient and family satisfaction.

As the demand for this kind of care grows with the aging population, more has to be done to ensure that there is a workforce equipped to provide that care. That is why I recently signed onto the Palliative Care and Hospice Education and Training Act, a bipartisan bill that will help our Nation's seniors who are struggling with the effects of Alzheimer's.

I have spoken to a few Members in this House who have not been touched by this serious illness in one way or another. Whether they have been impacted personally, supported a loved one during a tough time, or prayed for a friend who needed help, we all know how difficult that situation is.

This is a great bill. I urge my fellow colleagues to think back to that person that they have known and how much this could have benefited them.

Mr. Speaker, let us take some decisive action to help patients with Alzheimer's and their families. Let's pass this bill.

DON'T REPEAL ACA

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend who just spoke, if he wants to do something for Alzheimer's, don't pass the Senate Republican healthcare bill. It would devastate Medicaid and Alzheimer's victims who rely on Medicaid service.

Ensuring that every American has access to high-quality and affordable healthcare is the most important and enduring challenge, arguably, facing our Nation today. Ironically, we are closer than ever before to achieving that goal.

Since the Affordable Care Act was adopted, more than 20 million previously uninsured Americans have gained quality coverage. In fact, we have reduced the uninsured rate to the lowest level ever recorded. Americans no longer face punitive annual and lifetime limits, and they no longer have the fear of having their inadequate health insurance cut off if they dare get sick. Insurance companies can no longer refuse to cover Americans who suffer preexisting conditions, which is the case for tens of millions of Americans.

The Affordable Care Act has been the difference between life and death for adults who have been locked out of the system for years, for sick children who have reached their lifetime limits before they can even leave the hospital where they were born, for families bankrupted by a cancer diagnosis, and for everyday Americans that will require expensive treatments for the rest of their lives due to a chronic illness or accident.

The Republican effort to repeal this bill is a unilateral retreat from the progress made under the Affordable Care Act and from President Trump's own promise that there would be ''insurance for everybody.'' I guess there was a footnote: except for 23 million.

This promise made by the President is not the only falsehood perpetrated by many of my friends on the other side of the aisle about the Affordable Care Act. Here are three more:

Falsehood number one: Republicans say costs are out of control.

The truth is, since the Affordable Care Act became law, healthcare costs have grown at the slowest rate in 50 years. That is right, the slowest rate in 50 years, and considerably below the decade preceding the adoption of the act. Republicans conveniently ignore the fact that, under their own repeal plan, their premiums would go up an average of 64 percent.

Falsehood number two: Republicans claim the Affordable Care Act is in a death spiral.

Well, this would come as news to the Congressional Budget Office, Standard & Poor's, and the American Academy of Actuaries, all of whom have concluded that the Affordable Care Act's individual markets are stable and could continue to improve, except, of course, for Republicans talking it down.

Falsehood number three: Republicans say that insurers are fleeing the markets and consumers will have no choice.

The truth is the Affordable Care Act is not imploding, but Republicans have certainly tried to sow dysfunction and destroy the individual markets. In some places, they have succeeded. They have resorted to sabotaging the individual markets to fulfill their own false narrative. They killed the risk corridors that stabilized those markets and have used riders and must-pass spending bills to undermine premium stabilization programs.

This has resulted in huge losses to some insurers, causing them to pull out of markets, understandably, and to increase premiums when they otherwise would not have. Ironically, the same premium stabilization programs that the Republicans have attacked since 2014 are actually in their own repeal bill.

The Trump administration has refused to commit to making the cost-sharing reduction payments that lower out-of-pocket costs for consumers. That has caused premiums to go up. Without those payments, Americans will see premiums increase by an average of 19 percent.

□ 1030

One Blue Cross Blue Shield executive noted the premium increases would be 8 percent if the cost-sharing reduction payments were guaranteed.

Other insurers have explicitly stated that their participation is contingent on those payments. Threatening not to make those payments, of course, undermines the system.

Those payments are not the only aspect of ObamaCare the Trump administration has sabotaged. They have also disrupted enrollment in individual markets by refusing to enforce the individual mandate, by cutting the open enrollment period in half, and by refusing to promote the enrollment itself on television.

Republicans in Congress and the Trump administration have chosen sabotage and repeal over bipartisan cooperation to fix that which is not working. I would propose we work in a bipartisan fashion, and I have three ideas.

First, introduce a public option to increase competition in marketplaces; second, we can implement premium stabilization programs in order to keep premiums affordable for everybody; and third, we can increase premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies to lower costs and boost enrollment for middle class Americans. That is the bipartisan solution to healthcare, not a reckless repeal effort that will deny 23 million of our fellow Americans access to healthcare.

BRUCE HERSCHENSOHN BIRTHDAY WISHES

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of our Nation's greatest conservative minds and most eloquent voices, Bruce Herschensohn of California, on the occasion of his upcoming birthday.

I am told he is opposed to keeping an exact count of birthdays, either that or he has simply lost track, but it is a significant milestone and one for which his friends are grateful and his country is fortunate.

He served our Nation and the free peoples of the world in the U.S. Information Agency during the Cold War. Anyone who saw and was inspired by the classic tribute, ''John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums,'' has Bruce Herschensohn to thank. He went on to serve President Nixon as both speechwriter and adviser.

Anyone who lived in southern California in the late 1970s or the 1980s will remember Bruce's incisive nightly commentaries on KABC-TV and his decisive debates with John Tunney. I can tell you that they fundamentally shaped my thinking and animated my career, and I often encounter others throughout the country who trace their political roots back to his nightly conservative homilies.

Through the darkest days of the Carter malaise, Herschensohn became a beacon of hope, helping to pave the way for the Reagan Revolution. He marshaled the self-evident truths of the American founding and introduced them to a new generation that was losing its memory of them. He connected the dots between freedom and its importance to the prosperity and happiness of our society and the stability of our world. He helped lay the foundation for the Reagan administration on the Presidential transition team.

If he had had any knack or inclination for raising money, he would have served many years in the United States Senate, and both California and the Nation would have been infinitely better for it.

He was one of the earliest voices to raise the alarm over Islamist terrorism and has been one of the strongest defenders of the State of Israel through all its travails and challenges of the past half-century.

But I believe his greatest influence is through the thousands of students who have had the good fortune to study under his tutelage at the Pepperdine University School of Public Policy for more than a decade. The full measure of his contributions to our Nation will be measured over the many years to come as his students take their place in shaping our Nation's policies over the next generation.

On behalf of so many who have been influenced, inspired, and ultimately motivated by the elegance of his reasoning and the eloquence of his words, I am honored to offer happy birthday wishes to Bruce Herschensohn today.

HONORING SENATOR KEVIN O'TOOLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the retirement of New Jersey Senator Kevin O'Toole.

Like me, Senator O'Toole is a proud son of New Jersey. He was born to an Irish-American GI and Korean war refugee in Cedar Grove, New Jersey, where he still lives today with his wife, Beth. They are proud parents of two children, Kevin, Jr., and Ryan Marie.

Kevin's parents instilled in him a strong commitment to service that shaped his entire career. At age 25, Kevin was elected to the Cedar Grove Township Council and then mayor.

As assemblyman and State senator, Kevin has been a tireless advocate for small businesses, for law enforcement, first responders, our seniors, and our families. Like me, Kevin has been a strong advocate and force for lowering property taxes, supporting our veterans and first responders, cutting bureaucratic red tape, and strengthening domestic violence statutes. Kevin will soon continue his service at the New Jersey Port Authority, advocating for the critical infrastructure needed to drive economic growth.

He has been a true leader on business growth and streamlining regulations to attract companies to our State and encourage the ones in New Jersey to stay in New Jersey.

I applaud the high value Kevin has importantly placed on constituent service throughout his career as a legislator, a key and essential priority for any public servant. And Kevin has worked across the aisle with Republicans and Democrats alike, a practice that is essential in this time of gridlock.

As Kevin departs the Senate, we wish him all the best. I hope he enjoys more time with his family, many more rounds of golf, and I applaud and thank Kevin O'Toole, a true public servant.

HONORING FLORIDA HIGHWAY PATROL MASTER SERGEANT WILLIAM BISHOP

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart in honor of Florida's Highway Patrol Master Sergeant William Bishop, who lost his life in the line of duty on June 17 in Alachua, Florida.

Throughout three decades of public service, Master Sergeant Bishop demonstrated a clear and noble commitment to others. His tragic passing reminds us all of the real dangers that law enforcement officers face on a daily basis.

So many are quick to criticize the police, yet they are the first ones they call when they need help.

I join my colleagues and friends in thanking all law enforcement personnel around the Nation standing ready to risk their lives to safeguard our communities.

Master Sergeant Bishop's memory will live on through his fellow officers, family, and members of the public whose lives were positively impacted through a selfless dedication. I ask that you keep his wife and son in your thoughts and prayers during this difficult time.

RECOGNIZING DR. MARTHA ROBERTS

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Dr. Martha Roberts, a championed member of the Florida agricultural community and the latest recipient of the Florida's Woman of the Year in Agriculture award.

Dr. Roberts' esteemed career includes 35 years at the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. She is also a member of many Federal advisory groups, committees, and associations where her expertise has not only benefited the State of Florida but also the Nation.

More specifically, Dr. Roberts served as the director of the University of Florida's Institute of Food and Agricultural Science program, a Federal-State-county partnership dedicated to developing knowledge in agriculture and natural resources located in my home district.

Through her work with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Dr. Roberts has helped shape policy that will advance Florida's agricultural industry and trades for years to come.

I would like to congratulate Dr. Roberts on her accomplishment and thank her for her dedication to agriculture and food safety. Her positive, meaningful contributions to Florida's Third Congressional District and the Nation will not be overlooked.

CONGRATULATING THE FLORIDA GATORS

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Florida Gators for winning their first ever College Baseball World Series.

Florida coach Kevin O'Sullivan never doubted that his Gators would win a national championship. It was just a matter of time. He has done a tremendous job coaching a talented roster of student athletes.

With this victory, UF becomes the first university in the SEC and only the fourth in the Nation to win a national championship in football, men's basketball, and now baseball. No one can ever take that away from this team or the Gator nation.

I stand with all UF alumni, the Rowdy Reptiles, and the entire Gator nation when I say I could not be more proud of this team and the finest academic and athletic institution in the State of Florida. Go Gators.

THANKING SECRETARY PERDUE AND USDA'S FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Secretary Purdue and the USDA's Food Safety and Inspection Service for implementing a suspension of all imports of fresh beef from Brazil.

I would also like to thank my colleagues from across the aisle for joining together to back this crucial step to ensure the health and safety of American families.

Since March, the USDA has blocked 11 percent of fresh beef from Brazil due to safety concerns. As one of the world's leaders in beef production, the United States has the responsibility to set the highest possible standards for what we allow in our Nation's kitchens, grocery stores, and restaurants.

Brazil is an important trading partner, and we value our mutually beneficial relationships, but we cannot allow this substandard with potential health hazards of beef to enter our food supply.

I am encouraged by the Brazilian Government's commitment to fixing these issues, and I look forward to reestablishing relationships with the Brazilian beef market as soon as we can be assured that its qualities meet the high standards of the USDA.

REPUBLICAN PARTY FEVER HAS NOT BROKEN

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, in 2012, President Obama was speaking to some of his supporters in Minneapolis. They were eager to know how he was planning to make progress on key issues in his second term, given the uncompromising rabid opposition of the majority in this House.

Here is what President Obama said: ''I believe that if we're successful in this election, when we're successful in this election, that the fever may break, because there's a tradition in the Republican Party of more common sense than that.''

Five years later, I can say—we can all say—that the fever has not broken. The fever is running as hot as ever. The fever drove this House majority to threaten default on our Nation's debt, to shut down the Federal Government, to indulge racist birther conspiracies, to elevate the very champion of those conspiracies to the Presidency of the United States.

Ten years ago, I know Republican leaders could not imagine that kind of conspiracy would spread throughout the Republican Party rank and file, but it did and it has.

Five years ago, GOP leaders could not have imagined that their party would nominate Donald Trump and elect him to the Presidency, but they did.

One year ago, I know Republican leaders could not imagine that they would cover for the Trump campaign and Trump administration's collusion with the Russian Government, but they have, and they are.

For far too long, Democrats have wanted to believe that the GOP would come to its senses. We wanted to believe that it was really just a fringe minority within the GOP that was the problem, that sober, sensible leaders like John Boehner and MITCH MCCONNELL wanted to do the right thing, but they couldn't because of the Tea Party. They couldn't unless we helped them.

And that is why Democrats bailed out Boehner time after time, jam after jam. Democrats have to stop deluding themselves. There is only one Republican Party, and it is the party of Trump.

It is the party whose Senate leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, blocked efforts by the Obama administration to stop Russian interference in the 2016 election. It is the party that every day looks the other way in the face of Trump's appeasement of Russia and fails to hold Trump accountable.

Last week, Congressman TED LIEU and I introduced two amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act that the House is debating currently on the floor.

The first would endorse the intelligence community's assessment regarding the Russian's meddling in our 2016 election. This is critical because Donald Trump has repeatedly cast doubt, as recently as yesterday, on the report that despite unanimous agreement from all of our intelligence agencies, that indeed there was collusion, that indeed there was interference by Russians.

The second amendment would block an outrageous Trump administration initiative to create a new cybersecurity partnership with the Russian Government. Trump's plan would let the fox into the henhouse and pave the way for more election interference in our upcoming elections and others, all at the invitation of Donald Trump.

These would have been two sensible steps that the House of Representatives could have taken this week to counter interference in our elections, but last night, the GOP leadership, under Chairman SESSIONS and the House Rules Committee, blocked these amendments. They refused to give these amendments a chance to be debated and voted on the floor.

As more and more information comes out about Russia, Americans all over the country keep hoping that the GOP will do the right thing, that they will put country before party and hold Trump accountable, but they have not, and they will not.

Just this past week, Donald Trump, Jr., himself released emails that show unequivocally the Trump campaign's eagerness to collude with the Russian Government, but that hasn't changed a thing.

It hasn't stopped Speaker RYAN from blocking a Russian sanctions bill at the Trump administration's request. It hasn't stopped Chairman SESSIONS and the Rules Committee from blocking my amendment to set the record straight on Russian interference and help prevent it in the future.

The truth is, they are all complicit. It is time to recognize the GOP majority is not the victim here. They aren't suffering from a fever that Democrats have to help fight.

It is the United States Congress, as a whole, that has a fever, and it is the GOP's grip on the majority that is the cause.

It is time for us to face reality. The problem isn't the Tea Party, it is the Republican Party.

□ 1045

RECOGNIZING FULBRIGHT SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, for more than 70 years, the Fulbright program, established by Congress, has forged connections between Americans and emerging leaders around the world. The Fulbright program has provided more than 370,000 participants, chosen for their academic merit and leadership potential, with the opportunity to exchange ideas and contribute to finding solutions to shared international concerns.

Each year the Fulbright program grants students with the opportunity to study, research, or teach English abroad in an effort to internationalize communities and campuses around the world.

I rise today to recognize the prestigious accomplishment of students from my district who received Fulbright scholarships for the 2016–2017 grant year.

Our proud congratulations to:

Kimberly Algeo of Newtown, a scholar in anthropology from Rider University, for her work in Japan;

Elizabeth Beavers of Yardley, a student from the University of Maryland, College Park, on an English teaching assistantship in South Korea;

Hunter Gabbard of Doylestown, a student in physics from the University of Mississippi, for his work in Germany;

Michael Galperin of Warminster, a student from Lafayette College, on an English teaching assistantship in South Korea;

William Lescas of Churchville, a student in political science from the University of Delaware, for his work in Denmark;

Ivan Simpson-Kent of Levittown, a student in biology from the University of Scranton, for his work in Germany;

And Dr. Paul Swann of Doylestown, a scholar in communications from Temple University, for his work in South Korea.

On behalf of the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, to all

of our scholars, we congratulate them for their prestigious accomplishment. And just to let all of you know, you continue to make all of us proud.

EMPOWERING WOMEN AND ENDING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the mothers, daughters, and wives of my district. I stand here in solemn support for women not only in our community, but across our Nation and throughout the world who experience domestic violence each day.

This unacceptable treatment cannot go unnoticed. We must continue to push for better opportunities for those abused in our community.

By providing these women with more options, they can begin to find safety, support, and empowerment for a better way of life. Whether this be supporting a child or finding a better job and employment, it is important that their voices be heard.

I am proud to work with community-based organizations committed to empowering women and ending domestic violence for all. I commend A Woman's Place in Doylestown, Pennsylvania, for their steadfast commitment to a society where all individuals are safe and can flourish.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the leadership staff at A Woman's Place, Mae O'Brien, Lauren Bucksner, Danielle Ferri, and Heather Giampapa, as well as other staff and volunteers committed to promoting peace, quality, and respect in our districts and beyond.

PERKASIE PARK'S 135TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Perkasie Park on its 135th anniversary and celebrate its new status as a National Historic District.

Founded in 1882, Perkasie Park is one of just a handful of intact camp meeting facilities that continue to operate in Pennsylvania. Home to dozens of Victorian-era cottages and buildings, at its height, Perkasie Park was Bucks County's biggest attraction, drawing worshippers and vacationers from Philadelphia and the surrounding region to the quaint, quiet countryside of the Borough of Perkasie.

Last year, thanks to the tireless efforts of volunteers, residents, and community leaders, Perkasie Park was named to the National Register of Historic Places for its role in the American camp meeting movement of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Through their dedication, the park joined over 150 Bucks County properties on the National Register, including the 1832 South Perkasie Covered Bridge on the other side of town.

I am proud to represent a district that understands and honors its deep-rooted history, and I join with the people in Perkasie in celebrating this momentous anniversary and accomplishment.

MAINTAINING A STRONG DEFENSE IS NOT A NEW CONCEPT

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, before it was cool to quote Ronald Reagan's national security philosophy of peace through strength, there was our first Commander in Chief, George Washington, who, in his first State of the Union address, said, ''. . . to be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.''

See, maintaining a strong national defense is not a new concept.

While more war has been diverted, more peace has been kept, and more freedom has been defended by our Nation's armed services, today we risk not only our Nation's security, but the lives of those who serve if we fail to adequately fund our military.

The policies and posture of the past 8 years under the previous administration have left our defense arsenal dilapidated, our position in the world diminished, our allies doubtful, and, unfortunately, our enemies even more determined.

Our military men and women have faced years of cuts, almost a quarter of our entire military budget, with defense spending at historic lows, over $170 billion, since 2010.

So as the world becomes increasingly dangerous and unstable, the government has forced our armed services to do more with less.

One of the United States' greatest assets in our national security arsenal and one of the crown jewels of west Texas is Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas. Dyess plays a key role in protecting our democracy against the rising global threats, and our airmen from Dyess have been deployed all over the world in countless military and humanitarian operations. Additionally, Dyess hosts the largest B–1 bomber base in the Nation; and the city of Abilene has won the Air Force's award for most supportive communities so many times, they actually changed the name of the award to the Abilene award.

Now, that may sound like I am bragging, but in Texas, that is just telling the truth.

But while we put the lives of these men and women on the line daily and ask them to defend our Nation, they are crippled by this discouraging reality. The Air Force is now the smallest and the oldest it has been in our Nation's history. Altogether, given the current demand, our Nation's Air Force is short 1,500 pilots, 4,000 mechanics.

Before the House Armed Services Committee, General Stephen Wilson testified: ''Today we find ourselves less than 50 percent ready across our Air Force, and we have pockets that are even below that.''

In fact, just to get by, the Air Force has been utilizing bombers that were designed and constructed for World War II.

This is a national security crisis, Mr. Speaker. This is a great American travesty.

Why?

Because I believe our former President, for political reasons, in my opinion, arbitrarily withdrew troops from critical battlefronts and dangerously drew down our overall military resources.

Today, on behalf of Dyess Air Force Base and all the brave men and women who keep our great country safe, I urge my colleagues to pass the National Defense Authorization Act, which will rebuild our national security, repair our national defense, and restore America's leadership position in the world.

The NDAA will provide our military with the resources they need to address our current threats. We have increased funding 10 percent over the previous administration. The NDAA will fund Dyess Air Force Base and other military installations at appropriate levels, increase the size of our armed services, enhance and modernize our defense arsenal, give our troops a pay raise.

If anybody in the Federal Government has performed with excellence and with courage and distinction, it is our men and women in uniform, and they deserve a pay raise.

This NDAA will also build on the reforms that we have enacted over the last 2 years to update, improve, and streamline services to our armed services.

By passing the NDAA, we send a message to the world that America will continue to be the greatest force for good in the history of mankind; a message to our allies who promote liberty and democracy that you can count on us to defend you, we have got your back; a message to our brave military men and women that we are standing firmly behind you, we are going to put our money where our mouth is, we are going to protect you as you protect us; and a message to our enemies that America is no longer in the business of making idle threats.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I want to thank Chairman THORNBERRY for his hard work on this bill and for being a tireless advocate for our military. I am proud to call him a fellow west Texan, and I am even more proud to call him my friend.

One must wonder, on the heels of our 241st birthday, how did this oldest continuous democracy persist for two centuries against all odds? Don't you wonder?

Mr. Speaker, vote for NDAA, vote for our military.

God bless America.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Bishop Joshua K. Lynn, Mastin Lake Church of God of Prophecy, Huntsville, Alabama, offered the following prayer:

Holy Father, You are the almighty, all-knowing creator. We submit to Your infinite wisdom.

On behalf of our Nation and these leaders, we seek Your forgiveness for placing other ways higher than Yours. Grant us Your amazing grace from our sin as we turn to You. Open the ears of this body, this Nation's leaders, and all who call this great land home to hear Your voice. Tenderize the soil of our hearts so we may receive Your guidance.

Heal our land of bitterness, hate, and evil against You and one another. Grant our Nation a spiritual renewal and awakening.

Give this Nation and its leaders wisdom today and the days that follow. As we follow You, let Your favor be with us.

Let Your name ring higher than any other name. For it is in Your holy, loving, merciful, and gracious name we pray.

In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCNERNEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING BISHOP JOSHUA K. LYNN

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to welcome Bishop Joshua K. Lynn to the House of Representatives. I thank him for serving as today's guest chaplain.

Joshua is the senior pastor serving Mastin Lake Church of God of Prophecy in Huntsville, Alabama. He also serves as the area presbyter, regional overseer, of north Alabama.

Bishop Lynn earned his bachelor's degree and his master of arts in biblical studies from Clarks Summit University. He serves Huntsville not only as a pastor, but as a volunteer with the Covenant Christian Academy Athletic Committee.

Bishop Lynn and his wife, Chrissy, also direct a summer youth program at Camp Boothe in West Blocton, Alabama.

Bishop Lynn and Chrissy have been married for almost 18 years, and they have four children: Camille, Ava, Heidi, and Elias. I understand they are here with Joshua today. We welcome them to Washington.

I appreciate the work Bishop Lynn has done and the positive impact he has had on north Alabama by providing care and support not only for the spiritual needs, but also the social and physical needs of our community.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

HONORING MICHAEL ''MATT'' PATRICK RYAN

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the life and faith of my friend, local Houston radio favorite, Michael ''Matt'' Patrick Ryan.

Matt came to Houston after stints in New York, Indiana, and Ohio. Boy, he just became a favorite of our region, his no-nonsense but so optimistic way of informing and entertaining us as host of KTRH Morning News and his syndicated afternoon show.

In September of 2015, Matt faced a new challenge—stage IV melanoma. He shared his struggle with us. Matt's battle with cancer ended last Sunday, July 9, but his inspiration is eternal.

So today, as a country, we all join Matt's family—especially his best friend and wife, Paula; children, Alexandra, Alanna, and Jake; his family, friends, and listeners in ''the Sandbox''—to recognize his lifetime of service, his courage, and his absolute faith in God.

We love you, Matt. You will be missed, friend.

NOT A SOCIAL EXPERIMENT

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this House discriminating against transgender Americans and restricting their ability to serve our country, saying now is not the time for a social experiment. I firmly believe that the privilege and responsibility to defend our country should not be denied to anyone based on gender identification.

Prior to the 1950s, the ''not a social experiment'' argument was used to deny African Americans from fully participating in our military. Today there is a long history of service and heroism by African Americans, including Generals Colin Powell and Vincent Brooks.

Prior to 2010, the ''not a social experiment'' argument was used to keep gays and lesbians from full participation in our military. Today there is a long line of distinguished service by gay and lesbian servicemembers, including Generals Randy Taylor and Tammy Smith.

Today there is a long line of transgender servicemembers who are ready to distinguish themselves. I welcome their service and appreciate their willingness to sacrifice for our Nation.

As a Member of Congress, I will never deny that privilege and responsibility to those who want to serve.

PROVIDING FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE OF OUR NATION

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act.

With the hard work of the Armed Services Committee, this year's NDAA will begin to rebuild our military after years of spending cuts. Our troops have been facing a readiness crisis due to consistent underfunding.

This important legislation will begin to address the crisis with key investments in military readiness, and it fully funds a 2.4 percent, well-deserved pay raise for our troops.

In the 12th District of Georgia, we are at the forefront of cyber innovation, with the U.S. Army Cyber Center of Excellence located at Fort Gordon. I am happy to say that the NDAA will fully fund cyber operations with an increase of $1.7 billion from fiscal year '17 and provides over $85 billion in military construction and Army Family Housing funds.

It is our constitutional obligation as Members of Congress to provide for the common defense of the Nation. I believe that, with the passage of the fiscal year '18 NDAA, we are meeting our obligation to keep America safe, close the critical readiness gap, and rebuild the 21st century military.

SAVE AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding an issue that Congress

often decries but neglects: too many Americans are out of work because companies ship their jobs overseas without a thought for the workers and communities they leave behind. According to the group Public Citizen, the offshoring of American jobs has contributed to the loss of 4.5 million U.S. manufacturing jobs.

But we have an opportunity to change that. I am proud to introduce the Stop Outsourcing and Create American Jobs Act and the Outsourcing Accountability Act. These two bills are designed to save American jobs by curbing outsourcing. By cracking down on tax loopholes that give corporations a break on the backs of American taxpayers, we can grow our economy and increase economic opportunities for the middle class.

I hope my colleagues will join me in a serious discussion about how we can help our economy grow and help American workers. I welcome their support for these bills.

TWO YEARS OF THE FAILED IRAN DEAL

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks 2 years since the previous administration capitulated to the dangerous Iran deal, a one-sided agreement that rewarded the regime in Tehran with a $1.7 billion ransom of pallets of unmarked currency for four hostages and put our allies, including Israel, at risk. The Iran deal emboldened the authoritarian regime.

Just last month, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Nikki Haley correctly pointed out that Tehran has engaged in destructive and destabilizing actions, both testing ballistic missiles and engaging in arms smuggling.

This week, Senators TOM COTTON, MARCO RUBIO, TED CRUZ, and DAVID PERDUE, sent a letter to Secretary of State Rex Tillerson urging him not to certify Iran's compliance with the Iran deal as the deadline approaches.

Refusing to certify Iran's compliance with the Iran deal would send a clear message that President Donald Trump is committed to peace through strength and refuses to comply with a ridiculous deal that puts American families at risk.

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

REQUIRE A SCORE BEFORE THE FLOOR

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Congressman BRIAN HIGGINS and I introduced H. Res. 441, legislation that would require a Congressional Budget Office score before a floor vote. This resolution clearly enshrines in House rules a fundamental and very simple principle of good governance: namely, we should know the budgetary and practical impact of legislation before we vote on it.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it should not be necessary for us to introduce this legislation. For years, the CBO has been an important nonpartisan player in crafting legislation and giving an independent assessment of what a bill costs and whom it will benefit or whom it will hurt.

Unfortunately, we have seen House leadership rush major legislation to the floor without a CBO score, preventing Members from knowing the impact on their constituents and the budget before voting.

The most egregious example, of course, was the May 4 vote on the TrumpCare bill that barely passed this Chamber and would strip 23 million Americans of healthcare. That bill was rushed to the House floor before it had a CBO score, and Members voted blindly on it without knowing the impact on their constituents.

Our resolution simply says transparency, accountability, and know what is in the bill. No score, no floor; it's that simple.

HONORING LAURINBURG-MAXTON ARMY AIR BASE

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Laurinburg-Maxton Army Air Base in Scotland County, North Carolina, which played a vital but little-known role in World War II.

From 1942 to 1945, Scotland County helped prepare glider pilots for the invasions of North Africa, Sicily, and Italy. Generals Dwight Eisenhower and George Marshall visited the base during the war to observe glider training.

On June 6, 1944, when more than 160,000 Allied troops landed during the Invasion of Normandy, glider pilots trained in Scotland County were among the vanguard as American soldiers silently soared down the French coastline through the thick fog powered only by the prevailing winds.

The brave glider pilots who trained at Laurinburg-Maxton Air Base helped secure Allied victory on D-day. Today I ask you to join me in honoring those soldiers as well as the Scotland County community, which supported these efforts.

TRUMPCARE

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Republican House bill is a disaster for the American people. The process by which the bill was voted on, Members had very little time to review the text. As a result, we were forced to vote on legislation without the benefit of facts, on a bill that affects a $3 trillion annual industry.

That is why I have joined Congresswoman JAYAPAL in introducing H. Res. 441, to require a review by the Congressional Budget Office before a bill comes to the floor.

Members of Congress should have as much information as possible to make a smart decision on major legislation affecting 18 percent of the American economy. This resolution would simply affirm the time-honored principle that facts do matter and that a fair, honest, and transparent policymaking process is essential to a healthy and thriving democracy.

CELEBRATING NICKLAUS CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL IN MIAMI

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Nicklaus Children's Hospital in Miami, which has just been named amongst the best children's hospitals in the Nation by U.S. News & World Report.

Since 1950, Nicklaus, located in my congressional district, has been a shining light for our community and one of the leading pediatric healthcare centers in the world. Its doctors, nurses, and staff work tirelessly to provide the highest quality of care to children and teens in south Florida every day.

Nicklaus also includes the Miami Children's Research Institute, one of the largest providers of clinical research services for children in the Nation. From cardiology to neuroscience, our institute is at the forefront of the development of treatments and medicines which are improving the lives of kids not just in south Florida, but around the world.

So, once again, congratulations to Nicklaus on being selected as one of the best children's hospitals in the United States. Thanks to everyone at Nicklaus for continuing to inspire hope and promote lifelong health by providing the best care to every child in our community.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask Members to heed the gavel.

□ 1215

TRUMPCARE PROMISES

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, The Senate is introducing yet another version of TrumpCare today. I rise to express my grave concern with the most harmful aspects of this mean and merciless bill.

TrumpCare still includes billions of dollars in cuts to Medicaid, a critical source of healthcare for 1.75 million of America's veterans, two-thirds of U.S. nursing home residents, and one in five Americans. The latest Senate TrumpCare bill cuts Medicaid by as much as a third.

Every version of TrumpCare we have seen would result in more than 20 million fewer Americans covered over the next 10 years.

There is still no sign of a TrumpCare bill that would not break President's Trump's healthcare promises to the American people. The President promised ''insurance for everybody.'' He said: ''Everybody's going to be taken care of.''

Every version of TrumpCare would break that promise, big league. The President promised that Medicaid would not be cut under his healthcare plan. No version of TrumpCare has been proposed that even comes close to keeping that promise.

President Trump promised the American people a healthcare plan that would ''lower premiums'' with ''much lower deductibles.''

It is time for Americans to get a real plan and not be left with broken promises.

VIOLENCE IS NEVER THE ANSWER

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a tragic incident that occurred today in the Second District.

Early this morning, a man drove his truck into the side of the Bay County Government Center and caused a fire that resulted in his death. My district office has an office in that building. Thankfully, no workers or visitors were injured in the incident, and all of the district staff are safe.

It is a sad day to witness someone so troubled take such an action and, ultimately, their own life. While there is still much to learn about this person's motivations and the reasons behind this attack on a public building, we should all remember that, no matter how inflamed our passions, violence is never the answer.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking the first responders and the law enforcement officers who are addressing this incident, and please join me in a prayer for the Bay County community as they come together to respond to this tragedy.

TRUMPCARE BILL

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we wait for a vote on a bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act, I want to remind my colleagues that 51 percent of Americans have a favorable opinion of the Affordable Care Act, according to the Kaiser Family Foundation. That is more than the support for Congress or the President.

More importantly, a recent study from Kaiser found that the ACA markets are stabilizing and insurers are regaining profitability. Yet we continue to hear false arguments saying that markets are collapsing or in a death spiral. That is not true.

If the majority Republican is serious about fixing our healthcare system and cutting costs to healthcare, they should give up plans to repeal and start putting solutions over politics.

I have said for years that the ACA is not perfect. No bill this Congress ever passed is. But in order to fix it, we need to work together on a bipartisan basis.

The bill that the Senate and House GOP has proposed will undermine protections for Americans with preexisting conditions. Now we are hearing there is an amendment on the Senate side that will essentially allow for the sale of policies with skimpier benefits, so long as insurers offer an option that covers all ACA-mandated benefits. We know where that goes. We will not be able to afford those benefits.

WATERS OF THE U.S. RULE

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, in 2015, President Obama's EPA implemented the waters of the U.S., or the WOTUS rule, which arbitrarily and unilaterally expanded which kinds of waterways could be regulated under the Clean Water Act.

This rule turned every irrigation ditch, pond, and puddle on a farm into a new target for Washington regulators. In addition, this rule circumvented the Congress and the investigative process.

As a Representative for one of the largest agricultural districts in the country, I have heard time and again from farmers about the costs of these renewed regulations, not to mention the headaches caused by trying to comply.

By the EPA's own estimates, the rule would cost farmers and small businesses up to $460 million a year. It is not only bad policy, but also a bad idea to arbitrarily make it more difficult for farmers to do their jobs and provide our food and fuel for our economy.

That is why I was relieved to see that President Trump rescinded this rule last month. By rescinding this rule, the President sent a strong message that Washington must put farmers ahead of bureaucrats.

WILSON AMENDMENT TO THE 2018 NDAA

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on the night of April 14, 2014, Boko Haram kidnapped 276 girls from the Chibok Government Girls Secondary School in Nigeria, a night we all remember.

Although some girls fled or have been released, more than 100 Chibok girls remain in captivity today with Boko Haram, the deadliest terrorist organization in the world.

Last year, Congress unanimously passed bipartisan legislation sponsored by U.S. Senator SUSAN COLLINS and myself to require a 5-year strategy to conquer Boko Haram. Last night, an amendment to solidify the bill and add a sense of Congress that expresses our support for the kidnapped schoolgirls and the United States strategy for countering Boko Haram was passed in the 2018 National Defense Authorization Act.

I thank Armed Services Committee Chairman THORNBERRY, Ranking Member SMITH, Rules Committee Chairman SESSIONS, Ranking Member SLAUGHTER, and Congressman ALCEE HASTINGS.

We will continue to fight against Boko Haram and their vicious and cruel tactics against the Nigerian people. We will continue to wear red every Wednesday until all of our girls are released.

Remember to tweet, tweet, tweet, #bringbackourgirls.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask Members to heed the gavel.

CHANGE OF COMMAND

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of a time-honored U.S. Navy tradition: the change of command at NSWC Crane, a vital military command in my district in southern Indiana, located on the Navy's third largest base in the world.

Today, as we welcome our new commanding officer, Captain Mark Oesterreich, and family, to southwest Indiana, we say good-bye to Captain J.T. Elder, who has steered this premier center of excellence for the past 3 years.

Captain Elder empowered his team to manage NSWC Crane by focusing on people, connecting with its workforce, and being a champion for leadership development.

As a community leader, he realized that fostering relationships with neighboring cities, towns, and counties was essential to attracting and retaining Crane's outstanding workforce, and nurturing its workforce for the years ahead.

As Hoosiers everywhere join in salute, we are deeply indebted to Captain Elder for his remarkable 28-year contribution to our Nation's defense. I wish Captain Elder and Cynthia fair

winds and following seas in the next chapter of their lives.

WORK TOGETHER TO FIX HEALTHCARE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, Senate Republicans continue to push a flawed and harmful healthcare bill, TrumpCare. It fails to address the basic healthcare needs of Americans.

Republicans themselves are deeply divided on the subject. You have Republicans negotiating with Republicans and they can't come to consensus. Democrats, meanwhile, have been willing to work to come to consensus to work together to fix those real issues that we know we have to address in the Affordable Care Act. We have not been given the opportunity.

There has been no transparency in any of this discussion, no hearings, and no public input. The entire process is behind closed doors. Of course, we know why. This is a bill that kicks millions of Americans off of healthcare. Twenty-two million people would lose health insurance. For those lucky enough to get healthcare, they will pay more for less. Their out-of-pocket expenses will go up. If you are 50 to 64, there will be an age tax.

This is a terrible piece of legislation. It ought to be rejected and we ought to work together to fix the problems we have.

TAMPA BAY AREA COMBATS HUMAN TRAFFICKING

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, in light of the important anti-human trafficking legislation passed by the House, I want to recognize efforts in the Tampa Bay area to combat human trafficking.

I am especially proud of the joint task force formed by Pasco County Sheriff's Office Corporal Alan Wilkett, BayCare's Liana Dean, and many others. Their work brings us closer to a community that is safer for our most vulnerable citizens.

Human trafficking is not a distant problem for other countries. It is a human rights crisis happening right here at home. Last year, Florida reported 550 human trafficking cases. That is the third largest number of cases in the country. It is unacceptable.

We passed three bipartisan bills to strengthen detection systems, improve education efforts, and protect victims. We have got to pass them in the Senate as well and have it become law.

The fight against human trafficking is a fight for the safety and security of our communities.

TACKLING THE CAUSE OF THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, in my home State of Hawaii, hospitalizations and emergency room visits from opioid-related conditions have more than doubled in the last decade. More people are now dying from overdoses than motor vehicle accidents. This opioid epidemic is killing 91 Americans all across this country every single day.

For years, companies like Purdue Pharma, the maker of the commonly known drug OxyContin, have profited off of the suffering of millions of Americans who are dealing and struggling with opioid addiction. Now Purdue and others are going overseas, targeting foreign populations, using the very same shady marketing tactics, lies, and false advertising that helped them get rich at the expense of the American people.

This is absolutely unacceptable. We can't just keep wringing our hands about the opioid crisis without actually tackling the cause of it. Purdue and those responsible should be prosecuted for the deaths and lives that have been ruined as a result of their lies.

LET'S GET ON WITH BUSINESS

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe I have ever seen a bigger mountain made out of a tinier molehill in my 29 years in Congress than what is being made out of Donald Trump, Jr.'s, meeting with the Russian lawyer. It reminds me of the Wendy's ad several years ago that asked: ''Where's the beef?''

I know that hindsight is 20–20 and holier than thou, but this is ridiculous.

Do you really believe that Chelsea Clinton would have refused to meet with a Russian lawyer who she was told had evidence that would incriminate Donald Trump?

Donald Trump, Jr., met with this woman for a few minutes, saw she had nothing, and nothing came out of it. No action was taken. Even Director Comey testified he had seen no evidence that even one vote was altered by anything the Russians did.

They have been investigating this for months, and this is the best they can come up with?

It is time to stop crying over the election and do something about some real problems.

AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleagues for passage of my three amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act last night.

Two of my amendments would address our Nation's opioid crisis as it impacts or Nation's servicemembers and veterans. They would direct the Defense Department to study the effectiveness of their opioid prescriber education policies and require Department providers to counsel or give referrals to the VA for transitioning veterans that suffer from addiction or chronic pain.

My third amendment would direct the Department of Defense to analyze sexual coercion in the military as part of its annual report on sexual assault.

While I commend the Department for their progress in reducing the occurrence of sexual assault in the military, more work needs to be done. Understanding sexual coercion is important to the safety of our brave men and women, and important for our national security.

□ 1230

RECOGNIZING MISS MOLLY MATNEY

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Miss Molly Matney, an outstanding resident of Metcalfe County in the First Congressional District of Kentucky.

Ms. Matney was crowned Miss Kentucky 2017 on July 1. She is an agriculture major at Western Kentucky University and hopes to pursue a career as an agricultural lending executive. Her talents and accomplishments distinguish her as a valuable asset to the Miss Kentucky organization, as well as the First District of Kentucky.

The ''Farm Fit'' platform she has developed encourages consumption of products found in local farmers' markets to help individuals maintain a healthy lifestyle. This concept complements and reemphasizes fundamental aspects of the Kentucky Department of Agriculture's ''Kentucky Proud'' campaign.

Her yearlong travels will allow her to promote both of these initiatives throughout the Commonwealth. I am confident she will utilize her knowledge of Kentucky's agriculture industry for the betterment of her platform and will continue to be a deserving advocate for Kentucky farmers.

I wish her the best of luck as she prepares to compete at the Miss America pageant in Atlanta City, New Jersey, on September 10, and I look forward to her continued contributions to the First District of Kentucky.

MILITARY HUNGER PREVENTION ACT

(Mr. McGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as the House considers the fiscal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act this week, I would like to draw attention to one provision that was left out of the bill: the Military Hunger Prevention Act.

It is shameful that military families like lower ranking enlisted servicemembers with larger households are among the 42 million Americans suffering from food insecurity.

While up to 22,000 military households rely on SNAP, many military families are unable to receive modest benefits due to an unintended provision that counts certain housing allowances as income when determining eligibility for SNAP.

To address this issue, I have joined with my friend, Representative SUSAN DAVIS, on the bipartisan Military Hunger Prevention Act. I am disappointed that this commonsense technical fix was left out of this year's NDAA, and I plan to continue working with my colleagues and our advocacy partners like MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger to move this legislation forward.

We owe it to the families who have sacrificed so much for our country to do all that we can to end hunger now.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO HABITAT FOR HUMANITY OF LIVINGSTON COUNTY, MICHIGAN

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an inspirational organization in my district, Habitat for Humanity of Livingston County, located in the Eighth District of Michigan.

This July, Livingston County's Habitat for Humanity is celebrating its 25th year of transforming lives by building quality homes.

Habitat for Humanity was incorporated within Livingston County in 1992, and since then, the organization is dedicated to many community and international service projects.

Over the past 25 years, Habitat for Humanity has made a positive impact on Livingston County, constructing and rehabilitating 18 homes for families in need within the community.

Livingston County's Habitat for Humanity also supports the services of Habitat International in its fight against homelessness across the world, providing monetary donations which funded and constructed an additional 15 homes worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to congratulate Livingston County's Habitat for Humanity for its 25 years of service. Thank you, Habitat for Humanity, for your commitment to the people you serve and to our entire Livingston County community.

REMARKS ON NORTH KOREA

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

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last week, as we celebrated our Nation's birthday, news broke that North Korea successfully launched its first intercontinental ballistic missile.

The missile's estimated range would put Alaska within reach. Like all Americans, I am deeply concerned by this development.

North Korea's possession of an estimated 20 nuclear warheads and chemical and biological weapons makes it an urgent and imminent threat to the United States.

While there are no easy options, our country must do more to deter the Kim regime. I strongly support building our missile defense programs, which is a priority in this year's National Defense Authorization Act, which the House is considering this week.

I also support increasing sanctions against China and Chinese companies that support the Kim regime. At this critical time, all options, including military action, must be on the table. The threat of a nuclear-armed North Korea is too serious to simply maintain the status quo.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 440 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 440

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against the further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 440 provides for a complete consideration of H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. The rule allows for consideration of 122 amendments in addition to the amendments made in order by yesterday's rule.

This brings the total number of amendments made in order for full consideration to 210. When you add in the 275 amendments offered during the Armed Services Committee markup, we will, in total, have considered 485 amendments to this year's NDAA.

Just as important, there is a clear bipartisan split between the number of majority and the number of minority amendments made in order.

Mr. Speaker, this has been an incredibly open process that allowed Members of this body from both sides to have their input on this critical national security legislation.

Like other years, the NDAA is a great example of the House working through regular order in the authorizing process and getting the job done.

Thanks to this rule and the one we passed yesterday, the House will debate a number of issues where Members of this body have diverse views. From the future of GTMO to the future of the New START, the two NDAA rules provide for a robust debate on many important topics. That is a good thing, and I look forward to the debate.

Before I continue, I want to briefly thank the staff in both the Armed Services Committee and the Rules Committee for their hard work on this rule. Dealing with this large number of amendments takes a considerable amount of time, and I know I speak for the entire body, both the majority and minority, in expressing our gratitude for their time and work in helping the members of the Rules Committee come to this product.

Yesterday, I outlined my strong support for this year's NDAA, which will help keep the American people safe and secure, so I won't rehash all those points. But I want to share some numbers that highlight the readiness crisis facing our military. This crisis has been caused by cuts to defense spending. This bill authorizes funding for the military at $688.3 billion, which is 16.8 percent of total Federal outlays and 3.4 percent of projected gross domestic product.

As a guiding point, 30 years ago, the fiscal year 1988 NDAA represented 27.3 percent of total Federal outlays. This year, 16 percent; back then, 27 percent. And 5.2 percent of projected GDP. This year, 3.4 percent; back then, 5.2 percent.

We are spending less proportionately today on our military, despite the fact that we face a wider range of threats across the globe. That should be troubling to every American.

Let's think about the threat environment we faced 30 years ago: the Soviet Union. That was about it. There was no ISIS or al-Qaida or other radical Islamic terrorist organizations threatening the United States 30 years ago. Iran was not an existential threat to the American people 30 years ago. North Korea wasn't developing nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles 30 years ago. China was not on the radar as it relates to a military power 30 years ago. We weren't worried about cyber attacks or cyber espionage 30 years ago.

It is safe to say the world was a lot different 30 years ago, yet we were devoting a greater portion of our Federal budget to the military. We must make that same or an even greater commitment today. For too long, we, in Congress, have allowed our military to steadily atrophy, bringing us to a readiness crisis. Providing for our national defense is the most important job of this Congress, and this bill helps rebuild, repair, and reform our military.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 440 and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last night, the majority on the House Rules Committee once again decided to exclude from debate 230 amendments to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act. That means that half of the amendments submitted were rejected.

I can never understand why these amendments are denied the chance to be debated by the full House. When I first came to Capitol Hill as an aide to our former friend and colleague, Congressman Joe Moakley, the Defense Authorization bill would often take up to a week for debate. But even back then, it was one of the largest and most complex bills debated, and certainly one of the most important from a national security point of view.

The NDAA rule was also structured back then, but more in terms of the amount of time permitted for debate. And many amendments receive 1 hour, half an hour, 20 minutes, even 2 hours of debate. Why? Because they were about the important decisions and priorities facing our national defense policy at the time.

But that is not the case today. Amendments are lucky to get 10 minutes of debate equally divided if they are lucky enough to be debated at all. And the Defense bill takes up a total of maybe 2 days' worth of debate, if that. No wonder, no wonder Members are frustrated by this process.

This year, like every year for the past several years, important issues, especially on war and peace, were left on the chopping block by the Republicans.

They decided that the House should not debate two bipartisan amendments that would make sure that nothing in the NDAA could be construed as authorization to use force against the governments of North Korea or Syria.

The Republican majority decided it is okay to debate a bigoted amendment that prohibits medical treatment for transgender servicemembers who are in transition, but they will not let the House debate an amendment that just calls for a study, Mr. Speaker, on blood donations from gay men.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, did you know that there is a provision in the NDAA that sets up an entire new military service branch, the Space Corps? The Pentagon doesn't want it; the Air Force doesn't want it; they say it is premature, but an amendment by Mr. TURNER, a Republican, to require the Pentagon to report on the need to establish a Space Corps is not included in this rule. I guess the Republican leadership doesn't want the House to have a say and a debate on such a major change.

Mr. AMASH led a bipartisan amendment to block the sale of cluster munitions to Saudi Arabia. Last year, this amendment failed by just a handful of votes. I guess that is why the Republicans on the Rules Committee aren't about to let it come up for a debate and a vote this year.

When it comes to sending our uniformed women and men into war, into danger, where their very lives are at risk, the Rules Committee decided that such amendments were not worth the House's time to debate.

Last night, Republicans on the Rules Committee denied the opportunity for debate on a bipartisan amendment offered by myself and Representatives WALTER JONES, BARBARA LEE, TOM MASSIE, JOHN GARAMENDI, DAN KILDEE, and PETER WELCH.

The amendment is very straightforward. If the President decides to increase the level of U.S. troops deployed in Afghanistan in fiscal year 2018, then he would report to Congress on the purpose and mission of those troops, how many were required, and how long they would be there, and then Congress would vote to approve or disapprove that escalation.

This would give the American people the voice they deserve when it comes to sending our men and women in uniform into battle.

Mr. Speaker, the President and General Mattis just decided to send an additional 4,000 troops to Afghanistan to fight the Taliban, on top of the 8,400 U.S. troops already there. That will bring the total number of American troops there to more than 12,000.

Now, if they should decide that they want even more troops in Afghanistan in fiscal year 2018, Congress should know why, and vote on it.

We can't keep giving the administration a blank check and allow America once again to go down the slippery slope of incremental escalation over the next year or two. Congress needs to step up to the plate and either approve or disapprove any renewed escalation in Afghanistan. Isn't that amendment worth debating?

We are in year 16 of the war in Afghanistan. It is the longest war in American history. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. Afghanistan is the longest war in U.S. history. The costs are already in the hundreds of billions of dollars, and the human cost to our troops, our veterans, and their families have been enormous, yet Congress has not taken a single vote, has not taken a single stand on this war for 16 years. Most of the Members of this House weren't even here when that one and only vote was taken.

So in the absence of debating an updated AUMF for Afghanistan, the very least we can do is debate whether we will once again escalate our military footprint in Afghanistan, but the Republican leadership of this House doesn't agree.

Each year, the Republican leadership does everything it can to stop any debate on these wars, and this year is no different. They will allow some amendments on reports and a sense of Congress here and there, but any amendment of substance that requires Congress to act is denied.

Mr. Speaker, I want to advise my colleagues of one thing, and that is, we are not an advisory commission. We are a legislative body. We need to start doing our job.

Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with a report, but it won't be the first time we have seen a report, whether on Afghanistan or Iraq or Syria. Even the underlying bill calls for a strategy report on Afghanistan and other conflicts, but Congress avoiding taking any responsibility for continuing to send our servicemen and -women into harm's way is absolutely shameful. Mr. Speaker, it is cowardice.

Every day, military families say good-bye to their loved ones as they go into battle, placing themselves in harm's way to keep our country safe, and Congress does nothing. All we do is kick the can down the road and call for another report and then another report.

Mr. Speaker, we don't even act when the President actually does send us an AUMF, the way President Obama did on Iraq and Syria and the war against ISIS. We did nothing. We said we didn't like it, but we did nothing. The Republican leadership complained that they didn't like it, but then they never even tried to act on it or to write their own AUMF. They would rather just stand on the sidelines, complain and criticize, but do nothing, absolutely nothing, except stop other Members from taking any action that might require the House to debate these wars. Shame on all of us for allowing this to continue over and over and over and over again.

Now, I am guessing that whenever the House takes up the Defense appropriations bill, the Republican leaders will find a way to make sure that the bipartisan-supported provision in that bill to sunset the 2001 AUMF on Afghanistan and vote on a new one within 8 months will somehow disappear without a single Member of the House at large having a chance to vote on it. Maybe we will get another report. And so it goes on and on.

Mr. Speaker, there is nearly $700 billion authorized in this bill for wars, for weapons systems, for military equipment, and for personnel, all because Congress refuses to make hard choices. We can never seem to find the money to take care of our own neighborhoods and schools. We can't find the money to provide our citizens with better, more affordable healthcare, or make sure that all our families can put food on the table. We don't invest nearly enough in our roads and our bridges, railways and transit systems. There is never enough money to invest in a 21st century manufacturing base, provide training to support the jobs of the future, or raise the Federal minimum wage to a livable wage. We are told we don't have the money to take care of our parks or to make sure that our air and water are drinkable and breathable. We can't even seem to find the money to take care of our senior citizens and our children, but when it comes to spending on war or building more nuclear weapons, then magically we find trillions of dollars to operate and spend.

We need to pay more attention, Mr. Speaker, to the choices we make each year on how much spending our Nation really requires for its national defense. I believe, at a minimum, Mr. Speaker, that Congress needs to debate and vote on whether to keep sending more and more of our military men and women to fight in endless wars.

And I have to say, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues, what the Rules Committee did last night by shutting out debate was shameful.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 77, nays 326, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

YEAS—77

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Bonamici
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Crowley
Delaney
DeSaulnier
Doggett
Ellison
Engel
Espaillat
Evans
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Maloney, Carolyn B.
McGovern
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Neal
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree
Pocan
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Slaughter
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Torres
Vargas
Velázquez
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Wilson (FL)
Young (AK)

NAYS—326

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Eshoo
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—30

Barletta
Bishop (UT)
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
Costa
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Doyle, Michael F.
Grijalva
Hoyer
Huffman
Johnson, Sam
Larsen (WA)
Lieu, Ted
Meehan
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Rooney, Thomas J.
Royce (CA)
Rush
Russell
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shuster
Thompson (PA)
Titus

□ 1319

Messrs. MOONEY of West Virginia, KEATING, PANETTA, Ms. ROSEN,

Mrs. BLACKBURN, Messrs. PEARCE, BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. WALZ, NEAL, GUTIÉRREZ, and DELANEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 353.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) has 25½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has 20½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

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

Mr. Speaker, now that the gentleman's motion to adjourn has been defeated by a wide, bipartisan majority, the House can get back to work and do the people's business. I want to go back over some statistics we talked about earlier. This rule makes in order for floor consideration 210 amendments which are on top of the 275 amendments that were offered in the Armed Services Committee.

Now, let's go back to the days when the NDAA was considered on this floor and this floor was under the majority's control on the other side of the aisle. Let's start with 2007. 135 amendments were offered; only 50 were made in order.

In 2009, 129 amendments were offered; only 58 were made in order.

In 2010, 129 were offered; only 69 were made in order.

In 2011, 193 were offered; only 82 were made in order.

And we are making in order in this rule, and yesterday's rule, 210. This has been an open process by any measure.

The gentleman also referred to the fact that there are other needs in America that are not being met because we are spending money on defending the United States of America.

Let me go back and remind what I said earlier. Only 16.8 percent of next year's Federal outlay will go to defending America if we adopt the National Defense Authorization Act as passed by the committee, less than 20 percent. That means almost 85 percent of Federal outlays are going to go to every other thing that we do in government. If there is a problem with something not being paid for, it is not because of the money we are spending on national defense.

Then finally, the gentleman's comments about the need for us to make sure that we are properly authorized as we engage in military activities abroad; I do agree with him. We have had some mission creep over the last several years. We have gone from Iraq and Afghanistan, under President Obama, to Syria, to Libya, to Yemen, and many of us on both sides of the aisles decried the fact that we did that.

It is, indeed, our responsibility, not the President's responsibility, to declare war, to authorize the use of military force. That is why this rule makes in order an amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) that will set in place a process that will lead to the consideration on this floor of the Authorization for Use of Military Force.

So I believe this rule does exactly what the people of America expect us to do, and that is to stay in this room, stay on this floor, and act on the National Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my amendment to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, to prohibit Federal funds from being used to implement the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty unless the Senate first ratifies the treaty.

This language is identical to the version of my amendment that was enacted into law in last year's NDAA and reflects the consistent will of the American people and the unified position of Congress in opposition to this misguided and dangerous treaty.

The U.N. ATT is a deeply flawed agreement signed by the Obama administration in 2013. It would undermine our national sovereignty, harm our most vulnerable allies, and threaten the Second Amendment rights of every single American. Turning over our arms trade policy to the United Nations is just wrongheaded.

The U.N. ATT would force the United States, the world's most important defender of liberty and democracy, onto equal footing with the world's worst dictatorships and terror sponsors. It would be readily politicized by bad actors around the world to try to stop America from providing arms to our friends and allies, including Israel, South Korea, and others.

In short, just like gun control, it would stop the good from doing good without stopping the bad from doing bad.

Congress has stood strong for the past 6 years on this issue. Together, we were successful at stopping the Obama administration from ever implementing this treaty or using hard-working American taxpayer dollars to promote it.

Nevertheless, our work is not over. One of former President Obama's parting shots as he left office was to submit the U.N. ATT to our colleagues in the Senate for ratification, even though he knew it was dead on arrival.

Regardless of who is seated in the Oval Office, renewing this ban is important because no Presidency is permanent. A future administration may well try even harder to put this treaty into effect.

Fortunately, in Donald Trump, we now have a President who believes in protecting our sovereignty in every possible way. America should never cede its sovereignty to the United Nations to determine its arms trade policies.

Therefore, in addition to supporting this amendment, I strongly urge President Trump and Secretary Tillerson to take the final step and officially withdraw the United States from the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty once and for all. It is time to tear it up.

I urge my colleagues to stand with me in support of the Second Amendment and our Nation's sovereignty and vote in support of my amendment.

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

When asked about this process that we are now dealing with this morning, with respect to the Hartzler amendment, Speaker RYAN said: ''It's a free process. It's open process. She can bring an amendment to the floor if she wants to.''

Really? This is an open process? She should be able to bring an amendment that we all think is discriminatory and, quite frankly, bigoted, to the floor; yet amendments that we have tried to bring to the floor that deal with the issue of war and whether or not we should be in these endless wars are denied.

What kind of free process is that? Maybe it is a free process in Russia, but it is not a free process in the United States of America.

This process is a sham. Fifty-two percent of the amendments that were brought before the Rules Committee were rejected. You might want to defend that process, but I don't.

The gentleman says that mission creep has occurred, and that we have a responsibility here in this House. You are absolutely right we have a responsibility. When are we going to live up to it?

And the Cole amendment, which I am happy to support, is a report. We have had reports up to here that have been brought before the NDAA process over the years. Enough. Time to do our job.

This is why people are cynical about Washington when they hear this kind of doubletalk. Yeah, we get it. We are worried about mission creep. Congress ought to do its job. And so what are we going to do? Not do our job, but we will issue a report.

Come on, enough.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, and I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative POCAN's Leveraging Effective Apprenticeships to Rebuild National Skills Act, H.R. 2933, which will promote effective apprenticeships that will give

students and workers the skills they need to find well-paying jobs.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss that proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a vital tool for ensuring workers are able to secure good-paying, family-supporting jobs, and that is apprenticeships.

I grew up in Kenosha, Wisconsin, a working class town with a very large skilled trade presence. I understand what good, middle class jobs look like, and the impact they can have on a community. A good middle class paycheck ensures people can afford a mortgage, have healthcare for their families, take a family vacation, and send their kids to college if they want to; and that is what we need right now are more higher-paying jobs.

But not everyone goes to a traditional 4-year college or university, nor does every job require this type of degree. That is why, for many, apprenticeships are the key to family-supporting wages.

Apprenticeship programs have proven very effective at helping prepare workers for careers in highly skilled professions. This bill would increase the number of highly skilled workers in the United States and strengthen apprenticeship programs as an effective earn-and-learn model for students, workers, and employers.

□ 1330

It is a win-win for workers and businesses. The LEARNS Act supports closer connections between registered apprenticeship programs, employers, and others offering good-paying jobs.

But there is a problem. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to talk about their support of apprenticeships. I hear the Secretary of Labor talk about them. I even hear the President talk about them. But that is all it is: talk.

As a new member of the Appropriations Committee, I was shocked to see that Republicans' newly released Labor-HHS funding proposal entirely eliminates Department of Labor apprenticeship grants. Again, that appropriations proposal cuts $95 million from apprenticeship funding, every singer dollar in the program. There is not a penny left to connect workers and businesses with apprenticeships.

You can't have it both ways. If you support apprenticeships and job training for workers, then you should support funding for job training and apprenticeship programs. It is pretty simple.

If Republicans are serious about job creation, about training workers for a 21st century economy, and they actually want to do more than talk about jobs and apprenticeships, then we should move forward to defeat the previous question in order the bring forward the LEARNS Act.

Walk the walk, Mr. Speaker. Talk is cheap. The American people deserve action. I urge all of my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is right. Workforce training is very important, and that is why we passed on this floor a few weeks ago the reauthorization of the Perkins Act—not by a bipartisan majority, by a 100 percent vote.

We have other bills that we are considering in the Education and the Workforce Committee that will deal with that because it is important that we build the workforce in America. But you don't do that in the National Defense Authorization Act. That is what we are here today about.

I am afraid my colleagues on the other side have forgotten what this bill is about. It is about making the people of America safe and secure. We will deal with those other issues, as important as they are, in other legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on an important piece of legislation, the National Defense Authorization Act. This funding is vital to our national security and the readiness of our military.

As our Nation continues to face threats around the globe, our soldiers must have the necessary equipment to complete missions and return home safely.

Just 2 weeks ago, 4,000 of our troops returned home from South Korea to loved ones at Fort Riley, Kansas. In a short number of weeks ahead of us this fall, the Dagger Brigade, also from Fort Riley, will travel to Europe for a 9-month deployment.

This legislation helps ensure readiness for brigade combat teams, such as the Dagger Brigade, and gives our troops a much-deserved 2.4 percent military pay raise. It also allows for over 17,000 more soldiers, and allocates $2.3 billion over the administration's request for maintenance and repair, which is so necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to send our troops to a gunfight with knives. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation to give our men and women in uniform the tools and support they deserve.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I agree with the gentleman from Alabama. This bill is about our national security and about protecting our country, which makes it all the more puzzling that the Republicans think this is an appropriate place to be debating amendments on transgender issues. But anyway, they are in charge, so they can do whatever they want to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear all these great amendments that have been made in order, and I was glad to hear my friend from Alabama reference the fact that this is a bill to make the people of America safe.

I rise in opposition to this rule because there was one amendment that makes the people of America safe that was omitted from the list that was approved. It was a bipartisan amendment by myself, Mr. YOUNG from Alaska, and Mr. JONES from North Carolina that would declassify a 50-year-old DOD project that sprayed biological and chemical weapons on our servicemembers and some civilians, and that amendment was not made in order.

Convulsions, paralysis, respiratory failure, and death—those are just a few of the most severe side effects of sarin gas, a chemical weapon so deadly and debilitating that it was outlawed as a weapon of mass destruction.

When Syria's military used it, we retaliated. But in the 1960s and 1970s, the United States Department of Defense sprayed biological and chemical weapons like sarin, VX nerve gas, and e. coli on our own servicemembers. In the years since, many of those exposed have suffered debilitating health effects.

For 40 years, the Department of Defense has not provided a comprehensive public accounting of these tests nor have they notified all the veterans and all the civilians who were potentially exposed. We can't allow this information to continue to be released piecemeal. These veterans can't wait any longer. Their health continues to decline, and some have already passed away. To sweep this under the rug is shameful.

These veterans served honorably for the security of our Nation. These tests are an ugly part of our history. They put veterans' lives at risk, and our veterans have every right to know what it was they were exposed to and how much they were exposed to. We need to think about their safety and their security.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Congress' most important job is to provide for the national defense of this country. Yet, during the past 6 years, America's military resources have been downsized and slashed.

Today, Congress is taking corrective action to rebuild our military, support our troops, and provide for a strong national defense. This Defense Authorization Act fulfills our promise to prioritize America's safety and protect our citizens from ongoing global threats, including radical Islamic terror.

This bipartisan bill increases resources for every branch of the U.S. military and ensures that our troops receive the compensation they deserve, with the largest pay increase in 5 years. It also supports a robust missile defense program, and it strengthens America's cyber warfare capabilities.

Simply put, this bill makes America safer, and I urge your support.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), and I also congratulate him on becoming a new dad.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I thank his wife, Lisa McGovern, for being a great support to my wife.

I rise today in opposition to this rule. It is not just because I am opposed to our policy of refueling planes into Yemen, refueling Saudi-led planes. It is because of our view, a bipartisan view, of the place of Congress, Congress' Article I of the Constitution. It is Congress' responsibility and duty to have a public debate about our foreign policy, about who we ought to be arming, who we ought to be intervening in overseas. We are abdicating that responsibility.

My amendments would have been very simple. They would have said that this body should debate whether we should be refueling Saudi-led airplanes that are leading to civilian deaths in Yemen, that are causing civil war in Yemen, a Saudi coalition that is aligned with al-Qaida in Yemen, and al-Qaida has hurt the United States.

Why wouldn't we debate this on the floor of the United States Congress? Why wouldn't we have transparency and let the American public weigh in on whether this policy is making us more safe and is upholding human rights?

It is with great disappointment that we are not having this debate in the United States Congress. I believe it is an abdication of our responsibility to the oath we take to uphold the Constitution.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I think that his issue comes within the broader question about the authorization of military force in various parts of the Middle East. I think he raises an important point. There is an amendment made in order under this rule that will put in place a process to get us to that debate.

I appreciate what he just said. I hope that he will hold that idea, and when we have that debate on the floor, will bring it back so we can consider it among those other items we will consider at that time. I appreciate what he just said. This is not the place or the time to take that up.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just take 1 minute to address something the gentleman from Alabama raised a while ago, and that is: Why would we be raising the issue of apprenticeships and workforce training as part of the Defense Authorization bill.

There are a couple of reasons why. One is because we are routinely blocked from bringing any meaningful legislation to the floor, and we are routinely blocked from bringing amendments to the floor that I think can help with this issue.

The gentleman mentioned the action we took in a bipartisan, unanimous way on the issue of Perkins loans and a few other programs. Those are important. But it is the beginning. We need to do much, much more in this country. We need to be able to prepare a workforce that can meet the needs of our manufacturers and be there for the jobs of tomorrow. That is why we brought this up. That is why we are bringing it up in this fashion.

I would just go one step further to say, when we talk about national security, I think we ought to broaden that definition to include not just the number of bombs we have, but the quality of life that our people in this country enjoy: whether or not people have the security of a job, whether they can afford a college education for their kids, whether they can afford to buy a home, whether they can afford to put food on the table.

We live in the richest country in the world, and there are 42 million Americans who are hungry, and yet we somehow can't get the political will to address that problem or fix some of these challenges.

We are going to take any opportunity we have to bring to the floor serious ideas that we think will benefit the American people, uplift the American people, and that is why I think that this bill that we are trying to bring up, H.R. 2933, authored by my colleague, Mr. POCAN, is appropriate.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I really believe very strongly we need to do more in workforce training in America. I am a former chancellor of postsecondary education, former chair of workforce development for the State of Alabama. It is something that is very near and dear to me. I know that we are working very hard on these issues and have already produced this one bill, the Perkins bill that we passed in the absolutely 100 percent vote here on the floor. There will be more coming.

