

Richard continues to serve NCCU and its alumni community in numerous capacities at the local, State, and national levels. He gives of his time, talent, and resources to help students from across the country succeed in obtaining a quality education from Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Richard Smith has been married to Jacqueline Beatty Smith for 28 years. They met 40 years ago as NCCU students.

Mr. Speaker, time does not permit me to fully describe Richard's many other contributions; but suffice it to say that Richard Smith is most deserving of this high honor—the NCCU Alumni Association 2017 Alumni Founder's Lifetime Achievement Award.

I am proud of Richard Smith, and I thank him for his extraordinary work. I ask my colleagues to join me today in congratulating this great American hero.

HEALTHCARE TOWNHALLS

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, 118,000—the number of people in my district alone who will lose healthcare if TrumpCare passes.

250—the number of people who joined me for a healthcare townhall on Monday in Charlotte.

Zero—the number of public hearings the Senate has held on TrumpCare.

Despite the potential for 22 million people who will lose their healthcare if TrumpCare passes, Senator McCONNELL hasn't asked to hear from any of them.

On Monday, I held a townhall where my constituents shared their stories and asked that I share them with you.

Katie Mpelkas, a mother of a 3-year-old with autism, relies on Medicaid for her son's healthcare. She is terrified at the thought that without Medicaid coverage her son won't get the care he needs.

Adrienne Gonzalez's son, diagnosed with autism at age 2, has been receiving care paid for by Medicaid since he was 11 months old.

Sadly, their stories aren't unique. Thirty-nine percent of children are on Medicaid for the care they need, and TrumpCare cuts the program by 35 percent by 2036.

Our constituents are begging for help. It is our responsibility to fight for them.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). 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 Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 0906

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. 2018) 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. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Thursday, July 13, 2017, a second set of amendments en bloc, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORBERRY) had been disposed of.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 115-217.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 115-217.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Florida, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title XXXV add the following:

SEC. . APPLICATION OF LAW.

Section 4301 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) For purposes of any Federal law except the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), any vessel, including a foreign vessel, being repaired or dismantled is deemed to be a recreational vessel, as defined under section 2101(25), during such repair or dismantling, if that vessel—

“(1) shares elements of design and construction of traditional recreational vessels (as so defined); and

“(2) when operating is not normally engaged in a military, commercial, or traditionally commercial undertaking.”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, this straightforward and bipartisan amendment would provide important clarity for the recreational marine industry as it relates to workers' compensation coverage.

For decades, Federal law stated that individuals who build, dismantle, or repair recreational vessels less than 65 feet could be covered under State workers' compensation law instead of the Federal Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

Under the Democrat-controlled Congress in 2009, the law was simplified by eliminating the size limitation, which

allowed more employers to purchase State workers' compensation.

Unfortunately, in 2011, the Department of Labor issued a burdensome and confusing rule creating a new definition of recreational vessel. This change contradicted legislation passed by the Congress in 2009, and effectively denied recreational vessel repair workers access to more affordable State workers' compensation insurance.

This regulatory confusion and uncertainty is reducing access to affordable workers' compensation policies and also hurting the overall recreational repair industry.

Our bipartisan amendment increases strong protections to ensure that no vessel used for commercial or military purposes is inappropriately excepted from the Federal requirements.

This amendment would provide regulatory relief for small businesses, including those in coastal Alabama, while also ensuring the maritime workers receive the protections they need.

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

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

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment that is offered by my good friend from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

I would just note that this is an amendment that has been around the last couple Congresses, and the intent clearly is to carve out a larger exemption from the longshoremen's act which is a law that goes back to 1927.

I would note that if that is the intent, the language of this amendment actually is kind of like legislating with a chainsaw instead of a scalpel because by carving out a larger exemption for recreational vessels above or beyond 55 feet long, basically there is a whole series of Coast Guard rules and regulations that have been enforced by the Coast Guard for many years that this amendment, unfortunately, is going to sweep up and undermine, including the rules related to alcohol on board vessels, waste management, Coast Guard inspection categories, vessel sales to non-U.S. citizens, tonnage taxes, and safety management systems.

The Coast Guard is out there every single day making sure that these rules which really protect our ports and make sure that particularly foreign, large, super yachts are paying their fair share, in terms of the costs of environmental protection, and boating safety is enforced. That is, again, what this amendment will undermine.

That is why last year the Coast Guard issued a statement pointing out the fact that because of the broad sweep of the language of this amendment, it is really undermining some key missions that the Coast Guard has been doing for decades for the American people.

So I would note that, at the outset, obviously there is, I think, another

issue which is just as significant which is undermining the longshoremen's act which goes back to Calvin Coolidge. It recognizes the fact that the folks who are engaged in longshoremen activity but also shipyard construction are engaged in a very high-risk type of occupation.

The longshoremen's act was a recognition that State workers' compensation systems, because of the fact that they varied up and down in terms of protections, really required a Federal minimum standard. That is really something that has obviously withstood the test of time over the last 90 years.

Again, if you look at the data, people who were involved in shipyard work, their risk of injury is much higher than many other occupations.

I am a proud Representative from a district that has the second largest employment level in shipbuilding according to the American Shipbuilding Association, and these folks are dealing with processes, equipment, and parts that, again, really are much higher risk than even aerospace or other forms of manufacturing.

Mr. Chairman, I think what we ought to do is stick to the Coast Guard definition of what a recreational vessel is because that has been on the books for many years, and it is something that I think all of us should listen closely to in terms of evaluating this amendment.