But the National Defense Authorization Act authorizes what our military does and doesn't do and how it does it around the globe. This is a separate, different vehicle designed to provide for the defense of the American people.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments. We need to take those comments up at another time as we take into consideration other bills that work on our workforce development.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there is a theme that is developing on the Republican side. We can always take it up at another time, at another time in the future. We can do the NDAA bill and this. That is the whole point of defeating the previous question. You can still debate the National Defense Authorization Act, and you can bring up this other thing that we think is of great value to workers in this country. It doesn't have to be one or the other.

It is that same thinking when it comes to war. As I began this debate talking about the war in Afghanistan and the fact that it is the longest war in American history, we don't even talk about it here. We don't even debate it here.

We ought to respect the men and women who we put in harm's way enough to make it a priority in this Chamber, and we don't even talk about it. We can't even bring amendments to the floor to deliberate on that. What we are told is: Well, we will vote on a study, another study. After 16 years? That is the best we can do? Or we are told that it falls under the jurisdiction of another committee.

Well, my friends on the Republican side are in charge. I am sorry to say that, but you are.

□ 1345

And I don't know what is standing in your way from asking the committees of jurisdiction or multiple committees to come together and to actually present to this Chamber an AUMF for these wars. There is nothing, other than the fact that you want to avoid an uncomfortable vote for your Members.

Well, that is just too bad. War is a big deal. It ought to be a big deal, and we ought to treat it more seriously than we are. And I will repeat what I said at the beginning of this debate: What the Rules Committee did last night was shameful; blocking germane amendments, blocking serious amendments, to address an issue that, quite frankly, we should have been talking about a long time ago.

Again, I regret that this is the rule that my Republican friends have come up with. They can say they are proud of it. Quite frankly, I am ashamed of it.

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

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

I remind all of us that the war in Afghanistan was authorized by an AUMF that was passed by Congress in 2001. So while we can have a debate about the other conflicts in other places, that conflict is, indeed, authorized, and has been authorized from the very beginning. So I would take exception to the gentleman's comments with regard to Afghanistan.

There are provisions in the underlying bill that this rule makes in order and in those provisions that do things to help with that war effort, help the men and women over there fighting that war effort for us.

So I think that this rule and the bill that underlies it are doing exactly what they should do with regard to Afghanistan, because Afghanistan is authorized.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the war and the authorization that the gentleman was talking about is 2001. We have been there for 16 years. In 2001 we were going after al-Qaida. Al-Qaida is gone. We are now fighting the Taliban and propping up one of the most corrupt governments in the world. Our mission continues to change.

The idea that we should be operating in Afghanistan under an AUMF from 2001, that somehow nothing has changed, is ludicrous. And the idea that we are using that authorization to justify our military operations in Syria and a whole bunch of other places in the world is ludicrous. Enough. Enough.

This Chamber needs to do its job, and this leadership needs to get out of the way, and Members of Congress—Democrats and Republicans—need to come together and debate these issues seriously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), a distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee's Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

I voted for this bill in committee because we have brave servicemembers in harm's way that depend on it. But I want to make clear that I don't believe we have done our job to address the unbridled waste in this bill; billions of dollars, the sheer amount of waste in this bill, billions upon billions of dollars. And even worse, the bill, as currently written, sets us up to throw away billions more for years to come.

I know it can be political suicide to take on defense contractors, but we owe the taxpayers a level of accountability and discipline. It is the same thing every single year, like the greatest hits of defense waste: the littoral combat ship, a combat ship that can't even survive combat, a ship on perpetual port call because it is always in need of repair, a ship the Navy said it needs only one of.

But, apparently, the White House knows better, because they forced the Navy to ask for another one. And even that wasn't enough, because our committee decided to give them a third one. We are tripling the number of ships the Navy said they need.

Now, how outrageous is that?

That is $500 million a pop. That is $1 billion more than the Navy wanted.

The F–35, the President has trumpeted how he brought down the price of this bloated program. But just a few days ago it was revealed that the bill for this program is actually going to jump 7 percent. You probably won't be seeing this on the President's Twitter feed, but the Pentagon now says it needs another $63 billion for the program.

But instead of demanding accountability, this bill rewards Lockheed and the Pentagon by committing the government to block buy F–35s without the testing that is required.

Then there is the USS *Ford*, a brand-new class of carrier that is at least 25 percent over budget right now. You would think that before sending a crew of 4,300 out to sea in a $13 billion carrier with a host of new mission-critical systems, we would want to ensure that the ship can actually survive in combat conditions. But you would be wrong. This bill actually eliminates the requirement for shock testing that Congress itself imposed just a few years back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KATKO). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, forgoing this testing could not only put our sailors at unnecessary risk, but could also lead to expensive retrofits for years to come. And for what?

This is not what Americans expect when they tell us they want a strong defense. This is not what Americans expect of us in our congressional oversight role. We are not doing our job if we don't do oversight, if we don't say ''no'' to wasteful spending, and if we don't say ''no'' to blank checks to defense contractors.

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

I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments. Most of those issues, if not all of them, were brought up in committee when this bill was considered as amendments, and they were defeated in virtually all cases by a bipartisan vote.

I appreciate the fact that she voted for the overall bill, as did everybody but one Member after you take it all into consideration, because that is what this bill is about. We are authorizing a broad swath of the defense of this country. There are a lot of moving parts to it.

Not everything in a bill this big is going to be satisfactory to everybody on the committee. I can pick out one or two things I don't like about it. But as a whole, it does the job that needs to be done for the people that we depend upon to defend America.

So I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments, but most of all, I appreciated her vote at the end of the day when we approved that bill after markup in committee.

Now, I do want to respond to one thing that the gentleman from Massachusetts said. He talked about, we are still there fighting the Taliban. The 2001 AUMF specifically references the Taliban.

So we can talk about how things in Syria that President Obama did, things in Libya that President Obama did, things in Yemen that President Obama did are outside the AUMF that was adopted in 2001 with regard to Afghanistan, and I think that is a legitimate debate. But there is no legitimate debate about whether or not the ongoing conflict in Afghanistan and our involvement with it has been authorized, because it has been authorized for 16 years.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from 14 conservative and liberal national organizations opposing a defense bill that busts the budget caps.

JULY 10, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCGOVERN: As organizations representing Americans across the political spectrum, we are writing to voice our strong opposition to attempts by Members of Congress to increase the Pentagon's fiscal year 2018 budget above both the budget caps set by the Budget Control Act and the President's budget request. The Pentagon is currently funded at a higher level than at almost any time since World War II, and the budget problems it faces should be solved by better fiscal management, not by adding more money to an already bloated and wasteful department.

The challenges facing our military are partially the result of years of failing to make the necessary, tough choices our nation's security requires. Rather than prioritizing basic needs of the warfighter, lawmakers have pursued huge, expensive weapons systems that fail to meet technical specifications and may never be ready for combat. Waste and unnecessary overhead abound, with a Defense Business Board study showing that the Department of Defense could save up to $125 billion over five years just by eliminating excess bureaucracy and inefficiencies.

Claims of a so-called ''readiness crisis'' are exaggerated. As former DoD Comptroller Robert Hale said in February, these claims are just the services ''putting their worst foot forward'' in the hopes of securing funding increases. General David Petraeus has also said that this idea of a readiness crisis is a myth. By opposing important cost-saving measures like base realignment and closure which could save several billion dollars a year just by closing excess infrastructure, Congress is demonstrating that it is not prioritizing fiscal responsibility or making the choices that will actually keep us safe. Moreover, the Pentagon cannot be sure what it is spending as it is the only federal agency that has never passed an audit.

Budgets necessitate tradeoffs. Pentagon spending increases shortchange other important priorities, from domestic needs including education, health and nutrition and affordable housing, to paying down the national debt. Further increasing the Pentagon's budget by tens of billions of dollars without a clear strategy will do little to solve national security challenges. Rather, it will simply guarantee further wasteful spending at the Pentagon. We hope that you will oppose any attempts to increase the Pentagon's budget for fiscal year 2018.

Sincerely,

American Friends Service Committee; Center for International Policy; Coalition on Human Needs; Council for a Livable World; Freedom Works; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Iraq Veterans Against the War.

National Coalition for the Homeless; Taxpayers Protection Alliance; Taxpayers United of America; The Libertarian Institute; United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society; Win Without War; Women's Action for New Directions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a letter to all Representatives from the American Civil Liberties Union in opposition to the Hartzler amendment, which it deems as discriminatory and unconstitutional.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
Washington, DC, July 13, 2017.

Vote NO on Hartzler Amendment No. 315 to the NDAA—Discriminatory and Unconstitutional.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) is strongly opposed to Hartzler Amendment No. 315 to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (NDAA), H.R. 2810. This amendment would bar transgender members of the Armed Forces and military families from receiving appropriate and medically necessary health care. This is a discriminatory, unconstitutional attack on transgender service members and their families, plain and simple. It should be overwhelmingly rejected by members of the House of Representatives.

Barring access to appropriate and medically necessary health care, including transition-related care, for transgender service members and their families is not only discriminatory, but runs counter to scientific evidence and contemporary medical standards of care. It also puts the health of certain service members at needless risk and undermines the ability of military medical professionals to provide necessary care for their patients.

There is a clear and overwhelming consensus among the leading medical organizations—including the American Medical Association, the American Psychiatric Association, and the American Psychological Association—that transition-related care is safe, effective, non-experimental, and medically necessary. If a military doctor determines that transition-related care (e.g. hormone therapy) is medically necessary for a transgender service member, then that treatment should be provided just as it would be for any other medical condition for any other service member.

Members of the House of Representatives should overwhelmingly reject this discriminatory attempt to deny necessary health care to certain service members and their families. All of the members of our Armed Forces willingly put their lives on the line in defense of our nation. The least that Congress can do is ensure that the health care needs of our service members and their families are being met.

Accordingly, the ACLU is strongly opposed to Hartzler Amendment No. 315 to the NDAA and urges all members to vote NO on it.

Please contact Ian Thompson, legislative representative.

Sincerely,

FAIZ SHAKIR,
National Political Director.

IAN THOMPSON,
Legislative Representative.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic to me that we have time to debate a bill that discriminates against transgender members of the Armed Forces and military families, but we can't find the time to debate war. It really is sad. It is a sad commentary on the way the Rules Committee conducted itself last night.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman believes that what we are doing in Afghanistan is consistent with what was envisioned 16 years ago, he can go on thinking that, but it isn't. And if he thinks it is okay that that authorization is used to justify every military involvement we have all around the world, he can go ahead and think that way. I think he is very much mistaken.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has to stop kicking the can down the road. It is unconscionable that the Republican leadership continues to prevent meaningful debate on these wars. But let me say one thing about why our House colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, keep bringing these issues up, despite the opposition from the Republican leadership. And that is because it is our job.

The American people sent us to Washington to debate the uncomfortable issues and to take difficult votes. Now, there were some in Congress—maybe my friend is included in that—who think that it is acceptable to give this administration a blank check to continue these endless wars. Why anybody—no matter who is President, but especially with this President—would feel comfortable giving him a blank check is beyond my comprehension.

There are others who would like to end them and bring our servicemen and -women home. And then there are others who look for a different policy somewhere between these two positions. This is why we need to debate these wars. This is why we need to bring updated AUMFs to the floor for a vote.

If that is a debate that you would rather not have, if that is a vote that you would rather not take, then Mr. Speaker, let me suggest that you should look for a new job. You should go into a different vocation.

I am sure that I speak for all of my colleagues when I say that protecting the lives and well-being of our uniform men and women is one of the highest priorities, if not the highest priorities, of this Congress. But they deserve more than a ''thank you'' on Veterans Day.

We do not respect their service and sacrifice and that of their families when we refuse to debate and take any responsibility for sending them year after year into war. They deserve a thoughtful, reasoned, and engaged debate. They deserve a debate. They deserve a little attention in this Chamber, not excuses and not more reports and not more, ''We will get to it in the future.''

And that is why, along with many of my Republican and Democratic colleagues, we will continue to demand that the Republican leadership of this House allow a debate and a vote on the future of these wars.

I just want to say, finally, Mr. Speaker, I have been raising this issue not just when Republicans have been President, but when Democrats have been President. I really believe that Congress has forfeited its constitutional responsibilities. We have abrogated our constitutional responsibilities. We have acquiesced time and time again to Democratic and Republican administrations when it comes to war.

We can't allow that to happen. That is not responsible governing. We have an obligation to make sure that whatever we are doing with regard to our military, that it is the right thing to do.

The idea that we once again come to the floor with the National Defense Authorization bill and we are told we cannot debate any of these things, we can't vote on any of these things, I mean, give me a break. What are you thinking? Why is this such a big, difficult thing to overcome with the leadership?

Again, if my friends don't want to take uncomfortable votes, then do something else. Don't vote. But it is not the right thing to do. We should be ashamed of this process. There is no justifying shutting out debate on war.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and vote ''no'' on the underlying bill, and vote ''no'' on the rule, too.

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

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

The gentleman said we can't debate anything. The rule we passed yesterday makes in order 210 different amendments to be debated on top of the general debate of the bill itself. And that is on top of 275 amendments in the committee of jurisdiction, the Armed Services Committee.

This is the most debated piece of legislation we have every year, and it should be for the very reasons the gentleman from Massachusetts itemized, because what we are doing here is of profound importance.

Now, I know that there are other issues that people try to stick into this bill every year that, frankly, distract us from the underlying importance of the bill; and that is, we are trying to do everything we possibly can to protect the American people. The threats the American people face today are more diverse, more profound than we have seen since the end of World War II.

So, yes, this bill authorizes a lot of very important and expensive things. I acknowledge they are expensive. But it is even more expensive if we don't do them, or don't do them right, and we leave the American people exposed.

Just take into account one of our threats, Kim Jong-un in North Korea. That missile test he did recently was an ICBM, an intercontinental ballistic missile. He does not need such a missile to hit South Korea or Japan. He needs that missile to hit us, to hit Alaska, to hit the West Coast of the United States, and ultimately to hit the entirety of the United States.

It is a direct threat to the safety of the people of the United States. This bill authorizes an increase in missile defense, just one of the things that it does.

So I hope that all of us will take the many things that we are going to debate here over the next several days very seriously and that we will come to the bipartisan conclusion, as we did in the committee, that when you take the totality of this bill together after you have gone through all of these amendments, it does the most important thing we are here to do, which is to defend the American people.

□ 1400

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 440 and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 440 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2933) to promote effective registered apprenticeships, for skills, credentials, and employment, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2933.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 187, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

YEAS—234

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

NAYS—187

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette

Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Cleaver
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
Johnson, Sam
Lieu, Ted
Moore
Napolitano
Peters
Price (NC)
Roskam
Sanford
Scalise

□ 1425

Messrs. GOTTHEIMER, COOPER, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. CROWLEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. WEBSTER of Florida, HOLLINGSWORTH, and RUTHERFORD changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 190, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 355]

AYES—230

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

NOES—190

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Arrington
Cleaver
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
Johnson, Sam
Lieu, Ted
Moore
Napolitano
Palmer
Price (NC)
Roskam
Sanford
Scalise

□ 1435

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 355.

REPORT ON H.R. 3219, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

Ms. GRANGER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–219) on the bill (H.R. 3219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KATKO). Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 431 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2810.

Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 1437

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (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, July 12, 2017, the fourth set of amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 115–212 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CONAWAY of Texas.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 5 by Ms. JAYAPAL of Washington.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. AGUILAR of California.

Amendment No. 88 by Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 225, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]

AYES—198

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Davidson
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NOES—225

Adams
Aguilar
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Comer
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crist
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—10

Cleaver
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
Grothman
Johnson, Sam
Lieu, Ted
Moore
Napolitano
Sanford
Scalise

□ 1441

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 73, noes 351, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 357]

AYES—73

Barragán
Bass
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeSaulnier
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans

Garamendi
Gomez
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Maloney, Carolyn B.
McGovern
Meeks
Nadler
Pallone
Panetta
Pelosi
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Raskin
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Takano
Tonko
Tsongas
Velázquez
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOES—351

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cicilline
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kihuen
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price (NC)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—9

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1447

Messrs. DOGGETT, JOHNSON of Georgia, GROTHMAN, Mses. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. TAKANO changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 245, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 358]

AYES—179

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—245

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)

Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—9

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1452

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 257, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

AYES—167

Adams
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—257

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Correa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—9

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1456

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 249, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]

AYES—173

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio

DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—249

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

NOT VOTING—11

Carbajal
Cleaver
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
Johnson, Sam
Kihuen
Lieu, Ted
Moore
Napolitano
Sanford
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1459

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. AGUILAR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 235, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 361]

AYES—188

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—235

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (PA)

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

NOT VOTING—10

Cleaver
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
Johnson, Sam
Lieu, Ted
Moore
Napolitano
Roskam
Sanford
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1504

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 355 and "nay" on rollcall No. 361.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 253, noes 172, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 362]

AYES—253

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

NOES—172

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Correa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gomez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Soto
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1509

Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 232, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 363]

AYES—192

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch

Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—232

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

NOT VOTING—9

Cleaver
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
Frankel (FL)
Johnson, Sam
Lieu, Ted
Napolitano
Sanford
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1513

Mr. BLUMENAUER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 254, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 364]

AYES—169

Adams
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—254

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem

Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Cleaver
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
Frankel (FL)
Johnson, Sam
Lieu, Ted
Massie
Napolitano
Sanford
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1517

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 248, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 365]

AYES—175

Aderholt
Amash
Barr
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bishop (MI)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)
Buck
Budd
Burgess
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clay
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Comer
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Davidson
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Gabbard
Gallagher
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harris
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hill
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Issa
Jayapal
Johnson (GA)
Jordan
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Love
Lowey
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
Meadows
Messer
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Newhouse
Nolan
Norman
O'Rourke
Palmer
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Suozzi
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—248

Abraham
Adams
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Cheney
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
DeLauro
Demings
DeSaulnier
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Dunn
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Ferguson
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Holding
Hoyer
Hunter
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kuster (NH)
Lamborn
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lee
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Noem
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Pingree
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Tenney
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walberg
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Cleaver
Cummings
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Frankel (FL)
Johnson, Sam
Lieu, Ted
Napolitano
Sanford
Scalise

□ 1522

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KATKO). There being no further amendments, pursuant to House Resolution 431, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) having assumed the chair, Mr. KATKO, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1532

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FASO) at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 440 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2810.

Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1533

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 14 printed in part B of House Report 115–212 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to House Resolution 440, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115–217 and amendments en bloc described in section 3.

Each further amendment printed in the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115–217.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 123.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chair, this amendment facilitates the construction of badly needed icebreakers. The United States does not have any heavy icebreakers that are available all year round. We only have one, and that is used in the Antarctic and, therefore, unavailable in the summer in the north.

Joining me on this amendment is the ranking member and others from the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

We need icebreakers; in fact, we need six icebreakers. We need to build the first one immediately and get it underway.

Language in the underlying bill provides a mechanism for us to fund that icebreaker using the authorities of the Department of the Navy, specifically, one of their sections. This amendment clarifies the language and makes it clear that the Navy can act as the fiscal agent to carry out the icebreaker task. It does not require in any way that the Navy shipbuilding account be used in any way to pay for the icebreaker. The money for the icebreaker will have to come from other sources. But it makes it clear that the Navy can expend money as a fiscal agent using the special account that was designated, that has been in existence for some time.

I can go into great length about why we need icebreakers, but the very short story is that Russia has over 40 icebreakers, probably closer to 50, many of them heavy icebreakers capable of operating in very thick ice in the Arctic. The United States really has none. We have some light icebreakers, but they will not suffice during the Arctic spring and winter. Therefore, we have to get with it.

We do know that in the future—well, today and this year, this summer—the Northwest Passage will be open for shipping, and the East Passage, which is along the Russian coast, is also open.

So the Arctic is a navigable ocean. The U.S. Navy cannot operate there without an icebreaker. We cannot conduct civil and maritime as well as military exercises without a heavy icebreaker. This allows us to do that.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment to strike a critical provision of this year's NDAA.

I do share my colleague's concern for the current state of our U.S. Coast Guard icebreaker fleet. I do believe there are ways that we can address that issue, but I disagree with his proposed solution.

To be clear, the National Defense Authorization Act authorizes funds for the Department of Defense. The U.S. Coast Guard falls under the Department of Homeland Security.

This amendment seeks to take millions of dollars away from the Navy in the long term and shift it to the Coast Guard for their expenditures. Make no mistake about it: if this amendment passes, there is no stopping the Department of Homeland Security or any other agency from poaching enormous sums of our Defense Department budget in the future. Today it is Coast Guard icebreakers, and next year it may be the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration research and survey vessels. The possibilities are endless; unfortunately, the funds are not.

Mr. Chair, I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment to ensure that our Navy and Department of Defense funds are used only by the Navy and the Department of Defense.

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Garamendi-Hunter amendment because I know how important a strong icebreaker fleet is to national security.

The committee recognizes this reality, as elsewhere in the bill we give the DOD some important authorities to support icebreaker procurement. However, this section 123 prohibits DOD funding for icebreaker procurement. This amendment strikes this provision because flexibility will be essential to funding new icebreakers.

Coast Guard shipbuilding budgets are insufficient for icebreaker procurement absent radical cuts elsewhere. As co-chair of the Arctic Working Group, I know that the United States needs icebreakers. These ships protect economic interests in the region, and they defend our sovereignty.

As the Arctic becomes increasingly navigable, the importance of icebreakers will only grow, and I urge my colleagues to support the Garamendi-Hunter amendment.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON), my friend and colleague.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chair, I rise today in respectful opposition to this amendment.

No one can dispute America's need for icebreakers. These capital ships are indispensable tools to ensure the safe and rapid movement of commerce in Arctic waters. I commend my colleagues for their strong advocacy for these ships and share their belief that we need them.

However, the responsibility and accountability for constructing and operating America's icebreakers must rest solely where the Congress has assigned it: the Department of Homeland Security and the U.S. Coast Guard.

The question we are debating today is not whether we need icebreakers, but how to appropriate the funds and who should build them. As important as icebreakers are, they are not warships, and we must not allow funding legitimately appropriated for our combat

fleet to be diverted for nondefense needs.

While I acknowledge the temptation to raid defense accounts for a worthy cause, we must be mindful of how deep in the hole we are with our air, land, sea, space, and cyber forces. We need to keep our eye on the ball in rebuilding our military's readiness and our modernization.

Mr. Chair, I urge a vote ''no'' against this amendment.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chair, just a couple of things.

First of all, there is a thing called the National Sealift Fund, which has been in existence for a long time, and it has been used to build non-Navy ships. That is exactly what we intend to do here is to use the National Sealift Fund, not the Navy shipbuilding fund.

Secondly, you may notice or you may want to know that the U.S. Coast Guard is, in fact, a defense as well as a civilian vessel; it has both obligations.

We also need to understand that we are not stealing money from the Navy. This is simply a mechanism in which the Navy acts as a fiscal agent to carry out the task.

The Coast Guard is not well suited to build ships of this type. We are looking for the most efficient and effective way to carry out the task, and the use of the National Sealift Fund, together with the U.S. Navy as the fiscal agent, is the best way to accomplish that.

I would end by simply saying the U.S. Navy is toothless, useless in the Arctic unless it has an icebreaker. So if you care about the Arctic Ocean and the role of the U.S. Navy in carrying out our national defense functions in the Arctic, then you must help us find a way to build the icebreakers.

We will do so without, in any way, taking funds away from the U.S. Navy shipbuilding. Indeed, it would be up to the appropriators to appropriate money quite hopefully from the Department of Homeland Security for this purpose, putting the money into this National Sealift Fund so that it can then be used to build the icebreaker, with the Navy acting as the fiscal agent.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I join with Chairman WITTMAN in expressing opposition to this amendment.

As he has indicated, the Navy has no indication that they have a military requirement for icebreakers. Right now we are trying to reverse the effects of sequestration. We are fighting against budget cuts. When you use money for something other than what it was intended for, it is a budget cut, and that is what this would be. No one is talking about raising the top line of the overall defense budget, but they are talking about using the funds otherwise for something that is not defense.

I want to join with everyone who is speaking on this issue of the importance of the Coast Guard and certainly its impact and certainly the issues of icebreaking, but shipbuilding for the Navy and for our military should be concentrated on our military. Certainly the funds that we are appropriating to the Department of Defense should remain in the Department of Defense, and, therefore, I rise with Chairman WITTMAN in support of the opposition.

□ 1545

Mr. Chair, in closing, I want to say that—going to Admiral Richardson's words—Admiral Richardson clearly states that the mission of icebreaking is a Coast Guard mission. There is not a disagreement there, but the disagreement is using resources that are within the Defense budget in order to do that.

If you are going to put the responsibility for building icebreakers and maintaining and operating them with the Coast Guard, yet you are going to put the money in the Department of Defense budget where there is no control, there is no oversight, that is a catastrophe waiting to happen.

If this is going to happen, it should happen within the Department of Homeland Security's budget or there needs to be a debate about where, ultimately, the Coast Guard needs to be located. But to put money in one area of the budget and expect that it is going to be managed properly and applied properly with someplace where there is not even jurisdiction, I think is problematic.

Again, it is clear where the missions are. It is clear where the responsibility lies between the Homeland Security Department, the Coast Guard, the Navy, and the Department of Defense.

I want to make sure we are building more cutters and icebreakers, and if we are going to do that, let's make sure we do it in the proper way. I think there are ways to construct language to make that happen, but this is not the way to do it.

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

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115–217.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 85, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 316. ALTERNATIVE ENERGY USE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) COST COMPETITIVENESS REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense shall not purchase alternative energy unless such energy is equivalent to conventional energy in terms of cost and capabilities.

(2) COST CALCULATION.—The cost of each energy source described in paragraph (1) shall be calculated on a pre-tax basis in terms of life-cycle cost. Such calculation shall take into account—

(A) all associated Federal grants, subsidies and tax incentives applied from the point of production to consumption;

(B) fixed and variable operations and maintenance costs; and

(C) in the case of fuel, fully burdened costs, including all associated transportation and security from the point of purchase to delivery to the end user.

(3) RESEARCH EXEMPTION.—Nothing in this Act is intended to prohibit alternative energy research by the Department.

(b) PROHIBITION ON RENEWABLE ENERGY MANDATES.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Defense shall be used to carry out any provision of law that requires the Department of Defense to consume renewable energy, unless such energy meets the requirements of subsection (a).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for the opportunity to speak about my amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

Our military is the greatest fighting force in the world. I applaud the Department of Defense's efforts to reduce its carbon footprint. However, with our limited resources, we must ensure that these resources are being put to use in the best possible way.

Every penny spent by the Department of Defense must be used to advance our military's mission and support our troops. Incorporating higher cost fuel sources into the Department's energy acquisition process is money lost to repair planes, buy ammunition, and defeat the enemy.

Moreover, Congress must ensure that we are being good stewards of the American people's money. With our debt soaring towards $20 trillion, it is irresponsible to ask American families to subsidize with their tax dollars fuel sources that have not yet been proven cost-effective.

Of course, the Department of Defense would still be allowed to research alternative sources of energy. My amendment ensures that the Department of

Defense can conduct research on alternative fuels to ensure these energy sources can be cost-competitive in the future.

My commonsense amendment is simple. It provides a framework for ensuring the Department of Defense is engaging in responsible energy acquisition practices. It prohibits renewable energy mandates placed on the Department of Defense and ensures that every unit of energy our military purchases is the most cost-effective option available while still maintaining the ability to research new sources of energy.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a blatant attack on the use of alternative energy by the Department of Defense. So we have existing contracts right now for renewable energy, both liquid fuels and electricity, at the Department of Defense, and this amendment seeks to really pump the brakes on those policies and bury them in a web of unnecessary requirements.

So requiring procurement managers to track all Federal subsidies and tax credits would be a burden to the government, and requiring suppliers to provide such information would be onerous, expensive, and may, in fact, actually drive them away. Also, this will result in less competition for contracts, and higher costs for the Department of Defense. Ultimately, it is going to result in higher costs to the taxpayer.

So most alarmingly, this amendment does not include any waivers for times of emergency when a retail, time-sensitive purchase of readily available alternative fuels might be imperative to completing the mission, even if it is at a price point higher than the usual market cost.

Mr. Chairman, it also does not provide consideration for renewable energy projects for military installations that, although they might not reduce costs, do have other quantifiable benefits that increase combat effectiveness or enhance mission resiliency.

This amendment is also redundant. For bulk purchases, of which the DOD has many, current law already prohibits the Department from an alternative fuel purchase unless fully burdened cost is cost-competitive with traditional fuels.

Burying suppliers in these requirements is an unnecessary compliance burden and could disincentivize some suppliers from doing business with the DOD.

Finally, this amendment is opposed by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment, which would unnecessarily tie the hands of our military as it seeks to diversify its energy supply.

The Pentagon is pursuing alternative energy not because they are some kind of tree hugger, but because the diversity of energy options improves mission capabilities and saves lives.

Just because the price of oil is low today doesn't mean it won't spike tomorrow and force military leaders to divert resources away from mission priorities. In some cases, this has meant turning ships around and cutting their voyages short because of budgeting issues around fuel.

This is of particular concern as we continue the fight against ISIS while pivoting towards the Pacific. The Pacific Ocean has an area of 64 million miles. It includes hotspots like the South China Sea and North Korea, whose recent aggression threatens the region and our security.

As we ask our military leaders to respond to threats at a moment's notice, they need the flexibility that comes with alternative energy sources. But you don't need to just hear that from me. That is the position of General Mattis at the Department of Defense, who opposes this amendment.

My colleagues on the other side are going to say that this is merely about choosing the most cost-effective option, but this amendment would place an undue burden on DOD procurement managers to track all subsidies and credits for fuel. It doesn't include a waiver for national security considerations or increasing combat effectiveness, and it would inhibit innovations that increase readiness and save lives.

A 21st century military with the capability to counter new and dynamic threats cannot be powered solely by the energy sources of yesterday. I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that asking the Department of Defense to make a cost-effective decision in any purchase is an unnecessary burden.

Mr. Chair, I disagree with my colleagues, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I believe this amendment would significantly hinder the Department of Defense's ability to procure energy, and I urge its defeat. As I stated previously, this amendment is opposed by the Department of Defense.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, the United States military is the greatest fighting force in the world. Our troops need to be focused on the mission at hand and have every tool at their disposal to complete that mission.

My amendment ensures that we practice fiscal discipline in the Department of Defense's energy acquisition process by ensuring that we are buying the most cost-effective source of energy.

I thank the chairman. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115–217.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 336.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for his hard work and his defense of those who wear the uniform and take on that tough task. In these tough and troubling times, especially in financial austerity, he stood up and let everybody know how the military, in actual dollars over the last 8 years, has been cut significantly, and the impact on our national security.

In that vein, my goal with this amendment is to prioritize those limited defense resources on efforts that pose an immediate and direct threat to our national security.

This amendment would strike section 336 of the NDAA, which strikes the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the vulnerability to military installations and combatant commander requirements resulting from climate change over the next 20 years.

I am not here to debate climate change, whether it is real or it is not, how it is created, how we fix it, and all that stuff. That is for another day. My point is that this shouldn't be the priority of combatant commanders in our military. The United States military is currently operating in a very complex threat environment in which our country must be ready to face our adversaries.

Our country is facing direct threats from a myriad of sources, including Islamic extremists: ISIS, al-Qaida, the

Taliban, Abu Sayyaf. The alphabet soup of names in that regard is continuous and unrelenting: North Korea, China, Iran, Russia, even in space.

Over the past 8 years, our military strength and readiness has suffered as a result of the underfunding and neglect from the previous administration that are in support of sequestration. Through the NDAA, we simply must prioritize, decide what is most important and be for that, and let our warfighters know where we stand.

These things must strengthen the rebuilding of our Armed Forces and resolve their focus on what they need to pay attention to. Literally litanies of other Federal agencies deal with environmental issues, including climate change. This Federal mandate detracts from the essential mission of the Department of Defense, which is to secure our Nation from enemies, and is best left to the agencies that are better suited to deal with these issues.

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

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

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chair, this amendment would strike a provision that we have already thoroughly debated and approved in a bipartisan fashion within the Armed Services Committee. Section 336 acknowledges what Secretary Mattis has already said and what we already know: that a changing climate will affect our military's readiness and alter the threat landscape for years to come, and that we must study these impacts to prepare for them.

I cannot see the harm in gathering information and doing an assessment. We already see the strategic implications of new sea lanes being cut in the melting Arctic, where countries are seeking an economic advantage. As we speak, along our coasts, rising seas are affecting our naval installations, including at Naval Station Norfolk, the home of the Atlantic Fleet.

The report required in section 336 is not about causes of climate change, nor do we discuss specific emissions, targets, or green energy goals. Instead, my section of the Armed Service Committee is very factual. We focus squarely on the readiness of our Armed Forces to combat the coming and existing climate threat, starting with a study of the 10 most vulnerable bases in each service, and a report on how a changing climate will affect combatant commanders' strategic battle plans.

□ 1600

As Secretary Mattis has said, ''the effects of a changing climate—such as increased maritime access to the Arctic, rising sea levels, desertification, among others—impact our security situation.''

Mr. Chairman, we need to support our leaders in the military and intelligence communities in addressing these concerns, so I urge defeat of this amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK), who is my good friend and the chair of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the House Armed Services Committee.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in opposition to Mr. PERRY's amendment which would strike language that requires the Department of Defense to compile a report on the vulnerabilities of military installations and combatant commander requirements resulting from climate change. As we heard earlier today, this language passed by voice vote on a bipartisan basis during our markup in committee.

Increased maritime access to the Arctic, rising sea levels, desertification, increases in natural disasters, damage to existing infrastructure, and other effects of climate change are drivers of geopolitical instability and degrade the security of the United States.

We would be remiss in our efforts to protect our national security if we do not fully account for the risk climate change poses to our bases, our readiness, and to the fulfillment of our Armed Forces mission.

This is about a report. Let's get the information. This is why I believe we have bipartisan support within the committee. We must incorporate environmental factors in our threat assessments and contingency planning to ensure the long-term operational viability of our missions and the safety of our men and women in uniform.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this Perry amendment which will strip vital language regarding the impact of Department of Defense activities associated with climate change.

The Defense Department does so many vital things for the safety and security of the United States and the American people. We all owe the brave men and women who wear the Nation's uniform a debt of gratitude that we can never truly repay. However, we must be cognizant of all the impacts that DOD activities have across the globe.

The Defense Department has such a large footprint, and the amount of military construction and other activity that it undertakes year round impacts our environment. How could it not?

We are talking about possible implications such as contributions to sea level rise—which is particularly important to my constituents in south Florida—that it would be irresponsible for us to ignore.

I have a Coast Guard base in my district, Coast Guard Miami Beach, located right there on the water in Miami Beach, and we know the impact of sea level rise in that area.

So as a member of the Climate Solutions Caucus, I urge my colleagues to oppose this Perry amendment. We have got to be clear-eyed, Mr. Chairman, about every possible impact of our military activities, and that includes the impact that we place on our environment.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, last year the Pentagon released a directive stating that the Department of Defense must be able to adapt to climate change in order to maintain an effective and efficient U.S. military.

General Mattis—now Secretary Mattis—during his Senate confirmation said: ''Climate change is impacting stability in areas of the world where our troops are operating today.'' Bases in the region I represent in San Diego—which is home to the largest concentration of military forces in the world—are already facing challenges from sea level rise, drought, and reliable energy sources.

For years, the most decorated military leaders in our country have been telling us that climate change is a national security threat. Congress cannot afford to make this debate about politics or ideology.

We don't have to agree on what causes climate change. We only have to agree with our military leaders that the effects of climate change are altering the security environment and the threats we face.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this reckless amendment and ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 30 seconds remaining.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, as we noted in our committee markup, there would be nothing controversial about studying this threat and being prepared to mitigate the risks. In fact, that is our responsibility.

The support for this climate resiliency language was truly bipartisan in

committee, and I hope we will send a strong message of support to the servicemen and -women who will have to lead with the effects of climate change by opposing this amendment.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the Secretary of Defense doesn't need Congress to tell him what the threats are. He knows what the threats are.

I can tell you as a person who has been privileged for over 30 years to wear the Nation's uniform—the Army, the military's uniform—and as a person who was privileged to lead troops in combat in the Middle East, I didn't need Congress to tell me who the enemy is or was. We know that. We also don't need Congress to tell us to report the issues that we might have in defending the Nation to the Congress or to the Commander.

We know our duty, and we will do our duty. If we have issues that need to be reported—whether it is sea level rise or the enemy has a new weapon or we can't feed our troops or what have you—we will report it, and we will resolve it. We don't need people in Washington, D.C., telling us how to run the war. That is our job. That is the military's job.

This amendment simply says that we ought to prioritize that. We ought to let them prioritize that. We ought to let combatant commanders—we ought to let the men and women who wear the uniform and defend our country focus on the enemy. If the enemy, indeed, is climate change, then they will focus on that as well, and they will submit information so that we can make decisions.

The point is, should somebody—should all of us in this uniform in Washington, D.C.—be telling the fine men and women in uniform across the globe defending our country that we know better? That is exactly what I am trying to avoid here.

Little by little, drip by drip, we have watched our Nation's and military's focus eroded—this and that. Believe me. I have filled out the reports. As an officer, I have filled out a whole bunch of reports on a regular basis that have nothing to do with completing the mission of securing our Nation and defeating the enemy—nothing to do with it. This is just one in the long line of them.

My only goal is to send this to where it needs to be—the agencies best adapted to deal with it and take it out of the agencies that shouldn't be dealing with it and should be dealing with securing our Nation and fighting the enemy.

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Chair, Naval Air Station Key West provides key training and support for the nation's military operations and readiness. The base trains fighter pilots from all branches and is home to the Joint Interagency Task Force South, which combats illicit narcotics.

However, most of the land in the Florida Keys lies at elevations 3 feet or less above sea level, making the Naval station extremely vulnerable to sea-level rise. But this threat is not unique to that station; many of our bases across the, country and around the globe are susceptible to the effects of climate change.

Recognition of this threat, and prudent planning for these contingencies, are vital to our military bases and maintaining the national security interests of the United States abroad.

I congratulate the gentleman from Rhode Island, and the Committee, for recognizing this and including language in the underlying bill asking the Pentagon to report on the vulnerabilities posed by climate change so we can responsibly identify and implement adaptive measures. This includes an honest discussion of the realities of our changing environment.

As co-chair of the Climate Solutions Caucus, I urge all my colleagues to reject the Perry Amendment.

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

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115–217.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after section 344 the following:

SEC. 345. DETERMINATION OF PREVAILING WAGE UNDER THE DAVIS-BACON ACT.

For purposes of this Act, any determination of the prevailing wage conducted under section 3142(b) of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act) shall be conducted by the Secretary of Labor acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics using surveys carried out by the Bureau that use proper random statistical sampling techniques.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment with the intent of accurately and transparently determining the prevailing wage for Department of Defense contracts. My amendment would require the calculation of wages for contractors and all defense projects to be based on actual statistics calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, or BLS, as opposed to the current process which determines these rates based on fundamentally flawed surveys within the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, or the DOL.

This amendment is needed. A 2008 Department of Labor Inspector General report found that ''one or more errors existed in 100 percent of the wage reports.'' The Congressional Budget Office estimates that upwards of $13 billion could be wasted over 10 years if Davis-Bacon is left unreformed. As stewards of the public treasury, we have an obligation to spend taxpayer money wisely. This amendment addresses that very need.

Additionally, this amendment doesn't remove funds from the Defense budget. The money this amendment saves—potentially in the billions of dollars—will be kept within the Department of Defense budget to be used for other important defense priorities. In a fiscal environment where every dollar counts, this amendment presents a welcome opportunity to make our defense dollars go further.

This amendment isn't an attempt to repeal Davis-Bacon. It is about competition, equality, accuracy, and transparency for everyone. It simply asks that wage determinations for Department of Defense contracts be made with statistically sampled information from the Bureau of Labor Statistics so that we are able to spend Federal dollars in a more efficient manner and support more jobs. The BLS has proven time and time again that they are the only agency capable of accurately determining these wages.

A fair wage for a fair job is fair to the American taxpayer. Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their continued work on the committee.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I come here today to speak in opposition to the amendment, one that would hurt the local economy, devalue workers' pay, and take a very important tool out of the toolbox for both Republicans, Democrats, and Americans.

Almost 100 years ago, two Republican Congressmen, James Davis and Robert Bacon, realized there was a problem with Federal contracts. Those contracts were unfair to the local economies. So in 1931, Congress unanimously approved Davis-Bacon prevailing wage. It ensures that construction workers are paid the same as construction workers in that local community.

The prevailing wage is based on surveys of local wages and benefits, not whether there is a union or not. It keeps the community vibrant, and it takes into account those things that happened in that local community. So when you hear the term ''if it ain't

broke don't fix it,'' this is a classic example.

They are trying to talk about surveys and methodologies. Quite frankly, this system has worked for over 80 years. They are talking about technicalities, but the fact of the matter is this is about cutting wages in your local community. Why would you ever want to go back and say, I want to hurt the people I represent? But apparently that seems to be what we are doing.

So we want to make sure that local workers are paid a fair wage. The system has worked fine for so many years and makes sure that those men and women who work hard each and every day are properly compensated.

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

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

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. NORCROSS, my co-chairman of the Congressional Building Trades Caucus, to be able to discuss this.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this amendment offered by my friend from Arizona. His amendment would change dramatically the methodology used to determine wage rates paid to construction workers across America.

While this proposal may appear to be reasonable at first blush, it would dramatically depart from the current practice and would result in massive pay cuts for working families.

Unlike the current system, the methodology would not take into consideration the total value of all wages and benefits into account. It excludes the cost of pensions, healthcare, and, vitally, training that we need to have.

So what we are trying to say, Mr. Chairman, is the full benefit must be considered, and it is not in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as someone who began in the construction industry in 1965, 52 years—after 52 years in this business, I understand how the Davis-Bacon Act works and how it works across the country.

So let's not forget, these wage protections are not just for union workers but for all construction workers. It ensures that the local workers can make a fair living on projects in their community. This amendment, unfortunately—as well intended as it might be—would undermine that. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not anti-Davis-Bacon. Let me give you some fun facts. In some cities, the Wage and Hour Division's calculated wages are 75 percent higher than the actual prevailing wage. In other areas throughout the country, they are below minimum wage and only 33 percent of the actual prevailing wage. What is fair is fair.

When you start looking at the figures that are used for calculation, they haven't been updated in many cases since 1970. Give me a break. This isn't about Davis-Bacon, this is about crony capitalism. This is about a vestige of the Jim Crow era.

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

□ 1615

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I align myself with the remarks of my friend, Mr. NORCROSS, and that of my friend, Mr. MCKINLEY.

There is bipartisan opposition to this amendment because we know what it would do. You can talk about it any way you want to talk about it, but the net effect is reduced wages for workers in the communities we represent.

I come from Flint, Michigan. I represent folks who play by the rules and have the right, after working in a trade, to get compensation that is equal to the quality of the work that they deliver. If we don't support that, all we are going to do is continue this race to the bottom.

We all talk about the fact that wages have not kept up. Here is yet another effort that will undermine the ability of American workers who work hard every single day to be able to have a decent wage, take care of their families, put their kids through school, and set something aside for retirement. This is the American Dream. Back in the 1930s, this is why this legislation was first put in place. This amendment would undermine that promise.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to just bring this back home.

Why in the world would you ever want to cut the wages of the men and women you represent? This is about fairness, leveling the playing field. It works, and we want to continue it.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, once again, this is not anti-Davis-Bacon. We want to make it an issue like that, but the statistics speak for themselves.

The Federal Government is willing to pay the wages for our hardworking contractors on what they deserve, but as stewards of the taxpayer dollar, we must insist that these wages are accurate, fair, and transparent.

The inspector general has stated there are fundamental problems with the current methodology. We owe it to the American taxpayer and the contractors themselves to make sure funds are based upon accuracy and wages are being paid fairly.

The opposition claims to be fighting in favor of Davis-Bacon, but if they really cared about its longevity and effectiveness, they would support this amendment and improve and strengthen it.

The opposition also believes this amendment is an attack on the American worker. Tell that to my contractors who have been put out of business with the military in south Arizona. Please tell them that when they couldn't calculate the Davis-Bacon application and were put out of business by the Department of Labor.

That couldn't be further from the truth. This provides certainty and clarity to the wages of hardworking tradesmen and women across the country who perform services for the government.

We as a body should be for fiscal responsibility and for proper worker compensation. This amendment is an opportunity to act exactly on this. I urge my colleagues to support this good-governance and commonsense approach.

I ask my colleagues: Do you support transparency and accuracy? Support my amendment.

Do you support the responsible use of taxpayer dollars? Support my amendment.

Do you support workers and fair compensation? Then support my amendment.

Do you support a fair wage for the hardworking contractors of the DOD? Support my amendment.

Anything stays safe in the military budget. This is military-specific.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair and the ranking member for their help, and I urge everybody to vote ''yes'' for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115–217.

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 541 (page 146, beginning line 20), relating to prohibition on release of military service academy graduates to participate in professional athletics.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, on April 29, Secretary Mattis issued guidance requiring graduates of the Air Force Academy, West Point, and the Naval Academy to compete 2 years of active commissioned service before they can seek permission to pursue a professional sports career while at the same time fulfilling their service obligation.

Traditionally, the service Secretaries may exercise discretion over whether or not to permit the very few academy graduates with the exceptional athletic talent to jointly serve either in the reserves, in Active Duty, or a combination of both, and be part of a professional sports team.

My amendment supports the flexibility and the discretion that has always been built into the Secretary of Defense's discretion to determine on a case-by-case basis how to deal with his own personnel.

Section 541 of this year's NDAA replaces Secretary Mattis guidance with a far more stringent, one-size-fits-all policy that allows for no exceptions, without explanation.

No one is saying that graduates should not fulfill their service requirement. No one is saying that graduates shouldn't pay for their education.

Section 541 is a significant departure from the policy which allows the Secretary of Defense and the military branches discretion, and more specifically, today, it handcuffs our own Secretary Mattis from implementing the policy as he sees fit, just like Secretaries of the past have always done.

Section 541 stipulates that academy graduates must fulfill, without exception, 5 years on Active Duty before they are able to request release to pursue an athletic career. This policy is overrigid and will make it nearly impossible for graduates of our service academies to pursue any professional athletic career.

Denying student athletes on a Secretary-approved, case-by-case basis the opportunity to pursue a professional athletic career in conjunction with their military service is a mistake. The possibility, no matter how remote, of going pro is a powerful recruiting tool that can attract exceptional, diverse high school athletes to attend and excel in our service academies.

Very few college athletes are talented enough to play professionally. I played college football and I ended up here. Most high school athletes dream and believe that they can go pro. The truth is, most won't. But to kill that dream before a student chooses a college also ruins the chance of the academies from recruiting top athletes.

Why does this matter? Because striking section 541 will maintain Secretary Mattis' policy, which was created to ensure that preserving the option for our academy athletes, we do so in a way that maintains the readiness and lethality of our military services. But it is also about morale at the academies.

I taught at West Point. I serve on their board today. I served on the Navy board before. I can tell you that if section 541 is retained, we lose out on the boost in morale afforded to the academies with competitive athletic departments and the recruitment benefit of the soldier athletes' exposure with professional sports teams and their fans.

If section 541 is retained, we will be sending a message that if you are a highly talented high school athlete and you also want to go to the Naval Academy, West Point, or the Air Force Academy, you need to give up any possibility of athletic aspirations after school.

We will be doing ourselves a disservice by not recruiting the absolute best and brightest individuals who could be so versatile enough to be professional athletes and also serve their Nation honorably.

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

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

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the gentleman from Florida's amendment. This amendment strikes section 541 of the 2018 National Defense Authorization Act, which ensures that graduates from military service academies fulfill their military service commitments, without exception, before participating in professional sports. Current policy allows a cadet or midshipman to be released from their 5-year Active Duty service to participate in professional sports just 24 months after graduating from a military service academy.

As chairman of the Military Personnel Subcommittee and a Marine Corps combat veteran, I believe that the service academies exist to develop future officers to lead, enhance readiness, and increase the effectiveness of the Armed Forces.

This is not an issue of recruiting qualified and motivated applicants. Each year, my district office receives far more applications from talented and qualified students who wish to serve their country than we can accommodate. For example, there were 17,000 applications for 1,100 slots last year at the Naval Academy. All of our military service academies have similar numbers of applicants.

We are a country still very much engaged in hostilities around the world, and we need these officers leading our troops and defending the country, not playing professional sports.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the provision in the overwhelming bipartisan HASC-passed FY 2018 National Defense Authorization Act and oppose Representative Rooney's amendment.

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

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY).

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to co-lead this bipartisan amendment. It would strike section 541 of the bill, a provision that would make it nearly impossible for graduates of the military service academies to play professional football, basketball, or any other sport.

I serve on the Board of Visitors at West Point, and I believe section 541 will be detrimental to recruitment and morale at the service academies, could undermine efforts to bridge the military-civilian divide through the use of sports ambassadors, and could compromise the effectiveness of our officer corps.

If our amendment is successful, the policy governing the circumstances under which graduates can play professional sports will be the guidance issued by Secretary Mattis earlier this year. Pursuant to Secretary Mattis' guidance, an academy graduate must complete 2 years of active commissioned service before he or she can seek approval to pursue a professional sports opportunity.

Section 541 goes far beyond this existing guidance, requiring a graduate to serve 5 years on Active Duty before pursuing a professional sports opportunity. This is the functional equivalent of prohibiting a graduate from playing professional sports altogether.

Section 541 applies retroactively to current academy student athletes, not just prospectively to future athletes, which strikes me as unfair. Moreover, it removes the flexibility and discretion built into Secretary Mattis' guidance, replacing it with a one-size-fits-all policy that allows for no exceptions. Before Congress takes such drastic action, we should carefully weigh the arguments for and against such action. That process has not taken place.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment and to allow Secretary Mattis' guidance to remain in effect until such time as we can examine this issue more fully.

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I am truly impressed by my colleague, Mr. ROONEY, on any number of issues. This is not one of them.

This is absurd. It is absolutely absurd. We have military academies to train the next leaders of this country. We are not running a training camp for the National Football League.

If you want to serve as a leader of the military, then you go to one of the

military academies. If you decide you want to have a pro football career, then pay back the $500,000 that the taxpayers of this country have paid for each and every one of these students.

In the Rules Committee yesterday, Mr. ROONEY listed three names of examples of academy graduates continuing in professional sports after graduation. All of the names he mentioned—Roger Staubach, David Robinson, and Alejandro Villanueva—served on Active Duty for at least 2 years.

The model for how this should work is like Villanueva, who served his 5-year commitment, deployed three times to Afghanistan, received a Bronze Star for valor, and then pursued a professional football career.

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 30 seconds.

□ 1630

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chair, I will just say that going pro, as Mr. ROONEY has said, is not the goal of our military academies. If we are concerned about morale because we want to make sure they can go out on the football field and have great games against the Army and the Navy, fine. If in the end you want to go pro, then pay back the money and go pro. Otherwise, you are taking a very important slot from any number of talented young men and women who want to be trained and then serve as the leaders of our military.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), my friend and colleague.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition. As the only Air Force Academy graduate in Congress, we train these cadets to become officers and leaders and warfighters for our military. We are not training them to become pro athletes, just like my colleague said here.

And you want to talk about morale?

Having been there, there is nothing worse than watching somebody try to get out of their commitment to go play pro sports, for the rest of the cadets that are there ready to lead America into battle.

I strongly support the underlying bill. We are at a time of military crisis and readiness crisis right now. We do not release people to go fly for the airlines or go start their own business or go be an entrepreneur or go to a high-tech company and then just say: Oh, just pay it back.

There are so many people that are trying to get into these academies so they can wear the uniform and lead America into battle.

So this is about warfighting, not about becoming a linebacker. So let's please—I am urging my colleagues to vote down this amendment and to support the underlying bill.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think that if Roger Staubach played for the Dallas Cowboys, graduated from the United States Naval Academy, served his entire Active-Duty commitment of 5 years before he went to play professional sports, this does not eliminate somebody from playing professional sports.

The fact is that we are a nation at war, and it is very competitive to get into these academies, and they ought to fulfill their 5-year obligation. If they want to play professional sports, there are lots of schools they can go to outside of our service academies.

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

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

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

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. 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. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115–217.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 725. TICK-BORNE DISEASES.

Using funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the Defense Health program, the Secretary of Defense may authorize grants to medical researchers and universities to support testing ticks for the purpose of improving the detection and diagnosis of tick-borne diseases.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make existing funds available from the Defense Health Program for collaboration with medical researchers and universities to address the growing number of tick-borne diseases through research and testing.

The Army Public Health Center has operated a basic tick testing program for nearly 30 years. Through this program, military personnel can assess tick identification services through military healthcare facilities at no charge.

However, the tests provided by this program are limited to only six tick-borne diseases, whereas the Centers for Disease Control and the Department of Defense have now identified 16 of these tick-borne diseases, some of which can be fatal.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, around 30,000 cases of Lyme disease are reported each year. However, additional CDC research reveals the actual number of diagnoses could be as high as 300,000. And, alarmingly, nearly 20 percent of the people surveyed in areas with high incidence of Lyme disease were unaware that the disease was even a risk.

This issue is of particular concern in my region. According to the Massachusetts Department of Public Health, my district includes the counties with the five highest rates of Lyme disease in the Commonwealth, including Barnstable County, home of Joint Base Cape Cod.

However, my region is not alone on this issue. Ticks carrying dangerous diseases can be found in all corners of the continental United States, from Massachusetts in the north to Texas in the south, from Pennsylvania in the east to California in the west. Our servicemembers are especially vulnerable as they frequently are exposed to heavily tick-infested areas.

For example, Powassan. The Powassan virus is a serious tick-borne illness known to cause encephalitis, meningitis, and even death. Multiple cases of Powassan have already been reported in Massachusetts this year, yet the DOD tick testing program does not even include a test for Powassan in their regimen.

Mr. Chair, I realize there is a concern that amendments to this legislation might lead to a Defense Health Program pushed beyond its capacity. That is not the case here. The military tick testing program already exists. This amendment would necessarily help the Department of Defense modernize the existing program to meet new challenges in the field of tick-borne diseases.

Indeed, the DOD's own website informs us that emerging tick-borne diseases are being discovered all the time and that yearly cases of known tick-borne diseases have been increasing steadily for years. We are fortunate to have experts already working to combat the rise in tick-borne disease.

My amendment would facilitate collaboration among these experts in DOD to test more tick samples for more diseases, meet the growing needs of our military, and ultimately lead to better healthcare outcomes.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON, for joining me as a cosponsor in this amendment. Pennsylvania is among the States in the mid-Atlantic region experiencing drastic increases in the incidence of tick-borne illnesses.

And the hope is our efforts today on the floor and by the Secretary of Defense in the next fiscal year will help save lives.

Also, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for his work on this important legislation as well.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from Massachusetts. He is exactly right, the Department of Defense Medical Research Program is already spending money on tick-borne diseases. I believe it is about $5 million this year. It was about $5 million last year. And as I understand the gentleman's amendment, he would expand the number of diseases that they can research.

I rise to claim the time in opposition, however, to express concern about the direction of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I have a chart that indicates the tremendous growth of dollars going into this congressionally directed medical research program. It has increased tremendously in recent years, and I would like to take just a few moments to read some of the diseases that it is researching: ALS, Lou Gehrig's disease, autism, bone marrow failure, breast cancer, leukemia, muscular dystrophy, epilepsies, food allergies, lung cancer, multiple sclerosis. There is a couple here that I can't pronounce, so I won't read. Osteoporosis, ovarian cancer, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, cancer, Peer-Reviewed Orthopaedic, prostate cancer, spinal cord injuries, of course, tick-borne disease, tubular sclerosis, and the list goes on.

And let me just say I certainly support Chairman TOM COLE's attempts to increase funding for NIH and other sorts of medical research through the NIH. What I am concerned about is that, increasingly, DOD dollars are being spent to research diseases that have a tangential, at best, connection with the Department of Defense and our military. And what happens is it is taking dollars away from the sorts of injuries and diseases that our military does confront. This is a trend that is getting worse each year.

So I don't necessarily oppose the gentleman's amendment. As he points out, there is research going on here, but it is a trend I do think we have to be cautious about.

And for that reason, I want to at least raise a warning flag about the trend to add to the amount of money and the number of diseases which we are looking to the Department of Defense to help research diseases which are not related, necessarily, to key functions of the Department of Defense.

So I appreciate the gentleman letting me express that concern, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, in my earlier remarks, I did associate myself with the chairman's concern that the Department of Defense, the Defense Health Program could be pushed beyond its capacity. It is very important to recognize what he recognized, because if it gets pushed too far, it can't accomplish the things that it is working to really address.

In this instance, as he mentioned, I believe I did distinguish the fact that this is nearly a three-decade program, and what we are doing here is making sure its mission is modernized so it is dealing with what is happening in the healthcare field within that area of tick-borne illnesses.

So I do appreciate the comments of the chairman, and I think it is wise to point that out. I do hope my colleague supports this amendment, because I have been able to distinguish that from this trend.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115–217.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 115–217.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MRS. HARTZLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 115–217.

Mrs. HARTZLER. 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 A of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 704. PROHIBITION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MEDICAL TREATMENT RELATED TO GENDER TRANSITION.

Funds available to the Department of Defense may not be used to provide medical treatment (other than mental health treatment) related to gender transition to a person entitled to medical care under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chair, today, North Korea is plotting the next ballistic missile test, Russia is threatening the NATO alliance, ISIS is spreading evil, and China continues their expansion in the South China Sea in defiance of the international community.

Our military has never been in such high demand, yet our readiness to confront these threats is at a dismal level. We must confront these challenges by ensuring our defense dollars maximize the military's readiness and lethality.

That is why I am offering an amendment to advance these goals by prohibiting taxpayer dollars from funding gender reassignment surgeries and related hormone therapy treatment for members of the military and their dependants.

There are many problems with this policy, but funding transition surgeries with tax dollars is especially problematic because the surgery is very costly. Surgical recovery time decreases deployability of our soldiers, and there is lack of medical consensus on the effectiveness of gender transition treatments.

Funding transition surgeries means diverting money from other defense priorities. Surgical costs alone can top $1.3 billion over the next 10 years. These resources could fund 13 F–35 aircraft to fight near peer adversaries like China and Russia; 14 F–18 Super Hornets to fight ISIS; or 8 KC–46 tankers needed for long-range strike missions to North Korea.

Our spending priorities must match our threat mitigation priorities. We must have soldiers who can deploy if called upon.

Military members undergoing transition surgery are nondeployable for up to 267 days. Similarly, regular hormone treatments renders individuals nondeployable into the future. It makes no sense to create soldiers who are unable to fight and win our Nation's wars, and it is unfair to nontransitioned individuals who must leave their families and deploy in their place.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chair, I offer this amendment as a responsible member of the House Armed Services Committee who has studied the threats and heard from each servicemember about the need for increased funding and readiness.

□ 1645

Prohibiting funding for transition surgery is the right policy for our military, our budget, and it is the right policy for the American taxpayer.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chair, this amendment goes backwards in an area where we have gone forward. This amendment takes us in the wrong direction. For years, we have had people serving in the military who are openly gay, lesbian, and transgender, and they have served, and served this country well.

For a lot of years, we did not allow them to do so openly. We finally repealed that for lesbians and gays, and now, just last year, we had the Department of Defense say we are going to do the same thing for transgender. So the people who have been fighting and protecting our country will be allowed to do so openly. It does not harm readiness at all. These people have served in

the military, served it honorably, and served it well.

As far as the costs, the military pays for people who have addictions, who have alcoholism, who smoke. They pay for a lot of things that are contained within the military.

This amendment would target one specific group, and very unfairly. And most unfairly, it wouldn't just, first of all, target transgender surgery, it would target some of the hormone drugs, which cost, like, $100 a year, cost absolutely virtually nothing to the military.

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

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

Most importantly, this wouldn't just impact transgender people who are serving, it would impact their children. If you are serving in the military and you happen to have a child who is transgender, you would now be cut off from this military service. All these other things, alcoholism, drug addiction, smoking, all manner of different problems would be served, but transgender people would be targeted to not be allowed to provide healthcare for their children.

This isn't going to help readiness. This is a social agenda that has no business being in the Defense bill. We didn't have it in committee, we shouldn't have it here on the floor.

Let's focus on the threats that Mrs. HARTZLER talked about, not make this into a social agenda based on the ignorance of what transgender truly is.

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds.

First of all, this does not preclude service by the transgendered. This simply says that we are not going to have taxpayers pay for this surgery.

This is different than somebody going in and having a cold, because this is a major surgery that requires a medical diagnosis that is going to render someone nondeployable. Just the recovery from the surgery alone is 287 days, and then the ongoing treatment precludes them from certain abilities to serve overseas.

So we need to take a look at all of this and make sure that we are addressing the threats, and we are spending every dollar that we can to go after the threats.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), Army National Guard Brigadier.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I thank Mrs. HARTZLER, my good friend, for offering this amendment.

Mr. Chair, we are $20 trillion in debt. Taxpayers, by my figures, are projected to pay $3.7 billion over the next 10 years for sex reassignment surgery and hormone therapy for those in the military who wish to transition from one sex to another. The total cost includes the manpower lost while the individual transitions, which can take up to a year or longer, depending on complications.

Sex reassignment patients also require specialized medicine following the procedure. And I find that interesting, in the face of the fact I just had a young gentleman come to my office who wants to serve, but he can't serve, because he has got a peanut allergy. Right? He can't go downrange, because we can't have the medicine downrange, and that doesn't cost the taxpayers anything, but we are going to spend $3.7 billion over the next 10 years on sex reassignment surgery as opposed to buying aircraft and body armor and the things that warfighters need to be successful in defending the Nation.

It is really just a priority issue. With limited defense resources and the current state of our Armed Forces, we must prioritize increasing our strength and readiness.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, there is no study whatsoever that shows this is going to cost $3.7 billion. And this amendment is not just about transgender surgery, it is about any treatment. Let's keep that in mind.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his extraordinary leadership as our ranking member on the Armed Services Committee. I thank him for his leadership in trying to help define what our security mission is so that we have the resources that are necessary to honor our oath of office to protect and defend.

Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. THORNBERRY as well for his leadership in the defense of our country. The bipartisanship in defending our country is something that we value, and any interference with that is unfortunate.

It takes a special kind of person, my colleagues, who steps forward to serve in the U.S. military. They are men and women of courage, of strength, and of patriotism, who shoulder the burden of defending our liberties so that the rest of us can live in security and freedom.

We owe these heroes an immense debt, a solemn responsibility to do everything we can to defend those who are risking and giving their lives for the United States of America.

The Defense bill before us today should be about honoring that responsibility, protecting those who protect our national security; instead, here we are considering a Republican amendment purpose-built to attack the health and dignity of thousands of men and women serving with honor and courage today.

Make no mistake, the effect and the intent of this unjust and mean-spirited amendment is to ban patriotic Americans from serving our country. It is designed to drum transgender servicemembers out of the military.

Instead of protecting the men and women who risk their lives to defend our freedoms, they are fighting to rip away the healthcare of thousands of brave servicemembers.

The integration of openly transgender servicemembers into our Armed Forces is the unfinished work of the bipartisan—and I commend our colleagues—efforts to repeal the discriminatory Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy.

I call upon my Republican colleagues that you immediately withdraw this cruel, discriminatory, and appalling amendment.

If not, I call upon all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to defeat this amendment, prevent this assault on transgender servicemembers, and get us back to the subject at hand, which is the defense of our country, which the distinguished chairman, Mr. THORNBERRY, and ranking member have served this Congress and our country so well in doing.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chair, I just want to point out that this amendment doesn't address any of the full healthcare that every soldier is entitled to; it just says that in this particular instance, we are not going to pay for the gender reassignment surgeries and related hormone treatment. And there is a high cost for it, there is a reason for doing it, and that is why we are addressing that today.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 45 seconds remaining.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the minority leader's words. I did three tours as a U.S. marine.

This is the silliest opposition to this amendment that I have ever heard. You are joining the U.S. military. Choose what gender you are before you join. We are not saying that transgender people can't serve, but if you are going to take the big step of serving in the U.S. military, figure out whether you are a man or a woman before you join up.

We are not stopping transgender people from joining. We are saying taxpayers in this country right now are not going to foot the bill for it.

This is a silly thing. It is time to put this to bed. I support the gentlewoman's amendment. Let's Make America Great Again.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I would note to my colleague from California that perhaps the members of their family are supposed to decide on all their future medical care, because this relates to their healthcare, and not just to the servicemembers'.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is discriminatory.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

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

□ 1705

AFTER RECESS

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 440 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2810.

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

□ 1706

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 115–217, offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115–217 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. BUCK of Colorado.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 10 by Mrs. HARTZLER of Missouri.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 220, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]

AYES—198

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Bridenstine
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gomez
Gottheimer
Graves (LA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Hunter
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—220

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Bilirakis
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cummings
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Gonzalez (TX)
Huffman
Johnson, Sam
Labrador
Lieu, Ted
Napolitano
Rush
Sanford
Scalise

□ 1729

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

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 367]

AYES—203

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

Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NOES—218

Adams
Aguilar
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Stefanik
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—12

Cleaver
Cummings
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Gutiérrez
Johnson, Sam
Labrador
Lieu, Ted
Napolitano
Sanford
Scalise
Speier

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1734

Mr. NUNES changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 368]

AYES—185

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Arrington
Babin
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Posey
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Rutherford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Stivers
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOES—234

Adams
Aguilar
Amodei
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Bridenstine
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Graves (LA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Huffman
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine

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

NOT VOTING—14

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1738

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MRS. HARTZLER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 369]

AYES—209

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—214

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1741

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 370]

AYES—183

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

Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)

NOES—242

Adams
Aguilar
Barletta
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
LaHood
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Mast
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1745

Mr. FERGUSON changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 318, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 371]

AYES—107

Adams
Aguilar
Amodei
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bridenstine
Bustos
Butterfield
Carson (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Comer
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Davidson
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSantis
Deutch
Dunn
Evans
Fudge
Gaetz
Garrett
Gonzalez (TX)
Gowdy
Graves (MO)
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Himes
Hoyer
Hunter
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jones
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lipinski
Love
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Mast
McKinley
Messer
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nunes
Payne
Pearce
Peters
Pingree
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Schiff
Scott, David
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Upton
Vargas
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder

NOES—318

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Cook
Correa
Costa
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hurd
Issa
Jayapal
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Knight
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Lance
Langevin
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rosen
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)

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

NOT VOTING—8

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1750

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

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1800

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

But what then?

According to this amendment, nothing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I always enjoy hearing the gentleman talk about this. When we agree on things, it is always pleasant. I commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for this amendment because I think it is important that we move forward, even if it is a small step forward.

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

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

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

□ 1815

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

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

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

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

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

I hope there is a big, strong bipartisan, if not unanimous vote, for the gentleman's amendment, but this is just the first teeny step in what we need to do. I promise him that he has my cooperation in any efforts to get it to the point where we actually debate these wars and develop AUMFs where people, as he said, can vote for them or against them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. FRANKS OF ARIZONA

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1830

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

By singling out a faith tradition for a strange and unprecedented study by our military, we are sending a dangerous message and signal that America is at war with Islam. America is not ever going to be at war with a single religion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This amendment doesn't even apply its arbitrary surveillance equally, because if it did, it would include assessments of White supremacist terrorism or terrorism committed against abortion clinics and doctors.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. CHENEY

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

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

(2) reducing, or preparing to reduce, the quantity of deployed intercontinental ballistic missiles of the United States to a number less than 400.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It also presupposes the completion of the nuclear posture review, which is currently ongoing and is expected at the end of this year. So instead of jumping the gun and acting precipitously, we should allow the administration time to finish the review and base our actions on its findings.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

During his confirmation hearing, Secretary of Defense Mattis agreed

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What is the best approach to our national security?

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

□ 1845

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wyoming has 2¾ minutes remaining.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 681, line 15, insert ''(a) INTEGRATION OF PATRIOT MISSILES INTO INTEGRATED MASTER TEST PLAN.—'' before ''Not later than''.

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

(b) NORMALIZING OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION.—

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What it is is a vendor's dream, what it is is a defense contractor's dream, because it would enable them to sell stuff to us, the American taxpayer and to the citizens of this country, promising national defense, but not proving it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Further, I do not agree with the contention that this amendment will further reduce oversight of the testing of missile defense capabilities. In fact, the plain language of the amendment inserts ballistic missile defense systems into the existing title 10 DOD OT&E testing requirement, just like every other DOD acquisition program.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1900

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK OF COLORADO

Page 375, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 1039. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO DESIGNATE OR EXPAND FEDERAL NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

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

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

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

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

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

''(A) unmanned aerial vehicles;

''(B) the Aerostat radar system;

''(C) night-vision goggles; and

''(D) high mobility multi-purpose wheel vehicles (commonly known as 'humvees').''.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. CHENEY OF WYOMING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. POLIQUIN OF MAINE

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

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

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

Page 39, after line 2, insert the following:

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

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

(d) FORM OF CONTRACTS.—

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

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

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

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

SEC. 2___. PILOT PROGRAM ON INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES.

The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy, shall conduct a pilot program among defense laboratories (as defined in section 2199 of title 10, United States Code), national laboratories (as defined in section 188(f) of title 10, United States Code), and private entities to facilitate the licensure, transfer, and commercialization of innovative technologies.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. LOEBSACK OF IOWA

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

SEC. _____. STEM(MM) JOBS ACTION PLAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

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

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

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

Page 104, after line 6, insert the following:

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

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

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

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

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

(b) REPORT AND BRIEFING.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 345. REPORT ON MATERNITY UNIFORMS.

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

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

(1) The design of maternity uniforms.

(2) Materials used in the fabrication of maternity uniforms.

(3) The sizing of maternity uniforms.

(4) Prices of maternity uniforms.

(5) The availability of maternity uniforms.

(6) The quality of maternity uniforms.

(7) The utility of maternity uniforms.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 115, line 21, strike ''10'' and insert ''4.8''.

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

Page 126, after line 12, insert the following:

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

(a) CODIFICATION OF CURRENT CONFIDENTIAL PROCESS.—

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

(A) a heading as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) in subsection (a)—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Page 146, after line 16, insert the following:

SEC. 531. SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD OF ARKANSAS

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

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

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

(1) in paragraph (12), by striking ''and'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (14); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new pargraph (13):

''(13) Explosive Ordnance Disposal Corps; and''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Jackson Lee Amendment will help to save lives.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Currently there is no targeted treatment for TNBC exists.

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

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

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

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

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

As a member of the South Sudan Caucus, and the sponsor of H.R. 48, the ''Equal Rights and Access for the Women of South Sudan Act,'' I have long advocated and supported emergency assistance to South Sudan, the world's newest nation, located in the center of Africa and bordered by six countries.

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

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

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

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

According to expert analyses, in the absence of urgent humanitarian action, as many as 4.9 million South Sudanese, about 4o percent of the country's population, face the grim and certain prospect of starvation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Compounding matters, South Sudan is awash with guns after decades of conflict and there is a history of ethnic tension for politicians to exploit if they believe that could help them gain, or remain in, power.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Ensuring that a significant portion of United States development, humanitarian, and relief assistance is channeled to local and United States-based South Sudanese organizations, particularly South Sudanese women's organizations;

3. Providing long-term financial assistance for primary, secondary, higher, nontraditional, and vocational education for South Sudanese girls, women, boys, and men;

4. Providing financial assistance to build health infrastructure and deliver

high-quality comprehensive health care programs, including primary, maternal, child, reproductive, and mental health care;

5. Requiring military training regarding the protection, rights, and particular needs of women and emphasizing that violations of women's rights are intolerable and should be prosecuted; and

6. Taking all necessary steps to ensure that internally displaced South Sudanese women are directly receiving food aid, shelter, relief supplies, and other services from United States-sponsored programs.

Mr. Chair, as a nation, we should support the Republic of South Sudan in its efforts to become a freer, more equitable society that respects, supports, and endorses the rights of women.

That is why I am pleased that Jackson Lee Amendment No. 168 has been included in the Chairman's En Bloc Amendment and I urge all Members to join me in voting for its adoption.

Mr. Chair, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to explain the Jackson Lee Amendment No. 83, as designated by the Rule governing debate on H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2018.

This Jackson Lee Amendment directs the Secretary of Defense to develop measures to defend against deployment of nuclear ICBMs by North Korea to protect against damage or destruction of satellites critical to U.S national defense and global communications, International Space Station, and other vital assets.

I request the support of my colleagues for this Jackson Lee Amendment because it: upholds the goals of the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater; addresses the fact that our nation should take the next step in preparing for a nuclear North Korea; establishes that the stakes may be far greater than a nuclear North Korea when they may have the capacity to launch a device using an ICBM, because of our nation's dependence on the global telecommunications infrastructure that includes Geo-stationary satellites as well as its implications for Space Stations and our space program; and may have serious consequences for a range of environmental factors that are critical to the health and wellbeing of our planet.

On July 4th, our nation's Independence Day, the U.S. confirmed that North Korea had achieved a major step toward its objective of delivering a nuclear weapon as far as U.S. shores.

This test represents a new escalation of the threat that a nuclear North Korea poses to the United States and our interest.

The launch of Hwasong–14 missile reached a range of approximately 4160 miles, a distance capable of reaching Alaska, according to experts.

The timing of this test launch was confirmed as a calculated insult when North Korean Leader Kim Jung-Un stated that the missile was a ''gift to Americans for the July 4th Anniversary.''

The United States must attempt to manage this situation and retain the peace in the region.

We understand the end to the Korean War was a Armistice Agreement signed in 1953, that put into place a cease fire.

North Korea still views itself as being at war with the United States.

Otto Warmbier, an American college student who died days following his release from a North Korean prison was held as a prisoner of war.

Given the unstable nature of the North Korean government, which has political purges in recent years that included members of North Korean President's Kim Jongun's family we can hold little hope for cooperation that is essential to avoid unintended conflicts and reduce tensions with its neighbors.

A nuclear-armed North Korea does not mean that country will be able to shoulder the burden of managing a responsible nuclear weapons program, given their single minded pursuit of a nuclear armed ICBM.

Nuclear arms programs are not always safe or easy for the nation attempting to develop weapons.

The United States had its share of near disasters.

For example, in 1961, a B–52 Stratofortress carrying two 4–megaton Mark 39 nuclear bombs broke up in mid-air, dropping its nuclear payload in the process over North Carolina.

Fortunately, neither bomb detonated averting a catastrophic nuclear incident at our own hands.

North Korea's program poses a danger to the entire Korean Peninsula, Japan, and the Asia Pacific region because it insists on using the world as its nuclear testing ground.

Even if an unarmed ICBM should land in a populated area, this could trigger a conflict.

If North Korea decides to test nuclear weapons on its ICBM rockets this poses serious problems for peace and stability not only that region of the world, but the United States as well.

Since the entry of the space age, America has lead and we now rely on the fruits of our investments in manned and unmanned missions to support a global telecommunications infrastructure; a permanent research presence in the International Space Station; plans for going much further.

A nuclear North Korea armed with ICBMs can put all of that in jeopardy.

We also have interest in the environment within our atmosphere, but also the physical environment that envelopes the earth.

One component of the earth's space environment that protects against solar radiation is called the Van Allen Belts.

The Van Allen belts present another factor to be considered when talking about North Korea's nuclear program.

The Van Allen belts may respond to incoming solar radiation and is known to change size.

The primary benefit to people on earth is they protect us from solar radiation.

Should North Korea's tests of ICBM include nuclear devices of significant size this could pose risks to not only our satellites, space stations, but extend to the Van Allen Belts.

This Jackson Lee amendment allows for a deliberative approach to addressing the potential for a nuclear North Korea.

This amendment works to develop plans to develop effective countermeasures to the threat that North Korea's nuclear program presents.

I ask that my Colleagues join me in support of this Amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my bipartisan amendment, introduced with Representative GOTTHEIMER and Representative SINEMA.

This amendment would expand opportunities for Active-Duty military men and women to learn career skills and provide education that would assist them as they transition back to civilian life.

The current United Services Military Apprenticeship Program is an effective program that provides this employer specific training. But, that program is only offered to the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, which is less than half of our uniformed services personnel.

This amendment expands the program to offer it to any member of U.S. uniformed services—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Public Health Service.

We should make it easier for these brave men and women who have served to transition to civilian life with a steady job, and, at the same time, infuse our workforce with the strong leadership skills that the military can provide.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for my amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act.

Our men and women in uniform are not immune from the epidemic of opioid addiction, an abuse that is ravaging our country. In fact, the National Institutes of Health reports opioid misuse are higher among servicemembers than among civilians, due to the use of these drugs to treat the symptoms of PTSD and chronic pain.

Our brave servicemembers have earned our gratitude and deserve our highest quality of care. We need to do all we can to ensure our military doctors are equipped with the most up-to-

date, best practices to help fight back against this disease.

This amendment requires medical professionals in the Department of Defense that prescribe opioids for pain management to undertake 12 hours of training every 3 years in order to prevent overprescribing and better identify and treat abuse.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense amendment to ensure that our Active-Duty military get the medical care they truly deserve.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment, which encourages partnerships between the DOD, DOE, and the private sector, to facilitate the licensure, transfer, and commercialization of innovative technologies.

We cannot let groundbreaking research and new technologies in our Nation's Federal laboratories sit idle when they have the potential to reenergize domestic manufacturing, create high-paying jobs, and transform our economy.

It is not government or private sector, it is government and private sector working together to create opportunities that have led to the development of many products in the marketplace today, including batteries powering electric vehicles, internet servers, and GPS.

Both the DOD and DOE have separate programs that support technology transfer to the private sector, but they don't work very well together. My amendment would fix that and ensure that these departments are actively collaborating to support the commercialization of cutting-edge technologies and make them more widely available to American businesses and consumers.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues' support.

□ 1915

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I urge adoption of the amendments en bloc.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, urge adoption of the amendments en bloc, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chair, my amendment is similar to an amendment of mine that passed the House 243–180 in the FY2017 NDAA. This amendment mirrors language that I have introduced called the SEND Act.

While the Department of Homeland Security—not the Department of Defense—is tasked with maintaining the safety of our southern border, it has long received help and assistance from the DOD and our military.

One of the ways the DOD helps the border patrol is through the transfer of equipment it deems "excess" to its needs.

Under current law, the transfer of this "excess" equipment already gives preference to counterdrug, counterterrorism, and border security activities.

My amendment simply takes that preference a step further, giving border security preference for a few specific pieces of equipment which are particularly useful for border security applications: unmanned surveillance vehicles including Aerostat blimps, night-vision goggles, and Humvees.

The border patrol is the first and last line of defense against those criminal gangs.

In my home state of Texas, and in other border states like New Mexico and Arizona, the war against the cartels is an ongoing affair. Cartels are involved in labor and sex slavery.

Just last week in Southern Texas, border patrol agents raided a home to find 37 illegal immigrants, including three children.

These men, women and children were being held by cartel drug runners for ransom.

I've been to the border countless times, Mr. Chair.

I've spoken with the men and women who have sworn to protect the good folks of Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico from the dangerous people who cross the southern border.

A Texas Ranger told me that they are outmanned, outgunned, out-financed and out-equipped by the drug cartels.

I've heard firsthand the need these men and women have for new equipment, specifically the equipment I just listed.

In fact when I recently visited the border in April, I met with the Border Patrol in the Rio Grande sector and they informed me that in areas where they were using Aerostat surveillance blimps, crossings were way down.

When asked what we could do to help the sector, the answer was clear: More Aerostat blimps.

Well, that is what we are trying to do here with this amendment, Mr. Chair.

This idea isn't new. In 2010, with our help, the excess equipment program sent 6 excess military Humvees to Texas Border Sheriffs. Often, before this transfer, the border sheriffs were forced to chase the drug cartels in Crown Victorias.

This amendment mandates that DOD give border security applicants an additional preference for the equipment listed in this amendment.

I've heard from our agents down on the border and this is the equipment they need.

Let's put this "excess" equipment to use on the southern border in the war against the drug cartels and help bring security, peace of mind, and more safety to those Americans living in the area.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MARSHALL). The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 440, I offer additional amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, and 53 printed in House Report 115–217, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

Page 155, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 544. ANNUAL TRAINING REGARDING THE INFLUENCE CAMPAIGN OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

In addition to any currently mandated training, the Secretary of Defense may furnish annual training to all members of the Armed Forces and all civilian employees of the Department of Defense, regarding attempts by the Russian Federation and its proxies and agents to influence and recruit members of the Armed Forces as part of its influence campaign.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF VIRGINIA

Page 155, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 544. PROGRAM TO ASSIST MEMBERS IN OBTAINING PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS.

Section 2015(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking "and" and inserting "or".

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. SMUCKER OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 155, after line 5, insert the following new section:

SEC. 544. EXPANDING ELIGIBILITY FOR THE UNITED STATES MILITARY APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall expand eligibility for the United Services Military Apprenticeship Program to include any member of the uniformed services.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "uniformed services" has the meaning given such term in section 101 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle E of title V in division A, add the following new section:

SEC. _____. ENHANCING MILITARY CHILDCARE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) HOURS OF OPERATION OF CHILDCARE DEVELOPMENT CENTERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The hours of operation of each childcare development center (CDC) of the Department of Defense shall, to the extent practicable, be set and maintained in manner that takes into account the demands and circumstances of members of the Armed Forces, including members of the reserve components, who use such center in facilitation of the performance of their military duties.

(2) MATTERS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—The demands and circumstances to be taken into account under paragraph (1) for purposes of setting and maintaining the hours of operation of a childcare development center shall include the following:

(A) Mission requirements of units whose members use such center.

(B) The unpredictability of work schedules, and fluctuations in day-to-day work hours, of such members.

(C) The potential for frequent and prolonged absences of such members for training, operations, and deployments.

(D) The location of such center on the military installation concerned, including the location in connection with duty locations of members and applicable military family housing.

(E) The geographic separation of such members from their extended family.

(F) The extent to which spouses of such members are employed or pursuing educational opportunities, whether on a full-time basis or a part-time basis.

(G) Such other matters as the Secretary of the military department concerned considers appropriate for purposes of this section.

(b) CHILDCARE COORDINATORS FOR MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—

(1) CHILDCARE COORDINATORS.—Each Secretary of a military department shall provide for a childcare coordinator at each military installation under the jurisdiction of such Secretary at which are stationed significant numbers of members of the Armed Forces with accompanying dependent children, as determined by such Secretary.

(2) NATURE OF POSITION.—The childcare coordinator for a military installation may be an individual appointed to that position on full-time or part-time basis or an individual appointed to another position whose duties in such other position are consistent with the discharge by the person of the duties of childcare coordinator.

(3) DUTIES.—Each childcare coordinator for an installation shall carry out the duties as follows:

(A) Act as an advocate for military families at the installation on childcare matters both on-installation and off-installation.

(B) Work with the commander of the installation in order to seek to ensure that the childcare development centers at the installation, together with any other available childcare options on or in the vicinity of the installation—

(i) provide a quality of care (including a caregiver-to-child ratio) commensurate with best practices of private providers of childcare services; and

(ii) are responsive to the childcare needs of members stationed at the installation and their families.

(C) Work with private providers of childcare services in the vicinity of the installation in order to—

(i) track vacancies in the childcare facilities of such providers;

(ii) seek to obtain favorable prices for the use of such services by members stationed at the installation; and

(iii) otherwise ease the use of such services by such members.

(D) Such other duties as the Secretary of the military department concerned shall specify.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle F of title V, insert the following new section:

SEC. 5___. AWARD OF VIETNAM SERVICE MEDAL TO VETERANS WHO PARTICIPATED IN MAYAGUEZ RESCUE OPERATION.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the military department concerned shall, upon the application by or on behalf of an individual who is an eligible veteran, award that individual the Vietnam Service Medal, notwithstanding any otherwise applicable requirements for the award of that medal. Any such award shall be made in lieu of any Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal awarded the individual for the individual's participation in the Mayaguez rescue operation.

(b) TREATMENT OF DECEASED VETERANS.—In the case of a veteran who is deceased, the application described in subsection (a) may be submitted by the next of kin of the veteran.

(c) ELIGIBLE VETERAN.—For purposes of this section, the term ''eligible veteran'' means a veteran of the Armed Forces—

(1) who was awarded the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal for participation in military operations known as the Mayaguez rescue operation of May 12–15, 1975; or

(2) who participated in such operation.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. LANCE OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5___. AWARD OF MEDALS OR OTHER COMMENDATIONS TO HANDLERS OF MILITARY WORKING DOGS AND MILITARY WORKING DOGS.

(a) PROGRAM OF AWARD REQUIRED.—Each Secretary of a military department shall carry out a program to provide for the award of one or more medals or other commendations to handlers of military working dogs, and to military working dogs, under the jurisdiction of such Secretary to recognize valor or meritorious achievement by such handlers and dogs.

(b) MEDAL AND COMMENDATIONS.—Any medal or commendation awarded pursuant to a program under subsection (a) shall be of such design, and include such elements, as the Secretary of the military department concerned shall specify.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Medals and commendations shall be awarded under programs under subsection (a) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for purposes of this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

Page 170, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 564. ELIGIBILITY OF VETERANS OF OPERATION END SWEEP FOR VIETNAM SERVICE MEDAL.

The Secretary of the military department concerned shall, upon the application of an individual who is a veteran who participated in Operation End Sweep, award that individual the Vietnam Service Medal, notwithstanding any otherwise applicable requirements for the award of that medal.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

Page 170, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 564. EXPEDITED REPLACEMENT OF MILITARY DECORATIONS FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II AND THE KOREAN WAR.

Section 1135 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''When'' and inserting ''Subject to subsection (c), when'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

''(c) RECIPIENTS OF MILITARY DECORATIONS FOR SERVICE IN WORLD WAR II OR THE KOREAN WAR.—If the recipient was awarded the military decoration for which a replacement is requested for service in World War II or the Korean War, the Secretary concerned shall perform all actions described—

''(1) in subsection (b)(1) in not more than 180 days; and

''(2) in subsection (b)(2) in not more than 60 days.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 575. PROOF OF PERIOD OF MILITARY SERVICE FOR PURPOSES OF INTEREST RATE LIMITATION UNDER THE SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

Section 207(b)(1) of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3937(b)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) PROOF OF MILITARY SERVICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of a servicemember's termination or release from military service, in order for an obligation or liability of the servicemember to be subject to the interest rate limitation in subsection (a), the servicemember shall provide to the creditor written notice and a copy of—

''(i) the military orders calling the servicemember to military service and any orders further extending military service; or

''(ii) any other appropriate indicator of military service, including a certified letter from a commanding officer.

''(B) INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION BY CREDITOR.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Regardless of whether a servicemember has provided to a creditor the written notice and documentation under subparagraph (A), the creditor may use, in lieu of such notice and documentation, information retrieved from the Defense Manpower Database Center through the creditor's normal business reviews of the Database Center for purposes of obtaining information indicating that the servicemember is on active duty.

''(ii) SAFE HARBOR.—A creditor that uses the information retrieved from the Defense Manpower Database Center under clause (i) with respect to a servicemember has not failed to treat the debt of the servicemember in accordance with subsection (a) if—

''(I) such information indicates that, on the date the creditor retrieves such information, the servicemember is not on active duty; and

''(II) the creditor has not, as of such date, received the written notice and documentation required under subparagraph (A) with respect to the servicemember.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY OF CONNECTICUT

Page 175, after line 24, insert the following new section:

SEC. 575. REPORT REGARDING POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS TO PROCESSING RETIREMENTS AND MEDICAL DISCHARGES.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall issue a report to the congressional defense committees and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding possible improvements to the transition of members of the Armed Forces to veteran status.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) Feasibility of requiring members of the Armed Forces to apply for benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs before such members complete discharge from the Armed Forces.

(2) Feasibility of requiring members of the Armed Forces to undergo compensation and pension examinations (to be administered by the Secretary of Defense) for purposes of obtaining benefits described in paragraph (1) before such members complete discharge from active duty in the Armed Forces.

(3) Possible improvements to the timeliness of the process for transitioning members who undergo medical discharge to care provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. MAST OF FLORIDA

Page 175, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 5___. ESTABLISHMENT OF SEPARATION OATH FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States Armed Forces is the largest, all-volunteer military force in the world, yet less than one percent of the American population serves in the Armed Forces.

(2) Each branch of the Armed Forces (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard) instills in its members a sense of duty and obligation to the United States, their branch of service, and their comrades-in-arms.

(3) The Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that approximately 20 veterans of the Armed Forces commit suicide each day and a veteran's risk of suicide is 21 percent higher compared to an adult who has not served in the Armed Forces.

(4) The Department of Veterans Affairs is aggressively undertaking measures to prevent these tragic outcomes, yet suicide rates among veterans remain unacceptably high.

(5) Upon enlistment or appointment in the Armed Forces, a new member is obligated to take an oath of office or oath of enlistment.

(6) Most members of the Armed Forces view this oath not as an imposition, but as a promise that they are bound to fulfill.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF SEPARATION OATH.—Section 502 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and, in such subsection, by striking ''The oath'' and inserting ''An oath established by this section''; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

''(b) SEPARATION OATH.—Prior to retirement or other separation from the armed forces, other than separation pursuant to the sentence of a court-martial, a member of an armed force may take the following oath:

'' 'I, __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __, recognizing that my oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, has involved me and my fellow members in experiences that few persons, other than our peers, can understand, do solemnly swear (or affirm) to continue to be the keeper of my brothers- and sisters-in-arms and protector of the United States and the Constitution; to preserve the values I have learned; to maintain my body and my mind; and to not bring harm to myself without speaking to my fellow veterans first. I take this oath freely and without purpose of evasion, so help me God.' ''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of section 502 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 502. Enlistment oath and separation oath: who may administer''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 31 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 502 and inserting the following new item:

''502. Enlistment oath and separation oath: who may administer.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MRS. WATSON COLEMAN OF NEW JERSEY

Page 175, after line 24, insert the following new section:

SEC. 575. EXTENSION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENT REGARDING DIVERSITY IN MILITARY LEADERSHIP.

Section 115a(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2022''.

Strike section 1051(a)(2) (page 376, lines 4 through 10).

Page 396, after line 4, insert the following:4

(5) ANNUAL DEFENSE MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS REPORT.—By inserting after paragraph (64), as added by paragraph (4), the following new paragraph:

''(65) Section 115a.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. DONOVAN OF NEW YORK

Page 185, after line 19, insert the following new section:

SEC. 605. REEVALUATION OF BAH FOR THE MILITARY HOUSING AREA INCLUDING STATEN ISLAND.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, using the most recent data available to the Secretary, shall reevaluate the basic housing allowance prescribed under section 403(b) of title 37, United States Code, for the military housing area that includes Staten Island, New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. TROTT OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle B of title VI, insert the following new section:

SEC. 619. IMPROVED EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.

(a) IMPROVED EMPLOYMENT SKILLS VERIFICATION.—Section 1143(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''The Secretary of Defense''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) In order to improve the accuracy and completeness of a certification or verification of job skills and experience required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy shall—

''(A) establish a database to record all training performed by members of the armed forces that may have application to employment in the civilian sector; and

''(B) make unclassified information regarding such information available to States and other potential employers referred to in subsection (c) so that State and other entities may allow military training to satisfy licensing or certification requirements to engage in a civilian profession.''.

(b) IMPROVED ACCURACY OF CERTIFICATES OF TRAINING AND SKILLS.—Section 1143(a) of title 10, United States Code, is further amended by inserting after paragraph (2), as added by subsection (a), the following new paragraph:

''(3) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy shall ensure that a certification or verification of job skills and experience required by paragraph (1) is rendered in such a way that States and other potential employers can confirm the accuracy and authenticity of the certification or verification.''.

(c) IMPROVED RESPONSIVENESS TO CERTIFICATION REQUESTS.—Section 1143(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''For the purpose''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) A State may use a certification or verification of job skills and experience provided to a member of the armed forces under subsection (a) and request the Department of Defense or the Coast Guard, as the case may be, to confirm the accuracy and authenticity of the certification or verification. A response confirming or denying the information shall be provided within five business days.''.

(d) IMPROVED NOTICE TO MEMBERS.—Section 1142(b)(4)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', including State-submitted and approved lists of military training and skills that satisfy occupational certifications and licenses''.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY OF CONNECTICUT

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 704. EXPANSION OF SEXUAL TRAUMA COUNSELING AND TREATMENT FOR MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS.

Section 1720D(a)(2)(A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''on active duty''; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''that was suffered by the member while serving on active duty, active duty for training, or inactive duty training.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER OF ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle B of title VII in division A, add the following:

SEC. _____. TRAINING REQUIREMENT FOR HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS PRESCRIBING OPIOIDS FOR TREATMENT OF PAIN IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that to serve as a health care professional in the Department of Defense as an individual who is authorized to prescribe or otherwise dispense opioids for the treatment of pain, the professional (other than a pharmacist) must comply with the 12-hour training requirement of paragraph (2) at least once during each 3-year period or be licensed in a State that requires equivalent (or greater) training described in paragraph (2) with respect to the prescribing or dispensing of opioids for the treatment of pain.

(2) The training requirement of this paragraph is that the professional has completed not less than 12 hours of training (through classroom situations, seminars at professional society meetings, electronic communications, or otherwise) with respect to—

(A) pain management treatment guidelines and best practices;

(B) early detection of opioid addiction; and

(C) the treatment and management of opioid-dependent patients,

that is provided by the American Society of Addiction Medicine, the American Academy of Addiction Psychiatry, the American Medical Association, the American Osteopathic Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Academy of Pain Management, the American Pain Society, the American Academy of Pain Medicine, the American Board of Pain Medicine, the American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians, or any other organization that the Secretary of Defense determines is appropriate for purposes of this subsection.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF TRAINING MODULES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish or support the establishment of one or more training modules to be used to meet the training requirement under subsection (a).

(2) To be eligible to receive support under paragraph (1), an entity shall be—

(A) one of the organizations listed in paragraph (2) of subsection (a); or

(B) any other organization that the Secretary determines is appropriate to provide training under such subsection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 440, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, this en bloc package consists of a variety of amendments from Members from both sides of the aisle. I believe that they deserve the support of the House. I recommend adoption of the en bloc package.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the chairman. I support the en bloc package, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMUCKER) having assumed the chair, Mr. MARSHALL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to address you here from the floor of the House of Representatives in this great deliberative body that has been deliberating all day long in the markup of the National Defense Authorization Act.

The work that is done, especially by the members of the Armed Services Committee, goes deeply into the destiny and the future of America. They have to look at the whole globe and the whole budget, and they have to look at the equipment that is out there and the technology that is developing, and it is a heavy responsibility to present this NDAA authorization bill to the floor.

Often, there are efforts that are made to turn it into a political bill, rather than the bill that can defend America, and ensure that we have the best military that the world has ever seen, and the best equipment for the best military the world has ever seen, and the best standards to uphold the best people, the nobility of the United States military.

So I want to compliment especially the members of the committee and the chairman for his work and the work that has been done here on this floor. They are going to take a deep breath and tomorrow will bring this thing back to the floor for a vote and a potential final passage.

I came to the floor to address a bit different topic, and I may revert back to the NDAA, and I actually intend to do that, Mr. Speaker. But I have wanted to come to this floor for some time to discuss the circumstances going on here in the United States of America and an issue that has been very important to me for a long time; and that is the issue of the United States of America getting to the point where we finally declare a language, our English language, as the official language of the United States.

I sat down once, and I went through the—when we had the World Book Encyclopedia, before the internet, more or less, eroded the ubiquitousness—that means everywhere—the World Book Encyclopedia was everywhere in the country and many places in the world.

I looked through—I took a 1979 almanac, and I looked at all the flags for all the countries in the world, and I looked up every single country to find out, do they have an official language, or don't they? And from that 1979 almanac, and some of the countries have changed since then, but every single country in the world had an official language, at least one of them, except for the United States of America.

As I studied this, and it comes to me, the more I look at history, the more I look at the forces that move the world and the people in it, often it is the culture; it is the cultural foundation that moves policy in America, and in every country in the world.

The culture lives in the hearts and minds of its people; and what is in the hearts and minds of its people is, if you are members of a nation state, what binds us together is having a common experience, a common cause, common enemies, perhaps, a common sense of history, a common sense of struggle, a common sense of economic ties, and also, a common language.

A common language is the most powerful unifying force anywhere in the world throughout all of history, even more powerful than religion, and religion is a very powerful unifying force, and sometimes it can be a dividing force.

But of those powerful unifying forces we have, it might be race, it might be ethnicity, it might be national origin, it can be those things. It could be religion, but all of these components go together to make your culture, and the binding force that we have proven in this country over and over and over again is the common language.

Some years ago, just one floor down, out that door, I sat down with several ambassadors to the United States from Israel, and I remarked to them that they had established Hebrew as their official language in 1954. The country was approved by the motion in the United Nations in 1948, and 6 years later, the Israelis established Hebrew as their official language.

I asked them: Why did you do that? Hebrew was a dead language. It was essentially a language only of prayer for 2,000 years. But they resurrected that language and decided we are going to make it the common form of communications currency in Israel in order to bind the Israelis together. And so they did.

They deployed the Hebrew language in the streets of Israel. In fact, there weren't any streets in Tel Aviv at the time. They created Tel Aviv also as a manufactured city to add to the glory of Israel. But as the people walked in the streets, they decided we are going to embrace this language of Hebrew. So it is today the language of the Israeli people, Hebrew.

Why did you do that? And their answer to me was: We looked at the United States. We knew we were going to be assimilating people from many countries in the world, maybe even all countries in the world, and they would come from all races, all ethnicities, all national origins, coming back because—primarily they were attracted back because they were of Jewish faith, many of them by Jewish blood and heritage; but they came into Israel, and they needed to be bound together as Israelis. And the best way to bind them together—these are smart people—was a common language.

And a common language that was unique was helpful, also. It gave them the distinction and the pride that they would have of the nationalism of being Israelis. And so Hebrew became the official language of the fresh new nation state Israel just 6 years after it was formed.

I was not astonished by that, but I was very impressed by the wisdom that they used to apply the necessity of a common language to bind them together so that they could be one people.

I went there, and I traveled, and I looked at what they were doing. They had brought in several hundred people from Ethiopia to come into the Israeli society, and they get 6 months to study Hebrew and to be assimilated into the broader Israeli economy.

Those who come to Israel that are not literate in their own language, they first had to teach them to read and write in the language that was native to them, their natural language, and then they taught them Hebrew and converted them into being able to read and write and speak in Hebrew. But they got 6 months to do that, and then out into the world they went. That is a pretty fast assimilation process.

But I don't know if there is a country since, other than the United States, that has done a better job of assimilating people from everywhere in the world into one society than has happened in Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that I never, ever hear anybody talk about divisions within Israelis. I don't hear them speaking, well, you are an African Israeli or a German Israeli or a Russian Israeli. There are a lot of them, but they see themselves as Israelis. They have a common language, common culture, and they are pulled together out of a need to have a common defense and a common cause.

That is the model that they created by looking at the model of the United States of America because we had been so successful in assimilating people into this country and binding us together by having a common language; that common language, a common form of communications currency that allows us to communicate with every American everywhere, to walk into any city council meeting, any county supervisor's meeting, any State legislature, any discussions that go on here in the House, in the Senate, any meetings that go on within the government buildings in the Federal and the State and the political subdivisions thereof. All of our meetings take place in English. Anybody that speaks English can walk in there and understand them.

That is the policy that brought us together as a people. That is the policy that was so admired by the Israelis that they emulated it. Yet we sit here still the only country in the world, by the measure that I described, of the World Book Encyclopedia and the 1979 almanac, at least, the only country in the world that doesn't have at least one official language.

We have a common language that is English. We need to make our official language English, and, of course, I have introduced legislation, Mr. Speaker, to do that. It is H.R. 997; it has been H.R. 997 since I came to this Congress, and one day we are going to see a President sign that bill, and it might very well be this President we have today, President Trump. He has spoken in favor of official English, and I certainly agree with him on this. But it is more than this.

When President Bill Clinton introduced the executive order, I believe it is 13166—and I am operating from a dusty memory here. Perhaps I have got it on a note. But let's go with 13166. That executive order directed that any government facility that is there needs to accommodate any language request that comes from anybody who walks into a Federal building or a State building or any government service. It just runs up the cost of our government in an unnecessary way.

The idea, I suppose, is, well, we are going to make it easy for people who have trouble understanding English; and so if we do that, eventually they will pick up and learn and understand English, and they will assimilate into society because, after all, every other generation, every other people that has come into America has assimilated into our society.

□ 1930

But when you change the rules and you change the format and you take away the incentive, then you can't expect to have the same result.

And how it was, was that people were brought into this country and they were immersed into the American culture and the American civilization.

For example, my grandmother came to the United States from Germany and she spoke only German. My father went to school, kindergarten—one of seven siblings altogether, number three in line—speaking German. He was quite confused on his first day of kindergarten, even though ''kindergarten'' is a German word. And when he came home from school that day, he walked into the house and said ''hello'' to his mother in German. My grandmother, his mother, Freda Catrina Johanna Harm King, said to her son: Emmett, speaking German in this household is for you from now on verboten. I came here to become an American. That means speaking English, and you will go to school and learn English, and you will bring it home and you will teach it to me.

So my father had spoken his last words of German in that household, and he went to school and learned English, and he brought it home and taught it to his mother, and she learned English from her son and her sons, but primarily my father. That was an expression of gratitude to the country that had embraced her and welcomed her, and she embraced this country, the United States of America. And of the six sons that she raised and a daughter, one of the sons was physically unable to serve, four of the remaining five went back to fight against the fatherland. And my father went to the South Pacific for 2½ years to fight the Japanese, and came home weighing 115 pounds on U.S. rations with a lot of stories that he never told. That was the way she thanked the host country, the United States of America. And there I sat growing up in a small town in Iowa being told: You hit the jackpot, Steve. You were born into the greatest country on the face of the Earth. You could not have been born anyplace better than this. The United States of America is the greatest country in the world, and you need to pay back this country that so welcomed the people that have come here.

Well, I want to continue to do that by tying together our society and our civilization, knitting us together, and English is the very best way to do that. We can eliminate the billions of dollars that we are unnecessarily spending by proliferating other languages within our government.

I think it is important that people learn multiple languages. It is important, especially in this world that we are in today where we have got so much foreign trade and so much foreign travel and so many foreign visitors into this country. I do a significant amount of travel myself. But to try to promote other languages to be spoken on the streets of America or confuse our students by catering to the language that is the language of their home rather than the language of the streets, then we end up with ethnic enclaves and people that really don't embrace the American culture and the American civilization.

I was quite struck by the book that was written by Winston Churchill called ''A History of the English-Speaking Peoples.'' I carefully read through that book forward and back. It took me quite a while to get through it carefully. I absorbed it and soaked it up. When I finished the book, I remember it was about 1:30 in the morning, and I looked up at the ceiling, and I thought: Huh. Wherever the English-speaking peoples have gone, by reading Churchill's book, freedom has accompanied the English language. How did that happen?

The concept of freedom is carried by the English language all over the world. And if you look where the British have gone, as far away as India where they taught English, and you look at the African continent where the English language has been established, you see that freedom is more likely to be found in the English-speaking peoples than of any other speaking peoples on the planet.

Is that some kind of coincidence? Or is there something about our language that carries freedom with it? Or is it about the people that carry the language that understand the concept of God-given liberty, and then they transport that God-given liberty and that freedom to the countries that they are settling, that they are contributing technology and science and medicine and literature and academics to and economy to?

I think it is a couple of things.

One is the British had enough confidence in their culture and their civilization to export it to the rest of the world. And we as Americans, up until the last generation or so, have had enough confidence in our culture and civilization to export it to the rest of the world. And the rest of the world has embraced our values, and we have seen it happen over and over again.

I point out Ataturk in Turkey, who, for 40 years, moved Turkey to the West, and the prosperity in the nation-state of Turkey improved the closer they got to the West.

I recall seeing pictures recently in Afghanistan from the 1960s, when the women wore Western clothing and there was a lot more civility in Afghanistan and more prosperity in Afghanistan.

I sat with the son of the Shah of Iran just a couple of months ago, and we had an engaging conversation. We have met several times along the way throughout the years. His father, the Shah, was moving Iran to the West. The women were uncovered; they wore Western clothes, and their education was accelerated, and they were moving into the Western world, and they had significantly more prosperity than they have today. Part of that was English language, part of that was culture, part of it is the Western civilization that we are.

But we wouldn't have a Western civilization if we didn't have an English language that helps to tie that together. And the Western civilization itself is rooted in the real estate where

the very footprint of Christianity laid the foundation for civilization, and most times it is the English language that is part of that, that ties that together. And where it doesn't exist, they have more troubles than where it does exist.

So I tip my hat to Winston Churchill for the wisdom that came together in his book. I want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that he never wrote that the English language took freedom to the rest of the world. He just wrote about the history of what happened to the rest of the world when the English-speaking peoples engaged themselves with the rest of the world.

However, there is another intellect from the United Kingdom, Daniel Hannan. Daniel Hannan is a member of the European Parliament. He has written a book that goes even deeper and takes a bigger bite out of this. He says that, as a member of the European Parliament, he will put his earphones on to listen to the interpreted versions as they are using different language. By the way, English is the official language of the European Union, and he has an understanding and he is at least, I will say, at a minimum, marginally fluent in multiple languages. And as he listened to the interpreters interpret into other languages, he would take that earphone back away from him and he would listen to the language they were using, and then he would hear the interpretation in the other ear.

He said that what he learned was that other languages didn't have the utility to express the concept of freedom that the English language has. I believe he is right on that.

So our concept of freedom and liberty, at least theoretically and by the theory of Daniel Hannan and my own, cannot be carried in any other language. And the English language does carry freedom. It expresses it like it can't be expressed in any other language because our history goes back to the Magna Carta. By the way, the Romans, who laid the foundation for a republican form of government and the rule of law, had a significant imprint on what is the United Kingdom today, Old England, and the English language that emerged from that brought many of our values to us.

If America had been formed by any other culture or any other civilization, any other language, we wouldn't be the country we are today. We wouldn't have the Declaration of Independence that we have. We are very unlikely to have this concept of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And we are very unlikely—and I will say it would be almost impossible—to conceive of a Bill of Rights that would give us the pillars of American exceptionalism, almost all of them packaged up in the Bill of Rights.

This came from our history, our culture, the derivatives of Mosaic law, Greek age of reason, the Roman rule of law, the Roman republican form of government that flowed up into England and into other parts in Europe and came about over here to the United States of America at the dawn of the industrial revolution with unlimited natural resources, a concept of manifest destiny, a Judeo-Christian foundation of beliefs and morality.

America was a giant Petri dish that was formed by, I believe, the hand of God that shaped this Nation and the foundations of this Nation. I would defy anyone, challenge anyone to reverse engineer America and come up with a better product than we have today.

But our principles, our values that came to us are essential to the future of our country as well. It is not just enough to look at our history and think—well, here is what some of my colleagues believe in, and I have trouble with that. They believe that society evolves, and this evolution of society can't be reversed, it can't be changed. It is essentially the product that comes because of time and technology and the force of human nature. So they are often looking at this on both sides of the aisle, but I just take some blame over here on the Republican side of the aisle, too, and they are kind of looking over their shoulder thinking: I am their leader. So I better get in front of this society and see where it is going because it is not going to revert back. The fundamental principles can be changed, too.

Well, I disagree, Mr. Speaker. I think what was a sin 2,000 years ago is a sin today. Fundamental principles are fundamental principles. The pillars of American exceptionalism are the pillars of American exceptionalism; and if we mess with them, if we alter them, we better come up with a good and a strong argument about why we should change these pillars of American exceptionalism. We can't just simply dish it off and say: Well, society has moved away from a man and a woman joined together in holy matrimony, so the family doesn't matter anymore, or we can redefine it to be something else. We can't just say, even though technology has proven without a doubt to us that human life begins at the moment of conception, that we can ignore that scientific fact and set aside the immorality of abortion and somehow our Nation is going to be blessed.

We can't ignore the idea that even though Adam Smith wrote his book on ''The Wealth of Nations'' published in, what a glorious year, 1776, and he laid out the fundamental principles of free enterprise that inspired this country and a world. We can't just disregard those principles and decide that, well, we can have now college students that reject free enterprise and embrace socialism and managed economies on the basis of what? On the basis of some kind of belief that free enterprise and capitalism victimizes people because some people get rich and other people don't get so rich? You can be a socialist, you can be a Marxist, but you have to believe it is a zero sum game if you are one of those folks, and then you are about redistributing the wealth, but the wealth ends up in the hands of the elitists—the leftist elitists. And if you belive in free enterprise and a meritocracy, then you know that the pie gets bigger. The more people create, the bigger the pie gets. The bigger the pie gets, the more people are prosperous.

It is an axiom for the world that when technology is invented and deployed, on average, it improves the standard of living of everybody. Some marginally, some not even noticeably, many a lot. But it moves the world into a modern place.

How could we think that whatever we had for net assets, or let me say—well, that is fine. Whatever we had for net assets in the year 1900 are not the net assets that we had in the year 2000, and not the net assets we have in the year 2017. We didn't have a lot of inventions in the year 1900 in comparison to what we have today. It was a smelly place, it was a dirty place, it was a dangerous place. There was no modern medicine. People died of diseases and the garbage got dumped out the windows, and the sewage ran in the streets, and we had invented the steam engine, and we were on the cusp of an airplane and a locomotive—well, we had locomotives by then. And we were on the cusp of airplanes and automobiles.

□ 1945

Modern medicine hadn't emerged. Pharmaceuticals hadn't emerged. Surely, the internet had not. All of the technology that has been developed in the last century has made our efforts far more efficient.

Back in the days when we were subsistence farmers and you had to spend 8, 10, 12 hours a day to try to raise a crop to feed you and your family and you had very little left to sell or to trade, our time was occupied with staying alive.

I have a cousin who spent 8 years in Honduras near Tegucigalpa in the Peace Corps. He was struggling to try to get them to raise 10 bushels of corn per acre, and we were raising 100 bushels at home at the time. I said: ''Jim, why don't you bring some seed corn down there? Why don't you bring some nitrogen fertilizer down there? What is the capability of that soil?''

He said: ''Oh, it is a 100-bushel soil and 100-bushel climate.''

''Cannot you bring them into the modern world? That is what you are doing down there.''

And his answer was: ''No, my biggest task is to keep them from having to eat their seed corn.''

Well, we moved along a lot faster in our society today. We have done genetic engineering, GMO products. We have gone from their 10 bushels an acre now to 300 bushels. We are on the way to 300-bushel corn. We can feed 7 billion people on the planet, and we will be prepared to feed 9 billion people on the planet as well, Mr. Speaker.

But technology has always moved us forward. It has always put us in a place where the standard of living for the world was improved, whether it was medicine, where not only our standard of living, our quality of life and the length of our life has been improved dramatically over the last couple of generations, or the technology that comes from this iPhone that is here, that has far more storage capacity and computer capacity in it than was in *Apollo 13* that went to the Moon, and it saves us time. We communicate in real time. It has changed our lives.

When I started my construction business, we all had to go in to eat lunch at noon, and we had 12 until 1 when we sat by the telephone and ate our lunch because that is when we communicated and reset our afternoon. We didn't have any other way to communicate with each other other than to be by that landline phone. And when they rolled that landline phone out, maybe 40 years earlier or so, we were pretty happy to have that because we had to go talk to people face-to-face to communicate.

Now if you send out an email and it is one that needs an action on it, if you don't get an answer back in 15, 20 minutes or 30 minutes, you think, well, that person is not a very good businessman or -woman if they are not answering their email, they are not answering their texts.

So now we make decisions on the fly. It is real time. Our efficiency is far much better because the communications are far much better. That is what has happened with technology. That is what has happened to move us into the modern era of the world.

But we still have this thing that is culture and civilization. We still have this thing that is language. And I know that the argument has been made to me that one day we will just hold up our iPhone and someone who speaks another language, it will come back and it will be interpreted into our ears, and we will be able to understand what they say.

And I think that will happen. I think that will happen, but I don't think we should overvalue what that means. Because if we are going to walk around and listen to our iPhone even when we are looking at people face-to-face and eye-to-eye, and if there is a delay in the interpretation—and there will be that delay, that will last indefinitely—we still have those pieces of our culture and our civilization that are instantaneous.

When people speak to us, we need to be able to hear and understand their voice inflections. We need to watch the body language and timing with the voice inflections. We need to pick up the slang and the vernacular that is used within the communities that we are. A nation needs to be able to do that in real time, instantaneously. And when we can do that, we are bound together and suspicion dissipates and unity comes together.

That is why America needs to establish English as the official language, because it is our common language. We are extraordinarily blessed to have English as our common language, and we can eliminate, then, the billions of dollars that we spend as we hire interpreters, and we slow down our process. And if we establish English as the official language, we will accelerate the learning of our language all across this land.

I mean, I don't know why in the world Spanish is in the airport in LaGuardia, for example. That is a long ways away from any country that speaks Spanish, but that is up there in dual signs, in English and in Spanish as you walk through the LaGuardia Airport.

As I am in a foreign country, I sometimes try to learn the language; and if they have got dual signs up there, I will try to read the sign to learn that other language while I am there. But I also know this: my eyes always revert to the language that I know and that I am comfortable with, and for me it is English.

When we put multiple languages on our signs in this country, it just helps facilitate for people—it takes away their desire to learn a foreign language. And so I am a strong supporter of English as the official language, H.R. 997, and I urge its movement here—and cosponsorship is necessary, of course—to finally get a vote on English as the official language here in the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I spent 6 years on this project in the State of Iowa, and I brought it three different ways in three different general assemblies. And finally, in the last term that I was there, I was able to—well, I didn't get to see the bill signed into law because the Governor wasn't thrilled about the bill-signing ceremony, but he signed it nonetheless, and it is the situation in Iowa and in nearly 30 States in this country that have adopted English as their official language.

The bill that I have introduced here is a mirror of the bill that is now law in Iowa. We did have to sue once on it and litigate, but it was because the secretary of state was determined to violate the law. He got pulled back in order. Otherwise, there would have been no litigation on the legislation itself. It has happened smoothly, and it has been a useful utility.

It saved money in the State of Iowa. It saved money in every State where English is the official language, and it is time for this Congress to adopt that a majority of the States have established English as the official language. I intend to continue beating this drum until such time as it becomes law, and at that point, then I will begin the celebration myself, Mr. Speaker.

I was about to change subjects, but I will carry on for just a moment.

I should also say that English is the language of success. Those who have developed proficiency in the English language do better than those who don't. We are seeing people who are sometimes three generations into America without learning the official language.

I recognize my friend from Tennessee has arrived and I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. JIM COOPER.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

PERMISSION TO REVISE REMARKS ON AMENDMENT NO. 15

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise my remarks, made during consideration of amendment No. 15 in the Committee of the Whole earlier today, beyond technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. I thank my friend from Iowa for yielding.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I am always happy to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, and I appreciate his contribution to the United States Congress while I have served here, and each year that he has been here as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to shift gears a little bit now and address the circumstances of the NDAA debate that has taken place.

I want to express my disappointment with some of the decisions that were made, some of the votes on the amendments, and also decisions that came from the Rules Committee.

Last year, in the authorization of the National Defense Authorization Act, I offered a number of amendments that were made in order, and I brought them here to the floor. We had a legitimate debate on those amendments, and I appreciate the ability to do that. But I also want to reiterate that this is a deliberative Congress, and Members have a right to be on this floor and to debate and to vote.

The Rules Committee's job is to make sure that that is in an orderly fashion, and I recognize that when you have well over 100 amendments that are offered, we could be here a long time if everyone debated those.

I would also point out that there was a unanimous consent agreement that was negotiated here a little bit ago, and the chairman, Mr. THORNBERRY, made the unanimous consent request that the balance of the amendments that weren't debated today would be approved en bloc. I supported that, and I verbally voted in support of it. That is a process that we do here.

But the amendments that I offered before the Rules Committee, all four of them, every single one of them was turned down, even a couple of them that I offered last year that were debated here on the floor.

The first one was an amendment, and it is this: ensuring that no funds under

the NDAA would be used to enlist DACA aliens—Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals was how President Obama listed it—to ensure that no funds will be used to enlist illegal aliens into our military, including our DACA personnel, into the United States military when they only consider them through the MAVNI program, which is to try to find special skill sets that aren't available in the United States. That is what the MAVNI program is about.

But President Obama, I will say, distorted that program, Mr. Speaker, and he began to push the DACA recipients through there. Well, DACA is unconstitutional. The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, as he named it, is unconstitutional. President Obama, 22 times, told the world that he didn't have the constitutional authority to grant amnesty to people who came into America, at least allegedly, before they were 18 years old—22 times.

The last time that I recall was at a high school here in Washington, D.C., which was only 2 or 3 weeks before he issued this policy, which was in September of 2014, to grant a quasi—and I will say an unconstitutional legal status to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals.

Now, it has been my position, conviction, and belief that if we reward lawbreakers, we get more lawbreakers. And it was the conviction of President Obama that he didn't have the constitutional authority to reward these lawbreakers. In his lecture to the high school students shortly before he implemented this policy, President Obama said: No, you are smart students. You know that there are three branches of government.

Article I is the legislative branch; they pass the laws. Article II is the executive branch, which he headed at the time. They enforce the laws. Article III are the courts, and they interpret the laws. That is about as clear and concise as it gets. And President Obama was an adjunct professor who taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago.

I would take issue with some of his constitutional interpretations, but I would not take issue with that one. He was right. He had no constitutional authority to award a de facto amnesty to people who attested that they were brought into this country maybe against their will, without their knowledge, or too young to be held accountable, to reward them with a path to citizenship.

But that is what this NDAA legislation fails to do is to strike out this language that was implemented by President Obama in September of 2014 that rewards people who attest that they came into America illegally, committed the crime of unlawful entry into the United States, criminals who then stepped up into the military and applied to go into the military and took an oath to support and defend our Constitution after they broke our laws.

They had to lie to get into the military, so they committed the crime of unlawful entry. They lied to get into the military, and then they took an oath to support and defend the Constitution.

Well, two of those three things are wrong at least. But did they mean it when they took the oath to support and defend the Constitution? Can you trust them if they violated our immigration laws and then lied about that in order to get into the military?

This President set about rewarding those kind of lawbreakers, those criminals, by granting them a path to citizenship because they signed up in the military.

I simply offered an amendment at the Rules Committee to be able to debate this on the floor of the House of Representatives so Congress could bring its considered judgment.

Now, I have an oath that I have taken, and that is to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, too, Mr. Speaker. When I see a bill come before me that, on its face, rewards lawbreakers under a policy that is a constitutional violation, one that Secretary Kelly said as recently as this morning he doesn't believe that the constitutionality of this can be upheld, and he doesn't expect that the Justice Department is going to defend it, and he anticipates that there will be a suit that will be filed—and I will tell you the specific date is September 5—that I believe will successfully litigate and put an end to this DACA program.

This Congress, every Member of this United States Congress has taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States—every one. And I don't think there is a single one that stood there and had their fingers crossed behind their back as they took their oath and said: ''Oh, unless I don't like it, it makes me politically uncomfortable, or unless I have some sympathy for the people that might be facing the enforcement of this supreme law of the land, the Constitution of the United States.''

□ 2000

They don't get to cross their fingers behind their back and make an oath that they don't mean. So when we take this oath—all 435 of us in the House and 100 of us in the Senate—we better mean it. We better believe what we say because we tell our constituents: You send me to Washington, D.C., send me to represent you in the United States Congress, and I will uphold the Constitution. That is the number one duty, to uphold the Constitution.

Well, in this Constitution, to support and defend it, I tell you it requires the President to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and, under the Take Care Clause, take care that the laws are faithfully executed. That doesn't mean kill off the law. It means enforce the law.

The President has violated the Constitution. Now the Rules Committee denied the ability of the House of Representatives to strike this out of the policy that exists under the authorization now of the National Defense Authorization Act. They are asking me to vote for this bill even though it violates a principle that was encompassed in our oath and a principle that was encompassed in everyone's oath.

Not only did we not get to put these Members of Congress up on a vote and challenge them afterwards as to whether their conscience is clear and whether they meant it when they took an oath to support and defend the Constitution, we don't get to have the debate. We don't get to have the vote.

So here is the National Defense Authorization Act all ready for a final passage to come to the floor tomorrow with unconstitutional components encompassed within it, that being something that Barack Obama 22 times said was unconstitutional, and we don't even get a debate or a vote here on the floor of the House of Representatives. That is amendment No. 1, Mr. Speaker. That troubles me a lot.

Second, a simple amendment that I brought last year ensuring that funds are not used to house UACs on military installations—unaccompanied alien children. When unaccompanied alien minors come into the United States illegally, they are violating Federal law. They are committing the crime of unlawful entry into the United States. They are facing up to 1 year in prison if we convict them and sentence them to the maximum of the law for one unlawful entry into the United States. We had a policy that existed under the Barack Obama administration to start to house them on our military bases.

Our military bases are for our national security. They are not there to be babysitting for children who are under 18—so they say—to house them on those bases to weaken our defense capability and interrupt the process of our military. We need that amendment to clean up another mistake of the Obama administration, and it was denied by the Rules Committee.

So we don't get to have a debate. We could very well have an administration that just continues the old process going of housing unaccompanied alien minors—illegal aliens—on the bases in America consuming our military resources for something like that. I disagree. I don't think they should be housed on our bases.

By the way, we ought to be picking them up at the border and sending them back to the country they came from. That is what every other nation does or should do. Those that don't are making colossal mistakes. I will try to stay out of what I think is going on in Europe today, but they are being subsumed by idiotic immigration policies.

The next amendment that was denied by the Rules Committee was the Obama-era Executive Order 13672 that prohibits Federal contractors and subcontractors from discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation and gender

identity. It is just an unnecessary executive order, common decency, common courtesy.

How do you discriminate against someone if you don't know what their sexual orientation is and gender identity is?

That has not been a problem out in this society. That executive order needed to be rescinded. We don't get a debate or a vote on that executive order either. This is the amendment that I introduced.

VICKY HARTZLER from Missouri, thankfully—I appreciate her bringing an amendment that was very similar to mine. My amendment ensured that no funds are used by the Department of Defense to force servicemen and -women to undergo any kind of transgender sensitivity courses or to screen servicemembers regarding gender reassignment surgery.

I will just couple it with discussion and debate on the Hartzler amendment. And that is this: that the United States military should not be used as an experiment. It shouldn't be used to do a social experiment agenda. Yet, under the Obama administration, not only did they decide to put an end to Don't Ask, Don't Tell, they set up an affirmative action program to promote people through the ranks who would assert their orientation to be different from heterosexual.

Then we got into this national fixation on transgenderism. And the orders came down in to the Department of Defense through our Secretary of Defense that the American taxpayer—well, let's just say we borrow money from China and Saudi Arabia to do sex reassignment surgery on people in our military?

It is something that has never happened before without a vote or a debate here on the floor of the House of Representatives or in the Senate for that matter. It is not a policy that has been approved by America or Americans, but a policy that was more or less shoehorned into this by the former President of the United States and the former Commander in Chief Barack Obama.

I can't believe that President Trump thinks it is a good idea to spend one-quarter or more billion dollars doing sex reassignment surgery, taking people out of the service of the military for the better part of a year while they recover from this surgery and thinking that somehow they are going to make our Nation stronger by using those resources when we have military members who are on food stamps today.

So we would divert resources for sex reassignment surgery, thinking that it would somehow enhance our national security? Sex reassignment surgery enhances our national security?

I can't say that with a straight face and expect anybody in this country is going to believe this.

So here we are, an America that is the unchallenged greatest nation in the world, significantly more powerful militarily than any other country in the world, but also with responsibilities that expand beyond that of any other country in the world, and we would obsess ourselves with the idea that we are going to send an advertisement out to people all over America, which is—well, maybe even outside of America—if you are contemplating sex reassignment surgery, come into the military and declare yourself a transgender, and then we will pay for that surgery. And we will have a whole lineup of people over at Walter Reed for their sex reassignment surgery laying in hospital beds next to our noble wounded who have lost an arm or a leg, or maybe both arms and both legs, maybe that have sacrificed a great deal, and we are going to divert the resources—the considerable resources—and medical skill and capabilities of our military medicine system that we have to sex reassignment surgery? Who would have thought?

I can't believe that the pundits haven't unloaded already on this all over the world. We are going to be the laughingstock of the world if this comes out that the Hartzler amendment failed on the floor of the House of Representatives by a handful of votes, but it failed. So that says to those who want to enter into the military and are contemplating sex reassignment surgery—by the way, I am not using the language that they are using. They are saying this is gender reassignment surgery—gender reassignment surgery.

Well, gender cannot be reassigned. That is in one's head. Sex is south of the border. Gender is in the head. It is not gender reassignment, it is sex reassignment surgery.

We would take those resources that we need to be using to take our combat-wounded and those who are ill and sick and serving in our military and get them well with the best care that we can provide for them, the battles we have had here on the floor to try to get the VA up to speed and they would divert those resources for sex reassignment surgery and for pharmaceuticals and the kind of medication that would make them physically more like they say they are in their head?

That is not a problem for the military to solve, Mr. Speaker.

I am greatly troubled by the arrangement of the amendments, those that were allowed and those that were denied. This amendment was the Hartzler amendment that failed.

I can only think of the MASH unit, and I will probably stop with that, Mr. Speaker, and not go any further into what images that brings to mind for me. But I saw that there were 24 Republicans that voted against the Hartzler amendment. That is greatly troubling to me, Mr. Speaker, to see that. By the way, Mr. Speaker, every single Democrat voted against the Hartzler amendment.

In the course here of about 18 to 24 months, this Congress thinks that they are reflecting the will of the American people, and now we have not only a social experiment but a medical experiment, a transgender medical sex reassignment surgery experiment going on in our military while we need to maintain ourselves as the strongest and most capable military in the world.

Our focus needs to be singular. We have people who can't get into the United States military for one reason or another. Maybe they aren't a strong enough physical specimen. Maybe they can't pass that physical test.

Former Secretary of Defense Bob Gates testified before Congress some years ago. He said that obesity is a national security problem in the United States, that too many of our young people sit in front of the television or in front of their Xbox. They eat junk food, they get fat, and they are too heavy to meet the standards to qualify to be recruited into our military in any branch of the service.

He said that if we don't do something to control the diets of young people so that they are not too fat to get into the military, he said it is a national security issue. Obesity in our young people is a threat to our national security.

Yet, rather than focusing resources on getting these young people in shape, we would get out the scalpel and do sexual reassignment surgery on somebody from the same generation who went to the same school and probably sat next to some of those other youth in the high school classes, and we would take a man and physically turn him into a woman or take a woman and physically turn her into a man at their request because she says: up here that is where I am.

Don't they know that when they sign up for the military? Can't they make that decision beforehand and can't the military screen for that?

If they can screen for obesity, if they can screen for intellect and for IQ, if they can screen for medical records and medical history, if they can screen for criminal activity or violations of the law, if they can say you can't get into our military because you don't meet our standards in any of these, if you are too short, if you are physically unable like my uncle who was physically unable to serve in the military, all of those things, from obesity to too short, to having flatfeet, to being cross-eyed, whatever it might be, they can say: no, you don't fit our standards.

But if you walk up there and you say, ''Well, I think here I am a woman and I am not a woman here,'' then we will bring you in because you meet all other standards and we have got these specialists up at Walter Reed and other facilities around America, we will surgically make you into whatever you want to be. And somehow that strengthens America's security and helps us to fight our enemies?

This is so utterly ludicrous for the United States military to be engaged in such a diversion from defending our country. Yet this Congress turned down the Hartzler amendment. At least

the Rules Committee allowed it to be offered. They didn't allow mine. They allowed that one to be offered. This is what we get? This kind of answer?

Every Democrat says: oh, this is okay. We want to do this. It is important to us.

And 24 Republicans agreed with them? Where is our country going? Can't we focus on the things that are important? Can't we focus on these constitutional principles?

Vote down this DACA thing that rewards lawbreakers, and support the Hartzler amendment and end this idea that we are going to do great medical and social experiments in the United States military and somehow out of that we are going to—there is no way in the world that makes us stronger.

So somehow do we even maintain our power when we become the laughingstock of the world?

There was also an initiative that I had to fight here a while back about meatless Mondays in our military. I recall a picture of the Norwegian military. They are vegans on Monday. Meatless military in the Norwegian military, and they are sitting there eating their vegan sandwiches and on their shoulder patch is a reindeer. I suppose that is their national animal, and that is good over there.

For us, we want a strong military. We want to maintain a noble military. We want to focus these resources on those things that matter. They are all going to take an oath to support and defend the Constitution when they sign up and commit themselves to the military.

□ 2015

God bless them for doing that. I take it, too. There are 435 of us here who did, and 100 down the Rotunda in the Senate did.

How many of us mean it? How many of us will take that stand and say: I will not vote for a piece of legislation that is unconstitutional because it violates my oath of office; and I am not going to commit the resources of the taxpayers of the United States of America to do social, medical, and pharmaceutical experiments on people who now would be attracted to come into the military for that purpose and then be discharged out onto the streets of America, having been reconstructed into a different kind of human being with a different hair cut?

That can happen on their own. That can happen in civilian life. That is each person's cross to bear or each person's choice, but it is not the duty of the United States military.

It is a national security issue, according to former Secretary of Defense Bob Gates, because too many of our youth are too overweight to meet the standards to get into boot camp. My answer to that was: if it is a military national security issue, sign them up. Put them in there. They can just stay in basics until they make weight. Maybe you add another 2 weeks, 4 weeks, or 6 weeks to their training. You will get them down to weight, if you work them hard enough, if you watch their diet. It will be a good thing for them.

It is not a national security issue, in my opinion, for too many young people to be overweight and they can't qualify for the military. If you work them hard enough, feed them right, keep them long enough, they will make weight.

But it is far wiser to do that than it is to do sex reassignment surgery and take somebody out of operations for 200-some days out of a year in order to recover from this reconstructive surgery.

It is a ridiculous thing that has happened today in the United States Congress. It is disgraceful that a vote like that could take place and that a majority of the people voting on the Hartzler amendment would turn it down when we have a country to save, a country to protect.

So I suggest this, Mr. Speaker. If this NDAA bill fails tomorrow, it will come back again. It will come back again with the Hartzler language in it, under a rule that will allow it to pass here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Democrats are not going to help us pass this bill. Only a handful of them will do that. So Republicans have to do the right thing. We should stop dividing ourselves. We should stop letting America be embarrassed in front of the word for a ridiculous decision that was made today.

So I urge a correction to the NDAA, and I urge English to be adopted as the official language of the United States of America, because it unifies us and helps us communicate with each other.

A common form of communications currency is the most powerful unifying force throughout the entire history of the world. We need to employ it here and protect it in law here in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SANFORD (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a personal matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 14, 2017, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1948. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Karen E. Dyson, United States Army, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1949. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Availability of Funds and Collection of Checks [Regulation CC; Docket No.: R-1409] (RIN: 7100-AD68) received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1950. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Carbon County, MT, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2017-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8485] received July 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1951. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Walk-In Cooler and Freezer Refrigeration Systems [Docket No.: EERE-2015-BT-STD-0016] (RIN: 1904-AD59) received July 10, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1952. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Control of Communicable Diseases; Correction [Docket No.: CDC-2016-0068] (RIN: 0920-AA63) received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1953. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Flora D. Darpino, United States Army, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1954. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-23, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1955. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-40, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1956. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting two (2) notifications of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, and action and nomination, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2462(f)(1); Public Law 93-618, Sec. 502 (as added by Public Law 104-188, Sec. 1952(a); (110 Stat. 1920); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1957. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and

Human Services, transmitting three (3) notifications of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1958. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting two (2) notifications of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, and nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1959. A letter from the White House Liaison, Office of Legislation and Congressional Affairs, Department of Education, transmitting two (2) notifications of a federal nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1960. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Potomac River, Newburg, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0357] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1961. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Delaware River; Dredging [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0279] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1962. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Cleveland Construction Super Boat Grand Prix, Lake Erie, Fairport, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0201] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1963. A letter from the Deputy Chief Counsel, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership — Amendments to the Terms and Schedule of Financial Assistance [Docket No.: 170526519-7519-01] (RIN: 0693-AB64) received July 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

1964. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological Objects and Ecclesiastical and Ritual Ethnological Materials From Cyprus [CBP Dec. 17-07] (RIN: 1515-AE31) received July 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1965. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update of Pre-approved Plan Revenue Procedure (Revenue Procedure 2017-41) received July 10, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1966. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Conditions of Participation for Home Health Agencies; Delay of Effective Date [CMS-3819-F2] (RIN: 0938-AG81) received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 218. A bill to provide for the exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land in the State of Alaska for the construction of a road between King Cove and Cold Bay (Rept. 115–218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. GRANGER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 3219. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 3216. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the disclosure of the total number of a company's domestic and foreign employees; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 3217. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the identification of corporate tax haven countries and increased penalties for tax evasion practices in haven countries that ship United States jobs overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MESSER, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. COOK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BOST, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNN, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CORREA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 3218. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 3219. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. HOLDING):

H.R. 3220. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to preserve taxpayers' rights to administrative appeal of deficiency determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 3221. A bill to provide exemptions under the Truth in Lending Act and the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 to encourage access to affordable mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. AGUILAR, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. POLIS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 3222. A bill to amend the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 to protect civil rights and otherwise prevent meaningful harm to third parties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNN (for himself, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. FASO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 3223. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the statute of limitations on making a claim for credit or

refund and shorten the statute of limitations on collection after assessment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KIND, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 3224. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to clarify reasonable costs for critical access hospital payments under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 3225. A bill to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians to lease or transfer certain lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 3226. A bill to extend the supplemental security income program to Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 3227. A bill to improve Federal sentencing and corrections practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Energy and Commerce, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 3228. A bill to require the President to provide frequent press briefings covering the official business of the President to the White House press corps; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 3229. A bill to protect the safety of judges by extending the authority of the Judicial Conference to redact sensitive information contained in their financial disclosure reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H.R. 3230. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 915 Center Avenue in Payette, Idaho, as the ''Harmon Killebrew Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 3231. A bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act with respect to adoption and other pregnancy options counseling; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. BUDD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BARR, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland):

H.R. 3232. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a separation oath for members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 3233. A bill to promote fair trade, allow for greater participation in trade enforcement, and improve accountability and transparency in trade matters; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEAL (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 3234. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit legally married same-sex couples to amend their filing status for returns outside the 3-year limitation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 3235. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 with respect to the administration of wetland determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 3236. A bill to amend titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve provider and supplier cost reporting of ambulance services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 3237. A bill to require the Secretary of State to withhold certain assistance for Honduras until the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Honduras has settled all known commercial disputes with United States citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 3238. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide assistance for common interest communities, condominiums, and housing cooperatives damaged by a major disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KIND, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MESSER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COLE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 3239. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 3240. A bill to improve the productivity and energy efficiency of the manufacturing sector by directing the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the National Academies and other appropriate Federal agencies, to develop a national smart manufacturing plan and to provide assistance to small- and medium-sized manufacturers in implementing smart manufacturing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H. Res. 442. A resolution of inquiry directing the Secretary of the Treasury to provide certain documents in the Secretary's possession to the House of Representatives relating to President Trump's financial connections to Russia, certain illegal financial schemes, and related information; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 443. A resolution recognizing the importance and effectiveness of trauma-informed care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H. Res. 444. A resolution encouraging the courts of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to allow Charles William Gard and Constance Rhoda Keely Yates to pursue innovative medical care for their son; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. McGOVERN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 445. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Liu Xiaobo for his steadfast commitment to the protection of human rights, political freedoms, free markets, democratic elections, government accountability, and peaceful change in the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 3216.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 3217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3218.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 3219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 3220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution, providing, in relevant part, that ''[t]he Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.'

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 3221.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional Authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate in commerce in and among the states, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to repeal any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 3222.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 3223.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—Congress has the authority to enact all laws deemed necessary and proper.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 3224.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.''

By Mr. DeFAZIO:

H.R. 3225.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 3226.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution

''All legislative power herein grated shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives''

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3227.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 3228.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: ''To make all Laws which shall be necessarry and proper for carrying into the Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department Officer thereof.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 3229.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1: All legislative powers vested in a Congress

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws necesary and proper

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 3230.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 3231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 3232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Regulation of the land and naval Forces Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

H.R. 3233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3, to regulate commerce with foreign nations

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 3234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 3236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 3237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9.

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 3238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fifteenth Amendment, Section 2, section 1 The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the U.S. or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 19: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 36: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 38: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 95: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 112: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 147: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 299: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. BRAT, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 305: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 350: Mr. TURNER, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 356: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 449: Mr. TONKO, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 480: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 490: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 535: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 553: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 559: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 641: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 721: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LANCE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 790: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 806: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 825: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 846: Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 849: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 873: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 976: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 997: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 1002: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 1007: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1017: Mr. BABIN and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1038: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 1057: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. KIHUEN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1065: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 1990: Ms. SINEMA and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1124: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 1148: Mr. VELA and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1155: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1187: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1222: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1231: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1322: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 1377: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 1484: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1542: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1606: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1626: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1676: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KEATING, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1685: Mr. VELA.
H.R. 1697: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 1699: Mr. BUCK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 1843: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 1847: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1861: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1872: Mr. NOLAN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1898: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1963: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1976: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 2038: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2091: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2092: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 2106: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2135: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2142: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2152: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 2180: Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 2211: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 2315: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ROSS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BRAT, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2322: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2340: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 2404: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2414: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2451: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2479: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2515: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2519: Mr. HILL, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2561: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 2640: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2641: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 2644: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2651: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2658: Mr. CRIST and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 2663: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2775: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 2841: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2856: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2871: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2876: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HOYER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 2898: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2908: Mr. SOTO and Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 2909: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 2926: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2929: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2932: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2938: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2968: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2972: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 2973: Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 2992: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 3084: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 3088: Mr. KILMER and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 3111: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 3131: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3174: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 3178: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 3199: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3212: Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 3214: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.J. Res. 51: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. JORDAN.
H.J. Res. 107: Mr. PETERSON.
H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H. Con. Res. 59: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. KHANNA.
H. Res. 43: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 135: Mr. DONOVAN.
H. Res. 224: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CLAY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Ms. MOORE.
H. Res. 363: Mr. TAKANO.
H. Res. 406: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H. Res. 407: Mr. POE of Texas.
H. Res. 426: Mr. MCGOVERN.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 13, 2017 No. 118

Senate

The Senate met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable DEB FISCHER, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be offered by Pastor Bill Ewing of Christian Life Ministries in Rapid City, SD.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Please join me.

As we bow our knees before You, Father, grant us thankful hearts and let our eyes see the many blessings we have been given living in this great land.

Put a protective hedge around these leaders, their marriages, and their families, and let peace dwell in their homes. O Lord, strengthen these that You have placed with this authority so Christ may dwell in their hearts through faith; and that they would be rooted and grounded in loving kindness and truth. May they be able to comprehend the knowledge of Your will and to know the love of Christ so they make decisions that protect and preserve the lives You have entrusted to them.

Lord, teach us to listen. The times are noisy and our ears are weary with the thousands of sounds that continuously assault us. Give us the spirit of young Samuel when he said to You, ''Speak, for Your servant is listening.'' Let us hear You speaking in our hearts so that we get used to the sound of Your voice; that its tones may be familiar to us, and we would lead this great Nation accordingly.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 13, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DEB FISCHER, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. FISCHER thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

The Senator from South Dakota.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I wish to express my appreciation for the opportunity to welcome to the U.S. Senate Pastor Bill Ewing.

Pastor Bill Ewing started a ministry called Christian Life Ministries in the early 1980s in Rapid City, SD, along with his wife Nancy. It is a ministry that has impacted thousands of people across this country, my wife Kimberly and I being among those, and our family. We have benefited enormously from Pastor Ewing's spiritual mentorship, his always wise and godly council, and his example of faithfulness.

In addition to those in my State of South Dakota and across the country, the ministry has been involved through the years in ministering to people who have been through very difficult circumstances. They were there after 9/11 in New York and after Hurricane Katrina. There have been countless examples of things that happened not only here at home but also around the world—all the things that have gone on in the country of Haiti—Christian Life Ministries has been on the scene and has been very ably ministering to people who have been impacted by these horrific events.

Bill Ewing is a lifelong South Dakotan, although he did venture over to Wyoming to go to college, where he was a two-time All American baseball player and actually was in the California Angels farm system for a number of years before an injury ended his career, but that loss to the California Angels and Major League Baseball was an enormous win for people all over South Dakota and all across this country who have benefited from the work he and his team in Christian Life Ministries have done.

So it is my honor to be able to welcome Pastor Bill Ewing to the U.S. Senate. I thank Chaplain Black for his hospitality and generosity for allowing my friend and pastor, Bill Ewing, to be the visiting Chaplain here in the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, the American people deserve better than ObamaCare.

Across the country, Americans are paying more for less under ObamaCare. Already, ObamaCare premiums have increased, on average, by more than 100 percent on the Federal exchange. Next year, ObamaCare premiums could rise by as much as 50 percent or more in States like Georgia and Maryland.

All across the country, Americans are losing choice and access. Already, Americans living in 70 percent of the counties have little or no options for ObamaCare insurance. Next year, nearly 40 percent fewer insurers have filed to participate in the ObamaCare exchanges. Many Americans face the real possibility of having no options to pick from at all.

These trends are not new—costs have been going up and choice has been going down for years—but these trends continue to get worse, and things are not likely to turn around unless we act.

ObamaCare was a direct attack on the middle class from the very start. It is a ticking timebomb today. ObamaCare's years-long hurtle toward collapse is rapidly approaching its seemingly inevitable conclusion, total meltdown, which would hurt even more Americans on top of those it has hurt already.

We can't let that happen, and we are continuing to work hard to ensure it doesn't.

After extensive consultation across the conference, numerous meetings with constituents, and intensive conversations with Members, our conference has updated last month's Better Care discussion draft with additional provisions to make it stronger. We just walked through that revised draft together. It is now available online. I encourage everyone to review it.

As before, it aims to stabilize and reform the collapsing insurance markets that have left too many with no options, and it aims to make insurance more affordable and more flexible so it is something Americans actually want to buy.

For those stuck with ObamaCare insurance they don't want or can't afford, we don't think they should be forced to buy it any longer. For those who buy insurance on an exchange and want to continue doing so, we want them to have lower premiums and more choices.

For those tired of healthcare decisions being outsourced to far-off bureaucrats, we want to transfer millions of those decisions back to them and to their doctors.

We also want to strengthen Medicaid for those who need it most, by giving States more flexibility while ensuring that those who rely on this program don't have the rug pulled out from under them. Many States want the ability to reform and improve their Medicaid Program so they can actually deliver better care at a lower cost, and we would like to dramatically expand their authority to do that. It is an idea that should significantly improve healthcare in States all across our country.

The draft we just discussed, like the one before it, addresses all of these objectives. It would again give Americans more tools for managing their own care and this time goes even further. It would again devote significant resources to the fight against the opioid crisis and this time goes even further. The revised draft improves on the previous version in a number of ways, all while retaining the fundamental goals of providing stability and improving affordability.

Now, regardless, I am sure we can expect many of the same, tired, and predictable attacks from the defenders of ObamaCare's failed status quo. It hardly matters what the draft says; they would launch the same kinds of attacks anyway.

I would remind colleagues, this is the same crowd that said ObamaCare would lower costs, they pledged it would increase choice, and they promoted the infamous broken promise—if you like your plan, you can keep your plan. They were wrong before, and they are wrong again today.

Moreover, serious ObamaCare solutions from Democrats are hard to find these days. What we have heard recently essentially boils down to this:

No. 1, apply a multibillion-dollar bandaid—no reforms, no changes, just billions more for insurers. That is the game plan of the folks on the other side.

No. 2, quadruple down on ObamaCare and pass a massive expansion of a failed idea that puts bureaucrats in control of nearly every single healthcare decision in the country. The total cost of that so-called single-payer idea could add up to $32 trillion, according to an estimate of a leading proposal.

These are not serious solutions that Americans need to solve the real problems before us, but if Democrats would like to offer these ideas, then let's open debate on the underlying legislation so they can do that. I am sure Members will have more ideas about how we can improve this draft. The only way for anyone—Democrat, Republican, or Independent—to have that opportunity is to vote yes on opening the debate.

We expect an updated projection from the Congressional Budget Office early next week. Once that is released, we will have the opportunity to vote on the motion to proceed. That is the only way by which everyone will be able to come to the floor, share their ideas, and have their voices heard through both robust debate and a robust amendment process.

I remain disappointed that our Democratic friends made clear early on that they did not want to engage in a serious, bipartisan effort to solve this issue. But they have a renewed opportunity to engage now. I hope they will take it. I hope every Senator will vote to open debate because that is how we change the status quo.

This is our opportunity to really make a difference on healthcare. This is our chance to bring about changes we have been talking about since ObamaCare was forced on the American people. It is our time to finally build the bridge away from ObamaCare's failures and deliver relief to those who need it.

Failure to act means more families get hurt as it continues to collapse. It also means the law's problems will grow more formidable, making them even harder to solve. That is not something any of us should be comfortable with.

So it is time to rise to the occasion. The American people deserve better than the pain of ObamaCare. They deserve better care, and the time to deliver that for them is next week.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, after 2 weeks of delay, we have now seen the revised Republican TrumpCare bill. It appears that little has changed to the core of the bill.

The Republican TrumpCare bill still slashes Medicaid. The cuts are every bit as draconian as they were in the previous version—a devastating blow to rural hospitals, to Americans in nursing homes, to those struggling with opioid addiction, and so many more. The Republican TrumpCare bill still allows insurers to charge older Americans five times or more than they charge younger Americans. Premiums for so many people aged 55 to 64 will go way up. Americans in their sixties could be paying tens of thousands of dollars more than they do today. The Republican TrumpCare bill still blocks funding to Planned Parenthood, limiting access to affordable healthcare for millions of women.

So what is new in the bill? Well, it appears that Republicans have included a new $60 billion tax break on health savings accounts, which only benefits those wealthy enough to afford putting money into them. For Americans who are struggling to pay for insurance coverage, for the average family who sits down on a Friday evening and says: How are we going to pay our existing bills, and for middle-income families who struggle to make ends meet, a tax break on health savings accounts will not help. It will only help wealthier Americans, who sometimes use these accounts as tax shelters.

It appears the Republican TrumpCare bill includes something like the Cruz amendment, which makes the overall bill even worse than before. The Cruz amendment causes costs to go up by letting insurers sell cutrate insurance policies with lower premiums but huge, huge deductibles and copays, so that out-of-pocket costs would actually go up, not down, even if premiums are lower.

The Cruz amendment drives Americans with preexisting conditions into markets with unaffordable coverage. They virtually would have no coverage at all. Even Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY said the amendment would likely ''annihilate the pre-existing condition requirement.'' The Cruz amendment will likely cause death spirals in the insurance markets for Americans who need coverage the most. Even the conservative American Action Forum said the Cruz amendment is ''the definition of a death spiral.''

From what we are seeing, the new Republican TrumpCare bill is every bit as mean as the old one, and, in one big way, it is even meaner, with the addition of something like the Cruz amendment.

Moderate Republicans looking at this bill should be able to see that the incredibly modest changes to the tax provisions—the small pot of funding for opioid abuse treatment and these other tweaks around the edges—are like a drop in the bucket compared to what the bill does to Medicaid, to seniors, and to Americans with preexisting conditions. It is clear that the core of this bill will remain until the bitter end.

So a vote on the motion to proceed will be a vote on the core of this bill. It is a vote on the idea that middle-class Americans and seniors should pay more for less healthcare. It is a vote on the idea that it should be harder for the neediest Americans to afford healthcare. It is a vote on the idea that corporations and special interests deserve another tax break.

If you are for that idea, vote yes on the motion to proceed. But my Republican friends should not be tempted by the promise of amendments to fix this bill. It is clear that the Republican leadership wants and needs to keep the core of this bill—a dagger to the heart of Medicaid and tax giveaways for corporations and special interests—to the bitter end.

Republicans keep talking about needing to change the status quo on healthcare, but you don't change the status quo to make it worse. That is what this bill would do. This is far, far worse than the status quo. We, Republicans and Democrats, can work together to actually improve our healthcare system, to stabilize the marketplaces, and to reduce the costs that average Americans pay for their healthcare, particularly for prescription drugs.

We can do it, but my Republican friends need to abandon this wrong-headed, partisan, behind-closed-doors approach, and they ought to do it on the motion to proceed next week.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, we Democrats sent a letter to our Republican colleagues laying out our principles on appropriations so that Republicans would know exactly where we stand and we could avoid the possibility of their shutting down the government. We have three principles: relief from damaging sequestration cuts, parity between defense and jobs and economic growth funding, and no poison pill riders, like the ineffective border wall. These are the same principles we laid out during the last budget negotiation, which resulted in a strong and bipartisan package.

But on Tuesday—which is why I am on the floor speaking—the House Appropriations Committee released a draft of its Homeland Security bill, which includes funding for an unnecessary, ineffective, and expensive border wall with Mexico, paid for by American taxpayers, breaking the President's promise, repeatedly given, that Mexico would pay for it. The bill also funds an unacceptable deportation force and unnecessary detention beds.

The President's budget calls for funding a new eminent domain strike force—a team of Trump lawyers that the administration wants to send to the border to take private land away from the American people to build this wall. This proposal has met with stiff resistance from homeowners living in border communities. Republicans and Democrats on both sides of the aisle have rightfully come out against this proposal. Not a single border State Republican supports the idea. The Senate should reject it outright.

If House Republicans keep on this path—the path of these poison pill amendments and dramatic cuts in programs that help working Americans—I fear they are steering us toward a train wreck.

Remember, the President said he wanted a shutdown. He tweeted earlier this year: ''Our country needs a good 'shutdown' in September to fix mess!'' He wants one. His budget director, Mick Mulvaney, has always been for a shutdown. By including border wall funding in their proposal and dramatically cutting domestic spending, House Republicans, unfortunately, are playing right into their game.

I urge my Republican colleagues, please, let cooler heads prevail. To my Republican friends in the Senate, I would say persuade your colleagues in the House to abandon this dangerous, irresponsible path they put us on, which can only lead to a government shutdown. I guess they want it.

We should be working together on a responsible way forward on appropriations, in line with the principles we laid out which produced a successful bipartisan deal on the last budget.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, as public servants, I have always thought it is our duty to serve with dignity, integrity, and fairness to the best of our abilities. No matter where you are from or how we got here, the citizens of our States have sent us to Washington with the hope that we will do what is best for them. We hold the public's trust, and that is something that should guide us in everything we do.

Last week, I was home in Michigan for the Fourth of July. My family and other Michiganders celebrated and honored those who had fought for our independence and those who continue to defend our sacred freedom. Our American democracy is rooted in the promise of freedom and equal opportunity for every American. Our resilient Nation has persevered because of shared commitment to do what is right, even if we don't always agree on how to get there.

While home last week I had the opportunity to speak to many Michiganders and hear what was on their mind. They had a whole range of topics on their mind, but the No. 1 issue I heard was about the proposed Republican healthcare bill. Some were angry, some were confused, but most were simply scared. They are scared for their children, they are scared for their spouses, they are scared for their aging parents, and many are scared about what this bill could mean for their own health and well-being.

I wish to highlight a few of the stories shared with me in recent days. Susan from Clawson, MI, shared her unfortunate story about when she fell on hard times, unexpectedly lost her small business and with it her income.

Susan, despite all of her hard work in the past, no longer had the resources to obtain private health insurance. During this time—and it was an extremely stressful time—she also discovered she had an unidentified lump on her breast. Through some research and the help of friends, Susan was able to enroll in Medicaid and get the treatment for what she discovered was a very aggressive but treatable form of cancer.

Without Medicaid, Susan may not have gotten the treatment she needed and may have lost her life. Nobody

takes pleasure in sharing such deeply personal stories, but Susan wants to be sure anyone that who finds themselves in such a difficult position has the support she had.

I appreciate her bravery in beating cancer and her willingness to share this very personal experience.

Alayna from Southfield, MI, shared that she was diagnosed with a rare tumor almost a year ago. Alayna serves as a minister of music in her church in downtown Detroit and enjoys working with children through various local programs. Alayna works part time and her husband works full time, often 70 hours per week. Neither has healthcare benefits through their employers.

Alayna and her husband were able to obtain coverage through the ACA marketplace, a plan she would not have been able to purchase without the Affordable Care Act. Alayna is rightfully terrified by the Republican plan and said she would probably be dead without the affordable coverage she received under the Affordable Care Act, leaving her husband and her 5-year-old daughter behind.

Matt, from Waterford, was unable to get health insurance before the ACA due to two preexisting conditions. After obtaining healthcare through the Affordable Care Act, he discovered one of his preexisting conditions had led to cancer in his digestive tract. Matt is convinced the ACA literally saved his life and that he would not have been able to afford the care he needs otherwise.

Hearing the stories of Matt, Susan, Alayna, and countless other Michiganders like them, I feel the need to remind this body that these individuals are our neighbors. They are husbands and wives and fathers and mothers. Illnesses or emergencies can happen to anyone. Ministers get sick. Students get sick. Small business owners get sick.

Matt didn't choose to be born with a preexisting condition, Susan didn't ask for breast cancer, and Alayna's tumor could have been on any one of us.

Last week, we honored our country's fight for independence, our Nation's brave Founders, and all who have sacrificed to build our Nation by working toward a more perfect union to ensure America is the land of opportunity for all.

The healthcare bill Republicans have written goes against the very values we honor and cherish. It does not bring us closer to opportunity for all. When the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office concludes that the Republican bill will leave millions of people uninsured, that should send a strong signal to all of us that we need to go back to the drawing board.

About an hour ago, my Republican colleagues released additional last-minute changes to their healthcare bill, intended to win over a few more votes within their party—changes that were drafted behind closed doors and without input from the American public, the very people we represent. In their rush to get this bill done quickly, my colleagues have not fully considered how this proposal will impact their constituents.

Healthcare stakeholders and our Nation's insurers have told Republicans this latest change will still cause premiums for older Americans and those with preexisting conditions to skyrocket. It will still increase the number of Americans without health insurance by millions.

We should be working on bipartisan legislation that will truly improve our healthcare system by increasing insurance coverage while bringing down cost, not forcing a vote next week on legislation that is seriously flawed.

I ask my Republican colleagues to listen to their fellow Americans, Americans who are scared of what this bill will mean for them and for their families. I ask my Republican colleagues to listen to the people calling their office every single day and even traveling here to Washington, DC, to speak out against this bill. I ask my colleagues to listen to the independent experts and healthcare stakeholders who have said, in no uncertain terms, that this bill will cost millions of people their health insurance and could cost thousands of Americans their very lives.

I ask my colleagues to remember why they came to Washington in the first place. I ask my colleagues to step back and ask themselves some tough questions. Will this bill help people or will it hurt people? What will this bill mean for rural hospitals in their State, for lifesaving addiction treatments, for preventive care that saves lives and taxpayer dollars? Does this bill hold true to the important American values of fairness, freedom, and equal opportunity for all?

If the answer to any of these questions is no, we should scrap this bill, start over, and work together, in a bipartisan way, to bring down healthcare costs and improve the quality of care available to every American, no matter who they are or where they live.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Hagerty nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, let me begin by reviewing the threats the United States is facing around the world today. The campaign against ISIS is far from over. We must build on the success of retaking Mosul and ensure an enduring defeat of terrorist threats in Iraq and Syria and throughout the region.

Every day we learn more about Russia's asymmetric capabilities—from cyber attacks to disinformation campaigns—even as they modernize their military, occupy Crimea, destabilize Ukraine, and threaten our NATO allies. China continues to militarize the South China Sea and modernize its own military at an alarming rate. North Korea gets ever closer to developing the capability to strike the U.S. homeland with a nuclear-armed missile.

I could spend a lot of time going through all of the threats we face. We are at war. We are at war. There are brave young men and women serving in Afghanistan, as I speak. Some of them have been wounded and killed. We must always ask ourselves: Are we really doing all we can to support them?

Our military is facing a crisis. Years of budget cuts from this Congress have failed our men and women in uniform. In order to rebuild the military, the Pentagon needs to ramp up readiness programs and embark on an ambitious plan for modernization to make sure our servicemembers are given the training, resources, and capabilities they need. To do that, the Department of Defense must have senior leadership.

The position of Deputy Secretary of State is one of the most critical positions in our government. It is essentially the chief operating officer of the largest, most complex organization in the world—the Department that is entrusted with ensuring our national security.

Patrick Shanahan is a well-qualified nominee who passed out of the Armed Services Committee on a voice vote. This body voted overwhelmingly, 98 to 1, to confirm General Mattis as Secretary of Defense. He had our overwhelming support to lead the Department during challenging times. Yet we have not given Secretary Mattis the senior leadership he needs to help him do his job.

Tomorrow, I say to my colleagues, the current Deputy Secretary of Defense, Bob Work, will leave his office. There simply is no more time to delay moving the nomination of Patrick Shanahan. You can choose to vote no, you can choose to vote yes, but let's just vote. The obstruction has gone on long enough, and it has to stop.

I wish to say, I understand the frustration my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel with the process we have been through, particularly on the issue of healthcare. The issue of healthcare should have gone through

the relevant committees. It should have had amendments, it should have had debate, it should have had discussion, and maybe we could have passed something going through the regular order, and we didn't. I understand the frustration my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are feeling. I felt the same thing in 2009 when we did ObamaCare, basically on the same basis. Yet amnesia seems to have set in here or new Members are not remembering or care.

What is going on in this body, unfortunately, these days is plagued by partisanship and politics. This is a time to put aside all of that for the sake of our national security and come together as Republicans and Democrats to move this nomination. Our men and women in uniform deserve no less.

Let me say again to my friend from New York, whom I have enjoyed doing battle with for many years, he is a man of honesty and integrity and a man of his word. I understand his frustration, and I understand the frustration on the other side of the aisle because we felt the same thing.

I would again ask the indulgence of the leader of the Democrat Party on the other side to at least consider this unanimous consent request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 157, the nomination of Patrick Shanahan to be Deputy Secretary of Defense; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, first, there is no one I have more respect for on either side of the aisle than the Senator from Arizona. He said some nice words about me, and I extend them back to him five times over. He is a fine man. He has great integrity, great courage, great service to our country, and no one has helped defend America more—both when he was in the Armed Forces and here on the Senate floor—than the gentleman. I respect that.

I respect that you always try to put yourself in the other person's moccasins. That was one of the great Indian proverbs.

I know he is doing that, as he mentioned in his remarks.

I would like to make a couple of quick points.

First, our Republican leader has chosen this week to proceed with three nominees under regular order. He could have advanced this nominee and a few others from the DOD but instead chose a district court judge in Idaho, a nominee to OMB, Ambassador to Japan. So I say to my good friend from Arizona, given the frustration he remarked on that our side has on healthcare, which is so important to so many—as is keeping a strong and fully staffed Defense Department—I would say to the gentleman that we would be happy to consider the nominee in the regular order. And maybe once things change a little bit on healthcare, with the consent of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, we can move a lot of things quickly. But at this point, despite my great respect for my dear friend, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCAIN. Before the Democratic leader leaves, may I ask one more?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. on Monday, July 17, the Senate proceed to executive session for consideration of Executive Calendar No. 157. I further ask that there be 30 minutes of debate on the nomination equally divided in the usual form and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate, and that, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

Before I ask for a ruling on that, may I just say that the Senator from New York has a legitimate comment. Why in the world we would be wasting time on the Ambassador to Japan when we have the Department of Defense nominees in line is something I can neither account for, nor can I condone. So I understand the frustration of the Senator from New York.

Maybe sometime after our 2 weeks in August, perhaps some of us ought to sit down and talk and work out an agenda. We have a train wreck coming, as the Senator from New York knows. We have the debt limit. We have appropriations bills to pass. We have all these things piling up, we have about 30 days to do it in, and so far, I have seen no plan to address these challenges.

The only way we are going to address some of these challenges, I say to my colleagues, with their partisanship and anger and dislike of anybody who lives over there, the fact is that we need to work together to work these things out, and we can do it without betraying principle, but we can also do it by understanding the priorities and the dedication and patriotism of those on the other side of the aisle.

So I understand the Senator from New York. I don't agree with the Senator from New York, but I understand his frustration. So I renew my consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reluctantly, again, I must object. But I would say to my colleague from Arizona, I would like very much to sit down and work out these other problems. I think that if he and I sat in a room together, we could figure these things out ourselves pretty well, and it would be our job to persuade our colleagues to try to do the same. I understand. I used the same words—''train wreck''—earlier this morning. If we don't come to a good agreement, for instance, on appropriations and the budget, the defense forces that he so dearly holds and so many of the issues on our side would be hurt dramatically—the country would. So I promise him, I will endeavor to work with him in the most good-faith way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask one more question of the Democratic leader? When would Mr. Shanahan's nomination be in order?

Mr. SCHUMER. I think if it is filed—it will be up to the Republican leader. If it is filed tonight, the cloture motion would be voted on Monday night, and then maybe we could talk about—with the permission of my colleagues from the other side—speeding it up after that.

Mr. MCCAIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I am speaking today because proponents of TrumpCare have their heads stuck in the sand. Many of the Republicans in this Chamber are clearly in denial that we live in a country where 91 Americans die each and every day from an opioid overdose; where 1.3 million Americans went to the hospital for an opioid-related issue in 2014; where 2,000 Massachusetts residents died from an opioid overdose just last year, and 69 percent of those cases had the illicit opioid fentanyl in their bodies. If people across the country were dying from overdoses at the same rate as in Massachusetts, that would be 100,000 people per year—two Vietnam wars' worth of deaths every single year. Over 10 years, that would be 1 million people who die if they were dying at the same rate as they are in Massachusetts—1 million people over 10 years dying from opioid overdoses in our country.

If these Republicans took their heads out of the sand, they would hear the near-unanimous calls from the experts and the pleas of mothers and fathers to stop this machete to Medicaid which they have brought with their new healthcare reform bill. They would hear the alarm bells Americans across the country are ringing against this cruel and heartless and immoral legislation.

These desperate voices should be enough to get Republicans to abandon their efforts to rip away insurance coverage for treatment and recovery services for Americans struggling with substance use disorders, but instead of accepting the truth and listening to their constituents, they have decided to take a cynical path and replace these life-saving services with a paltry opioid fund of $45 billion over 10 years.

There has been a lot of talk from the Republicans about so-called fixes that they can work on with Democrats, but this opioid fund isn't a fix, it is a falsehood. It is a false promise to the people suffering from opioid addiction. It is a

false future that won't include critical Medicaid funding for treatment and recovery services. It is a false bargain that Republicans will make at the expense of families desperate for opioid addiction treatment.

This opioid fund is a politically craven effort to buy votes from Republicans whose States are being ravaged by the prescription drug, heroin, and fentanyl crisis, but the American people will not be fooled. This opioid funding is nothing more than a public health pittance, a wholly inadequate response to our Nation's preeminent healthcare crisis. In fact, the amount included in this latest version of TrumpCare is not even half of the amount that the Affordable Care Act would have spent on covering opioid use disorder treatment if we just left that law alone to work as intended.

Here are the numbers. The Center for American Progress has estimated that the Affordable Care Act would spend $91 billion for opioid coverage alone over the next decade, compared to the $45 billion the Republicans are putting into their bill which they announced today.

We already know that access to treatment is a challenge. Only 1 in 10 Americans with substance addiction receives treatment. There are estimated to be 2 million people with an opioid use disorder who are not receiving any treatment for this disorder.

It should not be a surprise to anyone that the epidemic of opioid abuse will only get worse as long as we have a system that makes it easier to abuse drugs than to get help for addiction disorders. And the paltry GOP fund that provides less than half of the funding of the Affordable Care Act is only going to accelerate the death sentence for the millions of people with substance use disorders.

Sadly, we know that my Republican colleagues who are attempting to jam this immoral and callous TrumpCare bill through this body actually are aware of the crisis facing their States. They speak to the same constituents. They read the same newspapers. They see the same obituaries of Americans who lost their lives to the opioid overdose epidemic. And that is why we have been able to make some bipartisan progress. Last year, we passed the CARA bill. We passed legislation to fund $1 billion for treatment. But support for the TrumpCare bill and this opioid fund is a betrayal of all of that hard-fought progress we were making.

Republicans are turning their backs on their vow to combat the opioid epidemic, and President Trump is breaking his promise from the campaign trail to ''expand treatment for those who have become so badly addicted.'' Instead, they are moving forward with a proposal that would rip insurance away from 22 million people and threaten insurance coverage for 2.8 million Americans with a substance use disorder.

This bill would eviscerate Medicaid—the leading payer of behavioral health services, including substance use treatment—by nearly $800 billion, and all of this to give billions in tax breaks to billionaires and big corporations.

One analysis has found that under the Senate's previous version of TrumpCare, Republicans provided a nearly $33 billion tax break to the top 400 earners, the top 400 billionaires in America, which is the equivalent of ending Medicaid expansion for too many people in our country.

Let's look at what they are planning. They are planning to cut from $91 billion down to $45 billion the amount of money we spend on opioid treatment in the United States. At the same time, they have $33 billion that they are going to give in a tax break to the wealthiest 400 billionaires in America. Where is that money going to be better spent in our country over the next 10 years—$33 billion for the 400 wealthiest people or adding that money back in so that we can have treatment for people who have opioid addiction problems in their families? What is going to be better for America?

Well, the Republicans say: We need all that money that would go for treatment to give it to the wealthiest people in our country.

They can afford their treatment. Their families will have all the healthcare coverage they need if they have problems in their families. But the Republicans don't care. If you kicked this bill in the heart, you would break your toe. That is how bad it is.

So, for me, this is without question, at the heart, a simple explanation of what is fundamentally wrong with this Republican bill. There are many other things wrong with it—preexisting conditions, go all the way down the line—but how can you, when we have this plague hitting our country, take all that money away and give it away to billionaires? It is just wrong. There are too many families, too many letters, too many conversations that we have all had with these families. There are too many tears that we have seen. So, for me, there can be nothing that is worse than doing that to families—taking away their hope.

This is going to be a battle of monumental proportions. All I can tell you is that for the 2,000 families who had someone who died in Massachusetts last year, we are going to make sure this is a battle that everyone knows because if the American people understood that they are doing this to all of those families who have an opioid problem right now, there would be a revolt that would rise up across this country. Over this next week, the American people are going to learn about what is in the soul of this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am here with Senator CORKER today to address the Senate and encourage this body to vote in support of Bill Hagerty as our Ambassador to Japan.

In 2013, when Bill Hagerty was the commissioner of economic and community development for Tennessee, he gave a speech entirely in Japanese at the American Embassy in Tokyo.

I have looked it up. There have been 16 U.S. Ambassadors to Tokyo, a very distinguished group since World War II: a five-star general, two former Senate majority leaders, a former Vice President of the United States, a former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the daughter of a former President of the United States. So far as I know, none of them were able to do what Bill Hagerty did in 2013 when he made a speech entirely in Japanese at the American Embassy in Tokyo.

That is just one reason I think Bill Hagerty is one of President Trump's best appointees.

He was born in Tennessee, graduated from Vanderbilt University, was associate editor of the law review, worked as a consultant for the Boston Consulting Group. During his final 3 years, he lived in Tokyo, and he served as senior managing executive for their clients around Asia.

He was selected by President George H.W. Bush to be on his staff, and there he worked on trade, commerce, defense and telecommunications issues. He was a White House fellow. He was founder and chairman of a company in private life that became the third largest medical research company in the United States. He founded his own private equity and investment firm.

From 2011 to 2015, he was the commissioner of economic and community development for Tennessee. In that role, working with Governor Haslam, he was enormously successful. They secured $15 billion in investments and 90,000 jobs for our State. For 2 of those years, Tennessee was the No. 1 State for economic development and the No. 1 State in job creation through foreign direct investment.

Bill Hagerty is a distinguished Eagle Scout. He was head of a capital campaign for the Scouts. He served on the board for the Far East Council of the Scouts, encouraging the growth of Boy Scouts throughout Asia. One way he intends to continue that mission is that his two sons will join their respective troops in Japan following his confirmation. His wife, Chrissy, would want me to quickly add that there are two aspiring Girl Scouts in their family who will have time to do the same.

This is not only one of the best appointments but one of the most important of this President. There is a reason we have had such a distinguished list of Ambassadors since World War II, including our former majority leader, Senator Howard Baker from Tennessee.

Mike Mansfield, another former majority leader of this body, was also Ambassador. He used to say in every speech he made that the Japanese-American alliance is the most important two-country relationship in the world, bar none. Ambassador Mansfield said that so often that Americans in

Tokyo used to call our Embassy there the ''Bar None Ranch.''

If you will permit a little parochialism, Mr. Hagerty comes from a state, Tennessee, which has the most important relationship with Japan of any State, bar none.

That began about 40 years ago. I remember President Carter saying to me as a new Governor and to other Governors: ''Go to Japan. Persuade them to make in the United States what they sell in the United States.''

Off we all went. During my first 24 months as Governor, I spent 3 weeks in Japan and 8 weeks on Japanese-American relations. I explained to Tennesseans that I thought I could do more good for our State in Japan than I could in Washington, DC. It turned out to be true. Nissan, Bridgestone, Komatsu, and other companies came, and so did the jobs.

By the mid-eighties, Tennessee had 10 percent of all the Japanese capital investment in the United States, and this has continued. Nissan and Bridgestone have North America's largest auto plants and tire plants in Tennessee. With Mr. Hagerty's help, Bridgestone, as well as Nissan, have decided to locate their North American headquarters in our State.

Bill Hagerty, if approved by the Senate, would go to Japan not only able to speak the language but, having lived and worked there, understanding how close ties between Japan and the United States can create bigger paychecks for Americans, as well as for the Japanese.

I join my colleague, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CORKER, in enthusiastically saying it is my hope that the Senate will approve today his nomination and that he will soon be on the job, and his children will be in their respective Scout troops in Japan.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER, for his eloquent comments about this great nomination. I also thank him again, as I have many times, for the outstanding relationship he developed with Japan that has borne so much fruit for the citizens in our State and so many States across the Southeast. I thank him very much for that.

I rise today also to offer my strong support for the nomination of Bill Hagerty to serve as the U.S. Ambassador to Japan. Bill is one of the most outstanding appointments that President Trump has made, and his confirmation is long overdue.

The relationship between the United States and Japan speaks for itself, and hosting Prime Minister Abe as one of the first visitors speaks to how the Trump administration and our country feel about Japan.

As a fellow Tennessean, I have had the privilege of knowing Bill Hagerty and his family on a personal level. I have seen him in business and the outstanding things he has done there. I have seen him represent our State as commissioner of economic development, and he caused it to be one of the most heralded States in the country relative to job creation. Much of that had to do with his ability to deal with other governments around the world and cause them to be attracted to our State.

I also know that he and his wife Chrissy actually met in Japan, so this is an exciting time and sort of a homecoming for their family.

There is no one more well-suited to fill this important role, and I know our Nation will benefit from Bill's leadership and experience as he carries on the tremendous legacy of U.S. Ambassadors to Japan, including the late Howard Baker, another fellow Tennessean.

I am really, really proud of this nomination and know that Bill will represent the very best of our country during his service in Japan.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this confirmation. This is long overdue, and I know he will be going to Japan at a time when we truly need an ambassador with his capacity.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Hagerty nomination?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 160 Ex.]

YEAS—86

Alexander	Bennet	Boozman
Baldwin	Blumenthal	Burr
Barrasso	Blunt	Cantwell
Capito	Grassley	Perdue
Cardin	Hassan	Portman
Carper	Hatch	Reed
Casey	Heitkamp	Risch
Cassidy	Heller	Roberts
Cochran	Hoeven	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Coons	Isakson	Sasse
Corker	Johnson	Schatz
Cornyn	Kaine	Schumer
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Scott
Cotton	King	Shaheen
Crapo	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cruz	Lankford	Strange
Daines	Leahy	Sullivan
Donnelly	Lee	Tester
Duckworth	Manchin	Thune
Durbin	Markey	Tillis
Enzi	McCain	Toomey
Ernst	McConnell	Van Hollen
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Fischer	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Flake	Murphy	Wicker
Franken	Murray	Wyden
Gardner	Nelson	Young
Graham	Paul	

NAYS—12

Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Stabenow
Gillibrand	Merkley	Udall
Harris	Peters	Warren

NOT VOTING—2

McCaskill	Moran

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the Hagerty nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 157.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Patrick M. Shanahan, of Washington, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Patrick M. Shanahan, of Washington, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Mitch McConnell, Joni Ernst, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, Lindsey Graham, Mike Crapo, John Boozman, Roger F. Wicker, Dan Sullivan, John Cornyn, John Thune, Steve Daines, John Barrasso, David Perdue, Mike Rounds, Orrin G. Hatch, John McCain.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1552 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. FLAKE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I wish to make some remarks paying tribute to a former staff member of mine for whom I have the highest opinion. However, before I begin those remarks, I should take a moment to address the elephant in the room.

Mr. President, today the majority leader revealed a revised discussion draft for legislation to repeal and replace ObamaCare. Let me say at the outset that this bill isn't perfect. There are some things in the bill that, given my preferences, I would do very differently. But one thing I have learned in my 40 years in this Senate is that people who demand purity and perfection when it comes to legislation usually end up disappointed and rarely accomplish anything productive. That is particularly true when we are talking about complex policy matters.

The next vote on this legislation will presumably be whether to let the Senate proceed to the bill. Regardless of any of the positions of my colleagues on this particular draft, if they support the larger effort to repeal and replace ObamaCare, they should at the very least want to have a debate on this bill. Under the rules, we will have an open amendment process. Members will get a chance to make their preferences known and to have the Senate vote on them. Taking that opportunity is the very least we can do.

Keep in mind, virtually every Republican in this body has supported the effort to repeal and replace ObamaCare more or less since the day it was signed into law. We have all made promises to our constituents along those lines. This legislation, while far from perfect, would fulfill the vast majority of those promises.

If we pass up this opportunity, we are looking at further collapse of our health insurance markets, which means dramatically higher premiums and even fewer healthcare options for our constituents. Make no mistake, while some are talking about a bipartisan solution to prop up markets in the event this bill fails, there is no magic elixir or silver bullet that will make that an easy proposition.

I have to think that at the end of the day, if we fail to take action to fulfill the promises we have all made, we will have to answer to the American people for the missed opportunity and the chaos that will almost certainly follow. I hope all of my colleagues will keep that in mind.

TRIBUTE TO EVERETT EISSENSTAT

Mr. President, I wish to take this time to pay tribute to a very dear and noble colleague of mine, Everett Eissenstat. For the past 6 years, Everett has served as my chief international trade counsel on the Senate Finance Committee—a very important position. He has had a long and distinguished career in public service, obtaining and utilizing what is really an unparalleled level of knowledge and expertise about our Nation's trade policy. In fact, I think it is safe to say that very few, if any, individuals have had as great an impact on the current state of U.S. trade law as Everett Eissenstat. His public service will continue, as he has recently gone on to serve as the Deputy Director of the National Economic Council.

Everett received his juris doctorate at the University of Oklahoma, where he graduated cum laude and served as research editor of the Oklahoma Law Review. He also holds a master's degree in Latin American studies from the University of Texas at Austin and a bachelor's degree in political science and Spanish from Oklahoma State University. With diverse alma maters like that, some might wonder how Everett decides what colors to wear on college football Saturdays. But those of my colleagues who know Everett will correctly guess that he has, since his undergraduate days, remained a devoted fan of his beloved Cowboys.

After obtaining his law degree, Everett went to work for Dixon and Dixon in Dallas, TX. Later, he worked as Congressman Jim Kolbe's legislative director and, shortly thereafter, he became the international trade counsel for the Senate Finance Committee for Senator GRASSLEY, who was then the lead Republican on the committee.

Everett was a key staffer in the effort to draft and pass the Trade Act of 2002, which renewed trade promotion authority for the first time in 8 years. This was a major update to our Nation's trade laws and made possible the completion and passage of trade agreements with Chile, Singapore, Australia, Morocco, Bahrain, Oman, Peru, Colombia, South Korea, Panama, as well as the countries of the CAFTA-DR agreement; namely, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic.

Everett then helped implement a number of these agreements when he served as Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for the Western Hemisphere, a position he held from 2006 through 2010.

After recognizing his fine work, I asked Everett to return to the Finance Committee in January of 2011 to once again serve as chief international trade counsel, and he continued to distinguish himself as one of the most knowledgeable and dedicated trade lawyers in the country.

Very early in his second tenure at the Finance Committee, he helped shepherd our free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea through the Senate. In 2015, he was the key staffer in the effort to draft, introduce, and pass the bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act, which, among other things, once again renewed trade promotion authority after another 8-year gap, and updated our Nation's trade negotiating objectives for the 21st century.

At about the same time, Congress also passed legislation to update our customs enforcement and facilitation laws, as well as a bill to reauthorize some important trade preferences.

All of these successes were the culmination of years of hard work and represent the most ambitious legislative agenda on trade in recent history, and Everett was an indispensable part of it all.

With his work on passage of those laws in 2015, his work on the prior TPA statute in 2002, and his efforts at USTR, Everett has been a key player in the development and facilitation of a generation of U.S. trade law. That is no small feat. More than anyone I have known, Everett is committed both to improving opportunities for Americans abroad and to ensuring an increasingly free-trade economy around the world. He is a true believer in free trade and the benefits free trade brings to our economy.

I am not the only Senator who will miss Everett's knowledge and expertise. Indeed, during his time here, he was an asset to the entire Senate. But, more than that, I will miss him personally: his tireless work ethic, his calm and thoughtful demeanor, and his cheerful disposition, even when he is breaking bad news or telling Senators things they may not want to hear.

While I am sad to see him go, it is comforting to know that Everett is continuing to serve our country and will keep advancing pro-growth economic policies at the National Economic Council. His expertise and wisdom are more important now than ever before, with numerous trade possibilities on the immediate horizon.

As I have said before, and I imagine I will say many times again, Everett is very, very good at what he does. The administration and the country are lucky to have such an important asset. I look forward to seeing his successes in this new chapter of his career, though it goes without saying that he leaves behind some very big shoes to fill. I count myself lucky to have been the beneficiary of Everett's knowledge and advice for several years.

I want to wish Everett, his wonderful wife Janet, and their sons Jacob and Alex the very best in this and any other future endeavors. Everett has a dedicated family, and I understand that they are here today; that Everett's wife and his one son were outside here just a short time ago. I am quite certain they are just as proud of Everett as I am.

I have worked with a lot of people in the U.S. Senate. I have had a lot of staff people, and all of them have been, almost to a person, very, very good. I have appreciated all of them, and I know that we wouldn't be nearly as good without our staffs whispering in our ears, preparing the documents that we put into the RECORD, working with us to help us improve our abilities to put forth our agendas.

I want my colleagues to know that Everett Eissenstat has been one of the all-time great staff people on Capitol Hill. I hesitate to even call him a staff person because he has the kind of reputation that goes far beyond being a staffer on Capitol Hill. He is one of the great leaders in this country, and I just want him to know how much I personally appreciate him. I want his wife to know how much I appreciate her and him; and his children—I want them to know what a great father they have.

Everett is a great, great man, and I am really happy to have said a few nice words about him on the floor. No matter what I say, it is not enough to explain what a truly great individual Everett Eissenstat really is.

I hope we can get other good staff people like Everett to help us on both sides. We are willing to work with both sides, willing to bring us together to do the things we know are important for this country and its future. Everett is one of those. I am going to miss him terribly. On the other hand, I know that where he is now is very important, and he will do the job as well as anybody alive.

I just want to pay tribute to him and his wife and his son who is here today, and tell him how much we all love and appreciate him.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be here with my colleagues—Senator KLOBUCHAR, from Minnesota, and Senator HEITKAMP, from North Dakota—to talk about the most prominent issue facing us right now; that is, what happens to healthcare for millions of Americans.

At a town hall in Kentucky last week, Majority Leader MCCONNELL said that if he can't secure the votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act, he will have no choice but to work in a bipartisan way with Democrats on legislation to repair and strengthen the law. Well, I was encouraged to hear the majority leader say that because I don't think bipartisanship should be a last resort. I think it should be the starting point. It should be the beginning of the work we do in this Chamber because that is what the American people want and that is the best way to make lasting public policy.

This is especially true with healthcare legislation, which impacts families all across America. As we have been hearing—and I have had a chance to hear it directly from my constituents in New Hampshire—the American people have wanted all along for to take a bipartisan approach. It is unfortunate that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have spent months trying to pass a partisan, deeply unpopular bill.

Now, I think we would all agree that there are changes we need to make in the Affordable Care Act, something for which I have advocated since we passed the law. I have had the opportunity to work with our colleague TIM SCOTT from South Carolina. In 2015, we worked together to make modest changes to the law to protect small businesses from excessive premium increases. I think that bipartisan approach is something with which, if we started today, we could make changes in the Affordable Care Act to improve it and to make sure that Americans could get better access to healthcare.

We all understand that there are problems currently in the market in terms of premium increases, and we know why these premium increases are happening. In their 2018 rate request filings, insurers justified the increases because of the uncertainty surrounding the repeal of the ACA and because this administration refuses to commit to making what are called cost-sharing reduction payments.

These payments were included as part of the Affordable Care Act to address premiums, deductibles, and copayments and to make them more affordable for working families, basically, to be able to help people afford insurance. The payments have been built into the rates that insurers are charging for 2017. But as we look ahead to 2018, there is a big problem because, if there is uncertainty around those payments, it means premiums will skyrockets, insurers will leave marketplaces, and people will lose their health coverage. Now, we could fix this today if we were willing to work together, because we know what we need to do.

I think New Hampshire offers a vivid example of what we are seeing across the country. Last year, insurance markets were stable, health insurance premiums increased an average of just 2 percent in New Hampshire—the lowest annual increase in the country and in our State's history. Unfortunately, today, because of the uncertainty in the market, it is a very different story.

Insurers in New Hampshire are raising premiums for 2018. The same thing is happening across the country. In some cases, insurers are filing two different sets of rates—one premised on the administration's continuing to make those cost-sharing payments that I talked about earlier, and the second set with higher premiums to account for continuing uncertainty and the possibility that the Trump administration, which is legally charged with implementing the Affordable Care Act, is going to renege on making the payments that have been promised to insurers and, ultimately, to families so that they can get healthcare.

This uncertainty is completely unnecessary. The instability in the ACA marketplaces is a manufactured crisis, and we could put a stop to it today. That is why I have introduced the Marketplace Certainty Act, a bill to permanently appropriate funds that would expand the cost-sharing reduction payments and ensure that we can count on those payments being made.

I am pleased to be joined by 25 other Senators who have already cosponsored this bill, and we can pass this right now if we had agreement with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

The Marketplace Certainty Act is also supported by a broad spectrum of provider and patient advocate groups—including the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the American Diabetes Association, and the National Association of Community Health Centers, just to name a few.

We can end the artificial crisis. We could immediately restore certainty and stability to the health insurance markets. In turn, this would give us the space we need to come together on a bipartisan basis to improve the Affordable Care Act, to strengthen what is working, and to fix what is not working. That is what we were sent to Washington to do.

Bipartisanship should be our first choice, not a last resort. The American people want us to stop bickering over healthcare, to work together, and to make the commonsense improvements to the law that we should be making.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota—North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. That is OK. I am from the better Dakota. I just have to tell you.

Mr. President, I am always perplexed when the opposition party, the Republican Party, says: We are the party of business. We are the party that believes that government should function more like a business. We are the party that believes that we have to make the tough decisions, we have to do the work that needs to get done, and we have to do it in a timely fashion.

OK, I get that. There is not a corporate board in America confronted with the challenge that we have in healthcare that would not shore up the

cost-saving payments. When you look at those of us who have served on corporate boards, those of us who have spent some time in the private sector, and, certainly, those of us who have been county officials or State officials, where we have actually had to make decisions, we look at how you make those decisions. The first thing you do is to try to make sure that while you are deliberating and while you are making decisions, you don't create market disruption. You don't do the things that create more uncertainty. You stabilize what you can, triage what you can, and then take a look at what the advantages are and what the experience you can bring to bear is to resolve bigger, broader, and more systemic issues.

If we look today at where we are right now with our constituents or our customers, if we can put it in a business sense, our customers are Americans and American families. Guess what. As for those of us who have been in our States and who have spent time looking at healthcare, talking to people about healthcare, talking to providers about healthcare, I will tell you that there are two emotions they have. They are mad, and they are scared. They are probably more scared than mad because under the bills that are being deliberated here, the Republican healthcare bills, they don't know if they can continue to keep their disabled children at home with them. They don't know if they can continue to provide for their parents in a nursing home. They don't know if their rural hospital is going to be able to survive the kinds of reductions in payments that are anticipated under this bill.

Today in North Dakota, $250 million is the value of Medicaid expansion. I have institutions in North Dakota, providers in North Dakota that are operating on razor-thin margins. They can't make ends meet without making sure that they keep that amount of uncompensated care greatly reduced. They need the cash flow.

If we raise uncompensated care, two things will happen. The first thing that will happen under this bill is that they will have a hit to their bottom line. The second and obvious consequence of that is that, when they negotiate with the private insurance market on what those next payments are going to be, they are going to ask for more money to put back on the private insurance market the cost of uncompensated care.

Let's also take a look at the growing issue in this country of opioids. I have a facility in southwestern North Dakota. Their new hospital anticipates that Medicaid is going to be about 14 to 17 percent of the billings they have. As they are trying to respond—as responsible healthcare providers would—to the opioid crisis, they are looking at converting the old hospital into a long-term facility, a facility where people can go and get healthcare when they are addicted.

They anticipate that the facility will have to rely on about 60 to 70 percent Medicaid reimbursement. When people tell you that these issues aren't intertwined, that the population that is going to need assistance in recovery from addiction is not our Medicaid population, they are wrong. Every person who has looked at this has come to the same conclusion.

The other thing I am going to tell you about the people whom I talked to is that most of them have never been involved in politics. They are not partisans. They don't really even care about politics, but they wonder why they are caught up in this tidal wave of political rhetoric when people are scaring them about whether they are going to have health insurance. They are wondering: What kind of responsible leaders would ever do that? What kind of responsible leaders would not do what they could today to provide some assurances in the near term that the health insurance is going to be available, that their Medicaid is going to be available, and that they are going to be able to take care of their kids?

I am telling you that, instead of continuing to release bad bill after bad bill, I hope the Republicans will come and honestly take us at our word. We stand ready to work with Republicans on a truly bipartisan bill that is going to deliver quality healthcare to North Dakotans and quality healthcare to the people of this country.

People think bipartisanship can't happen. That is not true. Yesterday I held a press conference on a completely separate issue that involves clean coal. Standing side by side when we announced that bill, we had Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, one of the most vocal advocates for aggressive action on climate, and Senators BARRASSO, CAPITO, and me, the most vocal advocates in support of coal. We all stood together introducing this bill because we wanted to offer a real solution on 45Q. We wanted to find out where that lane is where we can all coexist and solve the problems of the American people.

It is not impossible to do this. It is not impossible if we park the partisanship, if we park the ideology, and if we start examining what the true problems and the true issues with our healthcare system are.

The answer is usually in the middle. Has Medicaid worked to get more people with chronic conditions, to manage care, and to lower costs? The answer is yes. Are there too many people on Medicaid? The answer is yes.

We need to grow our economy. We need to help people move them into a workplace where they have workplace insurance. Instead of talking about how we are going to grow the economy, instead of talking about how we are going to raise wages, instead of talking about how we are going to help people get set, we are talking about shifting the responsibility of the sickest among us, shifting that responsibility to the States and back to the patients.

Just 2 weeks ago, I joined 15 of my colleagues trying to bring some commonsense bills forward. I thought we made a great case. We have been challenged: You really don't want to work with us.

That is all facade. That is not true. We are back here again, saying: Please, please, work with us. Let's just for a moment do what Senator MCCONNELL suggested we do. Let's take care of what is happening with the 2018 plan year. Let's remove the uncertainty as we are looking at premiums going up and skyrocketing because of that uncertainty. Let's remove that uncertainty and solve this problem.

That is why I am supporting my colleague Senator SHAHEEN's legislation that makes cost-sharing payments permanent and increases the eligibility and generosity for that benefit.

I also cosponsored Senator CARPER and Senator KAINE's bill to make the reinsurance program for the individual marketplace permanent and to devote resources to outreach and enrollment efforts. As a result, it would encourage insurance companies to offer more plans in a greater number of markets, improving competition, and driving down costs.

Isn't that what we all want? Everyone can agree that is the consequence of this legislation.

Also, earlier this week I introduced another commonsense bill—the Addressing Affordability for More Americans Act. That helps make healthcare more affordable for middle-class families. What does that mean? We know that right now on the exchanges—when we look at subsidization of families on the exchange—we have what we call a cliff event. You are either in or you are out, and there is no stepdown. Many of our middle-class families could experience a joyous event called a pay raise, only to find out that the pay raise evaporates because they lose some of the tax advantages that they received because they bought health insurance on a private exchange.

Why don't we glide that out? The same is true, actually, for Medicaid. Is there an opportunity to take that slide out, or that glide out, and moving more people into the workplace who are on Medicaid?

I share concerns that people have that the subsidization on both Medicaid and on the individual marketplace may result in people not taking economic opportunities that are available to them because, in the long run, it doesn't pencil out, given where they will be with healthcare. Let's take that incentive out. Let's work together. Let's solve that problem.

I think our bill is the starting point. If people have a better idea on how to address that concern, I stand willing and ready to make that work. I want to say that we are here saying: Let's work together. We are here saying: We do not believe that, on this side of the aisle, we have all the answers.

Guess what. I don't believe that, on that side of the aisle, they have all the

answers. I believe we could learn an incredible amount from a hearing with a bipartisan group of Governors who are going to be responsible. They are going to get this heaped into their lap if this passes. That is why you see a bipartisan group of Governors saying: You know what, keep it, because that is not a path forward.

If you want to hear some good ideas, I think we could hear some great ideas from the corporate America that has become self-insured—as they look at wellness programs, as they look at using big data metrics to help keep their population healthier and drive down costs, and as they negotiate for better deals with providers.

There are hundreds of ideas out there. There are hundreds of opportunities to learn more before we take this step, but what is the process we are in? The process we are in is this: Don't confuse me with the facts. Don't confuse me with a new idea. Don't confuse me because, politically, we have to do this.

Do you know what? No one, politically, has to do this. What we have been sent here to do is not to fulfill political promises. We have been sent here to legislate in the best interest of the American people and the people of our States. That is our job—not to represent a partisan political idea. Let's do it.

Let's bring in a whole lot of ideas, and let's park the ideology at the door. Everybody, park the ideology at the door. As so many people on the other side of the aisle would say, let's start acting in a business, yeoman-like manner and start working through these problems.

We have to do what Senator SHAHEEN has suggested, and that is to buy some time by making sure that we don't disrupt the marketplace today.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am honored to be here today with Senator HEITKAMP, from North Dakota—my friend from across the border, the prairies—and also Senator SHAHEEN, from the Granite State. I don't think it is a coincidence that the three of us are here today. We have worked on a number of bipartisan issues over the years.

As I was sitting here, I was remembering when Senator COLLINS stood during the government shutdown and asked for people who would be interested in working with her on a bipartisan plan to get ourselves out of that mess. And all three of us were involved in that effort, which was, I note, half women in the group. I think it is time to do that again when it comes to healthcare.

I appreciated it when last week Senator MCCONNELL said it may be time to work to strengthen the exchanges and to work across the aisle. Like Senator SHAHEEN, I didn't see it as a last option, I saw it as a first option.

I certainly appreciate the work my colleagues have done to propose some smart ideas that could help us improve the Affordable Care Act, including the Marketplace Certainty Act. When I talked with our small businesses and our citizens in Minnesota, they want that kind of certainty to help with cost sharing.

The idea of doing something more with reinsurance, which we just passed on a State basis in Minnesota with a Republican legislature and a Democratic Governor—we are awaiting a waiver from Health and Human Services here in Washington. We think we should do it in a bigger way on a national level, so I also support the Kaine-Carper bill.

The work that I have been doing on prescription drugs—much of it across the aisle with Senator GRASSLEY—to stop this unprecedented practice of big pharmaceutical companies paying off generics to keep their products off the market—it would save billions of dollars for our taxpayers if they stopped that practice.

Unleash the power of 41 million seniors who are currently barred from negotiating for less expensive drug prices. Bring in less expensive drugs from Canada—a bill that I have with Senator MCCAIN. There is nothing in this new proposal we have seen today that would help in any way with prescription drug prices, and that is just wrong.

That is why we are here to welcome our colleagues to work with us on some improvements in a bipartisan way to this bill, because the bill we saw this morning would again not do anything—minor tweaks but nothing about these major Medicaid cuts that have brought so many people together against this bill.

Minnesota seniors organizations have said that these proposals we are seeing that are not bipartisan—it feels like we are pulling the rug out from underneath families and seniors. That is why we have seen AARP so strongly opposed to a number of the proposals that have been circulating around with no Democratic input.

Many, many people have come up to us across our States. I was in northern Minnesota over the Fourth of July and was there among the Lawn Chair Brigade in one of my favorite units in the Ely parade and the clowns and the Shriners and everything else in the five parades that I did. I was so surprised, as I know my colleagues were, at the number of people who came up—especially parents of kids with disabilities—in front of a whole crowd on the side of the road and said: This is my child. He needs Medicaid. He needs help. We need you to stand with us.

So it is about people like that mom with that child with Down syndrome who needs Medicaid. It is about the senior who knows they are going to need nursing home help. Thirty-two percent of our seniors use Medicaid funding for their nursing home help. A woman told me about her mom, who died 2 years ago at 95 after suffering from dementia for more than 20 years. She had worked her whole life, but she couldn't afford that nursing home and needed that help. It is about our seniors, who don't want to see the age tax. It is about our rural hospitals that know how important it is to have healthcare not an hour away but 15 minutes away. That is what we are talking about.

So we would welcome any efforts to work on these commonsense bills we have out there, many of which have had Republican support in the past.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues who are here this afternoon for their eloquence, their remarks, their passion for making sure the people in this country can get healthcare when they need it, and for their hard work and legislation to try and make that happen.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1462

Mr. President, in the interest of trying to immediately help to stabilize the insurance markets, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 1462; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire would allow me to pose a question about her request?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Absolutely.

Mr. CORNYN. Is it true that under the so-called Marketplace Certainty Act, this would appropriate billions of additional dollars to insurance companies?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. What is true about the Marketplace Certainty Act is that it would guarantee the payments that were promised under the Affordable Care Act—not to insurance companies but to families who need help affording health insurance. That is one of the goals as we think about what our challenge is to address the healthcare needs of the people of this country, and that, in fact, is what the Marketplace Certainty Act would do.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I appreciate the response from the Senator from New Hampshire. I think I want to explore that a little more. I don't think the cost-sharing subsidies go directly to beneficiaries but, rather, to insurance companies.

Nevertheless, this is exactly the kind of proposal that the Senate can vote on next week when we proceed to the healthcare bill. As we know, unlike traditional legislation, there is an open and unlimited amendment process, and

Members on both sides will have a chance to offer amendments and have the Senate vote on them. So I would encourage all of our colleagues who have ideas about how to shape the healthcare policy to vote to get on the bill and then to offer amendments.

It has been 7 years since ObamaCare was passed. It is in meltdown mode. We are glad to have our colleagues across the aisle offer suggestions on how to improve the current terrible situation for so many millions of people, but I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I want to be clear that what we need to do is to provide certainty in the marketplace right now. What is happening because of the effort by our Republican colleagues to repeal the Affordable Care Act—which is providing coverage for literally tens of millions of people—what is happening because of this administration's refusal to guarantee those payments that would help people with the cost of their health insurance is that we are seeing instability in the marketplace. But the answer is not the proposal that was released this morning, the second or maybe it is the third draft of healthcare legislation that was done behind closed doors by our colleagues.

Earlier today, I had the opportunity to meet with two children from New Hampshire: Parker, who is 8, and Sadie, who is 10. These kids were here advocating for the children's hospitals that have meant that they can continue to live. They are kids who were born with serious health challenges. They continue to have those serious health challenges, but thanks to Children's Hospital at Dartmouth and Boston Children's Hospital, Parker and Sadie are alive today. They are smart, they are beautiful, and they are the delight of their families. They have been able to get the healthcare they need through CHaD and through Boston Children's because they are able to get covered for their healthcare under Medicaid. What our colleagues' healthcare legislation would do is dramatically cut the Medicaid funding that Parker and Sadie and so many children and old people and disabled in this country depend on in order to stay alive.

That is a mean-spirited bill. That is not the answer to the serious healthcare challenges we have in this country, and that is not what we should be doing to fix what needs to be fixed in the Affordable Care Act. What we need to do is work together.

I am disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to work behind closed doors instead of having an open process. If this legislation that was introduced this morning is such a great piece of legislation, then let's go through regular order. Let's have a hearing. Let's let the people of this country weigh in and then see whether this is a healthcare bill we should pass.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the comments from the former Governor and now Senator from the great State of New Hampshire.

It is not enough to say the system is failing. It is not enough to come here and say: We can fix it if you just agree to vote the way we are voting. If you just agree, you can present any amendments you want. You can do whatever you want.

We don't even have a CBO score on this legislation. We don't know what is in this legislation. There have been no hearings so that people on both sides of the aisle can ask questions and say: What does this mean for a family on traditional Medicaid who has to rely on this to keep custody of their kids? And by the way, what does it mean if, as a result of losing their Medicaid coverage, those children are no longer able to stay at home and they become foster children because it is the only way they can get healthcare? What does it mean for those families about whom we all think we ought to have a real discussion, young people, young families who have excellent health, how they might have been disadvantaged on the exchange? What do we need to do for them? Maybe they were doing better economically than a lot of folks until they hit the cliff.

That is why I want to see my bill debated, because it can, in fact, offer opportunity. Every time we talk about this, what we hear about is how much it would cost. Well, the bottom line is that if all you do is shift the burden of these costs without any discussions with Governors, with private payers, with corporate America that is self-insured—if all we are doing is shifting costs and saying ''It is now your problem,'' we are not doing our job.

If you look at the Rand Corporation study, 12 percent of the population of this country has five or more chronic diseases. As a result of those unmanaged—typically unmanaged chronic diseases, what you will see is they incur 40 percent of the cost. Is that a problem? The answer is yes, that is a problem. We need to figure out how we can better manage chronic disease.

A great friend of mine, a guy named Richie Carmona, who once was the Surgeon General of this country, used to say—and I think it is true—70 percent of all healthcare costs are related to chronic disease, most of which is preventible. Where in any of these bills are we talking about prevention? Where are we talking about wellness? Where are we talking about bending the healthcare curve? We are only dumping and running with these bills. We are not doing our job, and as a result, we are frightening people in this country. We are frightening the elderly. We are frightening people who say: Right now, I can afford my health insurance; I am on an exchange. But when we change the ratio from 1-to-3 to 1-to-5 and reduce the amount of subsidies, then 30, 40, 50 percent of their disposable income will be used to pay for health insurance. That is the thing you are not hearing here.

So we have to come together. We have to come together with the fundamental questions of what is wrong with not just the Affordable Care Act but what is wrong with healthcare and how we fix it and how we change outcomes. We can't do that if we don't work together. This is a body that is divided 48 to 52. How do you come together if you don't come to the middle, if you don't come to the middle to compromise? You don't.

At the end of the day, we have not met our deepest obligation, which is to speak for those who are the least fortunate among us. We have not met our obligation to govern this country in a way that would make our Founding Fathers proud, to make our citizens proud, and that can advance this idea that the U.S. Congress can get something done in the United States of America—instead of partisan rancor.

We hold out the hope that we will at one point be able to debate these ideas that we presented. We hold out the hope that we will, in fact, meet somewhere to arrive at a better plan for the delivery of healthcare in this country.

I just want to close with one thought. There is not one organized healthcare group or advocacy group in my State that supports the Republican healthcare plan, so as we are looking at judgment on that plan, don't take my word for it. Take the medical associations' word for it, take the hospital associations' word for it, take AARP's word for it, take the consortium of large hospitals in my State, which urged a ''no'' vote on this legislation, take the disabled children's advocacy groups' word for it. This is not a path forward, but we are big enough people and good enough leaders that we can forge a path forward if we just find the will to do it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEX TRAFFICKING

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an issue that Members on both sides of this aisle have a deep concern about, and that is human sex trafficking and, specifically, the work we have done to try to stop one website called backpage.com from selling people online.

This morning, I—along with my colleagues TOM CARPER and CLAIRE MCCASKILL—announced that we have asked the Department of Justice to investigate backpage.com for criminal

violations of the law. This is a criminal referral, and it is a new development in this case. We believe there is sufficient evidence to warrant this criminal review by the Justice Department, based on the work that we have done in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

With estimated revenues of more than $150 million a year, backpage.com is a market leader in commercial sex trafficking and has been linked to hundreds of reported cases of sex trafficking, including trafficking vulnerable women and children. Backpage has claimed that it ''leads the industry'' in its screening of advertisements for illegal activity, including sex ads for children. That is simply not true. In fact, we now know that this website has long facilitated sex trafficking on its site so that it can increase its profits—profits that come at the expense of those being trafficked, including children.

When victims or State authorities try to bring actions against this company, backpage has evaded responsibility by saying that it doesn't write the ads for sex; it just publishes. Frankly, as a rule, courts have sided with the company, citing the immunity granted by a Federal law that is called the Communications Decency Act. The law, in essence, says that if a company like backpage publishes an ad someone else gives them, they are not liable, even though, again in this case, we know that this website has long facilitated sex trafficking and they know what they are doing.

We also now know that backpage has actively edited words and images, which makes them cocreators of these ads. We also know from a new report in the Washington Post just this week that, despite claims, backpage has aggressively solicited and created sex-related ads designed to lure customers. It further demonstrates that backpage is not merely a passive publisher of third-party content. They are involved. The article found that backpage workers were active cocreators of many of these sex advertisements, including those that seek to traffic women and young, underage girls.

I believe the legal consequences should be that they should lose their immunity under the Communications Decency Act, and that is why we have asked the Justice Department today to review this matter.

Let me be clear about the Communications Decency Act. It has an important purpose. It is a well-intentioned law. It was enacted back in 1996 to protect online publishers, and I support the broader legislation, the Communications Decency Act. But the law was not intended to protect those who knowingly violate the law and facilitate illegal conduct, and it was never intended to protect those who knowingly facilitate the sex trafficking of vulnerable women and girls.

We are actively exploring legislation to fix this issue once and for all. I have been working with a bipartisan group of Senators on potential legislation, and I am hopeful that will soon be introduced in the U.S. Senate. We must protect women and underage girls and hold accountable websites that knowingly facilitate these types of criminal exploitations.

A couple of weeks ago, I was at a place in Ohio called the Ranch of Opportunity in Washington Court House. The Ranch of Opportunity opened its doors in the latter part of 2013. It is on a 22-acre site, a tranquil setting, a peaceful, spacious, and healthy environment for girls between 13 and 18 to help find healing and recovery during a residential program.

The ranch is a place of hope. As it says in its name, it is a ranch of opportunity, and a lot of the girls who spend time at the ranch have been victims of human trafficking and child abuse. In fact, I am told that the majority—roughly 60 to 80 percent—of the young girls who come through this program have been trafficked.

As I have talked to some of the girls and the staff there, of course, backpage.com comes up again and again, as it always does when I talk to survivors and victims of human trafficking. These types of crimes—sexual abuse and trafficking—are horrific, but they are happening. They are happening all over the country, and they are happening more and more. So in your community, wherever you live, sadly I will tell you that this is a problem. Part of it is because of these online traffickers. In other words, as many of the survivors of human trafficking have told me: ROB, this has moved from the street corner to the smartphone, and the smartphone is where backpage.com dominates.

In touring the State, I have heard over and over again about this specific link between drugs and human trafficking. I have talked to trafficking survivors who have told me that their trafficker first got them hooked on heroin and other drugs. I saw this firsthand in May, when I toured the Salvation Army of Greater Cleveland Harbor Light Complex. They have been operating in Cleveland for 65 years, providing incredibly important services to some of the most vulnerable members of society, including women who have been trafficked. It is important to know that link is there.

Both of those issues are so important to address—trafficking and what is happening in terms of the increasing heroin and prescription drug and fentanyl crisis in this country, which is now at epidemic levels. That is why the STOP Act is so important—the Synthetic Trafficking and Overdose Prevention Act, which we are trying to get passed here, as well as the Prescription Drug Monitoring Act, which is so important. There is a connection.

Human trafficking requires urgent action, and so does the opioid epidemic. On human trafficking, including sex trafficking, we are now told it is a $150 billion a year industry. Think about that. It is the second biggest criminal enterprise in the world behind the drug trade. Unfortunately, again, it is happening in all of our States.

Just last month, a 26-year-old man was indicted on human trafficking charges. He used backpage.com to advertise the availability of two girls, ages 15 and 17. He advertised them for sex and trafficked them out to several hotels in the area. Thankfully, in this case, members of the Central Ohio Human Trafficking Task Force rescued both of the victims, one in Columbus and one in Toledo.

Cases like this are alarming, but they are happening all over the place. At the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, experts on this issue report an 846-percent increase in reports of suspected child sex trafficking from 2010 to 2015. That is an increase of more than 800 percent in 5 years. The organization found this spike to be ''directly correlated to the increased use of the internet to sell children for sex.'' Again, it is the dark side of the internet, and trafficking has now moved from the street corner to the cell phone.

To confront this problem, as chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, along with my colleague and ranking member, Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL, now Senator TOM CARPER, I opened a bipartisan investigation into sex traffickers and their use of the internet. The investigation began over 2 years ago. The National Center for Missing & Exploited Children now says that nearly three-fourths—73 percent—of all suspected child sex trafficking reports it receives from the general public are linked to one website, backpage.com.

According to leading anti-trafficking organizations, including Shared Hope International, service providers working with child sex trafficking victims have reported that between 80 percent and 100 percent of their clients have been bought and sold on backpage.com. Backpage now operates in 97 countries—934 cities worldwide—and is valued at well over one-half billion dollars. According to an industry analysis, in 2013, $8 of every $10 spent on online commercial sex trafficking advertising in the United States goes to this one website, backpage.com.

As I said earlier, they say that they lead the industry in screening; in fact, their top lawyer described their screening process as a key tool for disrupting and eventually ending human trafficking. That is not true. Despite these boasts, the website and its owners have consistently refused to cooperate with our investigations on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. With regard to our inquiries, despite subpoenas for company documents on how they screen advertisements, they have also refused to provide us documents after a subpoena. As a result, this body, the U.S. Senate, last year, for the first time in more than 20 years, voted to

pass a civil contempt citation—in other words, holding backpage.com in contempt and requiring them to supply these documents and come forward with this information or else face a lawsuit and potential criminal violations. Finally, last August, after going through the district court, the Circuit Court, all the way to the Supreme Court, we were able to get their request to appeal it rejected, and we were able to get the documents.

Over 1 million documents were eventually turned over, including emails and internal documents. We went through them all, and what we found was very troubling, to say the least. After reviewing the documents, the subcommittee published a staff report in January that conclusively showed that backpage is more deeply complicit in online, underage sex trafficking than anyone ever imagined. The report shows that backpage has knowingly covered up evidence by systematically deleting words and images suggestive of the illegal conduct, including child sex trafficking. The editing process sanitized the content of millions of advertisements in order to hide important evidence from law enforcement. I encourage people to take a look at this report. They can look at it on our website and other websites here from myself or Senator MCCASKILL.

Backpage CEO Carl Ferrer personally directed his employees to create an electronic filter to delete hundreds of words indicative of sex trafficking or prostitution from ads before they were published. In other words, they knew these ads were about selling girls, selling women online; yet they published them.

Again, this filter they used did not reject ads because of the obvious illegal activity. They edited the ads only to try to cover up the illegal activity. It didn't change what was advertised; it changed the way it was advertised. Backpage did nothing to stop this criminal activity. They facilitated it, knowingly.

What did they do? Well, afraid to erode their profits—they were afraid because, as Mr. Ferrer said, in his words, it would ''piss off a lot'' of customers. They began deleting words. Beginning in 2010, backpage automatically deleted words including ''lolita,'' referencing a 12-year-old girl in a book sold for sex, ''teenage,'' ''rape,'' ''young,'' ''little girl,'' ''teen,'' ''fresh,'' ''innocent,'' ''school girl,'' even ''amber alert''—and then they published the edited versions of those ads on their website. They also systematically deleted dozens of words related to prostitution. This filter made these deletions before anyone at backpage even looked at the ad.

When law enforcement officials asked for more information about the suspicious ads, backpage had destroyed the original ad posted by the trafficker, so the evidence was gone. This notion that they were trying to help law enforcement flies in the face of the fact that they actually destroyed the evidence that would have helped law enforcement.

We will never know for sure how many girls and women were victimized as a result of this activity. By backpage's own estimate, the company was editing 70 to 80 percent of the ads in their adult section by late 2010. Based on our best estimate, this means that backpage was editing more than one-half million ads a year—more than one-half million ads a year.

At a hearing on the report, the backpage CEO and other company officials pled the Fifth Amendment, invoking their right against self-incrimination rather than responding to questions we had about the report and its findings.

We also heard powerful testimony from parents whose children had been trafficked on backpage. One mother talked about seeing her missing daughter's photograph on backpage. She frantically called the company to tell them that it was her daughter—they finally found her—and to please take down the ad. Their response: Did you post the ad?

Her response: Of course I didn't post the ad. That's my daughter. Please take down the ad.

Their response: We can take it down only if you pay for the ad.

Talk about heartless.

Based on our report, it is clear that backpage actively facilitated sex trafficking taking place on its website in order to increase profits at the expense of vulnerable women and children. Then, after the fact, they covered up the evidence of these crimes.

What is happening to these kids is terrible. It is not just tragic. To me, it is evil.

No one is interested in shutting down legitimate commercial activity and speech. As I said earlier, the Communication Decency Act plays an important role, but we want to stop this criminal activity.

I see some of my colleagues are here to speak. I appreciate their allowing me to finish, but I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in reforming these laws to be able to protect these innocent victims, these children.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, before the chair of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations leaves, I also would like to put into the RECORD that, recently, in a raid that was performed in the Philippines, some very interesting documentation was seized about backpage, according to news reports, and the FBI was immediately called.

I think there is an opportunity to use that information to advance the investigation and to continue to expose the participation of backpage, not just as a billboard or as a want ad but as a knowing participant in the trafficking of children—not just in our country but globally.

I thank the chairman.

FUTURE ACT

Mr. President, today I am joined by my colleagues from West Virginia and Rhode Island. We are kind of a motley group. We are talking about something that has brought us together with a level of excitement and bipartisanship. I would like to say that it is not just bipartisanship but really coming across the ideological barriers we frequently experience here to try and talk about an issue that is near and dear to our hearts, which is maintaining an opportunity for our coal miners and our coal industry to continue to do what they have done for generations—and that is to produce electricity that fuels this economy in the United States of America—but also recognizing that regulatory certainty is one of the key values we need to establish. In order to provide that certainty, we need to address concerns of other Members of our caucus who have in no small measure a lot of concern about what is happening with CO_2 emissions and what those emissions are doing environmentally.

I want to just kind of introduce this concept. Back in 2008, we passed something called 45Q, which was a provision that would allow for tax credits similar to what we have for wind and solar. Wind credits are production tax credits, and solar credits are investment tax credits. To provide for tax credits, $10 and $20—$10 if you are injecting into a formation or you are enhancing oil recovery, $20 if you are injecting into a geographic formation to store the carbons as CO_2—those credits have proved to be, albeit used, but somewhat anemic to jump-start the technology, to jump-start the opportunity to see wholesale carbon sequestration.

We also know that since 2008, we have seen new technologies coming. I know my colleague from Rhode Island will talk about carbon utilization. We are expanding beyond just carbon sequestration—carbon capture and sequestration—to carbon utilization. It is a hugely important part of this puzzle. We believe that if we provide these tax incentives to our industries, if we provide these tax incentives to our innovators, it will drive technology that will have the benefit of guaranteeing that we will see a diverse fuel source in America that includes coal and includes natural gas. We always want to point that out, wherever we represent coal States. I know West Virginia is in proximity to huge natural gas fields. We know that we may be faced with a carbon challenge in natural gas, and the ability to capture CO_2 behind natural gas-fired power may be an essential ingredient for regulatory certainty into the future.

We are excited about this bill. We have 25 cosponsors who will advance and continue to talk about it and continue to grow colleague support. We hope this show of bipartisanship, this ability to work across the aisle, this

ability to come together—maybe not with the same motivations but certainly with the same goal—will prove that on one of the most contentious issues here, which is climate and coal, we can come together and actually get something done that we can all agree on.

With that, I yield the floor, and I defer to my colleague from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota. She has been a champion of building this bipartisan coalition. When we announced this yesterday, we had a very large board that showed quite a broad array of groups from around the country that are very much in support of this concept. So, I thank Senator HEITKAMP for her great leadership.

It is terrific to be on the floor with Senator WHITEHOUSE. We both serve on the EPW Committee together, and many times we are totally opposite. Sometimes we feel as if we are on opposite planets, I think, but definitely on different sides of this issue. It is great to be on the same side of an issue such as this, which really helps fortify not just our country but our regions and our beliefs as well.

As Senator HEITKAMP said, we have 25 cosponsors. Some of them are utilities, environmental groups, oil and gas companies, Governors, labor unions, so it is a great array of the country interested in carbon capture utilization and storage. We have done a lot of research in this area, but we haven't been able to scale it up to a point where it is economically viable, and that is where I think the tax credits will be not just welcomed and used, but it will be very important to see that scalability—which we have seen coming in small bits and pieces—maybe come in much greater amounts.

We obviously have a very robust coal industry in the State of West Virginia. We have lost thousands of jobs. Senator WHITEHOUSE and I have talked about his stay in West Virginia. He has great empathy for the coal miner and for those families that have lost jobs, but he is very concerned, as I think we all are, about what it is doing to our environment and how can we improve this.

That is what this legislation, I think, will help do. It will spur domestic investment in the technologies. It will also help us, I think, bring energy security because it goes to the baseload fuels, whether it is coal or natural gas, that we have to have.

I mean, in Washington, DC, today, it is hot out there, and I can guarantee you there are a lot of air-conditioners that are running at maximum speed. If we do not have this baseload power, which is coal and natural gas in areas—and I see my fellow Senator from West Virginia. We know, in coal country, how important that is and also what smiles on people's faces these air-conditioners can bring, as these hot days go, because we are running at full capacity.

We want to make sure that by capturing the carbon stream, we prevent any waste emissions and we provide a possible valuable resource for industry. I remarked yesterday for industry to extract oil, which is very important, obviously, to the Senator from North Dakota and also in our Marcellus shale region.

I believe that with this research and with the spurring of this technology, CO_2 is going to have another use out there. There are all kinds of utilization possibilities, but if we just turn our backs on it or try to shut it down and make it unviable financially to invest in these technologies, we are never going to find that next best use of CO_2.

So we tweaked the bill a little bit. The Senators have had this bill out for at least a couple of years. There is a companion bill in the House with a lot of cosponsors as well. I think it has, with 25 cosponsors on the Senate floor, bipartisan but very different philosophical beliefs, maybe. Maybe that is not the best way to put it. There are very different regional approaches to this, I guess would be a better way to state that.

We have our universities, such as West Virginia University and Marshall University, that are working on this. We have the National Energy Technology Lab in Morgantown, where Secretary Perry joined both Senator MANCHIN and me to talk about the technologies that are in front of us and the challenge for researchers.

I feel like financing and the economic model is where we are trying to go, in order to spur investment, to provide the regulatory certainty but also the investment certainty in that this is a keeper; that this is something that is here to stay, that it is doable, that it is economically feasible, that it is scalable, and it provides us with a lot of energy security at the same time. I think its greatest benefit of all is to keep our air clean and get it cleaner and meet the challenges of the next several decades.

With that, I turn it over to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to be here with Senator HEITKAMP. We knew each other as attorneys general so I have admired the Senator from North Dakota for a long time. From my time in West Virginia, I remember Senator CAPITO's father who is a very formidable and renowned political personality in West Virginia. To be here with the two of them is a personal pleasure. Senator MANCHIN is also joining us, so I am very happy to be here.

I thank Senator HEITKAMP, Senator CAPITO, Chairman BARRASSO, and my friend Senator GRAHAM for leading this bipartisan effort, and I thank Senator MANCHIN for joining us on the floor.

We have more than 20 other cosponsors so this is a bill that has broad bipartisan support and has a great coalition behind it. It has everything from my great friends at the Natural Resources Defense Council, many of our friends in the AFL–CIO, to nonprofits like the Clean Air Task Force, to moderating groups like Third Way and the Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, which are trying to pick their way through the divide, industry groups like Wyoming's Cloud Peak Energy coal company and West Virginia's Peabody, a coal company, and the ethanol industry. So we have really good, broad support. It is an unusual coalition, and I am excited by it.

There are ways to remove carbon dioxide from the air and from emissions, and we are seeing a lot of it. I went with LINDSEY GRAHAM up to Saskatchewan to see the Boundary Dam facility, where they basically put the output of the coal-burning powerplant through a cloud of amino droplets that strip out the carbon dioxide and pump it to a nearby oilfield where they can use the carbon dioxide to pressurize the oilfield and facilitate the extraction of oil. That is made possible because they have an oilfield nearby that will pay for that carbon dioxide to use in order to extract the oil. If I remember correctly, they were getting close to $30 per ton. That is a pretty real revenue stream, but a lot of our American coal facilities do not have the luxury of being next to an oilfield that will pay for the carbon so you have to look elsewhere for revenues to make it worth your while. What we have in America is a market failure in which there is nobody who will pay you for removing carbon pollution. The way our market is structured it just does not work.

The simplest approach, of course, would be to put a proper price on carbon and let the whole economy go to work in solving the problem of carbon pollution. Short of that, this bill takes an important step by putting a value on reducing carbon emissions by paying facilities with a tax credit for every ton of carbon emissions they can keep out of the atmosphere. If we can get this passed and if we can get this into the Tax Code so it is lasting, then investors can look at it and say: Hey, we can finally put some money behind these technologies, and we can get them going, not just in the power sector.

This reaches into industrial carbon capture, into technologies like carbon utilization, and into really exciting new technologies like direct air capture. Now, most of these are happening elsewhere. To look for the models, you have to go to Saskatchewan, like I did and like Senator HEITKAMP has done, or you have to go to Iceland, where they are pumping carbon dioxide down into geological structures where it reacts and becomes stone, or you have to go to Switzerland, where they are taking direct air carbon capture technologies, because, there, their market

is not broken so there actually is a return on this.

We are seeing good work at our National Labs, I will say, which is funded by Congress and people like Dr. Julio Friedmann, whom Senator HEITKAMP and I know and work with. We are doing exciting stuff. Yet to take it to a marketable level, there has to be a business strategy. You have to be able to make a business case to investors if you are going to put money behind building what could be a multi-hundred-million-dollar carbon capture plant. This will begin to do that, and it makes me very excited.

In particular, I thank my cosponsors for making sure we are not talking about CCS any longer and that we are talking about CCUS. It is not carbon capture and storage. It is carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration.

I have also been to Shenandoah, IA. Shenandoah, IA, has a big ethanol plant, and there is a company, called bioprocessH2O, that is in the exhaust stream of that ethanol plant. They pipe out their waste heat, their waste energy, their waste CO_2, their wastewater all into a plant that grows algae, and the algae eats up the CO_2. They take about 15 percent of it out of the stream, and it turns it into a product. They use it for feed, for cattle, for fish. They use it for makeup and other products. They use it for a whole variety of purposes. It is a new form of agriculture that is going to be very valuable, and the fact that you can make it efficient to strip carbon dioxide out of a plant's exhaust is a great thing.

This is a good way we can work together. It may be the first time I can think of that Senator MCCONNELL and I have ever been on a bill together. He is not on it now in this particular iteration because neither he nor the Speaker want to get onto a bill that is a tax bill while they are looking at tax reform. Yet, clearly, we know where their hearts are from the fact that they were on it the last time. So there is a lot of welcomed political news around this, and I think it has the chance of really revving up American industry so it is not the Canadians and the Icelanders and the Swiss who are cleaning our clocks because we have not bothered to get our economic structure in order to make this a profitable undertaking. It is a great first step, and I am proud to be a part of it.

I yield to my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, JOE MANCHIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Rhode Island. I have been to his State, and we have gone to the algae farms. It has a lot of potential. I agree with the Senator 100 percent.

I applaud Senator HEITKAMP and Senator CAPITO for leading the effort to update and improve this tax credit for carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration. We have the support of 25 Democrats and Republicans—totally bipartisan—and when you have Senator WHITEHOUSE and Senator BARRASSO on a bill, you know you have a real bill. It can happen. So that is very encouraging.

Senator CAPITO and I come from West Virginia, and Senator HEITKAMP comes from the energy-producing State of North Dakota. Coal was one of the most abundant energy sources in the world. It is lying on most continents, and most countries have it, and they are going to use it. It is a very efficient way of producing energy because it is plentiful.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANCHIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Does the Senator know that, in Cumberland, RI, there used to be coal mining? In fact, there are still coal mines underground in New Cumberland, WV. Every once in a while, one collapses, so we have been there.

Mr. MANCHIN. I am so encouraged that you remember the history of your great State in not forgetting those coal mines.

We have to face the facts and the realization that there are 8 billion tons of coal being burned in the world on an annual basis. We burn less than 1 billion in the United States of America, and we are the country that has done more to clean up the environment than any other country. They all talk about doing different things, but we have taken the SOx and the NO_X and the mercury out and the particulates. We have done more in the last two decades than has ever been done, and there is more that can be done.

I have to be very honest with you. The last 8 years was very challenging and difficult for us. No one wanted to make the effort. They talked a good game, but no one would put the investment into the technology that was needed. Now we have this bill—it is bipartisan that everybody is working hard on—that has a chance to really put us in the forefront of how we utilize this carbon capture and sequestration.

West Virginia has one of the first powerplants, the Mountaineer Power Plant, that shows it can be done commercially. We did a commercial test there. We know it can be done. We know it is expensive. At the time, President Obama said to go ahead and build a coal plant, and we will break you. He knew it was not financially feasible, and that is where that statement came from.

First of all, coal was a baseload fuel. There are only two baseload fuels in the world today. Baseload is 24/7 uninterrupted power. That is coal and nuclear. Gas has now replaced coal in the United States of America in its being more plentiful for the production of energy, which we depend on, but it still can be interruptible because the gas pipelines could be sabotaged. They could break, and weather conditions could change that.

So you have to make sure everything is working for the people of the United States of America who have always been used to and been dependent upon turning the switch on or their heat and their power or opening their fridge, and everything is working. It comes because you have baseload that is dependable, reliable, and affordable. You are going to have that.

I think, maybe in my grandchildren's lifetimes, they are going to see, maybe, commercial hydrogen, which will be water vapor. I think that is coming. It is just not here yet. So we are going to use what we have and what we need and make sure we do it in the cleanest fashion. The United States should be and will be the leader of this. This is what helps us do it, and it gives us incentive to move forward on it.

When we were doing scrubbers back in the eighties, the Clean Air Act, I will never forget, at the time, to do scrubbers that take sulfur out, you have to inject, basically, limestone. This crushed limestone, basically, clings to the sulfur, and the sulfur drops out in the form of the ash. What are you going to do with all of this byproduct of this ash? Can it be detrimental? Is it hazardous? Guess what. A lot of the drywall you are using today is made out of the ash that came out of the new scrubbers from which we did not know we were going to have a byproduct.

So there is value. I still believe in my heart, with this piece of legislation, that we are going to find a valuable use of this waste. Can it be solidified? We know we can take clear stream CO_2 off. Can we solidify this CO_2? It would not just be sequestering it. We are doing it in liquid form now and pressuring it into the ground. If you have oil or some other energy that is valuable to return back, then you can offset the cost, but in a lot of parts of the country, we do not have that oil so we are not able to have a value returned. It is pure cost, and the cost is about one-third of the production. A perfect example: If you have a 900-megawatt powerplant and you have carbon capture sequestration, but you have no value in return, you lose 300 megawatts by pushing it into the ground. It makes it nonfeasible financially, and that is when the statement came, ''You build it, and we will break it.'' That is how they break it. You cannot do it. So if we don't have to sequester it and pressure it in the ground when we solidify this clear stream carbon from liquids to solids, can we use the spent fuel of a solid carbon, CO_2?

This is what we should be working on. These are the things we should be doing. We missed 8 years. We had a hiatus for 8 years. Let's catch up. This piece of legislation puts us on the path to make something happen, to truly make us unique in the world of what we do and how we do it. The rest of the world counts on us. All the other countries are talking about all the things they are doing in climate; trust me,

they are not. They are talking about it; they are not doing it. Even our NATO allies aren't using what we have already developed and perfected. They are not using scrubbers, and they are not using baghouses for mercury.

It is not CO_2 killing people in Beijing; it is basically particulates. It is particulates that we have taken out of the air. We can do this, but we need to work together. We can't be fighting each other. There is not a West Virginian I know who wants to breathe dirty air or drink dirty water—or an American—and they are not going to. We have improved and will continue to improve. But we can't be pitting one environmental group against another manufacturing or production group, and that is what we have done. We are just tearing each other apart because we are picking sides: Are you for the environment or are you for the economy? I am for both. I am for the environment, and I am for the economy, and I think there is a balance between the two.

If we do the technology and the manufacturers or the producers of electricity refuse to use the technology that is proven, then they should be shut down. They get a certain period of time to retrofit. If they will not do it, then shut them down.

We haven't gotten there yet on this, and that is why this piece of legislation is so important. All of the working groups and environmental groups—everybody should be behind this. We have an array of Senators who have come together, unlike most bills. We don't often have this happen. I am proud of what the Presiding Officer has done. I am proud of my good friend from North Dakota. I am proud of my friend from Rhode Island. I am proud of my friend from Wyoming. I am proud of everyone coming together and saying: If we are going to use it, let's do it better.

With that I say thank you—thank you to all of us for working together on this and for continuing to move the United States of America forward. West Virginia will do its part, I can assure my colleagues of that.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Madam President, one thing I want to talk about, as we are talking about carbon utilization—and Joe did a great job of talking about new technologies. Frequently when I talk about this topic people say: There is no such thing as clean coal. Coal cannot be a clean energy source. And I say: That is not true. I tell them about my personal experience with the largest carbon sequestration storage program in the country, up until some of the new developments, and that was Dakota Gas. I served on the board of directors of Dakota Gas, and, ironically, the carbon capture and transmission into an oil field was not done to respond to concerns globally about carbon; it was done to produce a salable and lucrative byproduct—CO_2—which can be used in the oil fields.

The one point I want to make is that a lot of the new development in exploration and in production of oil is done in tight formations, shale formations. This is not a technology, CO_2 flooding isn't a technology that has been widely used in tight formations because we haven't figured out how to do it.

I want to acknowledge one of those great American corporations, Occidental Petroleum, for doing something they call huff and puff, where they inject the CO_2. They basically let that sit in the well and then eventually recharge the well. They are seeing excellent results in using this as an enhanced oil recovery method.

We are very excited about the bipartisan group. We are very excited that we can take one of the most contentious issues—one of the most contentious issues here on the floor—an issue for which, time after time, no one could find a path forward, and we have met with great success in getting good people to come together.

Finally, I want to say that it has been a joy to work with the junior Senator from West Virginia. I spend a lot of time with the senior Senator from West Virginia. The junior Senator from West Virginia, from my experience, is always looking for solutions to problems—not adding to the rancor, but looking for solutions to real problems. We have had a great partnership, and I look forward to our continued partnership in promoting and moving this issue forward.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I wanted to say a few words about the new Republican healthcare plan that was just announced a few hours ago. While there are some modest changes in it, the truth of the matter is that this plan remains a disaster. It remains an embarrassment. I think the indication that it is an embarrassment is that with legislation that would impact about one-sixth of the American economy of over $3 trillion a year—legislation that, because it is healthcare, impacts virtually everybody—there has not been one public hearing on this legislation. It has all been done behind closed doors. Honestly, no matter what one's view may be on where we as a Nation should go with healthcare, whether you like this bill or you don't like this bill, I just don't know how someone can seriously say that we don't have to hear from physicians about the impact of this legislation on their ability to treat their patients. I just don't know how you do that—or that we don't have to hear from hospitals.

I come from a rural State. What will the impact of this legislation and the massive $800 billion cuts on Medicaid do to rural hospitals all over the United States? There is some belief that many rural hospitals in areas where they are desperately needed will be forced to shut down. Is that the truth? That is what I hear, but I can't tell you definitively because there hasn't been a hearing on that issue. So I don't know how we go forward with legislation without having administrators from rural hospitals coming before the committee—I am on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—or the Finance Committee to answer that question.

The Presiding Officer comes from a State and I come from a State where we have a major opioid crisis. It is devastating the entire country. What will this bill do to our ability to prevent and treat the opioid crisis, which is decimating this country from one end of America to the other? What happens if you cut $800 billion in Medicaid? How will people get the treatment they need today—which is inadequate? In my State, it is inadequate. I don't think there is a State in the country that today is providing the necessary treatment or prevention capabilities to deal with this opioid and heroin crisis, which is ravaging America. What impact will an $800 billion cut have on that? I understand there is some additional money going into opioid treatment, but how do you do that without the framework of allowing people the access to get healthcare? If you get thrown off of healthcare, what will the additional opioid money mean? I think not a whole lot.

In this bill, there are still hundreds of billions of dollars—several hundred billion dollars—in tax breaks to large health insurance companies, to drug companies, to medical device companies, and to tanning salons. As a nation, are we really interested in giving significant tax breaks to large insurance companies and then throwing children who have disabilities off of the Medicaid they currently receive? Is that what the American people want? I don't think they do.

I have to tell my colleagues that this Republican legislation, as the Presiding Officer knows, has been opposed by almost every major national healthcare organization in the country, including the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the AARP, which is the largest senior group in America, the American Psychiatric Association, the American pediatrics association. Virtually all of the major healthcare groups are saying that this legislation would be a disaster for the people they serve.

Just last night we had a teleconference townhall in Vermont and we had some 15,000, 16,000 people on the phone. The calls that were coming in were very painful calls. I almost didn't want to be honest in answering the calls. A woman calls up and she says: My son has a very serious medical illness, and we spend a fortune on prescription drugs. What is going to happen if this bill passes? What was I going to tell her, that perhaps her son would die? It is just not something I feel comfortable even talking about.

The truth is—and this is not BERNIE SANDERS talking, this is study after study after study that says that if you do as they did in the House, which is throw 23 million people off of health insurance, including people who are struggling with cancer, people who are struggling with heart disease, people who are struggling with diabetes, what does common sense tell us? If you are struggling with cancer and you lose your health insurance, what do you think is going to happen to you?

What study after study has shown is that thousands of people will die. It is not that any Republican here wants to see anyone die, but that is the consequence of what happens when you throw, as the House bill did, 23 million people off of health insurance. We should not be giving tax breaks to insurance companies and then throwing disabled children, or people with terrible illnesses who are fighting for their lives, off of health insurance.

The AARP is very strongly opposed to this legislation. The reason is pretty clear. What every person in America should understand, and I am not sure that many do, is that Medicaid now pays for over two-thirds of all nursing home care—two-thirds. What happens to the seniors and persons with disabilities who have their nursing home coverage paid for by Medicaid today? What is going to happen to those people?

What happens if your mom is in a nursing home? You don't have a lot of money, and your mom is in a nursing home paid for by Medicaid. What happens if Medicaid is slashed? What is going to happen to your mom? Is she going to be thrown out on the street or end up in the basement of your house? Are you going to have to make the choice about whether you take care of her or put away a few bucks to send your kid to college? If suddenly a daughter or a son is going to have to care for a mom or a dad thrown out of a nursing home, how do they go to work to earn the money their families need?

These are legitimate questions, and it would have been nice to have a hearing or two in order to answer those questions.

The bottom line is that we have legislation before us that is widely rejected by the American people. The last poll that I saw, which was done by USA Today, suggested that 12 percent of the American people supported this legislation—12 percent. Virtually every major healthcare organization in America opposes this legislation. There is nothing I have seen today—none of the tweaks that have been put into this make this legislation in any way, shape, or form acceptable.

It is no great secret that the Affordable Care Act is far from perfect. I don't think you hear anybody here say: Hey, the ACA is great; it doesn't need any changes. It does need changes. Deductibles are far too high in Vermont. Premiums are too high. Copayments are too high. And the cost of prescription drugs in Vermont and all over this country is off the charts.

I was in West Virginia, and I talked to a woman for a moment after I spoke, and she said that she is taking care of her older brother. Her brother has seizures. The medicine her brother was using went up by 900 percent over the last few years. Why? Because that is what the drug companies can get away with. Tomorrow it may be 1,000 percent. Does anybody in America think that makes sense? Is anybody happy in America? Are people in Missouri happy, are people in West Virginia and people in Vermont happy that we are paying by far the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs? I don't think so. There are ideas out there about how we can significantly lower the costs of prescription drugs in this country, how we can lower deductibles, how we can lower copayments.

Now, as I have said many, many times, I happen to believe that while it is important that we improve the Affordable Care Act, at the end of the day, this country must do what every other major country on Earth does, and that is to understand that healthcare is a right, not a privilege.

Right now, we have 28 million people who have zero health insurance. If this bill in the House were to go through, there would be another 23 million on top of the 28—over 50 million people—without any health insurance. Does that make any sense to anybody?

Our job is to join the rest of the industrialized world and make sure that every man, woman, and child has healthcare as a right, no matter what your income is. When you get sick, you go to the doctor. When you have to go to the hospital, you don't go bankrupt. That is what a civilized democracy is about. That is what they do in Canada. That is what they do in the UK, France, Germany, Scandinavia, and Holland. Every major country on Earth guarantees healthcare to all people. That is where I want to see our country go, and I will be introducing legislation to make sure that happens.

More and more people all over this country want to move us in that direction. But right now, our job is to make sure that millions of people do not lose their health insurance in order to give tax breaks to insurance companies. Our job is to make sure that disabled children continue to get the care they need and older folks aren't thrown out of nursing homes. That is what we have to do.

So I urge in the strongest possible way the defeat of this legislation. Then, let's go forward to improve the Affordable Care Act, not destroy it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, it has been nearly 7 months since President Trump took office. He was sworn in on the steps of the Capitol on January 20.

Our colleagues across the aisle have had, frankly, more than enough time to come to terms with the election results. Unfortunately, they seem to be channeling their disappointment through the confirmation process by engaging in an unprecedented level of obstruction.

We spent all this week when the Senate could do no other business on the executive calendar than to confirm three nominees—three nominees of about 500 that need to be appointed by the President. They are there only because the President would want them there. They come and go as Presidents come and go. Many of them have gone. The problem is that their replacements haven't been there.

If there is any doubt as to just how unprecedented this drawn-out confirmation process has been, let's look at how it stacks up against the previous administration. We are only a couple of weeks away from August, and Senate Democrats have only allowed us to confirm 52 of President Trump's 216 nominees. That is 24 percent. By the August recess of President Obama's first term, the Senate had confirmed 313 of his 454 nominations, or 69 percent.

So we start out with an incredibly slow start, where previous administrations—both the Bush administration and the Obama administration—by the end of the first week, or often by the end of the first day, had most of their Cabinet confirmed.

Getting a Cabinet confirmed is a process that took every minute of time that the Senate rules could possibly be stretched to allow.

Then, we look at nominations. The President, as I said, has nominated 216 people. Less than one out of four of them have been confirmed. In President Obama's term, even though he had more nominees by this time, he had a lot more confirmations. The Senate confirmed 69 percent of the Obama nominees.

There are currently more than 150 nominations waiting for confirmation, many of them are already out of committee. They are ready to come to the floor, but Senate Democrats have caused this backlog by using every procedural tactic to needlessly delay nominees. But, when they delay the nominees, they also delay our ability to get to the other work.

So there are two questions here. Are you going to let the President take over the government, which the Constitution and the Senate have been an active part of? Are you going to get the other work done? If you don't let the President take over the government, how do you effectively get the other work done? It is really a plan that works really well if what you want to do is slow down any changes of where the government was on January 20.

A Wall Street Journal editorial earlier this week said:

> Democratic obstruction against nominees is nearly total, most notably including a demand for cloture filings for every nominee—no matter how minor the position. This

means a two-day waiting period, and then another 30 hours of debate. The 30-hour rule means Mr. Trump might not be able to fill all of those 400 positions in four years.

In fact, at the rate we are going, it will take more than 11 years to fill all the jobs that the President is supposed to be able to fill. I guess that would put us in the third term of the Trump Presidency before he ever got every job filled the first time, which the President is expected to fill under the laws that have been there, most of them for a long time.

The Wall Street Journal editorial talks about these difficult terms, like cloture. What does that mean? That means that you have to get a vote to move forward with the nomination—normally, not done where nominations are concerned.

There is a rule that allows you to have vigorous debate on any nominee who really is a problem, but that rule has clearly been abused. Now the cloture vote only takes 51 votes. This is no odd Senate majority or anything like that. A majority of the Senators can vote to move forward with the nominee. But then, if you will not consent to waive any of the other rules, you have to wait 2 days before you can get to that. You can't do anything else during those 2 days. Then you have to have 30 hours of debate.

That has happened over and over. As a matter of fact, this happened 30 times. That sounded like about 5 days to me, certainly 3½ days. That whole process has happened 30 times, only to have many of these nominees get 90 or more votes, to have no debate on the floor about the nominee for whom you are supposed to be insisting on 30 hours of debate and to come to the floor and talk about whatever else you want to talk about. But if you go back and view the tape on whatever has happened during these confirmations, you will find very little discussion of the 30 times that 30 hours of debate was supposedly required before we could get to a final vote. Then, often, in the final vote, in a bipartisan effort to find nominees who are willing to serve, they get more than 90 votes. That just has never happened before.

By the first August recess in his administration, President Obama only had eight cloture votes. So what has happened here 30 times under President Trump happened 8 times under President Obama. Three percent of the nominees confirmed under President Obama had a cloture vote between swearing in and August, but 60 percent of the nominees from President Trump have had a cloture vote, but about the same amount of real debate. If we look back at what happened in 2009, the hours of actual debate on nominees were about the same, but the use of the maximum abuse of the rules is different.

Let me say this. The rules of the Senate were designed to protect the minority, and that is a good thing. This is a unique body in a democratic country, where the minority has been traditionally protected, and that protection lasts until the minority begins to abuse it. There will be a point here pretty quickly where I think Senators are going to have to wonder if this rule is any longer a rule that should be sustained.

We cannot continue to do what we are doing. We don't have 11 years and 4 months to confirm the Trump nominees. Nobody would want the President to have—well, maybe not anybody—an 11-year and 4-month term. But our friends on the other side are acting like that is how long he has to get just this rudimentary part of this job done that largely should have been done in the first 6 months.

Only 10 percent of the President's nominees' confirmations have been done by a voice vote. That is another alternative—just bring the nominee, nobody objects to waiving the rules, and you have a voice vote.

Ten percent of President Trump's confirmations have been done by voice vote while more than 90 percent of President Obama's confirmations were done by a voice vote. So we have the same percentages there, just totally turned around—10 percent for Trump and 90 percent for President Obama. The contrast is striking. It is not just simply math. It is, again, about the key positions of government that aren't filled.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I hear all the time that our country faces more threats from more directions than at any time in our history. But we have only been allowed by this strung-out process, insisted on by Senate Democrats, to confirm 6 of the President's 22 nominees for the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense has 22 nominees already made, and only 6 of them are over there doing the jobs, of which the President says: Here are the 22 people I would like to have, and there will be more names to follow.

The positions that haven't been confirmed are the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the next job in the Defense Department and the principal deputy under the Secretary of Defense; and the Assistant Secretary of Defense.

I don't know about everybody else. I was a little confused by how long these titles are. But if you look at what each of these people do, these are critical to the mission of defending the country and they haven't been filled. These are positions that need to be filled.

The President continues to work to improve the safety of our communities and enforce our Nation's laws. We have seen obstruction when it comes to the Justice Department and the 19 people who have been willing to serve—all of whom I think are out of committee or about to be out of committee.

If one of them is out of committee, that would be enough. But the President has nominated 19 people to fill these vacancies, and only 3 nominees have been confirmed. Two of the nominees who have been reported out of the committee received votes of 20 to 0 and 19 to 1. We would think that is somebody who could come to the floor with a likely voice vote.

My bet is that when they do get voted on, 98 Senators will vote for them. But if we continue to do what we are doing now, only 2 days after a cloture vote, 2 days after the vote, and then almost a day and a half of debate after that, it is a disservice to the people that elected us to do these jobs and even a greater disservice to the people who elected the President to do his job.

Once again, these are key positions in Justice—the Solicitor General of the United States, the principal person who argues in court for the United States of America—and it is the middle of July.

My colleagues from across the aisle have clearly decided that it is in their best political interests to stand in the way of the President's nominees, but, maybe, more importantly, to stand in the way of the Senate's ability to get its job done.

When I talked to Missourians, they want to know what we are doing and why we can't get the work done that they sent us here to do. They also want to know why we can't let the President do the job he was sent here to do.

We need to be working on the failures of the current healthcare system, how we make college more affordable, and what we can do to improve our infrastructure. Those are things we need to get to, and we need to allow the President to put his government in place for that to happen.

He was sworn in 7 months ago. He has every right to put the government in place. It is time for our friends across the aisle to stop grandstanding, to stop standing in the way. It is time to stop debating the Presidential election, and it is time to start debating the issues of how to run the government and to let the President put his people in those jobs so that process can begin.

Mr. President, I see my friend from Wisconsin is here. I will conclude my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

(The remarks of Mr. JOHNSON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1553 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING GENE ZERKEL

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, as you know, for months now, I have been

coming to the floor to recognize a special Alaskan, somebody who makes my great State a better place for all of us to live, someone we call the Alaskan of the Week, usually an unsung hero who has done great things but doesn't want anyone to tell you about it because they are humble people. Some of these people have been very well known throughout the State, and others, as I mentioned, are doing their jobs in different communities throughout the State, but they are all considered our Alaskans of the Week. Unsung, well known—they all share a love for Alaska for good reason: There is so much to love about our great State.

I know most of the people in this room and watching on TV and in the Gallery think of Alaska as a majestic place, majestic landscape. It is true. It is majestic, but it is truly the people of Alaska who make it such a special place, kind and generous people, patriots and pioneers who pave the way for the rest of us and leave a very indelible and important mark on my State and, in many cases, our country.

Today, I would like to recognize one of these very special Alaskans, a trailblazer, someone whose work has touched nearly every corner of the State, someone whom we recently lost, unfortunately, just this week, but his memory will last forever. I am talking about Gene Zerkel, who was a member of the ''greatest generation'' and an aviation legend in the great State of Alaska.

I don't have to remind you, but many others throughout our country don't know just how important aviation is to Alaska. In my State, our skies are the highways and the roads. We have about 8,000 general aviation pilots in Alaska, which is more than any other State per capita by far, and with good reason: There are no roads and ferry services to over 100 communities in Alaska, including regional centers like Bethel, Nome, Barrow, and Kotzebue. That means everything from mail services to baby diapers has to be flown in by plane, and if someone gets sick and needs to go to a hospital, the only way they get to see a doctor is by a plane.

Our pilots and our airline industry are essential to serving the people of Alaska, and Gene Zerkel has been a part of that service, a legendary part of Alaska aviation, for decades.

Let me tell you a little bit about Gene. He lived life on his own terms and defined it through love of God, family, country, and aviation. The latter—his passion for aviation—took hold when he was just 3 years old, then living in Indiana when he took his first airplane ride with a barnstormer. He was so taken with it, when he grew up, he continued to do some of those kinds of flights, traveling in airshows.

Like so many in the ''greatest generation'' in our Nation, he enlisted in the Army Air Corps during World War II and later joined the U.S. Air Force. He continued his passion for aviation after he left the military. Some of his favorite adventures were flying during the construction of the DEWLine throughout Alaska and Canada in the 1950s.

In 1973, he fulfilled a lifelong dream so many people in America have, which was to come to Alaska and start a family. He started to fly in the great skies above Alaska. We are a better State and a safer State for it.

In Alaska, he owned and operated Great Northern Airlines and became senior VP of operations and maintenance for the legendary MarkAir. He also started Alaska Aircraft Sales and Maintenance, which still operates to this day on Lake Hood in Anchorage, AK.

He was an innovator. He transformed the de Havilland DHC–2 Beaver into what was known as the Alaska Magnum Beaver, and he was known for always putting safety first.

In 2007, Gene was awarded the Wright Brothers Master Pilot Award from the U.S. Department of Transportation and the FAA in recognition of his more than 50 years—half a century—of promoting aviation safety within the aviation industry, particularly in Alaska.

Gene lived for 90 years. He saw so much and did so much for many of us. His name is written above the skies of Alaska. But most importantly, he was a devoted husband of 48 years to his wife Joyce and the faithful father of nine children.

I had the good fortune of calling Gene a friend and was able to visit with him a few weeks ago. At 90 years old, he was still full of life and spark and energy and passion and optimism. I have also been in touch recently with one of his sons, a young Alaskan hero, Keenan, who has his father's passion for serving our country, with many deployments to Afghanistan as part of the 210th Rescue Squadron of the Alaska Air National Guard. He is literally a true hero in my State. Keenan carries on his father's passion for aviation, Alaska, and serving in the military.

Gene's love of country, family, and aviation will always be with us. My wife Julie and I pray for his family and his friends during this time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise to speak to the repeal and replace effort that is before us, and the challenge has been how to do so. Senator MCCONNELL has recently introduced a bill, and as we pore over it, there is much to like, but quite likely, there will be some Senators who will still express reservations as to whether this amendment adequately fulfills President Trump's campaign pledges—those pledges specifically to continue coverage, care for those with preexisting conditions, eliminate mandates, and lower premiums.

If more is required, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and I have actually come up with an amendment that we will add to the bill being offered. It doesn't replace it but, rather, it adds to it. In it, we return to conservative solutions that devolve power back to States and rely upon the States to, in turn, devolve power to the patient.

So what does this bill do? What we do basically is take the dollars that the Federal Government would give to a State under ObamaCare and we give those same dollars in the form of a block grant. We allow the State to then administer the money in its best way to, one, give patients the power, and two, fulfill President Trump's pledges.

We think this works. It is a 10th Amendment solution in which that which is not specifically given to the Federal Government is, in turn, given to the State. Let the States decide what they want to do. Some object. They say: Oh my gosh. A conservative State may do something that we don't think—whoever is speaking—it should be allowed to do. Another might say: Well, I don't think a liberal State should be allowed to do that. Under our bill, we devolve to the State, so a blue State can do a blue thing and a red State can do a red thing. Let's let our States be the laboratories of democracy that teach each other the best way in which to insure others. But we say it will be the State that has the power and not the Federal Government.

If you oppose this approach, it means you would trust a Washington bureaucrat more to address the needs of your State than you would trust the people of your own State.

We would still have those protections which would allow folks to get the adequate coverage they need. There would still be—for example, preexisting conditions will be covered, fulfilling President Trump's pledge to that end. We would fulfill what I call the Jimmy Kimmel test—that everybody who is ill or has a loved one who is ill would have adequate resources to have that person's illness addressed.

We have a precedent as to how this is done. Congress, I am told, when it addressed the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program, gave the dollars necessary, with flexibility to the States. Although at the time the solution was criticized as giving too much money to the States, since, the Federal Government has not had to put in more money. Because of the flexibility, the States have been able to use the dollars allocated in such a way as to meet the needs of the population.

So what could a State do with these dollars?

It could help those patients who are at higher risk or higher cost purchase

the coverage they need, perhaps in a reinsurance or in an invisible high-risk pool that would allow premiums to be lowered for those individuals and for all.

It could maintain status quo. Those folks getting tax credits instead could have these dollars fund their purchase of insurance. It could be used together with Senator CRUZ's amendment, which would allow a health savings account to be used to purchase health insurance. The individual could set up such an account, the State could fund it, and then these dollars could then be used to purchase insurance. I like that, personally. That particular provision was in the Cassidy-Collins bill, the Patient Freedom Act, and it dovetails very nicely with block-granting these dollars back to the States to care for someone.

It could directly contract with providers to provide assistance to a specific population. So imagine you have an Indian reservation—or if not an Indian reservation, which might be covered under another source of funding, another fairly isolated population that does not have access to healthcare, the State could say: OK, we are going to come in and provide providers specifically for that population.

Alaska may adopt this because they have 700,000 people stretched over a land mass almost as big as the lower 48, and that might be a solution Alaska comes up with, but the point being, the solution would be specific for that State. Unlike ObamaCare, in which, out of Washington, DC, Washington bureaucrats dictate that the same approach be taken across the Nation no matter how different the States are, in this, the money is given to the State, and the State is asked to provide for their citizens in a way specific for the needs of that State.

We think the Graham-Cassidy amendment returning power to States and to patients is a conservative solution which ultimately gives the patient more power. I will repeat. This does not replace that bill which is being offered by Senator MCCONNELL. It would be an amendment to that. And if it turns out that some Senators feel as if that particular bill is not adequate to fulfill President Trump's campaign promises, we think this amendment could take the bill the rest of the way.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Thank you, Mr. President.

I know my Republican colleagues are working on versions of the healthcare bill they have been talking about today, and I know my colleagues are going to try to say they are protecting the sickest of Americans, and they are saying they do want to ensure that people with preexisting conditions don't have to pay through the nose when they need care. I think the President called the House version of this attempt a mean bill, and I think the original Senate bill was just as mean, if not meaner, with the number of people who would be cut off of Medicaid over a period of time and left without access to care.

Today's bill also includes an amendment or a package of ideas by my colleagues from Texas and Utah—a provision that allows insurers to sell junk insurance on the individual health insurance market. As long as they offer at least one plan that is real insurance, insurers could offer a bunch of plans that, as CBO has said, are not really insurance; that is, they just cover one or two things. Yes, they would be cheaper, but if CBO doesn't consider these types of plans insurance, how are they insurance?

I think the whole notion of junk insurance being invested into this bill is very problematic. Under junk insurance plans, they can limit or deny coverage of essential benefits, including hospitalization, maternity care, preventive care, prescription drugs, laboratory care, and substance abuse treatment. That is what they can limit. We wouldn't want those limited. This is why CBO says that if you can't go to the hospital and get care, then it is not really insurance. I have to agree with them on that.

These plans could charge people more or simply deny them based on preexisting conditions, and these plans could pay out less than 60 percent of the healthcare expenses, leaving the beneficiary with unbelievable, insurmountable deductibles that would be hard to pay. These plans could also impose an annual or lifetime cap on insurance.

I had a young woman come to my office today who was treated at Seattle Children's Hospital in our State. This family actually lives in a neighboring State, but Seattle Children's Hospital is such a regional entity in the State of Washington, in Seattle, and we are so proud of that. They told me about the debilitating disease this young child was born with and how many surgeries she has had. Literally, with the brain treatments she has had to receive, she and her mother told me that if there had ever been any lifetime caps, they would have exhausted them in the first few years. I am so proud that she came to see us today and is continuing to talk about why capping healthcare plans would be so devastating to somebody like her.

We don't want to create two markets of insurance. We don't want the one that is the real plan, real insurance, and the one where everybody goes and buys insurance that even CBO says is not real insurance.

I know that probably in the last few days of discussion, people have said: Ok, we will put a bunch of money in to help the real, or regulated market. I talked to my insurance commissioner in the State of Washington, and he said: Listen, when you don't spread out risk, you are not going to have a market and you are going to create problems.

So the notion that you think that catastrophic out-of-pocket costs won't be borne by these individual patients, I think, is wrong or that these higher premiums and deductibles could be paid by these individuals. It turns out that these junk plans, as I said, do not even count as insurance, and everybody who is in the real insurance market would then end up having to pay more.

The bill explicitly states that noncompliant plans will not count as creditable coverage for the purpose of individuals demonstrating that they have insurance.

I am checking with my staff.

Is that right? Is that what is in the proposal?

Yes. The bill explicitly states that noncompliance plans will not count as credible coverage for the purpose of individuals demonstrating that they have insurance.

Under this bill, if someone gets one of those junk plans—if somehow you see that marketed and you buy into it because you think it is cheap and you think it is the greatest thing ever—and then you try to enroll in a comprehensive plan, there is a good chance that you will get a lockout period of 6 months before you can get coverage.

Why am I here talking about this? Because the State of Washington tried this. We tried this approach in the 1990s. After our State had passed a major healthcare reform bill in the 1990s, a group of State legislators allowed these junk plans to be sold along with compliant plans. Guess what happened? Nearly all of the insurers in our State pulled out of the individual insurance market, and a death spiral ensued. Why? Because the cost then of that individual market was so high and so great that they could not service it.

They said: Oh my gosh, if I have to offer a compliant plan along with this junk insurance, I cannot make the compliant plan work because it costs so much. We are not staying.

This very important experience taught us that that is not the way for us to spread risk.

I am concerned—and I have heard from a number of patient advocacy groups, not just the young woman from Seattle Children's Hospital who came to see me today but consumer groups and health insurers themselves, like America's Health Insurance Plans, Blue Cross Blue Shield Association, AARP, American Cancer Society's Cancer Action Network, American Diabetes Association, American Heart and Lung Association, Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, March of Dimes, National MS Society, National Health Council, and the National Coalition for Women

with Heart Disease. All of these organizations do not like this idea of junk insurance, of saying you can have a compliant plan that is real insurance and a marketplace in which there are things that are not really insurance, because then people are going to go buy a bunch of things that are not really insurance and then not have the ability to get cost and care and run up uncompensated care. Then you are going to make the real market unsustainable and unsupportive, and the rates are going to go so high that people are just going to pull out.

A group of 10 of those leading patient advocacy groups wrote:

> Under the amendment, insurance companies would be allowed to charge higher premiums to people based on their health status—in addition to opting out of other patient protections in current law, such as the guarantee of essential health benefits—

Those are the things I was going over a few minutes ago—

> and the prohibition on annual and lifetime coverage caps.

They go on to write:

> Separating healthy enrollees from those with preexisting conditions will also lead to severe instability of the insurance market. This is unacceptable for our patients.

Yesterday, America's Health Insurance Plans wrote:

> Allowing health insurance products governed by different rules and standards would further destabilize the individual market and increase costs for those with preexisting conditions.

That is the largest health insurance group in the country, and they are writing this.

If they are telling us in advance that this is going to really destabilize the market and cause problems, we should listen because right now what we have had is an expansion of Medicaid and covering more people, raising the GDP and helping areas of our States and country and creating more stability.

We have had some challenges in the individual market. We should fix that. We should definitely drive down the cost of the delivery system by continuing to improve it. But the notion that this is the fix for the individual market when the providers are telling us it is going to destabilize the market and drive us out—we should understand what the result of that is going to be.

Yesterday, the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association wrote:

> The result (of Cruz/Lee) would be higher premiums, increased Federal tax credit costs for coverage available on the exchanges, and insurers exiting the market or pricing coverage out of reach of consumers.

I believe our goals should be trying to drive down the cost of insurance. We have lots of ideas about that, and I want to work with our colleagues on that, but I am very concerned that this approach to try to get people supporting a Senate proposal is the wrong approach and will drive people out of the market.

I think the bill is still a war on Medicaid. The bill still permanently cuts and caps the Medicaid Program. I have said numerous times that we saved $2 billion in the State of Washington by rebalancing people off of nursing home care and on to community-based care. It is a great concept. Look, we have a lot of people who are going to live longer. We have baby boomers who are reaching retirement. The number of people who are going to demand services, whether from Medicaid or Medicare, is going to be increased just because of the population bubble. We should be doing things to drive down the costs of care.

There are great ideas, and I was able to get some of those in the bill. We ended up passing those things, and some States are actually working on that. More than 15 States are actually working on that concept of rebalancing to community-based care and making long-term care more affordable under this provision. I guarantee you that we have to do that, but if you permanently cap or cut Medicaid, you are going to have veterans who use access to Medicaid for care who are not going to get care. You are going to get people who need opioid treatment.

I find it interesting that we would have this program over here. I see that my colleague from Michigan is on the floor. We call it the Saginaw Health Clinic.

One would say: OK, Saginaw Health Clinic, there is a bunch of money in this bill. Apply for opioid help.

They would say: OK. We are going to get $10 million.

When you walk in the door of the opioid Saginaw Health Clinic, the first thing they will ask is if you are on Medicaid. If you are not on Medicaid, you are not going to get any opioid help.

So the notion that we would cut people off of Medicaid but put more money in the opioid problem is not what we need to do to solve our challenge. What we need to do is make sure we are delivering the most cost-effective care as possible and make sure people are getting access to care.

That is why I have been all over the State of Washington. I have met so many people. I have met people at healthcare facilities who have told me that some of their highest costs were from a patient who continually came to see them in the emergency room, maybe 30 times a year, because he did not have coverage, so he drove up the cost for everybody. They said they finally got this person on the Medicaid expansion. Guess what. They do not have those costs anymore in their hospitals and facilities. It has driven down the costs.

I do not want to see people kicked off of Medicaid. I do not want to see it cut in a declining budget. I want us to improve Medicaid and make it more cost-effective and more utilized and supported.

Estimates by the CBO of the original Senate bill are that the Medicaid cut would be $772 billion over the next decade and that the Federal investment would be cut by 35 percent within the next two decades, relative to current law projections. That is a lot of consequence for the Medicaid population. I think that is why we have so many groups and organizations here that are anxious about this proposal and where we go. We definitely want to talk to our colleagues.

One former CBO Director said, the junk insurance idea is ''a recipe for a meltdown.'' This is someone who served in past Republican administrations, and I take his word seriously.

I think what we need to do is work together to make sure we get a program that addresses our most fundamental issues—the challenges in the individual market, keep addressing how we keep and stabilize a population on the most affordable rates there are, and keep the things we know have worked very well, like the Medicaid expansion. It has worked. It has supported people, and it has helped us stabilize the market.

I will remind my colleagues, too, that the State of New York took one provision of the Affordable Care Act and has 650,000 people in New York on a very, very affordable insurance plan. We think that if you are an individual in the individual market, you should be able to get the same clout as somebody who works for a large employer. You should be able to go in and buy in bulk as a class, as a group of people, and when you buy in bulk, you should get a discount. That is what we think will help us in the individual market to drive down these costs for what is about 7 percent of the marketplace.

I urge my colleagues to reject this latest proposal. Let's get serious about fixing the things that we know we can fix and improve upon, but for the over 22 million Americans who are very nervous about this proposal because they know they are going to get cut off of care, let's not do that to them. Let's improve where we need to go in affordability in the healthcare arena and not think that a junk insurance program or cutting people off is the solution for the future.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, I want to thank my friend from Washington State, who has been such a leader on healthcare.

In looking at her chart, at the junk insurance amendment and all of the groups opposing it, it reminds me of the calls I used to get prior to the Affordable Care Act from someone who was healthy and young and had a policy for years that was only $50 a month. He thought it was great. Then, all of a sudden, he got sick or his child got sick.

He called me up and said: I paid into insurance all of these years, and they only covered 1 day in the hospital.

I remember having that conversation with somebody—or no days in the hospital. That is what you call a junk insurance plan.

This latest version of the healthcare bill would allow that to come back so that somebody will have the false confidence in paying $30, $40, $50 a month and thinking he has insurance. Then, if something happens, he will find out it is just a bunch of junk and that it does not cover anything. That is going to be legal again. Right now, it is not legal to do that. With health reform, we stopped that. But that would be legal again under this proposal, and I am deeply concerned about that.

I am obviously rising to talk about the Republican healthcare bill. I do not believe it is a healthcare bill, but that is what we are debating, is healthcare or whether healthcare will be taken away. What I would rather be doing is working with my friend who is in the chair on lowering the cost of prescription drugs. We have worked on many things together—mental health and addiction services. I would rather be doing that than debating what we are debating. I would rather be focused on how we lower the cost of prescription drugs, which is the cost I hear about the most from my constituents, or about other out-of-pocket costs for people who are in the private insurance system, the individual insurance market.

We do have situations in which copays and deductibles are too high in the private insurance market. Gutting Medicaid will do nothing about that—nothing. It will just take away healthcare from tens of millions of people. It will not change the private insurance market at all, which is where I believe we need to focus, and I am anxious to do that and work across the aisle in order to do that.

I want to make sure we are talking about building on healthcare coverage, lowering costs, and tackling prescription drug costs. Instead, this bill would take away healthcare from millions of Americans. We know that from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. We don't know yet how many millions under the current version, but we know that at some point, we will get a score on that from the Budget Office. We know it will be a lot of people who are going to lose their insurance, and they don't need to lose their insurance in order to tackle bringing down the cost of insurance.

So what do we know about this proposal? The versions keep changing, but it is the same old song over and over again—a little bit of change, a little bit of different refrain, but it is the same old song in the end. What we know is that doctors don't like it and nurses don't like it, hospitals don't like it, insurance companies don't like it.

People in Michigan don't like it. They have called and written and told me in person, people approaching me in Fourth of July parades. People are scared. They are concerned. A woman's mom is in a nursing home who has Alzheimer's disease, and she is panicked. Three out of five seniors in nursing homes in Michigan are there with the help of Medicaid health insurance. Others are deeply concerned about their family members, their children, themselves.

This is called the Better Care Act, but there is nothing better about it. Democrats have ideas to actually make our healthcare system better, by stabilizing our insurance markets and making premiums more affordable. My friend Senator SHAHEEN of New Hampshire introduced the Marketplace Certainty Act. It would ensure cost-sharing payments that were part of healthcare reform, that they would actually remain in a stabilizing way so they could be counted on. This would offer peace of mind to families and stability to the market.

Senators CARPER, KAINE, NELSON, and SHAHEEN introduced the Individual Health Insurance Marketplace Improvement Act, which would create a permanent reinsurance program, which we had before—before it was changed 2 years ago—to stabilize the market and bring down premiums.

There have been things that would happen to destabilize the markets. Two years ago, there was an action, and now with a new administration we need to stop that and reverse it and stabilize the markets.

Senator HEITKAMP has a proposal that helps more families afford health insurance by smoothing out the individual market tax credit cliff that is there—the tax credits that help low-income, moderate-income people be able to afford insurance—to fix that in a way that is more beneficial to families.

Senator MCCASKILL's Health Care Options for All Act would allow people who live in a county without an insurer on the exchange—they don't have anybody in the private individual marketplace exchange, no insurance company—to sign up for the same exchange plans we have. There are people being covered. We hear a lot about Iowa, for instance. Even though there may be no private insurance companies doing a private marketplace option, Senators, Representatives, our staffs who are required to be in, as they say, ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act, have an exchange. So to help people immediately, we could allow the people of Iowa to get the same option that their Members of Congress in Iowa have and that their staffs have. That would be possible, as a way to address this issue in the short run and to help people. I don't know why somebody who is in Iowa or Michigan or anyplace else shouldn't be able to get the exact same coverage a Member of Congress can get.

Here is what we do know in terms of the ideas in the bill. Our Republican colleagues know how unpopular the bill is. A new poll found that only 12 percent—12 percent—of Americans support this bill. It is so unpopular they have been trying to rewrite it and get enough votes to pass it. We keep hearing about changes, but unfortunately none of these amendments make it better. In some cases, like the junk insurance policies that will be allowed, they actually make it worse.

Now, the proposal that would provide $45 million to tackle the opioid epidemic, even Republican Ohio Gov. John Kasich said it would be like spitting in the ocean. It is not enough, he said. I appreciate the focus on that. It is a horrible epidemic. It is an epidemic in Michigan and across the country, but it is certainly not enough to make up for the huge cuts to Medicaid insurance—healthcare insurance, as the Senator from Washington State indicated.

The other proposal that we understand is in the new bill, as I mentioned before, would give insurers the freedom to once again refuse to cover basic health services like maternity care or addiction treatment, as long as one plan they offer, among many, would include essential health benefits. So everything else could be junk, and there would be one high-cost plan that would actually cover things families need.

Insurance companies themselves know this is a terrible idea. In a letter to Senator CRUZ and Senator LEE, Scott Serota, president and CEO of Blue Cross Blue Shield Association, wrote that their plan ''is unworkable as it would undermine pre-existing condition protections, increase premiums and destabilize the market.'' That is what is viewed as this great new provision in the bill.

He added: ''The result would be higher premiums, increased federal tax credit costs for coverage available on exchanges, and insurers exiting the market or pricing coverage out of reach of consumers.''

In other words, premiums would skyrocket for older people, people who take prescription drug medications, people with chronic conditions. Everyone else would be left with the junk insurance policy that doesn't cover really anything, and they feel OK unless they get sick. We would all be stuck with a fragmented, destabilized insurance market.

Remember preexisting conditions? This would bring them right back.

This bill is wrong for many, many people, but let me mention Felicia. In 2011, she was an AmeriCorps member serving in Lansing who didn't have health insurance. When she started feeling tired all the time and losing weight, she went to the Center for Family Health in Jackson.

Felicia was diagnosed with stage IV Hodgkin's lymphoma. The Center for Family Health helped her get coverage through Medicaid and care at the University of Michigan, including chemotherapy and later a stem cell transplant.

Felicia writes:

Now I am feeling awesome. I am cancer-free, and I am working part time while I am

finishing up college. I feel that I owe my life to the Center for Family Health.

Felicia knows the importance of comprehensive health coverage. It saved her life.

Nick and Chelsey know it too. They and their three young children are covered by Healthy Michigan, our State's Medicaid expansion. Nick and Chelsey are both employed full time. Chelsey also attends college full time.

During a routine visit, doctors discovered that her oldest son was born with an obstructed kidney, which had lost one-third of its function by the time he was 5 years old. Thanks to the Medicaid expansion, he was able to have surgery before his kidney lost all function. Without the Medicaid expansion, which ends under the Republican bill, these working parents and their three children couldn't afford healthcare coverage, let alone surgery.

Margo knows this because she sees it every day. She manages a clinic in Kent County on the west side of the State. She said the lives of patients are much different today than they were a few years ago. Margo wrote:

> Seeing working people who have struggled all of their adult lives to manage their chronic health conditions finally have access to regular doctor visits, health education, and prescription medications has been a tremendous relief. You cannot imagine the sense of dignity our patients feel.

She added:

> Please see it in your heart to care about the people of Michigan who work but do not get insurance through their employer.

So, finally, let me just say, doctors know this is a bad bill. Nurses know this is a bad bill. Hospitals know this is a bad bill. Insurance companies know this is a bad bill. I know that even many of my Republican friends know this is a bad bill. Their amendments haven't changed that. Costs go up and care goes down. Preexisting conditions come back. Millions lose their coverage.

What we should be doing is working together to stabilize the marketplace, reduce out-of-pocket costs, and lower the outrageous costs of prescription drugs—by the way, not giving a tax cut to prescription drug companies, as is in this bill, and other companies as well.

Felicia, Nick, Chelsey, and millions more like them in Michigan and across this country deserve that much.

I sincerely hope that when it comes time to vote on whether to proceed to this bill, that the majority of the Members in the Senate will say no.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for today's vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 104, William Francis Hagerty IV to be Ambassador to Japan. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.•

HELP FOR WILDLIFE ACT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, I joined Senators BARRASSO, CAPITO, KLOBUCHAR, BOOZMAN, and BALDWIN in introducing S. 1514, the Hunting Heritage and Environmental Legacy Preservation—HELP—for Wildlife Act.

This bill represents a more than $100 million annual Federal investment in the protecting the bay. The bill has several provisions, one of which reauthorizes the programs at the heart of restoring and maintaining the health of the Chesapeake Bay watershed. S. 1514 reauthorizes the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's, EPA, Chesapeake Bay Program through 2022 at $90 million per year, which is more than the program has ever been funded in its history. This unique regional partnership, managed by EPA through the Chesapeake Bay Program office in Annapolis, helps program partners collaborate to achieve the goals of the voluntary, bipartisan Chesapeake Bay agreement. Because this program expired in 2005, reauthorizing the program is critical to secure necessary appropriations and reject the Trump administration's proposal to eliminate the program.

S. 1514 also reauthorizes the Chesapeake Bay gateways and watertrails network and the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Grants Assistance Program, which provides $6 million per year throughout the watershed in technical and financial assistance to State, community, and nongovernmental partners to increase access to the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. The bill also reauthorizes the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, NFWF, until 2023. As the Nation's largest conservation grant-maker, NFWF has been instrumental in completing conservation projects in Maryland and around the Chesapeake Bay. In 2016, the State received nearly $5 million in funding for projects protecting and restoring habitat for fish and wildlife.

S. 1514 also reauthorizes the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, NAWCA, which provides grants to increase and protect wetlands which not only provide habitat for wildlife, but also reduce the severity of flooding and coastal erosion, and improve water quality. In the 2014 to 2015 grant period alone, Maryland received $1 million from the NAWCA program, which was leveraged with nearly $3 million in additional contributions by outside partners to protect 1,600 acres of wetlands in the State.

The bill reauthorizes the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act for another 5 years and authorizes $6.5 million to be spent each year on conservation projects that protect more than 350 different species of birds which summer in the United States and winter in the tropical regions. Twenty-one different State birds are neotropical migrants, including Maryland's famous and beloved Baltimore Oriole.

S. 1514 codifies the National Fish Habitat Partnership, a collaboration between public agencies, private citizens, and nonprofits for promoting fish conservation. America is home to more than 3,000 species of fish, and 22 percent of the stream miles in this country are at high or very high risk of current habitat degradation. Over the past few years, $175,000 in funds from this program were used in Maryland to rehabilitate three different streams, funding which was 27 matched by $843,000 from private investors. The partnership estimates that the improved habitat in the three streams for brook trout provided a total socio/economic impact of $9.2 million.

I am proud that S. 1514 contains so many provisions to help the Chesapeake Bay and the State of Maryland.

I would like to speak for a minute about the importance of reauthorizing these programs and the ''power of the purse.'' As my colleagues in the Senate well know, the ''power of the purse'' is the two-step process of authorizing and appropriating. Authorizing legislation can establish, continue, or change programs and activities, and it signals to the appropriators that they should fund these programs. The budget process is not complete until the appropriations process provides the actual funding for the activities and programs established through the authorization process.

Office of Management and Budget Director Mick Mulvaney has said that President Donald Trump is sending a deliberate message to Congress about spending money on unauthorized programs. With the President putting an emphasis on boosting defense spending without adding to the deficit, administration officials are looking closely at expired authorizations. By reauthorizing these programs, we are sending our own clear message back: these programs matter to our constituents and to us.

Mr. Mulvaney said lawmakers too often ignore the ''regular order'' process of approving a budget, authorizing specific programs, and then appropriating the money for those programs. ''We actually spend a lot of money in the federal government on programs that aren't authorized at all,'' he said. ''Either they used to be authorized and they lapsed, or they were never authorized in the first place. They simply were appropriated without any authorization. It's the wrong way to do it.''

Because of President Trump and Director Mulvaney's position, it is more important than ever that the essential programs contained in S. 1514 be reauthorized.

None of these reauthorizations are more important to Maryland than EPA's Chesapeake Bay Program. In 1987, Congress ratified the Chesapeake Bay Program, a voluntary partnership among the watershed States and the EPA, under the Clean Water Act. The 1987 legislation supported cleanup efforts with a program of grants and scientific research. In 2000, Congress directed the EPA to ''ensure that management plans are developed and implementation is begun'' to meet the goals of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement. In June 2014, the Governors of the six States in the watershed signed a new voluntary Chesapeake Bay watershed agreement to work in partnership with the Federal Government through the Chesapeake Bay Program. The watershed agreement has ten goals to improve water quality in local rivers and streams and the Chesapeake Bay by 2025.

The program office is housed within the EPA, which provides staff and funding. Primary funding for the program comes from State governments. Federal funding was first authorized at $40 million annually from fiscal year 2001 to fiscal year 2005 to fund environmental studies and grants that support restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay. Congress has appropriated funds for the Program since the authorization for appropriations expired in fiscal year 2005. In fiscal year 2017, for instance, Congress appropriated $73 million for the program. The President's fiscal year 2018 budget eliminates funding for the program and cuts other programs that also benefit the bay across several Federal agency partners' budgets.

A healthy bay means a healthy economy, and this recovery cannot be accomplished without a strong Federal commitment. At a time when we have seen nutrient levels dropping and water quality improving, I am deeply disappointed President Trump is intent on turning the clock back to a time when a swath of the Chesapeake Bay in midsummer was a hypoxic low-oxygen zone or ''dead zone''.

The most recent State of the Bay report, issued biannually by the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, evaluates the progressing and overall health of the Bay for 2014 to 2016. The Chesapeake Bay's health was given a grade of C-minus, a slight improvement from the previous State of the Bay report in 2014. This progress is due largely to the continued implementation of the Chesapeake Clean Water Blueprint. This improvement, though modest, was hard-won. It is the result of countless hours of grueling work by State and Federal public servants and nonprofit workers, as well as citizens' actions across the watershed. A grade of C-minus is hardly an acceptable endpoint. To reach an A, which would represent a saved and comprehensively healthy Bay, we will need redouble and accelerate our efforts. I am determined to pass on a vibrant and healthy Chesapeake Bay to the next generation, for the sake of public health and the local economies that depend on a clean and bountiful bay. This is all the more reason that we need to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Program and make sure that it is fully funded in this year's appropriations bill.

Many Marylanders and national wildlife organizations are happy about the HELP for Wildlife Act. The Choose Clean Water Coalition and Blue Water Baltimore have issued statements of support. The Chesapeake Bay Foundation will testify in support of this bill next week in a legislative hearing the Environment and Public Works Committee is holding. The National Wildlife Federation's Collin O'Mara said the bill ''represents a great bipartisan effort to conserve America's outdoor heritage for hunters, anglers, campers, hikers, and wildlife enthusiasts, while helping to restore America's wildlife populations.'' The Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership said the bill is ''the strongest legislative package of sportsmen's priorities in years.''

As S. 1514 moves out of the Environment and Public Works Committee and to the Senate floor in the coming weeks, I urge my colleagues to support this bill that is critical not only to the Chesapeake Bay and the State of Maryland, but to conservation efforts in every State across the Nation.

INTERNATIONAL REGLIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, today I wish to speak about the issue of international religious freedom.

Sadly, in recent months, the nightly news has reported far too many stories of innocent people around the world who have been intentionally targeted in acts of horrible violence simply because of their desire to worship in a way their consciences dictate.

Recently, the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association held the first ''World Summit in Defense of Persecuted Christians'' in Washington, where participants from 130 countries gathered together, many of whom have faced brutal persecution in their home country because of their faith.

As I am sure my colleagues and most Americans know, Rev. Billy Graham has touched the lives of millions of people in the United States and around the world. He has counseled Presidents and Prime Ministers and has been called America's pastor. As a fellow North Carolinian, I am proud call both Billy Graham and his son Franklin my friends.

As the son of a Presbyterian minister, these recent events reminded me of a letter written by my late father, David Burr, to my grandparents. On Thanksgiving Day 1964, writing from South Korea as a soldier in the Army, my dad wrote a letter about a special worship service held for troops in a tiny chapel on the side of a hill, just within sight of the 38th Parallel dividing North and South Korea. With rifles in tow, my father and his fellow soldiers made their way through the snow and into the chapel. To their surprise, the man standing up front to conduct the worship was not their usual Protestant or Catholic chaplain, but a young Jewish rabbi and a veteran of the previous war.

In his letter, my father wrote about the beautiful lesson he had heard that day where the scripture reading was from Hosea chapter 6, which says, ''The voice of God cried unto His people, What shall I do with you? For your goodness is as the morning cloud, and as the dew that goes early away. For I desire goodness, not promises; I desire acknowledgement and not your bargains.'' My father, deeply moved by the message, then went on to write about the rabbi's powerful benediction prayer that closed the worship: ''He that enjoys anything without thanksgiving is as though he robbed God.''

Every July Fourth, our country gives thanks for the freedoms we are privileged to have as Americans and celebrates the birth of our Nation. Indeed, the freedoms we enjoy are immortalized in our Declaration of Independence: ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.''

The Founding Fathers understood that these unalienable rights, including the freedom to worship, was a fundamental human right endowed by our Creator.

As I read from my father's letter, I can see he realized this, too. ''All the way back to the barracks,'' he wrote, ''I knew that I was one who was stealing from God, for every day I am enjoying the times that were so full and wonderful there at home. Every day, though we are cold and discouraged, my heart is warm with your prayers and thoughts of you, and I have not been thanking God. I have not been fair, for God has walked with me all these years and I have never thought to say thank you to Him.''

I share this story today because I believe that, if we as Americans are thankful for these unalienable rights endowed by our Creator, we should also stand up for the millions across the world who are robbed of these same fundamental human rights—and sometimes lose their lives because of it. As Members of the U.S. Senate, we especially should not forget this.

As chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I think about North Korea, I think about Iran, and Ithink about all the different regions around the world where terrorist activity poses a real threat to our national security. Today I also think about

places like North Korea, Iran, and so many other countries not just in a national security capacity alone, but about the people who are suffering under political systems that deny their fundamental right to freely worship as they choose.

The rabbi's lesson of Hosea chapter 6 that day was about a passage where strength, courage, and hope by the great Hand above were poured into those who were lonesome, afraid, and discouraged. At the end of my dad's letter, he asked my grandfather, ''Please, dad, put the benediction of the rabbi over your desk for that is the quickest way you can bring me home.'' If so, by keeping international religious freedom as a foreign policy priority, I believe that is the quickest way we can bring persecuted people hope.

As my father did in his letter, I close by repeating the rabbi's benediction: ''He that enjoys anything without thanksgiving is as though he robbed God.'' I urge my colleagues: Let's remember to be thankful for the God-given freedoms we enjoy in the United States and to shine a light on the dark corners of the world. Let's not forget in this Congress how we can help the millions who are robbed of these fundamental rights.

Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO AFGHANISTAN ROBOTICS TEAM

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am very pleased that Afghanistan's robotics team will be coming to Washington to compete with students from nearly 150 countries in the FIRST Global Challenge, which begins on Sunday, July 16. I extend a warm welcome to these brilliant young minds, Lida Azizi, Somayeh Faruqi, Faramarz Najafi, Rodaba Noori, Fatemah Qaderyan, Kawsar Roshan, and Alireza Mahraban. Of course, we extend a warm welcome to the team's creation, a robot that can sort balls, recognize blue and orange, and move objects to their proper places. People across Afghanistan are extremely proud of the robotics team's achievements. In recent days, Americans have become acquainted with the many challenges they have overcome in order to excel in their studies and come to the U.S., and we too, are very proud of them.

I have been impressed to learn about their passion for education and determination to pursue STEM studies. This team's indomitable spirit is a testament to what can be achieved through hard work, creativity, and perseverance. Each member of the Afghan robotics team has become a powerful symbol for young women across the globe, especially for those in developing regions who face barriers to education and opportunity.

The FIRST Robotics Competition should also be recognized for its ability to bring young people together in the name of science, mathematics, and technology. It is the creation of Granite Stater Dean Kamen, and had its beginnings in a New Hampshire high school gym a quarter century ago. Today, FIRST programs reach more than 400,000 young people across the world every year. Beginning this weekend in Washington, the FIRST Global Challenge will bring some of the best and brightest young people from around the world to compete, to demonstrate teamwork, and to forge new friendships.

It gives me great joy to know that Lida, Somayeh, Faramarz, Rodaba, Fatemah, Kawsar, and Alireze will be among them. The FIRST Global Challenge is a competition, and only one team will leave Washington with top honors, but the seven young women representing Afghanistan are already winners. They have had the courage to overcome barriers and the audacity to compete with some of the most talented young people from across the globe. I wish these young women great success. I thank them for inspiring us with their fierce determination to achieve.

80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT JUDGES

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, today I am honored to congratulate the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges on 80 years of promoting justice for children and families.

On May 22, 1937, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, NCJFCJ, was established by judges who came together with a vision of strengthening the juvenile court system and providing support, sharing knowledge, and facilitating an exchange of ideas with their colleagues across the Nation. The NCJFCJ is the oldest judicial membership organization in the country and a leading provider of judicial education. The NCJFCJ believes judges are the leaders of the juvenile and family court system, and by engaging all stakeholders, better decisions are made with improved outcomes for children, families, and victims of domestic violence. I am so proud that they have made Reno, NV, their home.

The NCJFCJ brings together a broad constituency of judicial officers, attorneys, advocates, court administrators, clerks of court, probation officers, child welfare professionals, and others with a common goal of ensuring the most effective juvenile and family court system. It addresses a wide range of complex issues impacting the well-being of children and families that encompass juvenile delinquency, domestic child sex trafficking, child abuse and neglect, child custody and visitation, substance abuse, domestic violence, trauma, mental health, and military issues. The NCJFCJ also leads development and implementation of policies and practices to ensure fair, equal, effective, and timely justice for children, families, and victims of domestic violence.

For eight decades, the NCJFCJ has been known for the exemplary quality of its services, including advanced education, training, publications, technical assistance, research, data and statistics, and policy development to promote justice for children and families. Inspired by the leadership, experience, expertise, dedication, and passion of its members, the NCJFCJ is committed to another 80 years of efforts to meet the ever-evolving needs of our most vulnerable population: the children and families who seek justice.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and honoring the 80 years of achievements and tireless efforts of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, its members and staff, past and present, to ensure a timely, fair, and coordinated justice system for children and families and safer communities across the country.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JOE KALIKO

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I wish to thank and commend Joe Kaliko for his extraordinarily valuable commitment and service in aiding and advocating for our most vulnerable throughout the community. His many deeds of generosity and caring have made him a go-to person when people need help. His life is a real inspiration for all of us.

Joe Kaliko is founder of the Needs Clearinghouse, a private nonprofit organization. He has actively partnered with governmental agencies, in helping provide necessary—sometimes life-saving—resources to people through programs such as Hug a Hound and the Refugee Assistance Project. He has helped raise funds and contributions to a myriad of charitable causes, touching many, many lives. I have seen those people and the powerfully positive effects on their lives, disabled people who now have ramps for access to their homes, veterans who now have housing, ill people who now have better healthcare, and numerous others.

Joe Kaliko is all about making a difference. He is a true hero.•

RECOGNIZING THE HAVRE YOUTH BASEBALL ALL-STAR TEAM

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing the Havre youth baseball, 10U, All-Star team. This past weekend, the team from Havre won the Montana Cal Ripken Baseball State title for the 10 years old and under division.

Despite a loss to Belgrade in their opening game of the tournament, the Havre All-Stars battled their way to the championship game, and defeated Bozeman to claim the title. In addition to an outstanding performance on the

baseball diamond, the community of Havre also served as host for the tournament. A successful 4-day youth sports State tournament is the result of hard work from the many volunteers who pitched in to make the event a great success.

With summer events in full swing, I would like to commend the community of Havre for their hospitality and congratulate the youngsters on the All-Star team for their accomplishment.●

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF NEW BALTIMORE, MICHIGAN

● Mr. PETERS. Mr President, today I wish to recognize the 150th anniversary of the city of New Baltimore, MI. This celebration is a historic benchmark for New Baltimore, as well as the State of Michigan.

Located in Macomb County, along the northern coastline of Lake St. Clair, New Baltimore residents pride themselves on their traditional downtown, rich heritage, recreational activities, and a family-orientated spirit. Throughout 150 years of change and growth, the city remains anchored in that local spirit.

The area was first inhabited by French fur trappers and hunters. Among those was an explorer named Pierre Yax, the son of the first German resident of Michigan. Yax secured a land grant from President John Quincy Adams in 1826, in what was then the Michigan Territory. As other French settlers followed, long farms were established, stretching from the rivers outward. In 1845, the area was first recognized as a settlement when Alfred Ashley platted 60 acres of land. Mr. Ashley was a local businessman and would name the area the Village of Ashley. This name would remain until 1867 when the village was officially incorporated as New Baltimore. New Baltimore would stay a village until it became a city in 1931.

In its early days, New Baltimore was linked to the regional economy through its position along waterways. It operated as a small port, bringing agriculture and manufactured goods to the surrounding communities. The area became known for the manufacturing of barrels, brooms, bricks, coffins, corsets, and creamery products.

As shipping methods changed and automobile transportation increased, so too did the role of New Baltimore. The city began transitioning to a resort and commercial area. New attractions were built, including an opera house, hotels, saloons, a brewery, and other leisure and resort attractions. With the construction of a locomotive line between port Huron and Detroit in the 1800s, New Baltimore became a hub of activity well into the 20th century.

Today New Baltimore is a vibrant community covering nearly 7 square miles. Residents take pride in their excellent schools, including a high school, two middle schools, seven elementary schools, two early childhood centers, and an alternative education program. The resort industry continues to flourish with events such as the annual Bay-Rama Fish Fly Festival, which attracts thousands of people each year. The city's public park and beaches also provide opportunity for numerous recreational activities.

The city of New Baltimore has a proud history, vibrant present, and bright future. As New Baltimore celebrates this milestone, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating its residents, elected officials, and businesses as they celebrate their history. I wish the city continued growth and prosperity in the years ahead.●

REMEMBERING KENNETH ENGEBRETSON

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of Kenneth Engebretson, a lifelong Montanan—born and raised—and a veteran who served in World War II.

To Kenneth's family, on behalf of myself, my fellow Montanans, and my fellow Americans, I would like to extend our deepest gratitude for Kenneth's service to this Nation.

Kenneth was born in 1919 to Oliver and Tena Engebretson in South Gildford, MT. He was raised on the family farm that was homesteaded by his parents in 1910. Kenneth graduated from Gildford High School in 1937 and set out from home to explore his country.

After graduation he went to Dalton, MN, to work on his uncle's farm. He enlisted in the Army on October 16, 1941, out of Fergus Falls, MN. He was initially stationed at Fort Sill, OK, and then at Fort Leonard Wood, MO.

Kenneth went on to serve in World War II from 1941 to 1944 in the Philippines and New Guinea. While deployed, Kenneth contracted malaria and was hospitalized. As a result of the illness, Kenneth was discharged in November of 1945 and immediately returned to the Havre area to help on the family farm in Gildford, MT. He remained on the farm to raise a family of his own.

He was proudly involved in the Veterans of Foreign Wars organization and remained an active member until his passing on October 10, 1993. Kenneth left behind a deeply appreciative and loving family, and his memory is preserved in the living history of the Engebretson family farm.

Let us now take a moment to recognize the life of Kenneth Engebretson and the legacy he left behind. We deeply appreciate his service to the American people.●

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH BRANNON

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Joseph Brannon, one of my Washington, DC, interns, for all of the hard work he has done for me and my staff at the Senate Republican Conference.

Joseph is a graduate of Stevens High School in Rapid City, SD. Currently, he is attending Auburn University in Auburn, AL, where he is majoring in sociology. Joseph is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Joseph Brannon for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO WILL JANKLOW

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Will Janklow, one of my Washington, DC, interns, for all of the hard work he has done for me and my staff at the Senate Republican Conference.

Will is a graduate of Northland Pines High School in Eagle River, WI. Currently, he is attending the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, MN, where he is majoring in mathematics. Will is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Will Janklow for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DREW LINGLE

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Drew Lingle, an intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Drew is a graduate of Century High School in Bismarck, ND. Currently, he is attending Minnesota State University Moorhead, where he is majoring in history. Drew is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Drew Lingle for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH MACLACHLAN

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Elizabeth MacLachlan, a legal intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Elizabeth is a graduate of Brigham Young University in Provo, UT, having earned a degree in family life. Currently, she is pursuing a law degree at J. Reuben Clark Law School, Brigham Young University. Elizabeth is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of her experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Elizabeth MacLachlan for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO NICK MONTIETH

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Nick Montieth, an intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Nick is a recent graduate of Black Hills State University in Spearfish, SD, having earned a degree in political science. After a gap year, he plans to attend the University of South Dakota School of Law. Nick is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Nick Montieth for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO SCOTT SIMONS

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Scott Simons, an intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Scott is a graduate of Roosevelt High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, he is attending South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, where he is majoring in economics. Scott is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Scott Simons for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN PETER A. MACHTEL

• Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I wish to honor an outstanding American, Captain Peter A. Machtel, on his retirement from American Airlines.

Captain Machtel distinguished himself with over 30 years of safe commercial airline flying for Piedmont, USAirways, and American Airlines. In addition, he served the American public as a Federal flight deck duty officer, beginning with that program as soon as it was implemented following the attacks on 9/11. His work for more than 15 years with that vital security program demonstrated his selfless duty and commitment to the safety of the American people.

Over the years, I have relied on Captain Machtel's knowledge and insights on issues relating to airlines, pensions, and aviation safety. I know that his wisdom and dedication to our country will be sorely missed.

I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Captain Machtel for his distinguished service and congratulating him on his retirement.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1492. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to direct the Attorney General to register practitioners to transport controlled substances to States in which the practitioner is not registered under the Act for the purpose of administering the substances (under applicable State law) at locations other than principal places of business or professional practice.

H.R. 1719. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, for inclusion in the John Muir National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2200. An act to reauthorize the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2430. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2480. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include an additional permissible use of amounts provided as grants under the Byrne JAG program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2664. An act to direct the Secretary of Labor to train certain Department of Labor personnel how to effectively detect and assist law enforcement in preventing human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1492. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to direct the Attorney General to register practitioners to transport controlled substances to States in which the practitioner is not registered under the Act for the purpose of administering the substances (under applicable State law) at locations other than principal places of business or professional practice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2200. An act to reauthorize the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2480. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include an additional permissible use of amounts provided as grants under the Byrne JAG program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2664. An act to direct the Secretary of Labor to train certain Department of Labor personnel how to effectively detect and assist law enforcement in preventing human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1719. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, for inclusion in the John Muir National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 2430. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2163. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Flonicamid; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9962–15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2164. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prosulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9962–97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2165. A communication from the Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's annual report for calendar year 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2166. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2016 Purchases from Foreign Entities''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2167. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Karen E. Dyson, United States Army, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2168. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Flora D. Darpino, United States Army, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2169. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on

the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Nora W. Tyson, United States Navy, and her advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2170. A communication from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2016 Annual Report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation (SIPC); to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2171. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility (Carbon County, MT, et al.)'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2017–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2172. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Emissions Statement Rule Certification for the 2008 Ozone Standard'' (FRL No. 9964–65–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2173. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Redesignation of the Muncie Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule'' (FRL No. 9964–63–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2174. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Control of Emissions of Organic Materials That Are Not Regulated by VOC RACT Rules'' (FRL No. 9964–46–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2175. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; TN: Non-interference Demonstration for Federal Low-Reid Vapor Pressure Requirement in Shelby County'' (FRL No. 9964–56–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2176. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Volatile Organic Compound Reasonably Available Control Technology for 1997 Ozone Standard'' (FRL No. 9964–58–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2177. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Procedures for Chemical Risk Evaluation Under the Amended Toxic Substances Control Act'' ((RIN2070–AK20) (FRL No. 9964–38)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2178. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safe Harbor for Service Agreements Providing Electricity to Federal Government Generated by Solar Equipment'' (Rev. Proc. 2017–19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2179. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2017 Calendar Year Resident Population Figures'' (Notice 2017–19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2180. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological Objects and Ecclesiastical and Ritual Ethnological Materials from Cyprus'' (RIN1515–AE31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2181. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Conditions of Participation for Home Health Agencies; Delay of Effective Date'' ((RIN0938–AG81) (CMS–3819-F2)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2182. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Secretary of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2183. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2184. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2017–0724); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2185. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2017–0123—2017–0128); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2186. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of the Government of Cuba's compliance with the United States-Cuba September 1994 ''Joint Communique,'' and on the treatment of persons returned to Cuba in accordance with the United States-Cuba May 1995 ''Joint Statement,'' and the United States-Cuba January 2017 ''Joint Statement''; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2187. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2188. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Listing of Color Additives Exempt from Certification; Spirulina Extract'' (Docket No. FDA–2016–C–2570) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2189. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Labeling; Nutrition Labeling of Standard Menu Items in Restaurants and Similar Retail Food Establishments; Extension of Comment Period'' ((RIN0910–AG57) (Docket No. FDA–2011–F–0172)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2190. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Division of Select Agents and Toxins, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Control of Communicable Diseases; Correction'' (RIN0920–AA63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2191. A communication from the Acting Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Department of Homeland Security Privacy Office's Fiscal Year 2017 Semiannual Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2192. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2193. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''Metropolitan Police Monitor Nearly 2,500 Demonstrations in 2014–2016 and Report No First Amendment Inquiries''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2194. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''International Entrepreneur Rule: Delay of Effective Date'' (RIN1615–AC04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2195. A communication from the Director, National Legislative Division, The American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the financial condition of The American Legion as of December

31, 2016 and 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2196. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fishing Capacity Reduction Program for the Crab Species Covered by the Fishery Management Plan for the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands King and Tanner Crabs'' (RIN0648–AP25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2197. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fireworks Displays at Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary'' (RIN0648–BG50) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2198. A communication from the Deputy Chief Counsel, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership—Amendments to the Terms and Schedule of Financial Assistance'' (RIN0693–AB64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2199. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Transition Progress Report Form and Filing Requirements for Stations Not Eligible for Reimbursement from the TV Broadcast Relocation Fund'' ((MB Docket No. 16–306 and GN Docket No. 12–268) (DA 17–484)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2200. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Arbitration Agreements'' (RIN3170–AA51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–54. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to support the domestic beef industry; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 129

Whereas, the value of the domestic beef industry is a vital and integral part of the United States economy; and

Whereas, the 2016 economic impact was approximately sixty-seven billion in farm cash receipts for cattle and calves; and

Whereas, there are over nine hundred thousand total cattle and calf operations in the United States of which ninety-one percent are family owned or individually operated, and eleven percent are operated by women; and

Whereas, domestic beef production in 2017 is estimated to be approximately twenty-five billion eight hundred million pounds; and

Whereas, the amount of beef consumed in the United States in 2016 was approximately twenty-five billion six hundred million pounds; and

Whereas, it is essential to the success of the domestic beef industry to increase international trade to key export markets; and

Whereas, the promotion of policies which highlight the quality, safety, sustainability, and nutritional value of domestic beef will drive growth in domestic beef exports; and

Whereas, it is in the nation's best interest to protect against legislative policies or agency regulations that have a negative impact on the economic health of the domestic beef industry; and

Whereas, minor changes in future domestic beef import or export levels can significantly change the net beef supply and beef prices; and

Whereas, important steps to supporting the domestic beef industry include developing a comprehensive national strategy for including beef in future dietary guidelines and investing in necessary research to improve productivity and efficiency; and

Whereas, it is critical to the success of the domestic beef industry to identify barriers and develop strategies to attract and enable the next generation of farmers into the domestic beef industry; and

Whereas, terrorist attacks have heightened the nation's awareness of agriterrorism and placed a renewed focus on ensuring the protection of the nation's critical infrastructures, including the domestic beef food supply; and

Whereas, an intentional contamination of the domestic beef food supply could harm millions of people and cripple our vast agriculture system; and

Whereas, it is critical to preserve the United States domestic beef supply and prevent reliance on foreign nations for food; and

Whereas, it will be necessary to develop a variety of federal actions to support the domestic beef industry including proposals which encourage domestic beef production, improve consumer demand, protect our nation's critical infrastructure, attract new farmers, improve the business climate, and increase trade to export markets. Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to support the domestic beef industry. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM–55. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada expressing the support of the Nevada Legislature for the enactment and use of the Antiquities Act and the designation of the Basin and Range National Monument and the Gold Butte National Monument in this State; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 13

Whereas, The provisions of 54 U.S.C. 320301, commonly referred to as the ''Antiquities Act,'' authorize the President of the United States to designate as national monuments any historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are located on land owned or controlled by the Federal Government; and

Whereas, The Gold Butte National Monument was designated as a national monument under the Antiquities Act to protect and preserve approximately 300,000 acres of public lands in Clark County, Nevada; and

Whereas, Desert Bighorn Sheep, Gila Monsters, Desert Tortoises and other species of concern live in the Gold Butte National Monument; and

Whereas, As a way to honor their ancestral lands, the Moapa Band of Paiute Indians and the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe have supported the designation of the Gold Butte National Monument because it is rich with cultural artifacts and sublime petroglyphs; and

Whereas, The Basin and Range National Monument was designated as a national monument under the Antiquities Act to protect and preserve approximately 700,000 acres of public land in Lincoln and Nye Counties, Nevada; and

Whereas, The Basin and Range National Monument provides vital habitat for Desert Bighorn Sheep, Gila Monsters, Rocky Mountain Elk, mule deer, various kinds of sagebrush and many other species of concern; and

Whereas, The Basin and Range National Monument protects many cultural artifacts which date from the early human inhabitants of the area encompassed by the Basin and Range National Monument to the creation of one of the world's greatest works of art, entitled ''City,'' by world renowned artist Michael Heizer; and

Whereas, Hunting, hiking and hundreds of miles of motorized access are allowed in both the Basin and Range National Monument and the Gold Butte National Monument; and

Whereas, The residents of this State have long benefitted from the designation of the Lehman Caves National Monument by former President of the United States Warren G. Harding and the subsequent inclusion of the Lehman Caves National Monument in the Great Basin National Park; and

Whereas, Outdoor recreation activities generate approximately $15 billion dollars in direct consumer spending each year in the State of Nevada and approximately $1 billion dollars in state and local tax revenue; and

Whereas, The designation of the Basin and Range National Monument and the Gold Butte Monument will increase tourism and protect important wildlife habitat and cultural resources in this State; and

Whereas, Former President of the United States Theodore Roosevelt first used the Antiquities Act in 1906 and 16 former presidents in the last 111 years, of whom 8 were Republicans and 8 were Democrats, have used the Antiquities Act to protect the natural, cultural, and historic heritage of the United States; and

Whereas, The designation of national monuments is a uniquely American idea and the Antiquities Act was enacted to preserve worthy public lands as national monuments for future generations; and

Whereas, Many unique sites, including, without limitation, the Grand Canyon, the Statue of Liberty and sites that celebrate and memorialize American history from slavery to civil rights battles, have been protected under the Antiquities Act; and

Whereas, The designation of national monuments provides additional protections for public lands which are held in trust for all Americans, including public lands which are available for traditional uses such as hunting, fishing, grazing, tribal wood and herbal gathering and other historical uses; and

Whereas, The beneficial use of renewable land, water and wildlife resources is essential to the long-term economy of this State; and

Whereas, The management of national monuments is guided by plans developed with input from state, local and tribal governments, members of the public and other stakeholders; and

Whereas, Landscapes which are protected and remain intact are important to cultural and traditional activities for all residents of this State; and

Whereas, National monuments which recognize and protect the contributions, histories, cultures and spiritual beliefs of tribal communities and communities of color are some of the most precious public lands of the United States and are deserving of protection and are important in telling a more complete and inclusive history of the United States; and

Whereas, Recent polls indicate that approximately 81 percent of the residents of this State support keeping in place existing national monuments such as the Basin and Range National Monument and the Gold Butte National Monument; now, therefore, be it,

Resolved, by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the members of the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature affirm and support the designation of the Basin and Range National Monument and the Gold Butte National Monument under the Antiquities Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Nevada Legislature supports the enactment and use of the Antiquities Act as a critical tool for protecting the public good by authorizing the designation of national monuments under the Antiquities Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Nevada Legislature urges Congress to oppose efforts to weaken the Antiquities Act or to reverse the designation of any national monument under the Antiquities Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation.

POM–56. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada expressing opposition to the development of a repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 10

Whereas, Since 1954, when the Atomic Energy Act was passed by Congress, the Federal Government has been responsible for the disposal of radioactive waste, yet few environmental challenges have proven more daunting than the problems posed by the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste; and

Whereas, Pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 U.S.C. §§10101 et seq., as amended, the Department of Energy has been studying Yucca Mountain in southern Nevada as a possible site for a repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste; and

Whereas, In 1987, Congress amended the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 U.S.C. §§10101 et seq., specifying Yucca Mountain as the sole location for the placement of a national repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste; and

Whereas, The State of Nevada has since opposed the placement of a repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste in the State due to the extremely dangerous nature of such waste, the persistence of that danger for an extended period of time, the potential harm to the environment of the State and the serious and unacceptable hazard to the health and welfare of the people of Nevada that is posed by the placement of such a repository in the State; and

Whereas, The transportation of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste to a repository at Yucca Mountain poses serious and unacceptable risks to the environment, economy and residents of Las Vegas, Nevada, the largest city in the State; and

Whereas, In 2001, the Nevada Legislature enacted NRS 353.2655 creating the Nevada Protection Account which must be used to protect the State of Nevada and its residents through funding activities to prevent the location of a repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain; and

Whereas, In 2002, the United States Senate and House of Representatives approved the site at Yucca Mountain as a repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste, thereby overriding the notice of disapproval submitted by the Governor of the State of Nevada; and

Whereas, On June 3, 2008, the Department of Energy submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission a license application for construction authorization of a repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain; and

Whereas, On March 3, 2010, the Department of Energy filed a motion with the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission whereby the Department moved to withdraw the pending license application that was filed in 2008 and asked the Board to dismiss its application with prejudice; and

Whereas, The Atomic Safety and Licensing Board denied the Department of Energy's motion on June 29, 2010; and

Whereas, In 2011, after stating that it found itself evenly divided on whether to take the affirmative action of overturning or upholding the June 29, 2010, decision by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission suspended the licensing adjudicatory proceeding that began with such decision; and

Whereas, For the Fiscal Year 2012, the United States Congress ended funding of the repository at Yucca Mountain and has not subsequently appropriated any new funds to the Department of Energy the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for this purpose; and

Whereas, In 2012, the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future, in fulfilling its purpose to conduct a comprehensive review of the policies for managing nuclear waste, reported that any future repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste should be selected with the consent of the potentially affected state, tribal and local governments; and

Whereas, In 2013, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in In re Aiken County, 725 F.3d 255, 259 (D.C. Cir. 2013), ruled that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission had an obligation to resume the licensing proceeding for the repository at Yucca Mountain that was suspended in 2011 using the remaining funds from previous appropriations, notwithstanding the objections by the Commission that the funds were insufficient to complete the licensing proceeding; and

Whereas, The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has insufficient funds to complete the licensing proceeding for the repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain, has expended the majority of its remaining funds for the licensing proceeding for such a repository and has not received any additional funds to continue the licensing proceeding for such a repository; and

Whereas, The United States Congress is considering various legislation concerning nuclear waste, including S. 95, introduced by Senator Dean Heller, and H.R. 456, introduced by Representative Dina Titus, both of which are entitled the Nuclear Waste Informed Consent Act and which would extend the right of consent to the State of Nevada before the repository at Yucca Mountain could be authorized for development; now, therefore be it

Resolved, by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the Nevada Legislature protests, in the strongest possible terms, any attempt by the United States Congress to resurrect the dangerous and ill-conceived repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain; and be it further

Resolved, That the Nevada Legislature calls on President Donald J. Trump to veto any legislation that would attempt to locate any temporary, interim or permanent repository or storage facility for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste in the State of Nevada; and be it further

Resolved, That the Nevada Legislature calls on Rick Perry, the Secretary of Energy, to find the proposed repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain unsuitable, to abandon consideration of Yucca Mountain as a repository site, and to initiate a process whereby the nation can again engage in innovative and ultimately successful strategies for dealing with the problems of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste; and be it further

Resolved, That the Nevada Legislature formally restates its strong and unyielding opposition to the development of Yucca Mountain as a repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste and to the storage or disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste in the State of Nevada; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Energy and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage and constitutes the official position of the Nevada Legislature.

POM–57. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan expressing support for the construction of a new lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and urge the President of the United States and United States Congress to fully fund the project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas, The Soo Locks at Sault Ste. Marie. Michigan, are of the utmost importance to Michigan and play a critical role in our nation's economy and security. Each year, approximately 10,000 Great Lakes vessels, carrying 80 million tons of iron ore, coal, grain, and other cargo, safely and efficiently traverse the locks. Nearly 80 percent of domestic iron ore—the primary material used to manufacture steel critical to the auto industry, construction, and other industries—travels from mines in Minnesota and Michigan's Upper Peninsula through the Soo Locks: and

Whereas, Only one of the four Soo Locks is large enough to accommodate the modem vessels that commonly traverse the Great Lakes. Sixty percent of the American and Canadian fleet—carrying 70 percent of the

cargo traversing the locks—can only pass through the Poe Lock. The remainder of cargo goes through the smaller MacArthur Lock, with the smallest 100-year-old Davis and Sabin locks rarely used; and

Whereas, The reliance on one lock poses a serious risk to national security and the economies of the state of Michigan and the United States. A long-term outage of the Poe Lock due to lock failure or terrorist attack would disrupt steel production in the United States, crippling the economy and plunging the country into recession. Because no viable transportation alternatives exist, the United States Department of Homeland Security estimated nearly 11 million jobs would be lost. Other studies indicate that even a short-term failure of 30 days could result in economic losses of $160 million; and

Whereas, The United States Congress has authorized the construction of a second large. Poe-sized lock at Sault Ste. Marie. The project was originally authorized in 1986, and in 2007. Congress authorized the construction at full federal expense. Though the project has been authorized and preliminary work conducted, a lack of federal funding has stalled further work; and

Whereas, The economic benefits to Michigan, the Great Lakes region, and the entire country far outweigh the cost of constructing a new lock. A 2017 report to the United States Department of Treasury estimated that the $626 million investment in a new lock would provide a return of up to four times that amount; and

Whereas, The construction of a new lock would be a boon for the northern Michigan economy and create good jobs in a region that continues to suffer from higher than average unemployment rates. At its peak, the project would employ up to 250 workers and require 1.5 million man hours over the 10 years of construction; and

Whereas, It is long past time to construct a new lock. The investment of federal funds in this critical infrastructure makes sound economic sense and is vital to ensure our national security. Every year we delay, the Poe Lock gets another year older, increasing the total project costs and the chances of an unanticipated closure; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives (The Senate Concurring). That we express support for the construction of a new lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and urge the President and Congress of the United States to fully fund the project; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM–58. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada expressing the opposition of the Nevada Legislature to certain proposed changes to the federal laws relating to Medicare and the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance provisions of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, For generations, after a lifetime of work and dedication to this county, many older Nevadans were forced to live in poverty without adequate health care available to them during retirement; and

Whereas, When Congress passed the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance provisions of the Social Security Act in 1935, countless older Nevadans were lifted out of poverty and provided with an adequate, dependable source of income for their retirement; and

Whereas, When Congress passed the Social Security Amendments Act of 1965, crucial health insurance coverage through Medicare was made available to all Nevadans over the age of 65 years, regardless of their income or medical history; and

Whereas, Subsequent amendments by Congress to Medicare and the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance provisions of the Social Security Act established near-universal health care coverage under these programs and provided many older Nevadans with additional benefits, including, without limitation, yearly cost-of-living adjustments to account for inflation, prescription drug assistance and the extension of Medicare to certain Nevadans under the age of 65 years who have long-term disabilities; and

Whereas, When Congress passed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act in 2010, Medicare beneficiaries were able to receive certain preventive health care services and reduced costs; and

Whereas, In Fiscal Year 2015, spending on Medicare and the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance provisions of the Social Security Act constituted over one-third of the $3.7 trillion budget of the Federal Government; and

Whereas, Wide-ranging changes to the Medicare program are being considered by the 115th Congress, including, without limitation, raising the age of eligibility to receive benefits from 65 to 67 years and repealing certain improvements that were made to this program by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; and

Whereas, Wide-ranging changes to the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance provisions of the Social Security Act are also being considered by the 115th Congress, including, without limitation, raising the age for full retirement from 67 to 69 years, moving towards a cost-of-living adjustment based on the chained consumer price index and means testing benefits for certain recipients; and

Whereas, The 115th Congress is also considering the potential privatization of many of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance benefits that older Nevadans have earned during decades of work; and

Whereas, The changes being considered by Congress could have a damaging effect on the standard of living of Nevadans who retire; and

Whereas, A bipartisan solution is needed to ensure the future sustainability of Medicare and the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance provisions of the Social Security Act which fully preserves the critical benefits that many older Nevadans have come to rely upon, is fiscally responsible and ensures that all Nevadans have a reliable source of income and health care during their retirement; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the members of the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature hereby urge Congress to fully preserve the critical benefits which many older Nevadans have come to rely upon; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress should work towards establishing a bipartisan solution which avoids the privatization of Medicare and the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance provisions of the Social Security Act and strengthens these essential programs for future generations of Nevadans; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Chairman of the United States House Committee on Ways and Means, the Chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Finance, the Secretary of the United States Department of Health and Human Services, the Commissioner of Social Security and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

POM–59. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging Congress to propose an amendment to the United States Constitution to allow the governments of the United States and the individual states to regulate and limit political contributions and expenditures to protect the integrity of elections and the equal right of all Americans to effective representation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas, The growing influence of large independent political expenditures is a great and growing concern to the people of the United States and the State of Nevada; and

Whereas, In a democracy, the assurance of a fair and uncorrupted election process is of the utmost importance, and the Nevada Legislature believes that it is a legitimate and vital role of government to regulate political expenditures in an even-handed manner; and

Whereas, In fulfillment of this important role, the government of the United States and a majority of states have regulated and limited independent and other political contributions and expenditures; and

Whereas, The Supreme Court of the United States in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010), held that the First Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits Congress and the states from limiting or restricting independent political expenditures by corporations and unions; and

Whereas, *Citizens United* overturned a long-standing precedent of allowing regulation of independent political expenditures; and

Whereas, *Citizens United* has served as a precedent for further legal decisions which have harmed our democratic system of government, including *American Tradition Partnership v. Bullock*, 567 U.S. 516 (2012), which struck down a long-standing Montana campaign finance law, denying a state the right to regulate independent political expenditures by corporations in state elections, and *McCutcheon v. Federal Election Commission*, 134 S.Ct. 1434 (2014), which struck down aggregate individual contribution limits; and

Whereas, The people of Nevada and all other states should have the power to limit by law the influence of money in their political systems; and

Whereas, In the wake of *Citizens United*, there has been an exponential increase in large political contributions and expenditures which threatens the integrity of the election process, corrupts our candidates, dilutes the power of individual voters and distorts the public discourse: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the members of the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature hereby urge the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the United States Constitution to allow the governments of the United States and the individual states to regulate political contributions and expenditures; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1557. An original bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–130).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Richard V. Spencer, of Wyoming, to be Secretary of the Navy.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

John Kenneth Bush, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

Timothy J. Kelly, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Kevin Christopher Newsom, of Alabama, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Damien Michael Schiff, of California, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1548. A bill to designate certain land administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service in the State of Oregon as wilderness and national recreation areas and to make additional wild and scenic river designations in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 1549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a safe harbor for determinations of worker classification, to require increased reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STRANGE (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1550. A bill to improve the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire and retain physicians and other employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 1551. A bill to provide for the establishment of free market enterprise zones in order to help facilitate the creation of new jobs, entrepreneurial opportunities, enhanced and renewed educational opportunities, and increased community involvement in bankrupt or economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1552. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate that up to 10 percent of their income tax liability be used to reduce the national debt, and to require spending reductions equal to the amounts so designated; to the Committee on Finance .

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 1553. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl analogues as schedule I controlled substances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1554. A bill to require certain practitioners authorized to prescribe controlled substances to complete continuing education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1555. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the administration of Post-9/11 Educational Assistance by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. UDALL, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. FRANKEN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1556. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use designated funding to pay for construction of authorized rural water projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 1557. An original bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. 1558. A bill to amend section 203 of Public Law 94–305 to ensure proper authority for the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. 1559. A bill to ensure a complete analysis of the potential impacts of rules on small entities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1560. A bill to ensure the integrity of border and immigration enforcement efforts by requiring U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to administer law enforcement polygraph examinations to all applicants for law enforcement positions and to require post-hire polygraph examinations for law enforcement personnel as part of periodic reinvestigations; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1561. A bill to repeal the Jones Act restrictions on coastwise trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1562. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and any enablers of the activities of that Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 1563. A bill to authorize the Office of Fossil Energy to develop advanced separation technologies for the extraction and recovery of rare earth elements and minerals from coal and coal byproducts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1564. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit legally married same-sex couples to amend their filing status for returns outside the 3-year limitation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 1565. A bill to support the preparation and retention of outstanding educators in all fields to ensure a bright future for children in under-resourced, under-served communities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1566. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for mental health services from the Department of Veterans Affairs to include members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 1567. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to disclose certain patient information to state controlled substance monitoring programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. Res. 219. A resolution designating July 13, 2017, as ''Summer Learning Day'', a day to reflect on the importance of providing young people with safe, productive, and enriching activities every summer, ensuring the young people return to school in the fall with the skills vital to succeed in the year ahead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 220. A resolution expressing solidarity with Falun Gong practitioners who have lost lives, freedoms, and rights for adhering to their beliefs and practices and condemning the practice of non-consenting organ harvesting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 708

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 708, a bill to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1002, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1024, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1024, supra.

S. 1028

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1182, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. 1307

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1307, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand eligibility to receive refundable tax credits for coverage under a qualified health plan.

S. 1353

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1353, a bill to require States to automatically register eligible voters to vote in elections for Federal offices, and for other purposes.

S. 1391

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1391, a bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to restore Medicaid coverage for citizens of the Freely Associated States lawfully residing in the United States under the Compacts of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau.

S. 1426

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1426, a bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to expand the purposes of the corporation, to designate the United States Center for Safe Sport, and for other purposes.

S. 1455

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1455, a bill to amend the United States Energy Storage Competitiveness Act of 2007 to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish new goals for the Department of Energy relating to energy storage and to carry out certain demonstration projects relating to energy storage.

S. 1457

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1457, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to direct the Secretary of Energy to carry out demonstration projects relating to advanced nuclear reactor technologies to support domestic energy needs.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality from considering, in taking any action, the social cost of carbon, the social cost of methane, the social cost of nitrous oxide, or the social cost of any other greenhouse gas, unless compliant with Office of Management and Budget guidance, and for other purposes.

S. 1529

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1529, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand eligibility for the refundable credit for coverage under a qualified health plan.

S. 1532

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1532, a bill to disqualify from operating a commercial motor vehicle for life an individual who uses a commercial motor vehicle in committing a felony involving human trafficking.

S. 1536

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1536, a bill to designate a human trafficking prevention coordinator and to expand the scope of activities authorized under the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's outreach and education program to include human trafficking prevention activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1540

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1540, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for investments in qualified production facilities.

S. RES. 211

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 211, a resolution condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1552. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate that up to 10 percent of their income tax liability be used to reduce the national debt, and to require spending reductions equal to the amounts so designated; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a critical subject too often overlooked by Congress. It is the Federal debt and our deficit.

It is no secret that our national debt will soon surpass $20 trillion. To provide some context for that figure, $20 trillion represents the largest amount of debt ever owed by any nation in history. This fact, coupled with the fast-approaching end to our fiscal year, will leave Congress facing an unavoidable debt debate.

Our looming debt and deficit are two of our country's most urgent challenges, but the legislative branch does not treat them like the crises they really are. Since January alone, Congress has added $284 billion to the debt over the next 10 years. The Congressional Budget Office recently projected that if Congress continues on its current path, deficits will increase dramatically over the next decade. Specifically, by 2027, the deficit will grow from 3.6 percent of the Nation's GDP to 5.2 percent of the Nation's GDP, totaling $1.4 trillion. Yet, as the National Debt Clock continues to click upward toward $20 trillion, the Federal Government continues to spend money that it simply does not have.

If Congress continues to legislate in this current state of denial, one day soon, we may well wake up to discover that the financial markets have declared that the United States is no longer a good bet. We must also remember that Congress's failure to address this fiscal train wreck today will force our children and grandchildren to deal with its consequences tomorrow. Unless Congress can get this fundamental issue under control, nothing else will matter very much.

There ought to be an option that allows taxpayers to take matters into their own hands. That is why today I am reintroducing the Debt Buy-Down Act. The Debt Buy-Down Act is a commonsense bill that allows taxpayers to rein in the national debt with the simple check of a box. If passed, this bill would require the IRS to include an option on individuals' tax forms that allow them to voluntarily designate up to 10 percent of their tax liabilities to go specifically toward reducing the national debt. The bill would then require Congress to reduce Federal spending by an amount equivalent to that designated by the taxpayers. If Congress fails to make these necessary spending reductions designated by taxpayers, then across-the-board spending cuts would be imposed.

This is not a good way to reduce the Federal debt. The better way would be to make priorities as we consider our spending bills, but it is better than just letting these spending bills go and doing nothing. We ought to use a scalpel and go in and treat these programs as we should and make sure they are doing what they were intended to. If we cannot do that, then we need to take dramatic measures to get our debt and deficit under control.

The Debt Buy-Down Act would protect Social Security benefits, benefits for those in the uniformed services, and payments for net interest on the national debt from being included in any of these across-the-board cuts.

Simply put, in the absence of responsible Federal budget solutions, this bill allows taxpayers to take matters into their own hands. In 2014, Americans paid over $1.37 trillion in individual income taxes. If every one of these individuals had contributed 10 percent of their tax liability, Congress would have been required to have cut $137 billion in spending. While $137 billion does not solve our $20 trillion debt problem, it is certainly a good place to start.

Congress has been so desensitized to the growing national debt that the word ''trillion'' does not even raise alarm bells anymore. In fact, after I introduced the Debt Buy-Down Act in 2010, I began sending a weekly, pun-laden press release to help put the then-$13 trillion national debt—just in 2010—into perspective. It was called ''So Just How Broke Are We?'' Maybe it is time to bring it back.

So 7 years and $7 trillion in added debt later, just how broke are we today? We are so broke that, with our $20 trillion national debt, we could book 570,000 trips to the Moon on SpaceX. It is a pretty expensive excursion, but we could do it 570,000 times. We are so broke that, with our $20 trillion national debt, we could buy every seat at Chase Field in Phoenix for the next 22 million Arizona Diamondbacks games. Of course, that is just a ballpark figure, but it is the last pun. I promise. We are so broke that with our $20 trillion national debt we could buy 20 billion tickets to see Hamilton.

My love of bad puns and jokes aside, instead of thinking about how $20 trillion could be spent, maybe we ought to start thinking about how $20 trillion could be saved.

That is why I am calling on my colleagues to support the Debt Buy-Down Act and empower taxpayers to reduce the national debt. Just think, a simple check of a box would help save billions of dollars and preserve the strength of our national economy. It would save future generations from the consequences of our crippling national debt.

At any rate, I hope this bill makes like the debt and grows a lot of interest.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 1553. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl analogues as schedule I controlled substances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an epidemic that is sweeping our Nation. From big cities to small towns, communities across our country have been ravaged by drug addiction and the multiple problems caused by it. Opioid overdoses have quadrupled since 1999 and were responsible for over 33,000 deaths in 2015 alone.

We have all seen the dangers posed by the overprescription of highly addictive prescription opioids. According to the CDC, addiction to prescription opioid painkillers is the primary gateway to heroin abuse. In fact, Michael Botticelli, President Obama's drug czar, testified in my committee last year that people who are addicted and abuse prescription opioids are 40 times more likely to abuse heroin.

Almost all of the heroin sold on the streets of the United States today enters the country illegally from Mexico. It is trafficked by drug cartels into our communities through our porous southwest border.

It is a problem that continues to grow. Even as heroin has increased, it has remained available and affordable because increased production in Mexico has ensured a reliable supply of low-cost heroin. As long as there is a demand, the enormous profit potential of the drug trade will ensure that there is a sufficient supply. A kilogram of heroin can be produced in Mexico for around $5,000. It can be sold to dealers for as much as $80,000—a 1,500 percent profit.

At another committee hearing, we learned that heroin has significantly dropped in price. In 1981, the nationwide average price was $3,260 per gram of pure heroin. Today, it is between $100 and $150 per gram. That translates into as little as $10 for one hit, making heroin a very affordable and very destructive addiction. While prices have dropped, the potency has increased. Heroin sold in Wisconsin has increased from 5 percent purity in the 1980s to somewhere between 20 percent and 80 percent purity today.

As awful as that reality is, imported heroin is only one front in our fight against opioids. Another equally dangerous front is synthetic or man-made opioids—particularly fentanyl and its analogs—which are now commonly mixed into the heroin sold in our communities. Since fentanyl is 50 times more potent than heroin and 100 times more potent than morphine, it only takes a minuscule amount of fentanyl—just 2 milligrams, less than one one-thousandth of the weight of a penny—to be potentially lethal.

Even more alarming, we are now beginning to see carfentanil, often used to sedate elephants, also being blended into heroin and fentanyl on the streets. Carfentanil is 100 times more potent than fentanyl and 10,000 times more potent than morphine. A dose of carfentanil the size of a grain of salt can lead to a deadly overdose.

Just as we are seeing an increase in drugs coming across our southwest border, man-made opioids are on the rise as well. The profit potential of fentanyl is even more staggering than heroin's. According to an article in the Wall Street Journal, 25 grams of fentanyl costs approximately $810 to produce and has a market value of $800,000.

In 2013, 3,097 people died from overdoses involving synthetic opioids. Just 1 year later, we lost 5,544 people to that same drug—a 79-percent increase in just 1 year. My home State of Wisconsin has been particularly hard hit by the introduction of fentanyl and its analogs.

In April, 2016, I met Lauri Badura. Lauri is from Oconomowoc, WI, a suburb in Milwaukee. She lost her son Archie to a heroin overdose.

Here is a picture of Archie. He doesn't exactly look like a heroin addict, does he? Archie was just 19 years old when he died. He began using marijuana during his freshman year in high school and discovered opioids the summer after his high school graduation. After overdosing multiple times and trying to quit, Archie had stayed sober for 77 days before he relapsed again and finally overdosed on May 15, 2014.

In Archie's memory, Lauri started a foundation called Saving Others For Archie, or SOFA. Her organization raises awareness throughout Wisconsin of the dangers of drug abuse. It offers support for families battling addiction. Lauri is constantly being contacted by and providing comfort to other parents coping with similar tragedies.

Lauri's story is moving, and I applaud her for being such a strong advocate for those struggling with addiction. Unfortunately, her tragedy is not unique. The scourge of addiction and overdose deaths has devastated thousands of families, including my own.

In January, 2016, I lost a nephew to a fentanyl overdose. The legislation I am introducing this afternoon is in memory of my nephew, of Archie, and of all of the families in Wisconsin and throughout America who have lost loved ones in this epidemic.

Today I am proud to introduce the Stopping Overdoses of Fentanyl Analogues Act, or SOFA Act. Sharing an acronym with Lauri Badura's organization, the SOFA Act will give law enforcement a set of enhanced tools to combat the opioid epidemic by closing a loophole that criminal drug manufacturers are exploiting.

Fentanyl is a synthetic, or man-made, opioid—the result of complex chemistry that brings together multiple building blocks. Criminal chemists need change only one small piece of the chemical bond to be one step ahead of the law. The fentanyl analogs on the street today serve no known medical purpose and are contributing to the alarming overdose rates throughout the country. My legislation would classify these analogs under schedule I and give the DEA tools to quickly schedule additional fentanyl analogs as they are identified in our communities.

This body took a step forward last Congress when we passed the CARA legislation to improve addiction treatment programs throughout the United States. We can now take another important step forward by providing law enforcement with the tools it needs to get these dangerous synthetic opioids, such as fentanyl and carfentanil, off the streets.

In addition to Lauri Badura, I also want to thank Dr. Tim Westlake for working with me to craft this legislation. Tim has testified at a committee field hearing in Pewaukee, and he participated in an opioid roundtable in Milwaukee I convened in September. His leadership in Wisconsin and on this issue has been invaluable.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this legislation and additional opportunities to combat this serious problem that has plagued our Nation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1560. A bill to ensure the integrity of border and immigration enforcement efforts by requiring U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to administer law enforcement polygraph examinations to all applicants for law enforcement positions and to require post-hire polygraph examinations for law enforcement personnel as part of periodic reinvestigations; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1560

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Integrity in Border and Immigration Enforcement Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) LAW ENFORCEMENT POSITION.—The term ''law enforcement position'' means any law enforcement position in U.S. Customs and Border Protection (''CBP'') or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (''ICE'').

(2) POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION.—The term ''polygraph examination'' means the Law Enforcement Pre-Employment Test certified by the National Center for Credibility Assessment.

SEC. 3. POLYGRAPH EXAMINATIONS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.

(a) APPLICANTS.—Beginning not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security—

(1) shall require that polygraph examinations are conducted on all applicants for law enforcement positions; and

(2) may not hire any applicant for a law enforcement position who does not pass a polygraph examination.

(b) TARGETED POLYGRAPH REINVESTIGATIONS.—Beginning not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, as part of each background reinvestigation, shall administer a polygraph examination to—

(1) every CBP law enforcement employee who is determined by the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security to be part of a population at risk of corruption or misconduct, based on an analysis of past incidents of misconduct and corruption; and

(2) every ICE law enforcement employee who is determined by the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security to be part of a population at risk of corruption or misconduct, based on an analysis of past incidents of misconduct and corruption.

(c) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO DETERMINE TARGETED POLYGRAPH EXAMINATIONS.—The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security may—

(1) delegate the authority under subsection (b)(1) to the CBP Office of Professional Responsibility; and

(2) delegate the authority under subsection (b)(2) to the ICE Office of Professional Responsibility.

(d) RANDOM POLYGRAPH REINVESTIGATIONS.—Beginning not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(1) randomly administer a polygraph examination each year to at least 5 percent of CBP law enforcement employees who are undergoing background reinvestigations during that year and have not been selected for a targeted polygraph examination under subsection (b)(1); and

(2) randomly administer a polygraph examination each year to at least 5 percent of ICE law enforcement employees who are undergoing background reinvestigations during that year and have not been selected for a targeted polygraph examination under subsection (b)(2).

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1561. A bill to repeal the Jones Act restrictions on coastwise trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to introduce the Open America's Waters Act of 2017. This bill would repeal the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, better known as the Jones Act, an archaic and burdensome law that hinders free trade, stifles the economy and ultimately hurts consumers, largely for the benefit of labor unions. If this legislation becomes law, U.S. shippers will no longer be required to patronize market inefficiency but rather, effectively leverage the global shipping market.

As many of my colleagues know, the Jones Act is one of many of laws passed over time that addresses port-to-port coastal shipping, drafted in order to protect the U.S. domestic shipping industry. While the Jones Act may have had some rationale back in the 1920s when it was enacted, today it serves only to raise shipping costs, making U.S. farmers and businesses less competitive in the global marketplace and increasing costs for American consumers. This protectionist mentality directly contradicts the lessons our nation has learned about the many benefits of a free and open market. Repeatedly, it has been proven that trade liberalization has created

jobs, expanded economic growth and provided consumers with access to lower cost goods and services.

The forced purchase of American vessels combined with the immense cost associated with U.S. shipbuilding has forced U.S. shippers to act against their best interests to the detriment of their businesses. While foreign-built coastal-sized ships typically cost between $25–30 million, a U.S.-made ship of the same size can cost anywhere between $190–250 million. A repeal of the Jones Act, over time, would have broad impact. According to a 2002 U.S. International Trade Commission study, repealing the Jones Act would lower shipping costs by about 22 percent. The Commission also found that repealing the Jones Act would have an annual positive effect of $656 million on the overall U.S. economy. Though this decade-and-a-half-old study provides some of the most recent statistics available, it is not hard to imagine the modern affect that maritime deregulation would contribute to this industry.

Congress must take action to repeal laws that have outlived their usefulness and are no longer relevant to modern commerce. It is unacceptable that millions of dollars in the U.S. economy are lost every year to an antiquated policy, and unacceptable that this body is unable to disengage from special interests in order to participate in a productive debate on this issue. I encourage my colleagues to reflect on our responsibility as lawmakers and see the Jones Act for what it really is: an outdated and protectionist policy that only serves to harm the American economy and consumer.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 219—DESIGNATING JULY 13, 2017, AS ''SUMMER LEARNING DAY'', A DAY TO REFLECT ON THE IMPORTANCE OF PROVIDING YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SAFE, PRODUCTIVE, AND ENRICHING ACTIVITIES EVERY SUMMER, ENSURING THE YOUNG PEOPLE RETURN TO SCHOOL IN THE FALL WITH THE SKILLS VITAL TO SUCCEED IN THE YEAR AHEAD

Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 219

Whereas summer learning loss widens an already existing achievement gap that stays constant during the 9-month school year;

Whereas summer learning loss disproportionately impacts the learning of children from lower-income households or with special educational needs;

Whereas, during the summer, students lose approximately 2 months of grade level equivalency in math computation skills and low-income students lose an additional 2 months in reading achievement;

Whereas effective summer programs can bridge the eighth to ninth grade transition and strategically decrease dropout rates of high risk students;

Whereas only 1 in 7 students received the nutrition and meals they needed during the summer of 2016;

Whereas summer learning programs contribute to the academic and social growth of students, provide safe and healthy spaces for children during the summer, and give young people the tools necessary for success in school;

Whereas summer youth employment programs provide young people with access to meaningful experiences that foster interest in potential careers, encourage financial and personal responsibility, and emphasize community engagement;

Whereas many organizations, including public agencies, schools, libraries, museums, recreation centers, camps, and businesses, assist with the personal development of young people through summer activities;

Whereas students who do not receive supervision during the summer are far more likely to receive poor grades, exhibit behavioral issues, and drop out of school;

Whereas summer learning contributes to increasing high school graduation rates; and

Whereas summer learning is a crucial component in ensuring that all students graduate from high school and emerge ready for the next endeavor, which may be to attend college or start a career: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates July 13, 2017, as ''Summer Learning Day''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 220—EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH FALUN GONG PRACTITIONERS WHO HAVE LOST LIVES, FREEDOMS, AND RIGHTS FOR ADHERING TO THEIR BELIEFS AND PRACTICES AND CONDEMNING THE PRACTICE OF NON-CONSENTING ORGAN HARVESTING, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 220

Whereas Falun Gong (also known as Falun Dafa) is a Chinese spiritual discipline founded by Li Hongzhi in 1992 that consists of spiritual and moral teachings, meditation, and exercise, and is based upon the universal principles of truthfulness, compassion, and forbearance;

Whereas, during the mid-1990s, Falun Gong acquired a large and diverse following, with as many as 70,000,000 practitioners at its peak;

Whereas, on April 25, 1999, an estimated 10,000 to 30,000 Falun Gong practitioners gathered in Beijing to protest growing restrictions by the Government of the People's Republic of China on the activities of Falun Gong practitioners, and the Government of the People's Republic of China responded with an intensive, comprehensive, and unforgiving campaign against the movement that began on July 20, 1999, with the banning of Falun Gong;

Whereas the Constitution of the People's Republic of China guarantees basic rights, including the freedoms of speech, association, demonstration, and religion;

Whereas, in 1993, the Government of the People's Republic of China praised Li Hongzhi for his contributions in ''safeguarding social order and security'' and ''promoting rectitude in society'';

Whereas, in many detention facilities and labor camps, Falun Gong prisoners of conscience have at times comprised the majority of the population, and have been said to receive the longest sentences and the worst treatment, including torture;

Whereas, according to overseas Falun Gong and human rights organizations, since 1999, from several hundred to a few thousand Falun Gong adherents have died in custody from torture, abuse, and neglect;

Whereas a review of the Government of the People's Republic of China by the United Nations Human Rights Council's Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review in October 2013 recommended that China ''[s]top the prosecution and persecution of people for the practice of their religion or belief including Catholics, other Christians, Tibetans, Uyghurs, and Falun Gong'';

Whereas the United Nations Committee Against Torture and the Special Rapporteur on Torture have expressed concern over the allegations of organ harvesting from Falun Gong prisoners, and have called on the Government of the People's Republic of China to increase accountability and transparency in the organ transplant system and punish those responsible for abuses;

Whereas the killing of religious or political prisoners for the purpose of selling their organs for transplant is an egregious and intolerable violation of the fundamental right to life;

Whereas voluntary and informed consent is the precondition for ethical organ donation, and international medical organizations state that prisoners, deprived of their freedom, are not in the position to give free consent and that the practice of sourcing organs from prisoners is a violation of ethical guidelines in medicine;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party of China continue to deny reports that many organs are taken without the consent of prisoners, yet at the same time prevent independent verification of its transplant system;

Whereas the organ transplantation system in China does not comply with the World Health Organization's requirement of transparency and traceability in organ procurement pathways;

Whereas the United States Department of State Country Report on Human Rights for China for 2014 stated, ''Advocacy groups continued to report instances of organ harvesting from prisoners.'';

Whereas Huang Jiefu, director of the China Organ Donation Committee, announced in December 2014 that China would end the practice of organ harvesting from executed prisoners by January 1, 2015, but did not directly address organ harvesting from prisoners of conscience;

Whereas Freedom House reported in 2015 that Falun Gong practitioners comprise the largest portion of prisoners of conscience in China, and face an elevated risk of dying or being killed in custody;

Whereas the Department of State Country Report on Human Rights for China for 2016 reported that ''some international medical professionals and human rights researchers questioned the voluntary nature of the (transplantation) system, the accuracy of official statistics, and official claims about the source of organs'';

Whereas the Congressional-Executive Commission on China (CECC) stated in 2016 that ''international observers, including the U.S. House of Representatives and the European

Parliament, expressed concern over reports that numerous organ transplantations have used the organs of detained prisoners, including Falun Gong practitioners'' and also noted that international medical professionals ''expressed skepticism of reforms raised by discrepancies in official data''; and

Whereas a 2017 report by Freedom House concluded that there was ''credible evidence suggesting that beginning in the early 2000s, Falun Gong detainees were killed for their organs on a large scale'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses solidarity with Falun Gong practitioners and their families for the lives, freedoms, and rights they lost for adhering to their beliefs and practices;

(2) emphasizes to the Government of the People's Republic of China that freedom of religion includes the right of Falun Gong practitioners to freely practice Falun Gong in China;

(3) calls upon the Communist Party of China to immediately cease and desist from its campaign to persecute Falun Gong practitioners and promptly release all Falun Gong practitioners who have been confined, detained, or imprisoned for pursuing their right to hold and exercise their spiritual beliefs;

(4) condemns the practice of non-consenting organ harvesting in the People's Republic of China;

(5) calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party of China to immediately end the practice of organ harvesting from all prisoners of conscience; and

(6) calls on the People's Republic of China to allow an independent and transparent investigation into organ transplant abuses.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 258. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1519, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 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; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 258. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1519, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 710. EXCEPTION TO INCREASE IN COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS FOR TRICARE PHARMACY BENEFITS PROGRAM FOR BENEFICIARIES WHO LIVE MORE THAN 40 MILES FROM A MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (6) of section 1074g(a) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 706(a), the Secretary of Defense may not increase after the date of the enactment of this Act any cost-sharing amounts under such paragraph with respect to covered beneficiaries described in subsection (b).

(b) COVERED BENEFICIARIES DESCRIBED.—Covered beneficiaries described in this subsection are eligible covered beneficiaries (as defined in section 1074g(g) of title 10, United States Code) who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest military treatment facility to the residence of the beneficiary.

(c) REPORT ON EFFECT OF INCREASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the potential effect, without regard to subsection (a), of the increase in cost-sharing amounts under section 1074g(a)(6) of title 10, United States Code, on covered beneficiaries described in subsection (b).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of how much additional costs would be required of covered beneficiaries described in subsection (b) per year as a result of increases in cost-sharing amounts described in such paragraph, including the average amount per individual and the aggregate amount.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 13, 2017 at 10 a.m., in 328A Russell Senate Office Building, in order to conduct a hearing entitled ''Opportunities in Global and Local Markets, Specialty Crops, and Organics: Perspectives for the 2018 Farm Bill.''

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 13, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on the attempted coup in Montenegro and malign Russian influence in Europe.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 13, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, ''The Semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress.''

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 13, 2017, at 10:15 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to consider the nomination of Kevin K. McAleenan, of Hawaii, to be Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection Department of Homeland Security.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 13, 2017 at 9:30 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled ''Review of the 2017 Trafficking in Persons Report.''

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, in order to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nomination Hearing for Deputy Secretary of Labor and Members of the National Labor Relations Board'' on Thursday, July 13, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 13, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Thursday, July 13, 2017 from 2 p.m., in room SH–219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 13, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a Subcommittee Hearing on ''Reopening the American Frontier: Promoting Partnerships Between Commercial Space and the U.S. Government to Advance Exploration and Settlement.''

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Felicia Lucci, an AAAS fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 2430

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2430) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place

the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the title of the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 17, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, July 17; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Shanahan nomination; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture vote on the Shanahan nomination occur at 5:30 p.m., Monday, July 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 17, 2017, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:57 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 17, 2017, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

ROSTIN BEHNAM, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 19, 2021, VICE MARK P. WETJEN, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

MICHAEL LAWRENCE BROWN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, VICE JULIE E. CARNES, ELEVATED.

WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR., OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE KEVIN HUNTER SHARP, RESIGNED.

THOMAS ALVIN FARR, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA, VICE MALCOLM J. HOWARD, RETIRED.

CHARLES BARNES GOODWIN, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA, VICE ROBIN J. CAUTHRON, RETIRED.

MARK SAALFIELD NORRIS, SR., OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE J. DANIEL BREEN, RETIRED.

THOMAS LEE ROBINSON PARKER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE SAMUEL H. MAYS, JR., RETIRED.

WILLIAM M. RAY II, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, VICE HAROLD L. MURPHY, RETIRED.

ELI JEREMY RICHARDSON, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE TODD CAMPBELL, RETIRED.

TILMAN EUGENE SELF III, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, VICE C. ASHLEY ROYAL, RETIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN D. SLOCUM

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ANTHONY J. CARRELLI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. SAM C. BARRETT

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL N. ADAME
COL. JAIME A. AREIZAGA
COL. THOMAS G. BEHLING
COL. KAREN A. BERRY
COL. ROBYN J. BLADER
COL. DARRELL L. BUTTERS
COL. ROBERT B. DAVIS
COL. STEPHEN M. DOYLE
COL. JOHN J. DRISCOLL
COL. LARRY D. FLETCHER
COL. DAVID A. GAGNON
COL. TERRY L. GRISHAM
COL. ANDREW M. HARRIS
COL. HERMAN W. HOLT
COL. TODD H. HUBBARD
COL. JONATHAN S. HUBBARD
COL. MANLEY JAMES
COL. DAVID M. JENKINS
COL. JOHN T. KELLY
COL. STEVEN J. KREMER
COL. SCOTT M. MACLEOD
COL. SHARON A. MARTIN
COL. BRIAN R. NESVIK
COL. DONALD D. PEREZ
COL. STEPHEN M. RADULSKI
COL. CARL T. REESE
COL. ROBERT K. RYAN
COL. LAWRENCE E. SCHLOEGL
COL. GRANT C. SLAYDEN
COL. TROY J. SOUKUP
COL. BRIAN E. TATE
COL. JEFFREY M. TERRILL
COL. PATRICK C. THIBODEAU

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN C. ANDONIE
COL. JIMMIE L. COLE
COL. WILLIAM T. CONWAY
COL. JEFFREY L. COPELAND
COL. PETER B. CROSS
COL. JON M. HARRISON
COL. STEFANIE K. HORVATH
COL. LOWELL E. KRUSE
COL. HALDANE B. LAMBERTON
COL. STEPHEN F. LOGAN
COL. FRANKLIN D. POWELL
COL. CARLTON G. SMITH
COL. TIMOTHY N. THOMBLESON
COL. CYNTHIA K. TINKHAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. SAMUEL AGOSTOSANTIAGO
COL. HERBERT J. BROCK IV
COL. CHARLES G. CODY
COL. CHARLES T. CROSBY
COL. JAKIE R. DAVIS, JR.
COL. MARK D. DROWN
COL. CURTIS W. FAULK
COL. TIMOTHY A. GLYNN
COL. RICHARD A. GRAY
COL. GREGORY J. HADFIELD
COL. THOMAS W. HANLEY
COL. SHAWN A. HARRIS
COL. RALPH F. HEDENBERG
COL. JACKIE A. HUBER
COL. DAVID T. MANFREDI
COL. JUDITH D. MARTIN
COL. JOHN K. MULLER
COL. WILLIAM M. MYER
COL. RALPH R. MYERS, JR.
COL. ERIC J. OH
COL. AMOS P. PARKER, JR.
COL. JOSEPH K. PEARCE
COL. DEBRA D. RICE
COL. DOUGLAS C. ROSE, JR.
COL. MARK J. SCHINDLER
COL. FARIN D. SCHWARTZ
COL. RONALD F. TAYLOR
COL. DANIEL L. TOWNSEND
COL. WILLIAM L. ZANA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RYAN F. GONSALVES

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM R. MERZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOHN D. ALEXANDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. PAUL A. STADER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JOHN C. AQUILINO

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

WILLIAM O. MURRAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

PATRICK R. WILDE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JEFF H. MCDONALD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

EDWARD V. ABRAHAMSON
THOMAS C. ADKINS
MICHELLE I. AETONU
DAVID M. ALVAREZ
TREG E. ANCELET
HEIDI E. ANDERSON
CHARLES L. ARNOLD
CHARLES D. AUSMAN
MICHELLE D. BARBEE
BEAU J. BARKER
ISAAC L. BATES
JOSEPH BATISTE, JR.
JOSHUA J. BAXTER
CORINNE F. BELL
PAUL N. BELMONT III
DAMON F. BENNETT
JEANETTE E. BERNAOLA
KEN R. BERNIER
RODNEY G. BILBREW
TOBY A. BIRDSELL
MATTHEW J. BISSWURM
DAVID J. BLANCHARD
JASON D. BOHANNON
PERRY R. BOLDING
WENDY E. BOLTON
DALE P. BOND, JR.
BENJAMIN D. BORING
MICHAEL D. BOYLES
ERIC A. BROOKS
WILLIAM D. BROSEY
DEVRIM J. BROWN
KENNETH R. BULTHUIS
JENNIFER A. BURGESS
KEVIN R. BURGESS
ERIC M. BURKE
THADDEUS L. BURNETT
STEPHEN M. BUSSELL
THEODORE G. CAPRA
CRYSTAL L. CARBERRY
JEFFRY T. CARLSON
JASON E. CARNEY
JESSICA R. CARTER
KURSTEEN N. CHAMPAGNE
EDWARD CHO
TENN R. CHOWFEN
LUKE R. CLOVER
JENNIE E. CONLON
JOE CONTRERAS

CHARLES W. CONWAY, JR.
JERIMIAH J. CORBIN
PHILIP D. CORDARO
MARK R. CORN
AARON M. CORNETT
JAVIER A. CORTEZ
THOMAS U. CRARY III
JOSE A. CRESPO
RICHARD CRUZ
KIZZY M. DANSER
SHAALIM H. DAVID
ALBERT W. DAVIS
JOSEPH H. DAVIS
MATTHEW W. DAVIS
THEODORE DAVIS, JR.
MAUREEN A. DAVISBERK
MARTIN J. DEBOCK
CHRISTINE A. DESAINE
CHRISTOPHER L. DIEDRICH
RODLIN D. DOYLE
JASON J. DUMSER
BRYAN R. DUNCAN
CLAYTON J. DUNCAN
JOSEPH P. DZVONIK
SAMUEL J. ESKEW
ROBIN R. EVANS
DENIS J. FAJARDO
KENDRICK D. FANNIEL
TAMMY A. FANNIEL
HUGHIE E. FEWELL
JAMES T. FISHER
CHANDLER G. FISK
CARLITO O. FLORES
MIGUEL A. FLORESRIVERA
FELICIA R. FLOYD
LATOSHA D. FLOYD
ERIN H. FRAZIER
DEANDRE L. GARNER
JULIE J. M. GILBERT
YOLANDA D. GORE
DANILO A. GREEN
WILLIAM J. GREGORY
JEREMY A. GROOVER
EDWARD M. GUTIERREZ
EDWARD A. HALSTEAD
AAREN M. HANSON
DAVID O. HARLAN
DORIAN C. HATCHER
HEATH R. HAWKES
STEVEN T. HELM
PATRICK M. HENRICHS
RUSSELL E. HENRY
DANIEL P. HENZIE
JEFFREY R. HERNANDEZ
ANDREW W. HESS
CHRISTOPHER M. HETZ
GEORGE A. HILL
TRAVIS W. HILL, SR.
LINWOOD R. HILTON
JEREMIAH S. HIRRAS
JOHN D. HNYDA
JASON R. HOLLAND
YEMSRACH B. HOLLEY
ROY K. HORIKAWA
MICHAEL E. HORKAY
JEREMIAH J. HULL
LAURA G. HUTCHINSON
CARMEN J. IGLESIAS
DELIA L. IHASZ
SUNG J. IN
ADRIAN F. JASSO
MATTHEW D. JOHNSON
JAMES R. JOHNSTON
AARON L. JONES
ANGELO G. KELLUM
BRENT D. KENNEDY
BENJAMIN L. KILGORE
TURMEL A. KINDRED
CARL K. KLEINHOLZ
JASON W. KLOPF
GEORGE P. KLOPPENBURG
VIRGINIA A. KNORR
PAMELA D. KOPPELMANN
EBONY S. LAMBERT
ERNEST J. LANE II
LATRINA D. LEE
MICHAEL J. LEE
TYRONE D. LEE
CHRISTINA M. LEWIS
MICHELLE A. LEWIS
PAUL Z. LICATA
MICHAEL A. LIND
ROSS B. LINDSEY
FLOR Y. LOPEZ
BRIAN I. LUST
KENSANDRA T. MACK
MELISSA N. MAJANO
THOMAS D. MALONE
CANDICE MARTIN
ELIZABETH S. MASON
CATHY L. MASSEY
JAMES B. MATTOX
GEORGE B. MAY, JR.
JEFFREY S. MAY
JAMES D. MCCONNELL
JUSTIN M. MCGOVERN
STUART I. MCMILLAN
SHAUN D. MCMURCHIE
CHATA MEADOR
DUSTIN A. MENHART
JUSTIN L. MILLER
MATTHEW C. MILLER
JOSEPH S. MINOR
MELVIN T. MITCHELL
MONICA S. MITCHELL
CHAD L. MONIZ
CLARENCE L. MONTAGUE
ANDRA A. MOORE
STACY L. MOORE
JONATHAN R. MORRIS
MERNA C. MORRIS
VINSON B. MORRIS
DONYA K. MOSLEY
JILL MOSS
PHILLIP P. MURRELL
WILLIAM NAVARRO
JOHNATHON W. NELSON
DOUGLAS S. NEWELL
RYAN P. NOBIS
ROBERT R. OLIVER
SETH M. OLMSTEAD
ERIC E. ORJIH
SCOTT A. PARLOW
JAMES W. PAUL
FELIPE PEREZ, JR.
JULIAN PEREZ
MICHAEL O. PERRY
MATTHEW O. PETERSON
CHRISTOPHER D. PETREE
BRIAN J. PIEKIELKO
GEORGE J. PLYS
STEPHEN A. POLACEK
JAMES A. POLAK
JASON H. POLK
JOSHUA D. PORTER
WILLIAM PRINCE, JR.
KIMBERLY D. PRINGLE
LAKETHA D. PRIOLEAU
KEITH E. PRUETT
ALICIA L. PRUITT
PRESTON G. PYSH
DARE A. RAPANOTTI
JUSTIN M. REDFERN
ERIN M. REED
DONALD R. REEVES, JR.
HEATHER M. REILLY
TROY D. REITER
LUZHILDA P. RESTREPO
WILLIAM J. RICHARDSON
CHRISTINA L. RIVAS
NADINE I. ROSS
RAMON C. SALAS
SCOTT D. SAVOIE
ERIC J. SCHILLING
MICHAEL K. SCHULTE
CURT H. SCHULTHEIS
HEATHER J. SHARPLESS
MICHAEL L. SHAW
DANIEL J. SHILL
BRIAN K. SHOEMAKER
KELVIN V. SIMMONS
MATTHEW E. SIMPSON
DONNA S. SIMS
BECKY SIU
MARIE F. SLACK
BRIAN J. SLOTNICK
ARJEAN A. SMITH
BRADLEY A. SMITH
DONALD P. SMITH
PAUL W. SMITH
SAMUEL D. SMITH, SR.
TARA D. SMITH
ANGELA L. SMOOT
KARL P. SONDERMANN
PETER J. STAMBERSKY
BRIAN C. STEELE
JULIE M. STOCKELMAN
NATHAN A. STROHM
JEFFREY J. STVAN
ADRIAN J. SULLIVAN
ERIC D. SUTTON
SHAWN M. SVOBODA
RYAN H. SWEDLOW
BRIAN C. TABAYOYONG
TYLER J. TAFELSKI
TYRON P. TAYLOR
DANIEL R. THETFORD
AUTHER E. THOMAS
DEMETRICK L. THOMAS
VAUGHN C. THOMPSON
EVAN R. TIMMENS
RYAN B. TINCH
FRANK C. TORTELLA, JR.
TOMISHA A. TOSON
DWIGHT F. TOWLER
JOHN C. TRAEGER
BILLY J. TUCKER
TAVARES A. TUKES
FAAMAO UMALITANIELU
BRANDON H. UNGETHEIM
RONALD A. VELDHUIZEN, JR.
NICHOLE L. VILD
GORDON E. VINCENT
MICHAEL F. VOLPE III
COMANECI WALKER
GLORIA M. WALKER
BRANDON K. WALLACE
JASON W. WALSH
LAKESHA M. WARREN
MICHAEL E. WARREN
ODERAY L. WATSONFOWLES
NATASHA M. WAYNE
JAMES E. WEAVER
JASON A. WEIGLE
MARTIN E. WENNBLOM
SHERIDA Y. WHINDLETON
ERICA L. WHITE
ALTWAN L. WHITFIELD
DENNIS K. WILLIAMS II
MELONY L. WILLIAMS
NICOLE E. WILLIS
ANTHONY B. WILSON
SEAN R. WILSON
TODD A. WISE
LAURA P. WOOD
DELIAH M. WOODS
AARON T. WORKMAN
LOUWANNA D. WRIGHT
KATINA S. YARBOUGH
SHAWN R. YOUNG
D011855
D012359
D012726
D012929

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

SCOTT J. AKERLEY
PATRICK L. ALSUP
DANIEL J. ANDREWS
TODD W. ARNOLD
MATTHEW G. AUSTIN
ANDREW A. BAIR
JONATHAN D. BAKER
RAVI A. BALARAM
MICHAEL K. BARNETT
ANTHONY L. BARRERAS
JASON L. BARTLETT
JORDAN M. BECKER
WYNNE M. BEERS
RICHARD J. BENDELEWSKI
CRAIG M. BENKE
DAVID M. BESKOW
SHANEKA L. BIZZELL
JACOB A. BLANTON
GARY S. BLOUNT
DANIEL B. BOLTON
JARED V. BONDESSON
DEREK D. BOTHERN
JESSE J. BRANSON
CHRISTOPHER R. BRAUTIGAM
WILLIAM D. BRICE
MARIE E. BRIDGES
CLEO T. BROWN
EARL C. BROWN
STEPHEN S. BROWN
TEMARKUS M. BROWN
CHRISTOPHER S. BROWNING
VONTE Q. BRUMFIELD
PAUL A. BUBLIS
JASON A. BUCHANAN
RAVEN M. BUKOWSKI
JOSHUA T. BURDETT
STEPHEN J. BURROUGHS
JAMES D. BUSKIRK
LOREN A. BYMER
JEFFREY A. BYRD
DEVON M. CALLAHAN
MATTHEW J. CANNON
BRETT A. CAREY
DEREK J. CARLSON
JAMEL R. CARR
TARA S. CARR
THOMAS W. CASEY
TYLER M. CATE
NANCY C. CECH
TREVOR J. CHARTIER
RICHARD T. CHEN
WILLIAM J. CHERKAUSKAS
JOHN D. CHILDRESS
MICHAEL J. CHILDS
MIN K. CHOI
CRAIG A. CHRISTIAN
NANCY E. CLAUSS
CAMALA L. COATS
ERIC L. COGER
GEORGE H. COLEMAN
RONALD A. COLOMBO, JR.
LAKEETRA COLVIN
JOSHUA M. CONANT
SHANE W. CORCORAN
TRAVIS R. COX
MARTYN Y. CRIGHTON
IRA L. CROFFORD, JR.
MATTHEW J. CROWE
AARON D. CUMMINGS
STEVEN J. CURTIS
TROY G. DANDERSON
BRIAN C. DARNELL
CARSON E. DAVIS
JAY B. DAVIS
MICHAEL H. DAVIS
BRANDON B. DAWALT
JACOB H. DAY
ASHOK K. DEB
MICHAEL A. DECICCO
EDDIE J. DIAZRIVERA
BRENT B. DODD
AGUSTIN E. DOMINGUEZ
KENNETH H. DONNOLLY
DEBRA M. DOOLITTLE
JEFFREY R. DUPLANTIS
RODERICK M. DWYER
MICHAEL F. DYER
ANTHONNIE D. EASON
TYLER Q. EDDY
ERIN N. EIKE
STEVEN L. ELGAN
CHAD M. ENGLISH
SERANEL N. ENGUILLADO
ROBERT W. ERDMAN
NEAL R. ERICKSON
PETER R. EXLINE
TAMMY J. FEARNOW
PAUL J. FEDAK, JR.
ERIC P. FEKETE
JOEL M. FELTZ
SAMUEL T. FISHBURNE

JAMES R. FOURNIER
RUSSELL H. FOX
WILFREDO FRANCESCHINI
CRAIG E. FRANK
LUCAS N. FRANK
TIMOTHY C. FRIEDRICH
JOHN P. FRIEL
TERRY W. FRY
RASHAD J. FULCHER
ROBERT J. GABLE
SEAN GIBBS
JAMES H. GIFFORD
MICHAEL A. GIORDANO
KELLY D. GLEASON
DAVID L. GOMEZ
CHRISTOPHER A. GONZALES
CONTRELL D. GOODE
DERRICK L. GOODWIN
JESSICA D. GRASSETTI
CLAUDETTE D. GRAVES
MICHAEL A. GRYGAR
KRISTA J. GUELLER
JEREMY D. GUY
STARRIA HAIGOOD
ADAM D. HALLMARK
ARNOLD V. HAMMARI
PIERRE N. HAN
BRIAN M. HANLEY
THOR K. HANSON
JOHN L. HARRELL
WALTER R. J. HARRISON
BRIAN M. HART
MATTHEW E. HARTMAN
BRIAN K. HAWKINS
JEFFREY D. HAY
AARON P. HEBERLEIN
JOSEPH L. HEYMAN
PATRICK J. HOFMANN
JASON P. HOGAN
DENNIS L. HOLIDAY
AMBER J. HOLMES
GREGORY M. HOLMES
JAMES P. L. HOLZGREFE
DAVID W. HUGHES
MICHAEL J. ISBELL
BENJAMIN F. IVERSON
LANCE E. JACKSON
JOSEF M. JACOBSEN
ROBERT A. JAMES
HAEYONG JI
CARL P. JOHNSON
CHRISTOPHER M. JOHNSON
JEFFREY W. JOHNSON
MICHAEL C. JONES
TYLER L. JONES
ANTHONY S. JORDAN
MATTHEW P. KASKY
SCOT R. KEITH
SHANE P. KELLEY
TERENCE M. KELLEY
JEFFREY C. KENDELLEN
JOSHUA S. KHOURY
BRIAN S. KILGORE
DONALD D. KIM
JASON J. KIM
JESSICA E. KING
ROSS S. KINKEAD
CHRISTOPHER F. KIZINSKI
CHRISTOPHER R. KOBYRA
MONTE A. KOONTZ
CHRISTOPHER A. KREILER
CHRISTOPHER G. KRUPAR
JAMES A. LACOVARA
THOMAS J. LANEY
ANDREW C. LEE
JOHN C. H. LEE
HERB LEGGETTE
ROBERT C. LEICHT, JR.
JOSEPH J. LEMAY
NICHOLAS A. LONG
HECTOR J. LOPEZ
MARCO J. LYONS
MATTHEW D. MACKEY
WILLIAM A. MACUGAY
JOSHUA D. MADLINGER
CHEVELLE P. MALONE
GAETANO C. MANGANO
ANTHONY D. MARCHAND
ALBERT J. MARCKWARDT
GUALBERTO J. MARRERO
MATTHEW T. MASON
ADRIAN D. MASSEY
JAMES R. MATHESON
MARTRELL G. MATTHEWS
DAVID C. MCCAUGHRIN
ANNE C. MCCLAIN
BRIAN C. MCDOWELL
SIMON A. MCKENZIE
ROBERT E. MCMAHON
THOMAS H. MCMURTRIE III
DAVID L. MCNATT
GLENN A. MEDLOCK
JOHN A. MEISTER
DERRICK D. MELTON
CARIE M. MENDIOLA
PAUL E. MEYER
JAMES R. MIJARES
BRIAN J. MILLER
CATHERINE J. MILLER
KEITH B. MILLER
MATTHEW G. MILLER
ERICA M. MITCHELL
ANDRE S. MONGE
ANTHONY A. MOORE
JOEL L. MOORE
HAROLD L. MORRIS
SHYLO R. MORRISON
SCOTT D. MOSLEY
ROBERT C. MOYER
VINCENT J. MUCKER
KEVIN M. MURPHY
HURCULES MURRAY II
ALEXANDER J. MUSEL
ERIC M. MUSGRAVE
LOUIS P. NEMEC
PETER A. NESBITT
RUBIN R. NEYPES
LEE M. NORTH
JASON S. NORTHROP
BRIAN E. NORTHUP
RAHMIN J. NORWOOD
YAHMIN N. NORWOOD
LAWRENCE R. NUNN
RACHAEL L. OCONNELL
DANIEL J. OH
RICARDO J. ORTEGA
MOISES ORTIZ
PEDRO J. ORTIZ
MARK L. OSANO
CHRISTOPHER E. OSGOOD
BRIAN L. PARKER
LOLETA L. PARKER
DEIDRE E. PATTERSON
JASON G. PEPPER
PAUL J. PETERS
BRIAN J. PETERSON
WILLIAM M. PETULLO
ANDREW R. PFLUGER
JANET L. PHILLIPS
STEVEN S. PHIPPS
GARY W. PICKENS
RYAN M. PIFER
STEPHAN J. PIKNER
PONGPAT D. PILUEK
JEREMY F. PITANIELLO
CHANTE D. PONDEXTER
SCOTT J. PORTER
RILEY J. POST
SHAYLA D. POTTER
MATTHEW J. RADIK
PETER L. RANGEL
MATTHEW B. RAPP
ROBERT J. REDMON
ERIC M. REID
REGINALD H. RICE
DERRICK L. RICHARDSON
ROBERT M. RICHARDSON
JAMES R. RIGBY
FRED RIGGS, JR.
DAVID J. RISIUS
DAVID E. RITTENHOUSE, JR.
CARLOS E. RIVERA
RUSTY W. ROBINSON
DANIEL J. ROGNE
GAMALIEL ROSA
ABDIEL ROSADOMENDEZ
MICHAEL S. ROSOL
AARON M. ROSPENDOWSKI
BRIAN J. RYAN
KELLY K. RYAN
JARED D. SAINATO
KRISTIN C. SALING
ANDREW P. SANDERS
JOHN L. SANDERS
WAYNE A. SANDERS
ROBERTO A. SANTAMARIA
STEPHAN A. SCHOENBORN
PATRICK SCHORPP
ERIC R. SCHWARTZ
STEVEN J. SCHWOERKE
BRIAN J. SCICLUNA
SHANE P. SCOTT
LAWRENCE SEKAJIPO
KRYSTAL G. G. SESSOMS
NICOLE Y. SHADLEY
MATTHEW D. SHIFRIN
STEPHEN C. SHORT
PETER T. SINCLAIR II
BRIAN D. SLOSMAN
DAVID W. SMARTT
BETH R. SMITH
SLADE K. SMITH
JOAN E. SOMMERS
MICHAEL E. STADNYK
TYLER J. STANDISH
SCOTT H. STARR
JONATHAN L. STCLAIR
JASON J. STEGER
BENJAMIN J. STEICHEN
DAVID M. STURGIS
DOUGLAS M. SWEET
THOMAS J. SWINT
KAMIL SZTALKOPER
ROBERT L. TABER
COLIN M. TANSEY
ISAAC L. TAYLOR
SEAN R. TAYLOR
WILLIAM D. TAYLOR
KEVIN L. THAXTON
SARAH E. THOMPSON
MICHAEL C. THORPE
BRIAN W. TINKLEPAUGH
KENDRA T. TIPPETT
HOWARD C. TITZEL
MICHAEL T. TOBIAS
MATTHEW D. TOBIN
LAWRENCE A. TOMAZIEFSKI
MICHAEL B. TONEY
RAMON B. TORRES
MICHELLE H. TOYOFUKU
JAMES E. TRIMBLE, JR.
GARRETT W. TROTT
JOHN B. TURNER
TROY A. UHLMAN
RAPHAEL VASQUEZ
JEREMY D. VAUGHAN
DALE T. VERRAN
MICHAEL R. WACKER
ANGEL L. WADE
SCOTT R. WADE
KYLE M. WALTON
JAMES D. WATT
JASON L. WEBB
TERRI N. WEBB
ETHAN T. WEBER
DAVID I. WEST
WILLIAM D. WHALEY
JAMES C. WHITE
CHRISTY L. WHITFIELD
JACKIE A. WILLIAMS
RENOR S. WILLIAMS
JEFFREY M. WILSON
MASON J. WILSON
TIA C. WINSTON
MICHAEL D. WISE
GRAHAM D. WOOD
ROBERT J. WOODRUFF
KENNETH T. WOODS
GREGORY J. WORDEN
KYLE R. YATES
D012842
D013349
D010068
G010300
D010151
D003100
D012481
D013279
G010044
D010918
D012997
G010369
G001318
G010423
D012603
D012930
D011270
G010263
G010196
D004194
G010111
D010806
G010356
D011238
G010438
D010177
D012147
G001244
D012728
D011941
G010033
D002220

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RYAN C. AGEE
JERRID K. ALLEN
JONAS ANAZAGASTY
MERLIN F. ANDERSON
THOMAS N. ANDERSON
ERIK A. ANDREASEN
ERIK S. ARCHER
JOHN D. ARMSTRONG
KEVIN P. ARNETT
EDWARD L. ARNTSON
ERIC E. ARTEMIS
JACOB A. ATKINS
BOWE T. AVERILL
SONNY B. AVICHAL
CATHERINE M. BABBITT
DOUGLAS F. BAKER, JR.
EDWARD B. BANKSTON
KRISTOFFER R. BARRITEAU
JOHN R. BARTHOLOMEW
SCOTT A. BASSO
JOHN L. BECK, JR.
JAMES A. BECKER
KEVIN M. BEHLER
RICHARD BELL III
CARL E. BENANDER
CORY J. BIEGANEK
PATRICK M. BIGGS
ACHIM M. BILLER
CHRISTOPHER L. BLAHA
JUDE M. BLAKE
JESSE A. BLANTON
JOEL A. BLASCHKE
NORMA A. BOHATY
JUSTIN A. BOSANKO
CHRISTOPHER R. BRADEN
CHRISTOPHER E. BRAWLEY
JULIA A. BRENNAN
CORRIE S. BRICE
JONATHON M. BRITTON
JOHN W. BROCK II
ANDREW J. BROWN
JOSHUA W. BROWN
RODGERS BROWN, JR.
VANCE M. BRUNNER
JAMES P. BRYANT, JR.
TRAVIS D. BUEHNER
RYAN J. BULGER
JASON P. BURKE
CHRISTOPHER W. BURKHART
MARCUS J. BYNUM
NATALIE A. BYNUM
CURTIS L. BYRON, JR.
RICARLOS M. CALDWELL

JOSHUA L. CAMPBELL
SALVATORE E. CANDELA
SCOTT L. CANTLON
BRIAN C. CAPLIN
MATTHEW S. S. CARL
DAVID C. CASTILLO
BRANDON C. CAVE
ADAM S. CECIL
STEVEN L. CHADWICK
MATTHEW A. CHANEY
JAMES E. CHAPMAN, JR.
JONATHAN M. CHAVOUS
DALLAS Q. CHEATHAM
STEVEN C. CHETCUTI
YOUNG M. CHO
CHRISTOPHER M. CHURCH
EDWIN L. CLARKE
ROSANNA M. CLEMENTE
MATTHEW J. CLEMENTZ
TYLER J. CODY
MATTHEW J. COLE
PATRICK D. COLLINS
SHAUN S. CONLIN
STEVE CONRAD
KEVIN J. CONSEDINE
JOSEPH D. COOLMAN
MICHAEL S. COOMBES
KING E. COOPER, JR.
ANDREW J. CORNWELL
LOURDES A. COSTAS
JAMES C. CREMIN
ADAM B. CRONKHITE
NATHANIEL D. CROW
JOHN D. CUNNINGHAM
ROBERT B. CUSICK
HENRY J. DAILY
SAMUEL DALLAS, JR.
SHAWN D. DALTON
GREGORY A. DANIEL
PATRICK W. DARDIS
THOMAS C. DARROW
JOSEPH V. DASILVA
DONALD C. DAVIDSON
IAN R. DAVIS
JASON E. DAVIS
NATHANIEL B. DAVIS
PHILIP J. DEAGUILERA
JASON O. DEGEORGE
JAMES DEMONSTRANTI
FRANKLIN D. DENNIS
HAROLD W. DENNIS
MARK F. DESANTIS
KENDRICK S. DEVERA
STEVEN M. DEVITT
ANDREW J. DIAL
ROBERT W. DICKERSON
DANIEL A. DIGATI
ROBERT E. DION, JR.
TYLER R. DONNELL
SHANE R. DOOLAN
MICHAEL J. DOYLE
JASON G. DUDLEY
KIRK A. DUNCAN
KYLE E. DUNCAN
CHRISTIAN A. DURHAM
JUSTIN A. DUVALL
NICHOLAS H. DVONCH
JEREMY W. EASLEY
JOSHUA A. EATON
JEFFREY A. EDGINGTON
CHRISTOPHER M. EFAW
WAYNE E. EHMER
JASON A. ENGELBRECHT
GREGORY P. ESCOBAR
SAMUEL A. ESCOBARPEREZ
JENNIFER L. ETTERS
CHRISTOPHER P. EVANS
JEREL D. EVANS
ROBERT R. FAIREL, JR.
NICHOLAS J. FALCETTO
JOHN I. FAUNCE
AARON D. FELTER
BENJAMIN J. FERGUSON
KENNETH A. FERGUSON
LUCAS M. FISCHER
MICHAEL E. FISHER
JOSHUA M. FISHMAN
MATTHEW P. FIX
STEPHEN C. FLANAGAN
MARCUS R. FORMAN
KENRICK D. FORRESTER
RYAN H. FORSHEE
JEREMIAH C. FRITZ
LOUIS B. FRKETIC
JEFFREY R. FULLER
DOUGLAS K. FULLERTON
MARK O. FULMER
JONATHAN M. FURSMAN
ANDREW J. FUTSCHER
GREGORY L. GABEL
RICHARD A. GALEANO
DIANA B. GARCIA
JOSUE C. GARCIA
STEWART U. GAST
EDWARD P. GAVIN
STANLEY J. GAYLORD
JOHN GERVAIS
TIMOTHY J. GHORMLEY
MARK E. GLASPELL
JASON A. GLEASON
TRAVIS S. GODFREY
EDWARD GOMEZ
GEOFFREY T. GORSUCH
JENNIFER L. GOTIE
JOHN R. GRABOWSKI
DOUGLAS M. GRAHAM
MIRELLA GRAVITT
MAURICE GREEN CC
DANIEL D. GRIEVE
NICHOLAS A. GRIFFITHS
RICHARD Z. GROEN
DANIEL J. GROSS
JONATHAN D. GUINN
GARRETT J. GUITREAU
MICHAEL J. GUNTHER
LAWRENCE P. GUSZKOWSKI
JOHN C. GWINN
JOHN L. HAAKE
MATTHEW P. HALL
SETH G. HALL
SARA M. HALLBERG
CHRISTOPHER J. C. HALLOWS
JEFFREY S. HAN
TIMOTHY A. HARLOFF
BRYAN A. HARMON
WILLIAM D. HARRIS, JR.
DAVID L. HAWK
DANIEL A. HAYDEN
JEFFREY W. HAZARD
JOEL M. HELGERSON
DAVID W. HENSEL
GREGORY P. HENZ
ANDREW M. HERCIK
WILLIAM R. HERMANN III
ANDREW L. HERZBERG
JASON S. HETZEL
JEFFERY C. HIGGINS
DENNIS K. HILL
LUSTER R. HOBBS
CHRISTOPHER M. HODL
MATTHEW T. HOFMANN
ROBERT S. HOLCROFT
NEIL A. HOLLENBECK
RACHEL A. HONDERD
ERIC S. HONG
FRANK A. HOOKER
JASON D. HOPKINS
JAMES A. HORN
REX A. HOWRY
JENNIFER O. HUNTER
WILLIAM C. HUNTER III
STEFAN W. HUTNIK
STEVEN C. HYDER
JARROD A. ISON
STEVEN E. JACKOWSKI
MELVIN S. JACKSON
JASON D. JAMES
MELVIN B. JETER
ARTHUR E. JIMENEZ
AARON J. JOHNSON
CHARLES S. JOHNSON
JOEL M. JOHNSON
JACOB M. JOHNSTON
ADRIAN H. JONES
SHANE R. JONES
THOMAS M. JONES
MIGUEL A. JUAREZ
GARY R. KATZ
MARK A. KATZ
NICHOLAS S. KAUFFELD
BRIAN F. KAVANAGH
BRYCE K. KAWAGUCHI
ANTHONY J. KAZOR
SEAN C. KEEFE
DANIEL A. KEENER
SHAWN C. KELLER
CARINA L. KELLEY
DAVID L. KENNEY
JEREMY E. KERFOOT
CARLA A. KIERNAN
MIRANDA L. KILLINGSWORTH
BYUNG C. KIM
DONALD R. KIRK
BRIAN A. KLEAR
CHRISTOPHER P. KLEMAN
CALVIN A. KNOX
MICHAEL A. KRAMER
GEORGE P. LACHICOTTE
DAVID M. LAMBORN
CHRISTINE A. LANCIA
JERRY E. LANDRUM
JEREMY E. LANE
JONATHAN M. LARMORE
ERIC D. LARSEN
MARK E. LARSON
PAUL I. LASHLEY
ADAM F. LATHAM
MATTHEW R. LEBLANC
MATTHEW P. LECLAIR
ASHLEY S. M. LEE
GREGORY G. LEE
KACIE M. LEE
JASON A. LEGRO
ANDREW E. LEMBKE
RUSSELL P. LEMLER
LANCE S. LEONARD
TIMOTHY J. LEWIS
RYAN F. LIEBHABER
JASON A. LITTLE
CLAY J. LIVINGSTON
JUSTIN D. LOGAN
JASON R. LOJKA
DAVID R. LOMBARDO
MICHAEL B. LONG
WILLIAM H. LOVE
THOMAS C. LUDWIG
SEAN P. LYONS
ADAM E. MACALLISTER
GLEN A. MACDONALD
STEPHEN P. MAGENNIS
STEVEN R. MAJAUSKAS
MICHAEL S. MASSMANN
SEAN P. MCBRIDE
SEAN C. MCCAFFERY
DAVID J. MCCARTHY
BRAD C. MCCOY
JOSHUA T. MCCULLY
GARY P. MCDONALD
MATTHEW L. MCGRAW
SCOTT N. MCKAY
MATTHEW J. MCKEE
FREDRICK J. MCLEOD
BRENDAN T. MCSHEA
JEDEDIAH J. MEDLIN
LUIS R. MEJIAROMAN
JERROD E. MELANDER
JASON R. MELCHIOR
SETH D. MIDDLETON
ANDREW G. MILLER
JOSEPH M. MILLER
NATHANIEL S. MILLER
CRAIG W. MILLIRON
JOHN C. MILLS
PAUL B. MITCHELL III
JOHN H. MOLTZ IV
GAMBLE L. MONNEY
MASON M. MOORE
DONALD F. MOREY
AARON F. MORRIS
KAREL T. MORRIS
RAFAEL J. MORRISON
MARK P. MUDRINICH
JOSEPH R. MUKES
MICHAEL D. MURPHY
ISMAEL B. NATIVIDAD
DONALD R. NEAL
RONALD L. NIEDERT
ANDREW T. NIEWOHNER
KARL M. NILSEN
JASON H. NOBLE
DEREK R. NOEL
CHARLES E. NOLL
JEFFREY R. NORDIN
ALEJANDRO M. NUNEZ
KITEFRE K. OBOHO
CLEMENCE C. OBORSKI
BRENDAN B. OHERN
DARRYL T. OLDEN II
DAVID R. OLEARY
MICHAEL J. OLESON
MARIO A. OLIVA
MATTHEW S. ONEILL
SEAN M. ONTIVEROS
JOHN D. C. ORDONIO
BRENDAN D. ORMOND
PAUL G. OTTO
STEVE A. PADILLA
TIMOTHY R. PALMER
HEATH E. PAPKOV
DAVID C. PARK
JACY A. PARK
TYLER B. PARTRIDGE
NATHANAL J. PATTON
SENECA PENACOLLAZO
MICHAEL Q. PENNEY
FRANCIS B. PERA
ANTONIO PEREZ
WILLIAM R. PERRY
THOMAS V. PETRINI
MATHEW J. PEZZULLO
ERIC M. PHILLIPS
MICHAEL J. PHILLIPS, JR.
ROBERT R. PHILLIPSON
JEFFREY W. PICKLER
ROGELIO A. PINEDA
LONNIE PIRTLE
JASON R. POSEY
LEE A. PRUITT
JAMES A. RAMAGE
MICHAEL S. RAMSEY, JR.
GERALD E. RESMONDO, JR.
KARL A. REUTER
ADAM P. REYNOLDS
WILLIAM D. RICHARDSON
INGEBRIGT A. RIISE
REYNALDO A. RIVERA
CHRISTOPHER J. RIVERS
TRAVIS E. ROBISON
CARLOS F. ROCKSHEAD
FELIX O. RODRIGUEZ
JUAN C. RODRIGUEZ
BEAU G. ROLLIE
BRANDAN T. ROONEY
JORGE A. ROSARIO
CHRISTOPHER M. ROWE
KEVIN P. RYAN
ROBERTO R. SANCHEZ
ANDREW W. SANDERS
EDWARD J. SANFORD
STEVEN D. SANTAMARIA
RAYMOND SANTIAGORIVERA
MICHAEL S. SAXON
MARK J. SCHERBRING
RICHARD H. SCHILDMAN III
ERIC G. SCHNABEL
ERICH B. SCHNEIDER
JOHN M. SCHOENFELDT
TIMOTHY M. SCHUMACHER
ANGELA L. SCOTT
JOEL P. SEARS
JEREMY O. SECREST
MICHAEL M. SEMMENS
DOUGLAS F. SERIE
ANDRE J. SESSOMS
TRAVIS D. SHAIN
KELCEY R. SHAW
MICHAEL C. SHAW
BENJAMIN L. SHEPHERD
SEAN R. SHIELDS
JASON M. SHULTZ
TIMOTHY A. SIKORSKI

BRITTANY E. SIMMONS
CHUNKA A. SMITH
JAMES R. SMITH
LANDGRAVE T. SMITH
MARK K. SNAKENBERG
JOHN P. SNOW
SCOTT D. SNYDER
TERRENCE L. SOULE
AARON J. SOUTHARD
WESLEY M. SPEAR
BRENDA J. SPENCE
RONALD W. SPRANG
TANNER J. SPRY
DWAYNE W. STAPLES
JASON R. STARAITIS
RICHARD D. STEARNS
MARGARET G. W. STICK
BRADLEY R. STREMLAU
JAMES C. STULTZ
RONALD J. STURGEON
MEGHANN E. SULLIVAN
ROBERT M. SUMMERS
TODD S. SUNDAY
ADAM J. SWEDENBURG
GEORGE T. TATUM
STEVEN B. TEMPLETON
BRANDON S. TENNIMON
PETER A. THAYER
AARON M. THOMAS
TROY P. THOMAS
VINCENT A. THOMAS
ANDREW A. THUEME
DAVIS D. TINDOLL
GREGORY M. TOMLIN
JOHN T. TOOHEY
ROBERT K. TRACY
TRAVIS I. TRAMMELL III
MICHAEL P. TUMLIN
ANTOINETTE C. TURNER
CHARLES C. TURNER
JENNIFER L. UYESHIRO
PHILLIP J. VALENTI
RUSSELL W. VANDERLUGT
JOSHUA B. VANETTEN
MARK J. VANHANEHAN
JOSE R. VASQUEZ
ERICK R. VELASQUEZ
RENATO VIEIRA
DANIEL J. VONBENKEN
SETH W. WACKER
CHRISTOPHER K. WAGAR
NEILSON W. WAHAB
KENNETH W. WAINWRIGHT
JERMAINE M. WALKER
JERON J. WASHINGTON
JOSEPH D. WEINBURGH
SHANE M. WELLER
CHARLES W. WELLS
JOHNATHAN H. WESTBROOK
JAMES A. WESTGATE
JARON S. WHARTON
SHANA M. WHATLEY
ANDREW A. WHITE
JACOB A. WHITESIDE
CLARENCE W. WILHITE
JEREMY P. WILLIAMS
JOHN R. WILLIAMS
NATHAN B. WILLIAMS
RYAN T. WILLIAMS
DOUGLAS M. WILLIG
EDWARD B. WITHERELL
SEAN A. WITTMEIER
RICHARD E. WITWER
JOHN A. WOMACK
LILLIAN I. I. WOODINGTON
JASON T. WOODWARD
VASHAUN A. WRICE
D013658
D013297
D011241
D011563
D010451
D011888
D013209
D012269
D013418
D013263
D012599
D011242
D012382
D013351
D013196
D011536

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

ERIK C. ALFSEN
LUIS N. ANDA
TAIWO A. AROWOSEGBE
JON R. BAILEY
ROBERT D. BILLINGSLEY
TROY J. BLAN
DEXTER J. BROCK
MARLON W. BROWN
SHARON BROWNE
JORGE H. BUDEZ
ERIC B. BUNDRICK
CHRISTOPHER CAMPBELL
ANTHONY CECH
DANIEL A. CHASE
KEVIN M. CHERWINSKI
DAVID CHRISTENSEN
BRENT A. CROSSWHITE
GENE R. DAVIDSON
MICHAEL B. DAWSON
FREDERICK B. DENNING
BRUCE R. DUTY
ROBERT ELKOWITZ
JEFFREY P. ELLIS
MICHAEL A. FERGUSON
KEITH D. FERRELL
JASON V. FORTE
LUDOVIC O. FOYOU
ROBERT GINSBURG
GRAHAM B. GLOVER
BRIAN T. HARGIS
JODY L. HARLOW
EDWARD S. HARRIS
SHANE J. HENDERSON
ROBERT B. HENSLEY
JAY F. HUDSON
OYEDEJI IDOWU
DOUGLAS J. INMAN
PATRICK D. IRELAND
CHESTER R. IRWIN
JOHN G. JACOBSEN
MICHAEL J. JOHNSON
MARK A. JOHNSTON
CARSON M. JUMP
RAJA KANDANADA
CHANG J. KIM
TAYLOR KIM
MICHAEL J. KROG
JOHN B. L. LEE
TOBY E. LOFTON
WILLIAM G. LUTZ
TONY M. LUXEM
JOHN P. MCDOUGALL
JONATHAN R. MCPHERSON
JONATHAN MELENDEZ
HOCHANG MIN
JOHN A. MUTH
PATRICIA G. NICHOLS
MARK E. NIKONT
SAMUEL OLMOS
CHESTER W. OLSON III
ROGER B. OSBORN
RICK PAK
SANG W. PAK
JOSEPH P. PALERMO
JUSTIN G. PICKERING
JEFF S. PYUN
THEODORE F. RANDALL
HANS C. RUSKA
RUBEN G. SALDANA
ISMAEL O. SERRANO
MATTHEW F. SHENTON
PETER P. STONE
STEPHEN C. TAYLOR
KEVIN W. TRIMBLE
ANTHONY A. TURPIN
KIRBY L. VIDRINE
EDGAR G. VILLANUEVA
JARED L. VINEYARD
MICHAEL P. VOUDOURIS
JESUS O. WALLACE
MATTHEW W. WEATHERS
CHRISTOPHER W. WEINRICH
RICHARD D. WILLIAMS
MARK D. WORRELL
GLEN D. WURDEMAN
JERRY B. YOUNG
JOSHUA J. ZIEGLER
D013346

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

BRADFORD A. BAUMANN
DAVID A. BOWLUS
ROBERT S. BROWN
JOEY T. BYRD
STEVEN E. CANTRELL
BRIAN W. CHEPEY
SHMUEL L. FELZENBERG
GARY T. FISHER
KEVIN S. FORRESTER
ROBERT J. GLAZENER
DAVID V. GREEN
DENNIS E. HYSOM
RAJMUND KOPEC
CHRISTOPHER G. MORRIS
JIMMY D. NICHOLS
TONY S. PETROS
TERRY E. ROMINE
ALLEN W. STALEY
THOMAS B. VAUGHN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 716:

To be colonel

JAY A. JOHANNIGMAN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

PATRICK R. ADAMS
JOSHUA M. ANDERSON
JAMES S. BALL
MARK A. BEALE
WILLIAM G. BICKEL
SYLVESTER CAMPOS III
CAMERON A. CARLSON
JACOB R. CATES
DEIRDRE E. COLLINS
TIMOTHY J. DEVALL
BRIAN P. FLANAGAN
JOSHUA J. GLENN
JOHN T. GOFF
DANIEL S. GRAY
CHRISTOPHER J. HALL
SEAN L. HARRIS
CHRISTOPHER J. HART
DANIEL J. HOOGE
STEVEN D. HOPKINS
PAUL G. HUCKABY
ANDREW L. HUTCHISON
GEOFFREY B. JOHNSON
RYAN P. KELLY
KRISTOPHER J. KYZAR
ERIC W. LARSON
KASEY B. LEWIS
WAYNE D. LILEKS
NICOLE L. LOBECKER
TYLER E. MANESS
KYLE E. MCFADDEN
JAMES B. MONTGOMERY
GREGORY W. MOSLEY II
VICTOR H. MOYA
JAMES L. ONEAL
NATHAN S. PITSCH
ANDREW L. POLLACK
ERIC S. QUIRK
CHRISTOPHER W. RAKOSKI
JAIME E. RAMIREZ
SETH A. ROMO
JOHN R. SCHAEFFER II
CLINTON T. SCHUHART
RYAN J. SISLER
STEPHEN J. SKAHEN, JR.
DANNY G. SLOVER II
STEPHANIE A. SMIROS
JACOB A. UPTEGROVE
BLAKE M. WANIER
JAMES T. WATTERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

RANDALL G. SCHIMPF

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 13, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

WILLIAM FRANCIS HAGERTY IV, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO JAPAN.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING JAMIE MILLER FOR HER DEDICATED SERVICE TO VIRGINIA'S FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, during my time in Congress I'm grateful and have been fortunate to be supported by great staff. You know that while it's our name on the door and the ballot, behind the scene our staff labor tirelessly to support and serve our constituents. Today, I want to say thank you, congratulations and offer my best to one of my departing staff.

Jamie Jones Miller will be continuing her service to the nation by joining the Administration at the Pentagon as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for House Affairs. Jamie has worked in my office and for the constituents of Virginia's First District for 9 years.

As my Chief of Staff she's run my congressional operations for three and a half years, has been my top adviser through numerous important efforts, and has labored tirelessly to serve the Commonwealth and the nation.

Jamie has dedicated her career to public service. I take great pride in her devotion to ensuring our nation's military is strong and that our service members are equipped to protect and defend the homeland. I am confident she will use her passion, skills and abilities to continue to support our men and women in uniform.

I wish Jamie and Tim the best. I thank her for her service, leadership, and commitment to our great nation.

KATELIN BYRD

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Katelin Byrd for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Katelin Byrd is a student at Moore Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Katelin Byrd is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Katelin Byrd for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

SPEECH OF

HON. GREGG HARPER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2017

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes:

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Harper/Brady Amendment, which is included in this en block package of amendments. Our amendment while simple is critical to the security of the House of Representatives and its information technology systems. This amendment allows the Speaker, with the concurrence of the Minority Leader, to request assistance from the Executive Branch, within the confines of current law, in the event there is a successful cybersecurity attack on the House of Representatives.

Three scenarios readily come to mind in which Executive Branch assistance would be critical.

The first scenario addresses a situation in which the House of Representatives has a suspicion that a nation-state sponsored actor has successfully infiltrated the House network. The House of Representatives would need assistance from the National Security Agency, the Department of Homeland Security, or possibly even the Department of Defense's Cyber Command to help identify, eliminate and remove the nation-state sponsored actor from our network systems. The House of Representatives would also need additional assistance from the intelligence community to identify and validate the nation-state sponsored actor and their associated tactics, techniques, and procedures.

The second scenario involves assistance from the appropriate law enforcement agency in the event the House of Representatives and its network systems are victims of criminal activity conducted by a malicious actor or actors.

Finally, the House of Representatives would need assistance from the Executive Branch if a catastrophic event occurred and compromised a significant amount of the House of Representatives' enterprise system, and could not guarantee the integrity of the legislative process. The House of Representatives would seek assistance from the National Security Agency, the Department of Homeland Security, the intelligence community, or the Department of Defense's Cyber Command to identify the root cause of the compromise; protect existing House information systems; detect any collateral damage resulting from the incident; respond, resolve, and remove the incident from the House systems; and finally, restore the House of Representatives to an acceptable operational state.

The attempts to attack the House of Representatives are real. Every month, the House successfully defends against the three to four million cyber attacks against our networks. Before the July 4th recess, the House of Representatives successfully fought off a "brute force attack" in which more than 44,000 attempts to breach the networks occurred in just one day.

We are not dealing with hypotheticals. It may be just a matter of time before one of the millions of attempts is successful. The House of Representatives must be prepared.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

LEVI MICHAELS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Levi Michaels for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Levi Michaels is a student at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Levi Michaels is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Levi Michaels for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 2017, I missed Roll Call vote No. 341. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yes" on the Motion to Recommit with Instructions.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. ANDY DAVID, OUTGOING CONSUL GENERAL OF THE ISRAELI CONSULATE TO THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dr. Andy David, the Israeli Consul General to the Pacific Northwest. As 2017 marks the end of Dr. David's tenure in California, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring him for his leadership and commitment in the community to building bridges between the United States and his home country of Israel.

Dr. David stepped into the position of Consul General in 2012, following a history of distinguished Israeli diplomatic appointments that began in 1995. Throughout his half decade of service, he has helped strengthen ties between the West Coast and our allies in Israel. Dr. David has worked passionately to build the relationship between the University of California system and educational institutions in Israel, and his efforts have also resulted in new and fruitful partnerships between Silicon Valley companies and Israel's high-tech industry in Tel Aviv.

In addition to improving cooperation on the international stage, Dr. David has become a pillar of the community in his adoptive home of San Francisco. A prominent advocate for the Bay Area Jewish community, Dr. David will be missed by his friends here when he returns home this month.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Andy David, Israeli Consul General to the Pacific Northwest, as he celebrates his return to Israel. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring his efforts to strengthen the relationship between our two great countries.

KAYLA MOORE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kayla Moore for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Kayla Moore is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kayla Moore is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kayla Moore for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES A. HIMES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 2017, I was unable to be present to cast my vote on Amendment No. 5, offered by Mr. DESAULNIER of California, to the Gaining Responsibility on Water Act of 2017 (H.R. 23). Had I been present for roll call No. 350, I would have voted AYE.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANK BARTLETT

HON. CHARLIE CRIST

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of one of the greatest of our generation, World War II veteran Frank Bartlett, who left us last week at the ripe old age of 104.

Serving as a surgical technician for the Ninth Infantry Division, Frank was a hero, awarded six bronze stars, one silver star, and an American Defense Service Medal for his dedication to saving lives on the battlefield.

During World War II, Frank served in the European theater, providing life-saving medical care to his fellow servicemen in North Africa, Sicily, France, Belgium, and Germany. As a surgical technician, Frank followed his brothers into battle, serving at their side so they might withstand the attacks of the enemy. On D-Day, Frank was one of the only surviving medics of the Battle of Normandy, risking his life to aid his fallen brothers in the face of incredible peril. His efforts went above and beyond—Frank would often offer his own blood for a patient's blood transfusion in times of need. A talented and tireless surgeon, Mr. Bartlett's courage and humility earned him the respect and gratitude of his commanding officers and his fellow soldiers.

Before joining the Army, Frank worked as a hair stylist in New York, a profession he returned to after completing his military service. Following his move to Pinellas County, Florida, Mr. Bartlett channeled his talent as an artist into opening his own kite shop, sharing the fruits of his creativity with the community he loved. Even after being declared legally blind, Frank's tenacious spirit drove him forward, running his small business, and hiking the mountains of Peru.

Mr. Speaker, at the incredible age of 104 years, Frank Bartlett passed away on July 8, 2017. He will be honored and laid to rest at Bay Pines National Cemetery. Supported by his loving friends, Frank lived out his final days in peace. Please join me in offering the deepest gratitude to Frank for his service to our country, his commitment to his brothers-in-arms, and his ceaseless dedication to his friends and community.

LILLIAN NORRIS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Lillian Norris for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Lillian Norris is a student at Arvada K–8 School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Lillian Norris is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Lillian Norris for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING DALE HEMPHILL, FOUNDER OF THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA FOUNDATION

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dale Hemphill, a U.S. Navy veteran from Mishawaka, Indiana, on creating the Spirit of America Foundation and designing the Spirit of America flag to promote patriotism and appreciation for our nation's veterans.

The Spirit of America Foundation is a nonprofit organization founded in 2001 that works to identify and prioritize veterans' health issues, create a network among other veterans service organizations, coordinate fundraising, establish support groups, and provide information and educational resources. The Spirit of America flag Dale created symbolizes the mission of the foundation and serves as a powerful tribute to the brave men and women who have sacrificed so much for our country.

Dale served in the U.S. Navy for six years and embodies the values of a true patriot. He designed the Spirit of America flag with great attention to detail: each aspect of the flag serves to commemorate what our veterans have done to preserve our freedom in a special way. For example, the color red on the banner symbolizes bloodshed, and the color blue represents valor and bravery. Not only does the flag honor our veterans by listing every conflict Americans have served in, it also recognizes the civilians, firefighters, police officers, and paramedics who died in the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

Dale has given his flag to people all over the world, including four American presidents, every Indiana senator, governor, and representative, and the last surviving American WWI veteran, Frank Buckles. Nicknamed ''Old Glory's Companion,'' this patriotic flag flies over multiple U.S. military bases.

Dale's love of country is evident to anyone who knows him. He has dedicated both his professional life and free time to serving and honoring his country and those who have fought to protect it. Even his car reflects his patriotism, decorated with both the Spirit of America flag and the American flag.

His incredible commitment of time and talent and his positive impact on veterans should inspire us all. I am so grateful to Dale for the worthy mission he defends.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of 2nd District Hoosiers, I want to thank Dale Hemphill for his unwavering patriotism and his commitment to honoring his fellow veterans. He has truly left a mark on the northern Indiana community and the entire nation, and I look forward to the great things that lie ahead in his future.

HONONRING DRS. JOHN GORMAN, VINCENT FREDA AND WILLIAM POLLACK FOR CREATING THE RH VACCINE

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Drs. John Gorman, Vincent Freda and William Pollack for their creation of the Rh Vaccine. May 29, 2018, will mark the 50th Anniversary of the availability of this important and innovative medical therapeutic.

Prior to May 29, 1968, Hemolytic Disease of the Newborn (HDN), which is caused by a blood incompatibility between the mother and the fetus or newborn baby, had afflicted women over the ages. In the United States alone it was affecting thousands of Rh negative women and was responsible for nearly 9,000 fetal or newborn deaths annually. To address this crisis, Drs. John Gorman and Vincent Freda, practicing physicians at Columbia Presbyterian Hospital in New York, and Dr. William Pollack, of the Ortho Research Foundation at Johnson & Johnson in New Jersey, created a new vaccine that would prevent HDN and rapidly become the standard, worldwide, in the care and management of every Rh negative pregnancy.

The Rh Vaccine has nearly eliminated Rh hemolytic disease in the United States. This development has produced savings in human and financial costs that are estimated to exceed $750 million dollars annually. The Rh Vaccine has a track record of being one of the most effective and safest products in the history of vaccines.

Drs. Gorman, Freda and Pollack were recognized for their work by the American Association of Blood Banks in 1969. In 1980, they were again recognized for this accomplishment by sharing the Lasker Clinical Medical Research Award, which honors those whose contributions have improved the clinical treatment of patients.

The Rh Vaccine is just one example why New Jersey is known as the medicine chest of the world. All the research and development for the vaccine was done in Raritan, New Jersey, which is part of the district that I serve. The product continues to be manufactured there today.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of Drs. Gorman, Freda and Pollack should inspire all of us. They should remind us the important role Congress has in encouraging research and development. Together, we can continue to work in a bipartisan fashion to ensure that the next group of great doctors and scientists in this country has the support they need to bring innovative medicines and products to market.

KEVIN PHAM

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kevin Pham for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Kevin Pham is a student at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kevin Pham is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kevin Pham for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING MARY PAT RAIMONDI FOR A CAREER DEDICATED TO NUTRITION, HEALTH, AND STRONG COMMUNITY

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my warmest wishes to Mary Pat Raimondi, a Minnesotan and dear friend, who is retiring after a successful and long career as a dietician and anti-hunger advocate. Mary Pat most recently has served as Vice President of Strategic Policy and Partnerships of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics where she has used her vast experience and knowledge to inform and educate policy makers on nutrition issues that improve health and reduce hunger.

Mary Pat's enthusiasm for her work and dedication to nutrition issues is evident from a recent interview in which she said, "I have the best job because I can tell the story of the value we offer to improve health to members of Congress, federal agencies, and the White House. I love to promote our members' work that impacts health and helps families and communities."

The leadership demonstrated by Mary Pat was evident in Minnesota where she worked from many years as Program Director for the University of Minnesota Extension. She was a frequent visitor to my office and I could always count on her advice, insights, and solid information on critical policy issues. Mary Pat was a consummate professional and a tremendous resource for my staff and me.

Again, I want to thank Mary Pat Raimondi for her dedicated service and her passion for the children, families, and seniors who benefited from her work.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

SPEECH OF

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2017

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes:

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of my amendment No. 41 to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

My amendment directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a definition for the term Procurement Administrative Lead Time to be applied throughout the Department of Defense (DoD). Additionally, the amendment also requires a plan for measuring and publicly reporting data on procurement administrative lead time for DoD contracts and task orders above a certain threshold.

Given the number and costs of contracts and task orders issued by the Department of Defense, it is important that the Department collect information on the amount of time between when a solicitation is issued and the initial award of the contract or task order. By establishing a uniform definition and collecting this data, DoD, the contractor community, and other stakeholders can better analyze the data and use it as a tool to reduce unnecessary delays.

I am very pleased that the managers of this legislation recognize the need to find and address inefficiencies in the procurement process.

Mr. Chair, I also rise to speak in support of my bipartisan amendment No. 43 to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, which I have offered with my colleague, Mr. ISSA of California.

My amendment would extend three expiring provisions of the Federal Information Technology Acquisition and Reform Act, which is better known as FITARA or Issa-Connolly. This bipartisan legislation represented the first major reform of the laws governing federal IT management since the seminal Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996, and it was enacted as a provision of the FY2015 NDAA.

When I meet with stakeholders in federal IT from government agencies and industry, I am constantly reminded why previous major IT reform efforts have fallen short of their potential—the lack of a robust implementation plan and congressional oversight. Through countless hearings and briefings, close coordination with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Government Accountability Office (GAO), and the Oversight and Government Reform Committee's work on the FITARA

Scorecard, Congress is committed to the successful implementation and oversight of FITARA.

In working with GAO and OMB on FITARA implementation, we have found that there are areas of FITARA that would benefit from an extension of their original sunset date. These areas include the provisions on federal data center consolidation, transparency and risk management of major IT systems (IT Dashboard), and IT portfolio, program, and resource reviews (PortfolioStat).

Very simply, the federal data center problem is bigger than we initially thought. In 2009, when Federal Chief Information Officer Vivek Kundra directed agencies to determine how many data centers they had and begin to consolidate those centers, the government estimated it had roughly 1,100 data centers. That estimate grew to 11,700 by 2015.

As GAO has recommended, we are potentially leaving money on the table when it comes to data center consolidation if we allow FITARA's data center reporting and planning requirements to expire in 2018. Twenty-three agencies have reported roughly $656 million collectively in planned savings for fiscal years 2016 through 2018. This is $3.3 billion less than the estimated $4.0 billion in planned savings for fiscal years 2016 through 2018 that agencies reported to GAO in November 2015. As of April 2017, 23 of 24 agencies have submitted a strategic plan for data center consolidation. Of the 23 plans, only 7 included all required information. The remaining plans either partially met or did not meet the requirements.

We need to let agencies know that they are not going to be able to run out the clock on FITARA's transparency and reporting requirements. A limited extension of the data center provisions of FITARA, scheduled to sunset October 1, 2018, could help us do that.

Additionally, the IT Dashboard and PortfolioStat provisions of FITARA have allowed OMB to evaluate the efficiencies and risk of IT investments and would benefit from a permanent extension of the current December 1, 2019 sunset. These are valuable oversight tools, and we should continue to use them to reform federal IT procurement.

The federal government invests roughly $100 billion in IT each year. I look forward to continued bipartisan collaboration on FITARA implementation to ensure these investments are efficient, effective, and in the best interest of the taxpayer.

I want to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for working with me on this amendment.

KATELYNNE RIGGINS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Katelynne Riggins for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Katelynne Riggins is a student at Warren Tech North and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Katelynne Riggins is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Katelynne Riggins for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

SPEECH OF

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2017

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes:

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I ask that the following exchange of letters be included in the RECORD on H.R. 2810:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, July 3, 2017.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I write to you concerning H.R. 2810, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, which contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (''the Committee''). The Committee recognizes the need for proceeding expeditiously to Floor consideration of this important bill. Therefore, I do not intend to request a sequential referral.

This waiver is conditional on our mutual understanding that my decision to forego Committee consideration of this legislation does not diminish or otherwise affect any future claim over the matters in the bill which fall within the Committee's jurisdiction, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging the Committee's jurisdictional interest will be included in the committee report accompanying H.R. 2810 and submitted into the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House Floor.

I also intend to seek the appointment of Committee Members to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and request your support if such a request is made. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this and other matters between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,

Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, July 6, 2017.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 2810, the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018,'' which your Committee ordered reported on June 28, 2017.

H.R. 2810 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,

Washington, DC, July 11, 2017.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,

Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Hon. WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 2810,

the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Small Business takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 2810 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on Small Business has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Small Business is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. ''MAC'' THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

LILLIAN SLIGHT

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Lillian Slight for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Lillian Slight is a student at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Lillian Slight is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Lillian Slight for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING DEBBIE KRYCZKOWSKI, DEPARTMENT PRESIDENT, DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY

HON. CLAUDIA TENNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Debbie Kryczkowski, who was elected Department (State) President of the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of New York at the 96th annual convention in Binghamton, NY. Debbie is a 33-year member of Lee Unit 1794 of Oneida County, a past unit president, and life member. Debbie remains very active in her Unit, presently serving as Secretary. Debbie continues volunteering for various unit functions.

Debbie has chaired many committees on the county level and county offices, and is currently serving as Constitution & Bylaws Chair. Debbie received department awards as the County Chairman of Leadership, Empire Girls State, Membership and Veterans Affairs and Rehabilitation. Debbie served as 5th District President, District Membership Chairman, Sergeant at Arms, and a District representative at Department Conventions and member of two Department Convention Committees.

On the Department level, Debbie served on Junior Activities, Executive Board, Public Relation, National Security, Children & Youth and Veterans Affairs and Rehabilitation and is currently the Membership Chairman. Debbie is a graduate of the National American Legion Extension Institute and National American Auxiliary Leadership Correspondence Course. She was the Public Relations Instructor and is an Alumni of the American Legion Auxiliary College. Debbie is a Chapeau Passe' of the Oneida County Salon No. 31.

Debbie is spending the year promoting and raising money for the Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors. The Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors (TAPS) offers compassionate care to all those grieving the death of a loved one serving in our Armed Forces. Since 1994, TAPS has provided comfort and hope 24 hours a day, seven days a week through a national peer support network and connection to grief resources, all at no cost to surviving families and loved ones.

Their National Military Survivor Seminar and Good Grief camp has been held annually since 1994. TAPS also conducts regional Survivor Seminars and Good Grief Camps at locations across the country. The Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors (TAPS) is a not-for-profit organization and is not part of, or endorsed by, the Department of Defense.

On a personal level, Debbie received her eligibility through her brother, a Vietnam and U.S. Army Veteran Philip Racquet. She has five brothers, who are all Vietnam Veterans, and has three sisters. Her deceased father, Phillip E Racquet, was a WWII Army Veteran of the European Theater. Debbie's son is Retired Tech. Sgt. Robert Kryczkowski, Jr. of the United States Air Force. Debbie has five grandsons: Kevin, Nathan, Zachary, Rylan, and Christian. She is a volunteer with the Hemlocks at Rome Hospital and Rome Rotary Club as a Board of Director. Debbie recently retired from M&T Bank to devote her time to her family and her American Legion Family.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 2017 during the second vote series of the day, I was unavoidably detained on Roll Call No. 351 and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted Nay.

LARISSA TORRALBA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Larissa Torralba for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Larissa Torralba is a student at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Larissa Torralba is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Larissa Torralba for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RO KHANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for votes in the House of Representatives yesterday, Wednesday, July 12, 2017, due to the recent birth of my son. Due to the absence, I missed Roll Call votes 347 through 352. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Nay on Roll Call vote 347 (ordering the previous question on the Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 23, the Gaining Responsibility on Water (GROW) Act of 2017, and H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18));

Nay on Roll Call vote 348 (the Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 23, the GROW Act, and H.R. 2810, the NDAA for FY18);

Aye on Roll Call vote 349 (passage of H.R. 1492, the Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act);

Aye on Roll Call vote 350 (the DeSaulnier amendment to require the Interior Department to review available and new technologies for capturing municipal wastewater);

Aye on Roll Call vote 351 (the Carbajal motion to recommit H.R. 23 to add an exemption

to the underlying bill to ensure there is an adequate supply of water from reservoirs or other surface waters to help fight wildfires); and

Nay on Roll Call vote 352 (passage of H.R. 23, the GROW Act).

THANKING VICKIE PLUNKETT FOR TWENTY-THREE YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Vickie Plunkett for her over twenty years of service in the United States House of Representatives. As we consider the Fiscal Year 2018 National Defense Authorization bill in the House Armed Services Committee, for the tenth and final time with Vickie as a Professional Staff Member on the Committee, I would like to take a moment to reflect on her decades of service to this body, and our nation.

Vickie has served as the lead staffer for the Readiness Subcommittee, which oversees the largest account in the Department of Defense, Operations and Maintenance, to include military operations, readiness, and training issues, funding, and programs. In this capacity, she has fought to ensure that our men and women in uniform are trained, ready, and equipped to carry out missions we ask of them, while ensuring that we are acting as responsible stewards of the taxpayer dollar. As the Ranking Member of the Readiness Subcommittee, I have deeply valued Vickie's counsel and advice, as well as her candid perspectives.

Vickie joined the House Armed Services Committee in 2007 after more than a decade of working on defense issues in Congress. From 1989 to 2002, she served as the Deputy Chief of Staff and Military Legislative Assistant to my friend and the former Chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, Solomon Ortiz, as well as former Congressman Glen Browder, another member of the Subcommittee. Prior to relocating to Washington D.C., Vickie honed her critical thinking and journalistic skills as a publisher, editor, reporter, and photographer for daily and weekly newspapers in Alabama and Georgia. Her editorial expertise and deliberative approach served her and the Committee well not only as we crafted the annual defense authorization bill, but also through countless hearings, markups, and meetings. Her efforts have been instrumental to enacting good public policies for our military and our servicemembers and their families are better equipped, trained, and resourced because of them.

Mr. Speaker, Vickie's departure from the House Armed Services Committee will leave us without the decades of experience and wisdom that she brought to each and every challenge we encountered. I am proud of the work she did, as well as the intelligent, thoughtful manner in which she approached it. On a personal level, Vickie has been a tremendous friend of Guam and the men and women who serve on our island. So on behalf of my constituents and the people of Guam, I extend her my sincere un dangkulo na si Yu'os ma'ase (deepest gratitude). I wish her, her husband David, and their families well as they enter the next chapter in their lives.

KHANG TRAN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Khang Tran for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Khang Tran is a student at Oberon Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Khang Tran is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Khang Tran for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL (LTC) ROBERT B. NEWELL, SR.

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Lieutenant Colonel (LTC) Robert B. Newell, Sr., for the eleven years of his life that he dedicated to the Army as a surgeon, and the countless years he dedicated as a civilian to saving the lives of others.

After growing up in Buffalo, NY, LTC Newell attended Colgate University, leaving for financial reasons before he could achieve a full degree. However, this did not prevent him from earning his M.D. at the University of Buffalo Medical School. Colgate University would later issue LTC Newell a degree based on his medical school credits at the request of his son, although LTC Newell passed away shortly before hearing this news.

His service to our country started shortly after his graduation from medical school, when LTC Newell joined the army as a trauma surgeon during World War II. He saved the lives of many wounded allied soldiers in England, France and Germany until after the end of the war in 1946.

LTC Newell re-enlisted in the Army in 1948 and served as a Major and head of the Department of Surgery at Fort Lee. He was soon advanced in rank to Lieutenant Colonel and dispatched to Korea, where he served as commanding officer of the 2nd Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (MASH) Unit, the 8225th. LTC Newell received the Bronze Star Medal for his heroic achievements and service in combat zone in Korea as part of the MASH Unit. He gave soldiers the immediate and encompassing care that saved many lives throughout his years of service. He retired from duty in 1953.

Even after his time in the Army, LTC Newell continued to serve the community and save lives as a surgeon and as a leader. Over his long career, in addition to his surgical practice, he also served as the president of medical staffs at three different Illinois hospitals, and as head of the High Point Emergency room in North Carolina.

I am here today to honor LTC Newell after his countless years of service to both the U.S. Army and to injured civilians. His service and commitment to saving lives is commendable, and he is well deserving of this honor. His son, five grandchildren, and six great-grandchildren still remember the great deeds and legacy of their beloved father and "Grandfather Beach," as well as the positive influence he had on their lives. As his grandson Danny writes, Lt. Col. Newell "was the epitome of Brokaw's Greatest Generation."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for Roll Call vote 349 on Wednesday, July 12, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call vote 349.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNUAL FRANKLIN COUNTY FAIR

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of Ohio's 15th Congressional District to recognize the 100th Annual Franklin County Fair. Since 1917, the Franklin County Agricultural Society has given our Central Ohio community countless memories of summertime fun had at the County Fair.

Central Ohio has a rich agricultural heritage, and that heritage is on full display at the Franklin County Fair. Its craft marketplace allows patrons to purchase the exquisite and well-made products of local vendors, and its Junior Fair provides young student farmers with the chance to showcase their hard work and skill in agriculture.

But most importantly, the County Fair provides friends and families from Obetz to Hilliard time to reconnect with one another. They can forget their hectic lives and enjoy traditions that have been appreciated by generations for 100 years.

I am grateful to the Franklin County Agricultural Society and the Franklin County Fair Board for ensuring the success of this year's event, and I am proud to recognize all who have been a part of its storied history.

JOSIAH VIGIL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Josiah Vigil for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Josiah Vigil is a student at Arvada K–8 School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Josiah Vigil is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Josiah Vigil for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

ADDRESSING DIGITAL CURRENCY

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address digital currency. This new financial platform is recreating the structures of international finance, and in part offers many exciting opportunities for our future.

However, our nation must ensure that the rise of digital currency, and its use within our borders, does not help aid the actions of terrorists, criminals, and others who want to hurt us.

In recent weeks, the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance of the House Financial Services Committee, led by its chairman, Congressman Steve Pearce, held a critical hearing entitled ''Virtual Currency: Financial Innovation and National Security Implications.''

Mr. Speaker, at this hearing, the serious national security implications of digital currency, and its use by terrorists was examined. Unless we in Congress develop rational and balanced policies, we may be enabling the very terrorists who wish to destroy us.

Of particular concern is that many of the leading digital currencies are not compliant with the ''Anti-Money Laundering'' and ''Know Your Customer'' requirements that we demand of our other financial institutions. This lack of compliance provides a widely opened door for forces of evil to finance their terrible endeavors.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is how we are able to balance our desire to protect our nation and innocents around the world from terror, while not losing our freedoms or economic opportunities.

At this time, virtually all the world's digital currencies are not compliant with the critical AML/KYC standards we expect of our other institutions. Some in the digital currency world argue that digital finance requires a relaxation of these standards. This is absolutely incorrect.

I encourage Congress to continue its efforts to study digital finance, and I am hopeful that, in the coming weeks, our focus will attend to the issue of AML/KYC compliance, highlighting those currencies that refuse to provide this safeguard, and examining and encouraging those who do.

RECOGNIZING CAPE CORAL SWIM TEAM

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the nine swimmers from the Cape Coral swim team who qualified for the Florida Age Group Championships this weekend.

Swimmers Brent Baker, Evan Baker, Maddie Lehman, Jacob Bilancione, Hayden Tedhams, Skylar Gusler, Natalie Handzlik, Anne Kokosinski and Melana Greene have displayed tremendous skill and determination to qualify for this competition. All under fourteen years of age, these swimmers have shown commendable character as they have practiced tirelessly for this opportunity.

I would also like to honor veteran coach Ed Collins for his dedication to the swim team and the City of Cape Coral. His hard work has brought a record of nine swimmers from the team to this elite competition this year and his three decades of service have inspired many children in our community.

I am honored to have the Cape Coral swim team and Coach Collins represent our district at the championships in Sarasota this weekend.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DARIN LaHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Rollcall No. 349.

BELOVED: CHILDREN OF THE HOLOCAUST

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 2017, The State newspaper of Columbia, South Carolina, published a remarkable article by John Monk entitled, ''In S.C. artist's portraits, Holocaust children live.''

The following portions of the article reveal how the memories of these children are kept alive through an extraordinary heartfelt achievement:

''I draw their eyes first,'' said Mary Burkett, ''and I reach a moment where I just make some little subtle shading, and all of a sudden, I see the little person, and I just sort of say, 'Hey, darling.'

''It is so wonderful that they are there. They seem to me as though they are hiding in the paper, and I just reveal them. I just find them.

Since January, Burkett, 64, of West Columbia, has created 19 pastel portraits of children. Using old grainy black and white photos she printed from the Internet, she has spent hours, dabbing on minute amounts of pastel with a Q-tip or a rolled paper stump called a tortillon, creating the pictures on light brown paper.

She works at home, surrounded by high windows, or on the third floor of the Richland County's main library—both places with natural or bright overhead light. It takes her 25 or 30 hours over a week to draw just one image.

They aren't just any children. They are Jewish children who died in the Holocaust. Their faces exude happiness, though, for the photos that Burkett worked from were taken when the children were with their families, before being sent to the horror of the death camps created by Nazi Germany.

To those who have seen them, Burkett's portraits radiate life, love and loss, intertwined in a way digital or photographic images can't convey.

Many viewer tear up. They might have come across photos before of Jewish children killed in Hitler's concentration camps during World War II. But none like Burkett's, they said.

''I've never seen anything like it, personally,'' said Barry Abels, executive director of the Columbia Jewish Federation. ''Something gets yanked right out of me when I look at these pictures.''

Abels heard about Burkett's portraits. After showing them to some friends, he invited her to Holocaust Remembrance Day at Columbia's Tree of Life Synagogue in April. She set up a table, and people dropped by to see her sketches, still in her sketch book.

''Everybody was amazed,'' Abels said. ''The images jump out of the paper. She had captured the essence of the children. 'Remarkable' was a word I heard more than once . . .''

Because of the positive reactions from others, Burkett has made her goal with the pictures to share them with others in a way that lets others learn their stories . . .

Burkett showed her first portrait, of Hersch Goldberg, to her husband of 40 years, Ronny. He liked what she had done, encouraged her to continue, and advised her that if she felt she had to do the portraits, she should continue.

''I started looking for pictures of children from the Holocaust, wanting their pictures to be from the 1930s, before the Holocaust happened. The reason for that is, they were children. They laughed, and they cried, and they fussed, and they giggled, and they ran, all the things that kids do.''

Back then, Burkett said, cameras were a novelty and children didn't make faces when you took their picture. ''Whatever emotion they were feeling, is actually on their little faces . . .''

Belinda Gergel, a Burkett friend and retired history professor at Columbia College who now lives in Charleston, said, ''Quite frankly, these drawings are about as powerful as they could be.''

''Mary has a gift, and it's a gift that transcends time, and it brings the past right back into the present,'' Gergel said. ''When you look at these drawings, you are confronting the central question about human experience: How could we have lost these very special children?''

Gergel, Hamm, Abels and Filler all hope Burkett can find a way to share what she's done with wider audiences.

Whatever happens, Burkett doesn't want herself to be the focus of attention.

''All the power resides in the children. I don't think it's my drawing at all,'' she said.

FULBRIGHT PROGRAM GRANTEES

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize several outstanding individuals from my district who have received prestigious Fulbright awards during this past academic year. They are Cristaly Carrion, Debra Darnell, Emilio Feijoo, Joy Hazell and Mark Simpson.

Established by Congress in 1946, the Fulbright Program attempts to forge relations between Americans and emerging leaders around the globe through international education exchange. Each year, over 3,000 U.S. students and professionals in a myriad of disciplines are offered merit-based Fulbright grants to lecture, study, and conduct research all over the world. Alumni of the Fulbright Program have gone on to achieve distinction in science, the arts, business, and several other fields.

The five grantees from my constituency traveled to a diverse array of host countries—Cristaly to Spain, Debra to Peru, Emilio to the United Kingdom, Joy to Dominica, and Mark to Rwanda. Under the Fulbright Program, they worked with a wide range of partners and gained valuable skills and expertise that will serve them well in any endeavors they may wish to pursue. The relationships they formed will help build a foundation of trust on which the U.S. may advance global peace and security.

I congratulate Cristaly, Debra, Emilio, Joy and Mark on their outstanding honors, and wish them the best of luck as they continue toward their academic and professional aspirations.

HONORING MR. DAVID SMITH

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. David Smith for his nearly 50 years of service as a Professor of Music at Western Connecticut State University and for his community leadership in Danbury, Connecticut. Mr. Smith retired this year from his role at WCSU, and I thank him for his long commitment to encouraging students and their passion for music.

Percussion has been David's life work. As a student of music, David excelled in both his undergraduate and master's degree studies. He then began working as a Professor of Music at WCSU in 1970, and David demonstrated a remarkable ability to connect with and inspire thousands of students. His excellence in teaching and dedication to helping students was widely recognized, and he received Connecticut's Higher Education Music Educator of the Year Award in 1995 and WCSU's Teacher Excellence Awards in 2010. David touched the lives of countless students, and his legacy in musical education at WCSU and in our state will be remembered for generations.

In addition to his career as a professor, David also worked as a percussionist in several orchestras, including the New Haven Symphony Orchestra, the Ives Symphony Orchestra, the Bridgeport Symphony, and the Ridgefield Orchestra.

Mr. Speaker, David Smith committed his career to teaching and public service, and his devotion to his students, his work, and his community will have lasting impacts. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor Mr. David Smith here today. I offer my best wishes for a well-deserved and restful retirement.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

SPEECH OF

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2017

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes:

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of Amendment No. 18, and I'm proud to be a cosponsor of it.

The amendment authorizes $15 million for an innovative program known as Hacking for Defense. I'm proud this was originally piloted at Stanford University in my Congressional District and has since expanded to six other colleges and universities around the country.

Hacking for Defense offers our country's best and brightest students the opportunity to work directly with our nation's military to identify our most urgent national security threats.

Students design innovative solutions using a lean-startup model that can quickly lead to the procurement of new technologies that solve real-world problems facing our military and the warfighter.

Hacking for Defense integrates entrepreneurism with public service and helps the federal government become more flexible and less bureaucratic in its approach to problem solving, something Congress has long sought to foster.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

GEORGE TAKACS

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of George Takacs, a student at Gulf Coast High School in Naples, who recently committed to play football at the University of Notre Dame. By signing his commitment, George fulfilled a lifelong dream to attend the University he has admired throughout his life.

Selected as an Army All-American, George has proven his dedication to the sport and achieving his goals. He will be on the field with some of the finest athletes in the country, while pursuing his academic goals with some of the finest scholars in the world.

I congratulate George on his perseverance and look forward to seeing what he will accomplish in South Bend over the course of his collegiate career.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes yesterday due to my participation in a health care listening session in Lexington, Kentucky, with Vice President Mike Pence. As vice chair of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee, this was another great opportunity for me to hear firsthand from Kentucky's small business owners about their experiences providing health insurance for their employees. Had I been present, I would have voted on Roll Call No. 345, Yea; Roll Call No. 346, Yea; Roll Call No. 347, Yea; Roll Call No. 348, Aye; Roll Call No. 349, Yea; Roll Call No. 350, No; Roll Call No. 351, No; Roll Call No. 352, Aye.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

SPEECH OF

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2017

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes:

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Sinema-Fitzpatrick-Budd amendment to H.R. 2810, the Fiscal Year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act.

I thank Chairman Thornberry and Ranking Member Smith for their support of our amendment and for including it in the en bloc package.

The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) continues to represent a clear threat to the security of the United States and our allies, and to stability in the Middle East.

While ISIL has lost significant territory over the last six months, the terrorist organization continues to oppress and murder civilians in Syria and Iraq and spread its message of violence and hate across the globe.

ISIL's perverted orthodoxy and efforts to support and inspire attacks in the United States and elsewhere are direct threats to our security and safety.

We must do all we can to accelerate ISIL's destruction.

Our bipartisan amendment ensures that the Report on the United States Strategy in Syria

required by the underlying bill includes a description of amounts and sources of ISIL financing and our efforts to disrupt this financing as part of the broader US strategy in Syria.

Financing is the lifeblood of any organization.

Denying revenue streams from oil, from stolen currency, and from extortion, has helped in the fight against ISIL.

Less money means fewer weapons, fewer fighters, and fewer resources to support those fighters, but the fight is far from over and ISIL has already demonstrated its ability to adapt and evolve.

As ISIL loses territory in Iraq and Syria, it looks abroad to inspire and support terrorist attacks in other countries around the world.

We must choke off its sources of revenue. We must deny its access to resources that fund operations in Syria, Iraq, and abroad.

Our amendment ensures we stay focused on financing, and we do it in a way that supports our broader military and counter-terrorism strategies.

As we have seen, effectively integrating smart counter threat finance enhances our overall strategy in Syria and Iraq and can prevent ISIL support for attacks in the US, in Europe and elsewhere.

Ultimately, it will accelerate the fall of ISIL and keep Americans safe.

I thank my colleagues Congressman FITZPATRICK and Congressman BUDD for offering this amendment with me.

Again, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their support and for their continued bipartisan leadership in support of our country's national security.

RECOGNIZING THE 49TH CITI OPEN TENNIS TOURNAMENT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the Citi Open Tennis Tournament, taking place July 29 through August 6, 2017, in Rock Creek Park, and in recognizing these dates as "Tennis Week in the District of Columbia." All are invited to attend the 49th edition of this Washington tennis tradition, a cultural, economic and community staple in the region.

The tournament, now known as the Citi Open Tennis Tournament, was founded in 1969 by tennis legend and Hall of Famer Donald Dell, along with business partner John Harris, and with the support of Arthur Ashe, the first African-American to win both the U.S. Open and Wimbledon. Ashe declared he would participate in the inaugural tournament under two conditions: the tournament would take place in a naturally integrated neighborhood, and it would be played on public land where all people could come together, enjoy the sport and share the experience. Today, the tournament remains at its original location on 16th & Kennedy Streets NW., in Rock Creek Park.

In 1972, Donald Dell gifted the tournament to the Washington Tennis & Education Foundation (then called the Washington Area Tennis Patrons), a nonprofit organization supporting local education causes.

The Citi Open Tennis Tournament draws the best players in the world, making D.C. a global tennis destination. The tournament is also seen on television in over 180 countries. A recent economic impact study found that the estimated total gross impact of the Citi Open on the regional economy is more than $28.2 million. The tournament is the only Association of Tennis Professionals 500–level event in the United States, and it is one of only four professional tennis tournaments combining men's and women's events. It is also recognized as an International level tournament by the Women's Tennis Association. As the tournament returns to the District this year, the city and our office will be working with residents of the neighborhood to ensure that measures are taken to mitigate traffic in the area and that the beautiful residential neighborhood of the tournament's location is undisturbed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing "Tennis Week in the District of Columbia" for the Citi Open Tennis Tournament, as well as the Washington Tennis & Education Foundation for their efforts.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, my vote was recorded as Yea on Roll Call No. 350. My intention was to vote Nay on Roll Call No. 350.

GRACE JONES RETIREMENT

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues the good work of Grace Jones, who is retiring on July 14th as the executive director for the past 31 years of Couleecap. The people, families, and communities of western Wisconsin are better off as a result of her work and leadership.

As a community action agency, Couleecap serves low-income people and families in Vernon, La Crosse, Crawford, and Monroe counties, with programs that help people with housing, including home ownership and rehabilitation; weatherization and other energy efficiency measures; employment and training; transportation; food and clothing; and drug use prevention. However, under Grace's leadership, Couleecap continues to evolve with the needs of the community. Many people attribute Couleecap's success to Grace's ability to recognize and understand the needs and the challenges ofthe people that she and the agency serves.

Trained as a teacher, Grace began her work with Couleecap as a specialist working with at-risk youngsters. "As a teacher, I tried to instill in very student the hope and belief that they could achieve their dreams with hard work and persistence," Grace told the La Crosse Tribune. With her work at Couleecap, she has been able to help people grow, better themselves, and improve countless lives and families along the way.

Over the years, Grace has received a number of awards for her work. While appreciative of the attention, she has never forgotten the reason for her work, telling the La Crosse Tribune, "At Couleecap, we are so glad that we can help families with encouragement, hope and the tools that they need." She continues, "we prefer to believe we live in a land of great opportunity equally available to everyone. This is not true. Discrimination and poverty still exist—and too many people have talents that are quickly buried under poverty's crushing weight. For these talents to flourish, there must be equal opportunity for all."

I thank Grace Jones for her work at Couleecap. Her work has made a real and lasting impression to the people and communities she served.

RECOGNIZING MARK ZAMBON

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize someone who has made a lasting impact in my Congressional District and the community.

Two years ago, Mark Zambon joined my office as part of the Wounded Warrior Fellowship program through the House of Representatives. He will be leaving my San Diego office in July of 2017.

While he was my primary liaison with our veterans community, Mark also served as a community representative to neighborhoods and managed a number of issues critical to my district. Mark always has a "can do" attitude. If you needed something yesterday, you got it yesterday.

Mark marvelously represented Mission Hills, El Cajon, Mission Valley, University Heights, and Uptown.

His passion and work with the Veterans and Active Duty communities in San Diego has not gone unnoticed by my constituents. In the closing days of his service to the 53rd, communities have been honoring and thanking him for his work.

Mark hails from Marquette, Michigan. After graduating from Marquette Senior High School, he enlisted in the Marine Corps. Mark deployed to both Iraq and Afghanistan with six combat tours and two Purple Hearts. Serving as an explosive ordnance disposal technician in Afghanistan, he lost both legs from an explosion during a mission in Sangin, a town in Afghanistan's Helmand province.

Despite this, it's not uncommon to find Mark scaling up a rock face or racing cars. In fact, Mount Kilimanjaro was a recent conquest.

When he is not going the extra mile to help veterans in the 53rd Congressional District, Mark is probably traveling, tracking down a quality craft brewery, or hanging with his cat Frankly.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say enough about how Mark has taken on the role of providing support for his fellow warriors injured in the line of duty and honoring those who have given their lives in defense of our country.

I am proud to recognize Mark and thank him for all of his outstanding contributions to our

local communities, our constituents, and our country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DENNY HECK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a correction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Earlier today, this body took a vote series with twelve votes in a row, ten of which were amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act, H.R. 2810.

During that vote series, we considered Amendment Number Six, offered by my friend and colleague, Mr. NADLER of New York. That amendment would have struck Section 1022 of the bill, which prohibits the use of funds for transfer or release of individuals detained at Guantanamo Bay.

For too many of our friends and allies around the world, the Guantanamo Bay facility has become a symbol of human rights abuses, and our enemies use it to rally opposition to the United States. I have consistently voted to close Guantanamo Bay.

Unfortunately, my recorded vote was opposed to this Amendment. I would like to correct the record of my vote in favor of Amendment Six and opposed to detaining individuals at Guantanamo Bay.

REMEMBERING REVEREND KATIE R. FOSTER

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to hear of the loss of Rev. Katie R. Foster Anthony, a proud representative of the values, ambition, and resilience of the people of South Mississippi. Throughout her illustrious life she graciously and selflessly served others, setting an example of how to passionately pursue Jesus Christ and spread His love to all. The community is a much better place because of her tireless efforts, and her legacy will live on.

As one ofthe first Ordained Women Ministers in the United Methodist Church, she broke through gender barriers and continuously deepened her faith, spreading her wisdom to many people, including her congregation at Solid Rock Church of God in Christ. Pastor Katie shared the Gospel outside of her church as well, through her roles as host of the Common Sense Television Show, radio host minister on 94.5 FM WJZD, a prison minister, an ordained minister of the Haven Chapel United Methodist Church, and a member of ''The Way Christian Ministries.'' Her teachings will live on and continue to inspire others.

Pastor Katie has always been active in her Mississippi community. She was a 4H lifetime member, a member of the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, the founder of Foster Enterprises ''fast tax'' income tax service, a grocery store business owner, a social worker, a school teacher, and overall an outstanding community member. She had an insatiable thirst for knowledge, starting her education at Nichols High School in Biloxi, and continuing on to earn undergraduate and graduate degrees from many renowned colleges including Wiley College, Southern University, and Emory University.

I have been inspired by Pastor Katie and know her incredible life will motivate others to unselfishly serve their community. She believed anyone can make a powerful difference no matter where they are or what situation they may find themselves in, and this attitude is one I wholeheartedly commend. The people of South Mississippi can learn so much about what it means to be a good community member, American, and all around person by looking at the example Pastor Katie set. She will be deeply missed by her congregation, her loving family, and the multitude of people she impacted.

Words seem inadequate during a time of loss such as this, but I pray that all those that knew and loved Pastor Katie find comfort in the arms of family, friends, and community members on whom she left a tremendous impression. My thoughts and prayers are with everyone during this difficult time, and I will always remember Pastor Katie as the amazing woman and trailblazer that she was. On behalf of the people of Mississippi, I recognize her life and service.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 2017

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes:

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2018, which authorizes $2.5 million in increased funding to combat and treat Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Had it been made in order, this Jackson Lee amendment would have provided additional funding to be used toward outreach activities targeting hard to reach veterans; especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas.

Mr. Chair, along with traumatic brain injury, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD is the signature wound suffered by the brave men and women who fought or are fighting in Afghanistan, Iraq, and far off lands to defend the values and freedom we hold dear.

For those of us whose daily existence is not lived in harm's way, it is difficult to imagine the horrific images seen by American servicemen and women deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other theaters of war.

In an instant a suicide bomber, an IED, or an insurgent can obliterate your best friend and right in front of your face.

Yet, you are trained and expected to continue on with the mission, and you do, even though you may not even have reached your 20th birthday.

But there always comes a reckoning.

And it usually comes after the stress and trauma of battle is over and you are alone with your thoughts and memories.

And the horror of those desperate and dangerous encounters with the enemy and your own mortality come flooding back.

PTSD was first brought to public attention in relation to war veterans, but it can result from a variety of traumatic incidents, such as torture, being kidnapped or held captive, bombings, or natural disasters such as floods or earthquakes.

People with PTSD may startle easily, become emotionally numb (especially in relation to people with whom they used to be close), lose interest in things they used to enjoy, have trouble feeling affectionate, be irritable, become more aggressive, or even become violent.

They avoid situations that remind them of the original incident, and anniversaries of the incident are often very difficult.

Most people with PTSD repeatedly relive the trauma, called flashbacks, in their thoughts during the day and in nightmares when they sleep.

A person having a flashback may lose touch with reality and believe that the traumatic incident is happening all over again.

Mr. Chair, the fact of the matter is that most veterans with PTSD also have other psychiatric disorders, which are a consequence of PTSD.

These veterans have co-occurring disorders, which include depression, alcohol and/or drug abuse problems, panic, and/or other anxiety disorders.

The Jackson Lee Amendment recognizes that these soldiers are first and foremost, human and that they carry their experiences with them.

Ask a veteran of Vietnam, Iraq, or Afghanistan about the frequency of nightmares they experience, and one will realize that serving in the Armed Forces leaves a lasting impression, whether good or bad.

The Jackson Lee Amendment would have helped ensure that ''no soldier is left behind'' by addressing the urgent need for more outreach toward hard to reach veterans suffering from PTSD, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas of our country.

Mr. Chair, I also want to speak in support of the amendment to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2018, offered by Judiciary Committee Ranking Member CONYERS, and supported by Congresswoman BARBARA LEE of California, Congressman WALTER JONES of North Carolina, myself, and many other colleagues but not made in order by the Rules Committee.

The Conyers Amendment is simple and straightforward, stating:

''Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the use of force against North Korea.''

Interviewed by Reuters in the Oval Office on Apri1 27, 2017, the President stated:

"There is a chance that we could end up having a major, major conflict with North Korea. Absolutely."

According to media reports, military strikes against North Korea remain an option for the President and his national security team.

Earlier this year, the Trump Administration sent an aircraft carrier and a nuclear-powered submarine to the region in a show of force.

Of course, direct U.S. military action runs the risk of massive North Korean retaliation and huge casualties in Japan and South Korea and among U.S. forces in both countries.

The Conyers Amendment would make clear and explicit that nothing in the FY2018 NDAA can be construed as congressional authorization or acquiescence regarding the use of military force against North Korea.

The Framers understood that while the military does the fighting, the entire nation goes to war.

That is why the Framers lodged the power to declare war in the Congress, the branch of government closest to the people.

They knew that the decision to go to war was too important to be left to the whim of a single person, no matter how wise or well-informed he or she might be.

The President must consult with Congress and to obtain an AUMF before undertaking any military offensive against North Korea.

Over the last 16 years, we have seen 3 Presidents use the 2001 Afghanistan AUMF as a blank check to engage in serious military action.

In 2016, the Congressional Research Service issued a report detailing 37 unclassified uses of this authorization in 14 countries, including for operations at Guantanamo Bay, warrantless wiretapping, and recent military action in Libya, Syria, Somalia, and Yemen.

The overly broad 2001 AUMF represents a critical deterioration of Congressional oversight, which should be repealed, rather than repeated with respect to North Korea.

As our brave service members are deployed around the world in combat zones, Congress is missing in action.

As provided under the War Powers Resolution of 1973, absent a Congressional declaration of war or authorization for the use of military force, the President as Commander-in-Chief has constitutional power to engage the U.S. armed forces in hostilities only in the case of a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces.

As a co-equal branch of government, it is Congress's right and responsibility to be fully consulted regarding any potential plans to conduct military operations in North Korea, to assess whether such action is in the national security interest of the United States and its allies, and to withhold or grant authorization for the use of military force based on this assessment.

As we have learned from the painful and bitter experience of the past 16 years, at the initiation of hostilities, the costs in terms of blood and treasure of U.S. military interventions abroad are often underestimated and the benefits overstated.

For example, more than 6,800 American service members gave the last full measure of devotion to their country on battlefields in Afghanistan and Iraq, with hundreds of thousands more returning with physical, emotional, or psychological wounds that may never heal.

The direct economic cost of the war in Afghanistan exceeds $1.07 trillion, including $773 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations funds, an increase of $243 billion to the Department of Defense base budget, and an increase of $54.2 billion to the Veterans Administration budget to address the human costs of the military involvement in Afghanistan.

We should not repeat the mistakes of the past and my position on this issue is directly aligned with the will of the American people.

I commend my colleague, Congressman CONYERS for offering this important amendment and am disappointed that it was not made in order.

I am confident that depriving Members of the opportunity to debate and vote on the Conyers Amendment will strengthen our resolve to restore Congress's preeminent constitutional role in the decision to take the nation to war.

If it had been made in order and approved, Jackson Lee Amendment No. 179 would have directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct, and report to Congress within 180 days, the results of a study regarding whether the requirement to notify a Voting Action Officer within 10 days of registering to vote in a state where a service member resides, due to a duty reassignment, imposes a significant burden on military voters.

Members on both sides of the aisle want our men and women in the armed services to be able to vote.

Unfortunately, they often cannot, despite the option of casting an absentee ballot if they are deployed overseas.

For most of U.S. history, military personnel have been barred from voting by State laws and constitutions that specifically restricted military personnel from voting.

Following the Civil War, many of these laws began to change because so many citizens served in the military.

Today, there is a Federal Voting Assistance Program that assists military voters and their families living in the United States and abroad to vote in public elections.

Work has been done and is continuing to be done to make the absentee voting experience for military voters as easy as possible, but there are still issues with receiving a ballot and being able to return it by the deadline.

The military population is extremely mobile.

Since voting materials are postal materials that cannot be forwarded, it is important for them to provide their election office their current address annually, as well as after every move, because information provided is the only way of election agencies can contact them.

Military personnel are often relocated because of reassignments, which are outside of their control.

The process for voting is difficult for persons serving in the military and adding a requirement that military voters who decide to register where they may have been reassigned may need more than 10 days to meet the requirement of notice to their Voting Action Officer.

This Jackson Lee Amendment directs the Department of Defense to study and report to Congress the impact the 10 day requirement and whether it imposes an undue burden on military voters who seek to cast their ballots in person.

Military voters should have the option of casting an in-person ballot, while they serve our nation at a station or on assignment in the United States.

This Jackson Lee Amendment would have ensured that our men and women of the armed services have equal access to the ballot and the opportunity to cast a vote, without fear of violating a 10 day deadline.

I am disappointed that this Jackson Lee Amendment was not made in order, but I will continue working with my colleagues to find ways to ensure our armed services men and women have equal and just access to voice their opinion by casting a voting ballot.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2018, which would have required the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on programs and procedures employed to ensure students studying abroad through Department of Defense National Security Education Programs are trained to recognize, resist, and report against recruitment efforts by agents of foreign governments.

This training would have been helpful for students such as Glenn Shriver, an outstanding college student-majoring in international relations at a college in Michigan and interested in seeing the world.

Seeking new experiences, Glenn traveled to China during the 2002–2003 academic year to Study Abroad in one of Shanghai's universities and practice his Mandarin.

During his study abroad program in China, Glenn developed an interest in Chinese culture and considerably improved his fluency in Mandarin, so after graduating from college in 2004, he returned to the China to continue his language studies and to look for work.

After seeing potential in Glenn, a Chinese official going by the name of Amanda approached him and asked him to write papers and paid him $120.

In the following months, Glenn took some $70,000 from the woman and her associates, and eventually sought a U.S. government job with the aim of accessing classified information with the purpose of providing it to Chinese officials until his scheme was uncovered and he was arrested by the FBI in 2010.

To a recent college graduate, $70,000 seems like a lot of money if they are graduating with high student loan debt, and the promise of even more can be too tempting to pass up.

There are other means and methods for foreign agents to attempt to course, trick or in some other way deceive a college student into becoming a tool of that government.

The Jackson Lee Amendment would have laid the foundation for protected students attending domestic institutions of higher education by providing them with the training necessary to recognize, resist, and report recruitment efforts by agents of foreign governments when they occur in the United States.

Congress should not assume that foreign governments seeking to recruit students attending institutions of higher learning will limit their efforts to students studying abroad.

Had it been made in order and adopted, the Jackson Lee Amendment simply would require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on whether U.S. students attending institutions in the United States would benefit from similar or some aspects of the training described in the bill.

We have seen and learned so much regarding Russia's efforts to influence our nation's elections in large part by leveraging relationships between Russian agents and key individuals in President Trump's Campaign.

Although the work to investigate what took place continues, we should take steps today to make sure that young people attending institutions of higher learning are equipped with the knowledge and training needed to resist influence of a foreign government.

Although I am disappointed this important amendment was not made to order, I will continue to work with my colleagues to find ways to train our young people studying abroad on ways to detect, resist, and report attempts to recruit them by hostile foreign nations and actors.

Had it been made in order and approved, Jackson Lee Amendment No. 182 would direct the Secretary of Defense to develop plans for early detection, mitigation, and defense against state sponsored cyberattacks targeting federal public election assets, election administrators, election workers, or voter engagement efforts.

The aim of this amendment is to ensure that elections, and the peaceful transfer of power, which are pillars of our democracy, remain secure and are not undermined by external factors.

Last year, during one of the most contentious elections we have seen, a foreign state commenced a series of spearphishing attacks with the goal of penetrating the networks of a variety of Republican and Democratic Party organizations.

This foreign adversary was Russia, whose intelligence agencies worked under the directive of Vladimir Putin with the goal of making Donald Trump the 45th President of the United States.

Russian interference may have begun as early as 2015, and lasted through the winter of 2016. While at first, the hacking may have been done with the aim of foreign intelligence collection, by July 2016, Russian intelligence weaponized their information and worked to damage Hillary Clinton's campaign.

While the exact extent of Russia's influence on our elections may never be known, the fact is that Russia successfully intervened in our democracy and American intelligence agencies have determined that they have the capability and motivation to do so once more.

The Jackson Lee amendment would have helped to ensure that this never happens again.

Neither Russia, nor any other country, will ever have a say in our democratic processes.

The Jackson Lee Amendment would protect our election administrators, our election workers, and our voter engagement efforts.

I am disappointed that this amendment was not made in order, but I will continue to work with my colleagues to ensure that the United States has the proper technology, capability, and methods to defend our elections against malicious foreign state-sponsored cyberattacks.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3965–S4007

Measures Introduced: Twenty bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1548–1567, and S. Res. 219–220. **Page S3997**

Measures Reported:

S. 1557, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018. (S. Rept. No. 115–130) **Page S3997**

Shanahan Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Patrick M. Shanahan, of Washington, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense. **Pages S3971–88**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, July 13, 2017, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, July 17, 2017. **Page S3971–72**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S3971**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S3971**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, July 17, 2017, Senate resume consideration of the nomination; and that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination occur at 5:30 p.m. **Page S4303**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 86 yeas to 12 nays (Vote No. EX. 160), William Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador to Japan. **Pages S3968–71, S4007**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Rostin Behnam, of New Jersey, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for a term expiring June 19, 2021.

Michael Lawrence Brown, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

William L. Campbell, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee.

Thomas Alvin Farr, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

Charles Barnes Goodwin, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Mark Saalfield Norris, Sr., of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee.

Thomas Lee Robinson Parker, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee.

William M. Ray II, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

Eli Jeremy Richardson, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee.

Tilman Eugene Self III, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia.

3 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

77 Army nominations in the rank of general.

4 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Army and Navy. **Pages S4003–07**

Messages from the House: **Page S3992**

Measures Referred: **Page S3992**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S3992**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S3992**

Executive Communications: **Pages S3992–94**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S3994–96**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S3997**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S3998**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S3998–S4002

Additional Statements: Page S3990–92

Amendments Submitted: Page S4002

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S4002

Privileges of the Floor: Page S4002

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—160) Page S3971

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 5:57 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, July 17, 2017. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4003.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

2018 FARM BILL

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine opportunities in global and local markets, specialty crops, and organics, focusing on perspectives for the 2018 Farm Bill, after receiving testimony from Kenneth A. Dallmier, Clarkson Grain Company, Inc., Cerro Gordo, Illinois; Theo Crisantes, Wholesum Harvest, Amado, Arizona, on behalf of the Coalition for Sustainable Organics; Haile Johnston, The Common Market, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Eric Halverson, Black Gold Farms, Grand Forks, North Dakota, on behalf of the National Potato Council and the United Fresh Produce Association; and Greg Hanes, U.S. Meat Export Federation, Denver, Colorado.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill (S. 1557) entitled, "Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018".

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Transportation, after receiving testimony from Elaine L. Chao, Secretary of Transportation.

MONTENEGRO AND RUSSIAN INFLUENCE IN EUROPE

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the attempted coup in Montenegro and malign Russian influence in Europe, after receiving testimony from Nebojsa Kaludjerovic, Ambassador of Montenegro to the United States; Janusz Bugajski, Center for European Policy Analysis; Lisa Sawyer Samp, Center for Strategic and International Studies; and Damon Wilson, The Atlantic Council.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Richard V. Spencer, of Wyoming, to be Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense.

SEMIANNUAL MONETARY POLICY REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress, including H.R. 10, to create hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and S. 366, to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, after receiving testimony from Janet L. Yellen, Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

COMMERCIAL AND GOVERNMENT SPACE EXPLORATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competiveness concluded a hearing to examine reopening the American frontier, focusing on promoting partnerships between commercial space and the United States government to advance exploration and settlement, after receiving testimony from Robert D. Cabana, Director, John F. Kennedy Space Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Jeffrey Manber, NanoRacks LLC, Webster, Texas; Tim Ellis, Relativity Space, Inc., Inglewood, California; Tim Hughes, Space Exploration Technologies Corp., Washington, D.C.; and Moriba K. Jah, The University of Texas, Austin.

TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS REPORT

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the 2017 Trafficking in Persons Report, after receiving testimony from John Sullivan, Deputy Secretary, and Susan Coppedge, Ambassador-at-Large, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, both of the Department of State.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor, and Marvin Kaplan, of Kansas, and William J. Emanuel, of California, both to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of John Kenneth Bush, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Kevin Christopher Newsom, of Alabama, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, Damien Michael Schiff, of California, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, and Timothy J. Kelly, to be a United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 25 public bills, H.R. 3216–3240; and 4 resolutions, H. Res. 442–445, were introduced. **Pages H5830–32**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5832–33**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 218, to provide for the exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land in the State of Alaska for the construction of a road between King Cove and Cold Bay (H. Rept. 115–218); and

H.R. 3219, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–219). **Page H5830**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Donovan to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5763**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:54 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Pages H5769–70**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Bishop Joshua K. Lynn Mastin, Lake Church of God of Prophecy, Huntsville, AL. **Page H5770**

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the McGovern motion to adjourn by a yea-and-nay vote of 77 yeas to 326 nays, Roll No. 353. **Pages H5776–77**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:25 p.m. and reconvened at 3:32 p.m. **Page H5790**

Recess: The House recessed at 4:59 p.m. and reconvened at 5:05 p.m. **Page H5801**

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018: The House considered H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, and to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year. Consideration began yesterday, July 12th. **Pages H5783–90, H5790–H5801, H5801–23**

Agreed to:

Rogers (AL) amendment (No. 88 printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–212) that was debated on July 12th that amends section 1043 of the FY2012 National Defense Authorization Act to state that the Secretary may include information and data on the costs of nuclear weapons modernization beyond the currently required 10-year window if the Secretary determines such is accurate and useful (by a recorded vote of 253 ayes to 172 noes, Roll No. 362); **Page H5788**

Keating amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 115–217) that authorizes the Secretary of Defense to use Defense Health Program funds for testing ticks for tick-borne diseases; **Pages H5798–99**

Cole amendment (No. 12 printed in H. Rept. 115–217) that directs the President to provide to Congress a strategy and a budgetary analysis needed to defeat Al-Quaeda, the Taliban, The Islamic State of Iraq and ISIS, no later than 30 days after final passage; the report shall include an analysis of the Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) and the legal framework to accomplish the strategy described; **Pages H5806–09**

Cheney amendment (No. 14 printed in H. Rept. 115–217) that prevents reductions of ICBMs below the levels set by the New START Treaty;

Pages H5811–12

Thornberry en bloc amendment No. 1 consisting of the following amendments printed in H. Rept. 115–217: Hudson (No. 2) that restricts the funds available for the enhanced multi mission parachute system until the Secretary of the Navy submits a certification of need for the system and a report which addresses cost and safety concerns; Buck (No. 8) that prohibits the use of funds to designate or expand national heritage areas in southeast Colorado counties; Poe (TX) (No. 9) that directs the Secretary of Defense to give preference to State and Federal agencies who conduct border security functions for distribution of surveillance unmanned aerial vehicles including the MQ–9 Reaper, the Aerostat radar system; night-vision goggles; and Humvees as part of the DOD's Excess Property Program (1033 program); Cheney (No. 11) that requires a plan to enhance the extended deterrence and assurance capabilities of the United States in the Asia-Pacific region; Poliquin (No. 19) that amends section 126 to exclude FY16 DDG–51s from bill provision's retroactive (or retroactive Flight 3) requirement and make it clear the Navy should bear contractual burden for majority of risk on initial FYI 7 DDG–51 Flight 3 ship construction; Larsen (WA) (No. 20) that strikes section 211(d) and replaces with (1) requirement that commercial aircraft acquisition for PAR be conducted pursuant to a fixed price contract and (2) analysis of potential additional fixed price contracts during EMD phase; Michelle Lujan Grisham (NM) (No. 21) that requires the DOD, in coordination with DOE, to conduct a pilot program among defense laboratories, national laboratories, and private entities to facilitate the licensure, transfer, and commercialization of innovative technologies; Loebsack (No. 22) that requires the Secretary of Defense to perform an assessment of the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math, as well as Maintenance and Manufacturing (STEM(MM)) workforce for organizations within the DOD, identify the types and quantities of STEM(MM) jobs needed to support future mission work, and identify a plan of action to address the STEM(MM) jobs gap; Castro (TX) (No. 23) that incorporates a DoD recommendation which would allow nonprofit research institutions to enter into prototype projects with DoD without having to participate in cost sharing; Meng (No. 24) that authorizes the Jet Noise Reduction Program within the Office of Naval Research; Fitzpatrick (No. 25) that directs the Secretary of Defense to implement a process to coordinate annual research requests between all services and offices under Department of Defense in order to maximize the benefit of each request and minimize duplication; Norman (No. 26) that directs the Comptroller General to review Department of Defense Cost Models used in making personnel decisions; McKinley (No. 27) that increases the National Guard Youth Challenge Program by 25 million and decreases by the same amount Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide; Meng (No. 28) that requires a report from the Secretary of Defense regarding the design, material, sizing, price, availability, quality, and utility of maternity uniforms for pregnant members of the military in response to concerns raised by last year's Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services Report; Cartwright (No. 29) that directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to provide a briefing to the Congressional Defense Committees on the status of the formal process to provide Government agencies outside the Department of Defense with information on the availability of surplus, serviceable ammunition for the purpose of reducing the overall storage and disposal costs related to such ammunition; Perry (No. 30) that reduces required percentage of dual status conversions to 4.8; Herrera-Beutler (No. 31) that codifies and expands existing requirements from the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 that each military service establish a process by which alleged survivors of sexual assault may challenge the terms or characterization of their discharge or separation from the armed forces; Watson Coleman (No. 32) that requires the Secretary of Defense to implement changes to the Army National Guard and Army Reserve's sexual assault prevention and response programs in areas such as staffing, budget management, and investigation timeliness; Jenkins (WV) (No. 33) that increases the National Guard Counter-Drug account by $10 million with an equal offset; Gowdy (No. 34) that adds the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to the list of committees receiving the Department of Defense's recommendations regarding the employment, use, and status of military technicians in the National Guard; and Crawford (No. 35) that designates the Explosive Ordnance Disposal Corps as a basic branch of the Army; and **Pages H5814–20**

Thornberry en bloc amendment No. 2 consisting of the following amendments printed in H. Rept. 115–217: Kildee (No. 36) that allows the DoD to provide additional training to service members to counter Russian propaganda, disinformation and cyber measures designed to influence members of the military; Taylor (No. 37) that expands education opportunities for service members to include pursuit of

credentials valued by the services or by civilian employers; Smucker (No. 38) that expands the eligibility for the United Services Military Apprenticeship Program (USMAP) to include any member of the uniformed services; Meng (No. 39) that enhances the hours of operation of DOD childcare development centers and establishes childcare coordinators for military installations; Meadows (No. 40) that makes all those who participated in the S.S. Mayaguez rescue operation eligible for the Vietnam Service Medal; Lance (No. 41) that requires each military department to carry out a program for awarding medals and other commendations to military working dogs and/or their handlers; Graves (LA) (No. 42) that awards the Vietnam Service Medal to all veterans who participated in Operation End Sweep during the Vietnam War; Soto (No. 44) that expedites the replacement of military decorations for veterans of World War II and the Korean War; Heck (WA) (No. 45) that automates interest rate limitations under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act; Esty (No. 46) that requires the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue a report on possible improvements to processing retirements and medical discharges; the report shall address: the feasibility of requiring members of the armed forces to apply for Veterans Affairs benefits before members complete discharge from the armed forces, requiring members to undergo compensation and benefits examinations, and a review of possible improvements to the timeliness of the process for transitioning members who undergo medical discharge to care provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; Mast (No. 47) that establishes an ''Oath of Exit''; members of the military may take this oath upon separation from service to maintain a personal stake in the mental health of their fellow veterans into civilian life; Watson Coleman (No. 48) that extends reporting requirements regarding diversity inclusion in military leadership for 5 years; Donovan (No. 50) that requires the Secretary of Defense to reevaluate the basic housing allowance for the Military Housing area that includes Staten Island, New York; Trott (No. 51) that directs the Department of Defense to provide states with non-classified information about its training programs, so states can evaluate if this training meets state occupational licensing requirements; it would further provide that service members be provided with certificates for successfully completed training so they can present them to participating states for occupational licenses; Courtney (No. 52) that allows members of the National Guard and Reserves to seek treatment at the VA for Military Sexual Trauma regardless of their duty status; and Schneider (No. 53) that requires DOD providers who prescribe opioids for pain management to complete 12 hours of training every three years on pain management treatment guidelines and best practices, early detection of opioid use disorder, and the treatment and management of patients with opioid use disorder.

Pages H5820–23

Rejected:

Conaway amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–212) that was debated on July 12th that sought to prohibit the DoD from entering new biofuels contracts while sequestration remains law; once sequestration expires or is repealed, it sought to amend current law to require the DoD to include calculations of any financial contributions made by other federal agencies for biofuels purchases (by a recorded vote of 198 ayes to 225 noes, Roll No. 356);

Page H5784

Polis amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–212) that was debated on July 12th that sought to reduce the base Defense Department budget by 1 percent excluding military/reserve/National Guard personnel, as well as Defense Health Program account (by a recorded vote of 73 ayes to 351 noes, Roll No. 357); **Pages H5784–85**

Jayapal amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–212) that was debated on July 12th that sought to express the sense of Congress that any authorization to appropriate increases to combined budgets of National Defense Budget (050) and Overseas Contingency Operations should be matched for non-defense discretionary budget (by a recorded vote of 179 ayes to 245 noes, Roll No. 358);

Pages H5785–86

Nadler amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–212) that was debated on July 12th that sought to strike section 1022 of the bill prohibiting the use of funds for transfer or release of individuals detained at Guantanamo Bay to the United States (by a recorded vote of 167 ayes to 257 noes, Roll No. 359); **Page H5786**

Blumenauer amendment (No. 8 printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–212) that was debated on July 12th that sought to modify Sec. 1244 to include limitations on the development of an INF range groundlaunched missile system (by a recorded vote of 173 ayes to 249 noes, Roll No. 360);

Pages H5786–87

Aguilar amendment (No. 10 printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–212) that was debated on July 12th that sought to extend a currently required CBO cost estimate review on the fielding, maintaining, modernization, replacement, and life extension of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons delivery systems from covering a 10-year period to covering a 30-year period (by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 361); **Pages H5787–88**

Garamendi amendment (No. 12 printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–212) that was debated on July 12th that sought to modify and extend the scope of the report required by Section 1043 of the Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Act (by a recorded vote of 192 ayes to 232 noes, Roll No. 363); **Pages H5788–89**

Blumenauer amendment (No. 13 printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–212) that was debated on July 12th that sought to limit spending on the Long Range Standoff weapon (LRSO) until the Administration submits a Nuclear Posture Review to Congress including a detailed assessment of the weapon (by a recorded vote of 169 ayes to 254 noes, Roll No. 364); **Pages H5789–90**

McClintock amendment (No. 14 printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–212) that was debated on July 12th that sought to strike section 2702, the prohibition on conducting an additional round of Base Realignment and Closure (by a recorded vote of 175 ayes to 248 noes, Roll No. 365); **Page H5790**

Garamendi amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 115–217) that sought to strike section 123 regarding icebreaker vessels (by a recorded vote of 198 ayes to 220 noes, Roll No. 366); **Pages H5791–92, H5802**

Buck amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 115–217) that sought to require the DOD to complete a cost competitiveness calculation ensuring that the Department does not purchase alternative fuels unless they are as cost effective as traditional fuels; research on alternative fuels is allowed to continue (by a recorded vote of 203 ayes to 218 noes, Roll No. 367); **Pages H5792–93, H5802–03**

Perry amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 115–217) that sought to strike section 336, relating to climate change (by a recorded vote of 185 ayes to 234 noes, Roll No. 368); **Pages H5793–95, H5803–04**

Hartzler amendment (No. 10 printed in H. Rept. 115–217) that sought to prohibit funds for medical treatment (other than mental health treatment) related to gender transition to a person entitled to medical care under chapter 55 of title 10, U.S. code (by a recorded vote of 209 ayes to 214 noes, Roll No. 369); **Pages H5799–S5801, H5804**

Gosar amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 115–217) that sought to direct that any determination of prevailing wage pursuant to this Act, shall be conducted by the Secretary of Labor using surveys carried out by the Bureau that use proper random statistical sampling techniques (by a recorded vote of 183 ayes to 242 noes, Roll No. 370); and **Pages H5795–96, H5004–05**

Thomas J. Rooney (FL) amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 115–217) that sought to strike Sec. 541 which prohibits student-athletes graduating from service academies from seeking a deferment of service in order to pursue professional athletic careers (by a recorded vote of 107 ayes to 318 noes, Roll No. 371). **Pages H5796–98, H5005–06**

Proceedings Postponed:

Franks amendment (No. 13 printed in H. Rept. 115–217) that seeks to require the Secretary of Defense to conduct strategic assessments of the use of violent or unorthodox Islamic religious doctrine to support extremist or terrorist messaging and justification; and **Pages H5809–11**

Lamborn amendment (No. 15 printed in H. Rept. 115–217) that seeks to normalize the operational test and evaluation process for the ballistic missile defense system by conforming the condition for proceeding beyond low-rate initial production in line with all other major defense acquisition programs. **Pages H5812–14**

H. Res. 440, the rule providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2810) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 230 ayes to 190 noes, Roll No. 355, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 187 nays, Roll No. 354. **Pages H5774–76, H5777–83**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and seventeen recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5776, H5782–83, H5783, H5784, H5784–85, H5785–86, H5786, H5786–87, H5787–88, H5788, H5788–89, H5789–90, H5790, H5802, H5802–03, H5803–04, H5804, H5804–05, and H5805–06. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

Committee Meetings

THE FUTURE OF FARMING: TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS, OPPORTUNITIES, AND CHALLENGES FOR PRODUCERS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing entitled ''The Future of Farming: Technological Innovations, Opportunities, and Challenges for Producers''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup on the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Bill, FY 2018; the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill, FY 2018; and the Report on the Revised Interim Suballocation of the Budget Allocations, FY 2018. The Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Bill, FY 2018; and

the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill, FY 2018 were ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a markup on the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, FY 2018. The State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, FY 2018 was forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a markup on the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2018. The Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2018 was forwarded to the full committee, as amended.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR STATE LEADERSHIP OF EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education held a hearing entitled ''Opportunities for State Leadership of Early Childhood Programs''. Testimony was heard from Cindy Brown Barnes, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment held a markup on legislation on the Drinking Water System Improvement Act. The legislation was forwarded to the full committee, as amended.

IMPACT OF THE DOL FIDUCIARY RULE ON THE CAPITAL MARKETS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investment held a hearing entitled ''Impact of the DOL Fiduciary Rule on the Capital Markets''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

AMERICA'S INTERESTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA: THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2018 BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Middle East and North Africa held a hearing entitled ''America's Interests in the Middle East and North Africa: The President's FY 2018 Budget Request''. Testimony was heard from Stuart Jones, Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, Department of State; and Maria Longi, Acting Assistant Administrator, Bureau for the Middle East, U.S. Agency for International Development.

THE PERSISTENT THREAT: AL QAEDA'S EVOLUTION AND RESILIENCE

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held a hearing entitled ''The Persistent Threat: al Qaeda's Evolution and Resilience''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE TERRORIST DIASPORA: AFTER THE FALL OF THE CALIPHATE

Committee on Homeland Security: Task Force on Denying Terrorists Entry into the United States held a hearing entitled ''The Terrorist Diaspora: After the Fall of the Caliphate''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE IMPACT OF BAD PATENTS ON AMERICAN BUSINESSES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet held a hearing entitled ''The Impact of Bad Patents on American Businesses''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

COMPARING 21ST CENTURY TRUST LAND ACQUISITION WITH THE INTENT OF THE 73RD CONGRESS IN SECTION 5 OF THE INDIAN REORGANIZATION ACT

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing entitled ''Comparing 21st Century Trust Land Acquisition with the Intent of the 73rd Congress in Section S of the Indian Reorganization Act''. Testimony was heard from James Cason, Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior; Fred B. Allyn III, Mayor, Ledyard, Connecticut; and public witnesses.

THE PUERTO RICO OVERSIGHT, MANAGEMENT, AND ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT: STATE OF SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTING

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce; and Economic Growth, Tax, and Capital Access held a joint hearing entitled ''The Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act: State of Small Business Contracting''. Testimony was heard from William Shear, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, Government Accountability Office; and Robb

N. Wong, Associate Administrator, Office of Government Contracting and Business Development, Small Business Administration.

EXAMINING VA'S PROCESSING OF GULF WAR ILLNESS CLAIMS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations; and Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held a joint hearing entitled ''Examining VA's Processing of Gulf War Illness Claims''. Testimony was heard from Bradley Flohr, Senior Advisor, Compensation Service, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Melissa Emrey-Arras, Director, Education, Workforce and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

MAXIMIZING ACCESS AND RESOURCES: AN EXAMINATION OF VA PRODUCTIVITY AND EFFICIENCY

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Maximizing Access and Resources: An Examination of VA Productivity and Efficiency''. Testimony was heard from Carolyn Clancy, M.D., Deputy Under Secretary for Organizational Excellence, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Randall B. Williamson, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

HOW TAX REFORM WILL HELP AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESSES GROW AND CREATE NEW JOBS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Tax Policy held a hearing on ''How Tax Reform Will Help America's Small Businesses Grow and Create New Jobs''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3178, the ''Medicare Part B Improvement Act of 2017''; H.R. 3168, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide continued access to specialized Medicare Advantage plans for special needs individuals, and for other purposes; and H.R. 1843, the ''Restraining Excessive Seizure of Property through the Exploitation of Civil Forfeiture Tools Act''. H.R. 3178, H.R. 3168, and H.R. 1843 were ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3180, the ''Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018''. H.R. 3180 was ordered reported, as amended. This was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

ENERGY INSECURITY IN RUSSIA'S PERIPHERY

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission received a briefing on energy insecurity in Russia's periphery from Peter Doran, Center for European Policy Analysis, Edward Chow, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Lyndon Allin, Baker McKenzie, and Mamuka Tsereteli, Central Asia-Caucasus Institute, all of Washington, D.C., and Andrian Prokip, Kennan Institute, Kyiv, Ukraine.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 14, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investment, hearing entitled ''A Review of Fixed Income Market Structure'', 9:15 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''The Tragic Case of Liu Xiaobo'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Federal Lands, hearing on H.R. 873, the ''Global War on Terrorism War Memorial Act''; H.R. 1547, the ''Udall Park Land Exchange Completion Act''; H.R. 2582, the ''Confirming State Land Grants for Education Act''; and H.R. 3115, the ''Superior National Forest Land Exchange Act of 2017'', 9 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing entitled ''Social Security's Solvency Challenge: Status of the Social Security Trust Funds'', 10 a.m., 2020 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, July 17

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Patrick M. Shanahan, of Washington, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, July 14

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Complete consideration of H.R. 2810—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Beatty, Joyce, Ohio, E975
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E980
Bost, Mike, Ill., E983
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E977
Crist, Charlie, Fla., E976
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E983
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E982
Esty, Elizabeth H., Conn., E982
Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E982
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E980
Harper, Gregg, Miss., E975
Heck, Denny, Wash., E984
Himes, James A., Conn., E976
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E979
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E984
Jones, Walter B., N.C., E980
Khanna, Ro, Calif., E979
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E983
LaHood, Darin, Ill., E981
Lance, Leonard, N.J., E977
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E976
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E977
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E983
Palazzo, Steven M., Miss., E984
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E975, E975, E976, E976, E977, E978, E979, E979, E980, E981
Rooney, Francis, Fla., E981, E982, E982
Sinema, Kyrsten, Ariz., E982
Stivers, Steve, Ohio, E980
Tenney, Claudia, N.Y., E979
Thornberry, Mac, Tex., E978
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E976
Williams, Roger, Tex., E981
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E981
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E975

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.