I think also we should recognize that we can build a great American shipbuilding sector in this country for commercial and recreational vessels, but we should not do it on the backs of worker protection.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman. He and I have worked together on shipbuilding issues a lot of times, and I appreciate his leadership in that industry.

These are recreational vessel companies. They are small companies doing small things on different types of vessels than the ones that Mr. COURTNEY and I are typically working together on. So trying to apply the same rules when it is a completely different activity to where, when we are usually talking about very large ships, it just doesn't make any sense.

This has traditionally been a Democrat amendment. I have always supported it. I am happy to be here to support it today. I would like for us to continue our tradition of bipartisan support on this issue.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) who is a colleague from another great shipbuilding district and also the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The amendment shifts workers who repair super yachts and large, luxury watercraft out of coverage under the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act and into coverage under State workers' compensation programs.

But it doesn't just amend the longshoremen act. Rather, it creates a problem with the Coast Guard law. The Coast Guard opposed an identical amendment last year because it creates widespread damage to Coast Guard regulatory and enforcement authorities, implicates U.S. treaty obligations, and could affect the collection of tonnage taxes on foreign flagged vessels.

The Department of Labor also opposes the amendment because it could lead to uncertainty and foster litigation under the longshoremen coverage. Moreover, by shifting workers out of longshoremen into the weak State workers' comp laws such as Florida, it could permanently impoverish workers.

Last year, the Florida Supreme Court held that the Florida workers' compensation law was so anemic that it was unconstitutional.

If the goal is to provide reasonable insurance rates, then it should be in the insurance industry not by complicating the Coast Guard, by complicating the Department of Labor, and denying workers their benefits under the Longshoremen's Compensation Act.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Committee on Education and the Workforce opposing this amendment.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE
WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, July 12, 2017.

Re Opposition to Making Amendment 302 in Order as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2018 (H.R. 2810)

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER,
Ranking Member, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS AND RANKING MEMBER SLAUGHTER: I am writing to request that you not make Amendment 302 in order as part of the rule for the FY 2018 National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 2810).

The amendment offered by Representatives Frankel and Byrne changes the definition of a "recreational" vessel under U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) boating safety authorizing legislation. The amendment authors' goal is to change workers' compensation coverage for those repairing luxury water craft and superyachts by shifting coverage for these workers from the Longshore and Harbor Workers Compensation Act (LHWCA) into state workers' compensation programs.

However, the amendment does not amend the LHWCA. Rather it changes the definition of "recreational vessel" under Section 4301 of Title 46 (the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971). According to the Coast Guard, this approach to amending the LHWCA will have adverse collateral impacts on Coast Guard regulatory and enforcement authorities, implicate U.S. treaty obligations, and affect collection of tonnage taxes on foreign flagged vessels. The USCG statement, at-

tached to this letter, notes that this provision could:

Exclude vessels now covered under the U.S. implementing legislation for the International Convention on the Control of Harmful Anti-Fouling Systems on Ships, and reduce available civil monetary penalties to deter violations;

Allow a foreign vessel owner to exempt itself from tonnage taxes by declaring its vessel to be under repair; and,

Allow foreign flagged vessels to avoid requirements for safety management systems under the International Safety Management Code.

The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) objected to this provision in the last Congress, as it would "lead to uncertainty and foster litigation regarding Longshore Act coverage" because the definition of "recreational" vessel introduces subjective criteria.

This identical amendment was included in the House National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2017 as Section 3512, but was removed in the House-Senate conference following the numerous objections raised by the U.S. Coast Guard and the U.S. Department of Labor.

None of these concerns have been considered in hearings within the respective committees of jurisdiction for USCG or DOL, and deserve careful consideration before being brought to a vote.

I thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. BOBBY SCOTT,
Ranking Member.

Encl: U.S. Coast Guard Views on Amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act (this set of views applied to the identical language included in Amendment 302 that was adopted in Section 3512 the FY 2017 National Defense Authorization Act).

COAST GUARD VIEWS ON SEC. 3512 OF H.R.
4909, THE NDAA FOR FY17

The Coast Guard would oppose the previously referenced amendment to 46 U.S.C. §4301. As a general matter, it seems like this proposed amendment is out of place. Sec. 803 of the American Investment and Recovery Act amended sec. 2(3)(F) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. §902(3)(F)), a statutory regime squarely within the purview of the Department of Labor (DOL). Indeed, in 2011, it was DOL—not the Coast Guard—that promulgated the rule in question that, according to industry background documentation, would appear to be the root cause of this issue. Thus, any changes to address this issue should be more properly directed either to the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act or to DOL and its implementing regulations.

Aside from the amendment's misplaced statutory location, the proposed amendment contains numerous drafting issues. For example, the proposed amendment contains no limitation of the "dismantling" language to those activities "in connection with the repair of such vessel." Irrespective of the drafting issues, the proposed amendment would not provide any immediate relief as the draft language contains terms undefined by statute that prevent it from being self-executing. Finally, if adopted, the amendment would likely create a wholly unnecessary bifurcated regulatory scheme between the DOL regulations under 20 C.F.R. §§701.501-701.505 and additional regulations promulgated by the Coast Guard.

The proposed change to the definition of a "recreational vessel" to include "any vessel, including a foreign vessel, being repaired or dismantled [. . .] during such repair or dismantling if the vessel (1) shares elements of

design and construction of traditional recreational vessels (as so defined); and (2) when operating is not normally engaged in a military, commercial, or traditionally commercial undertaking” has significant impacts on Coast Guard regulatory and enforcement authorities.

The change in the definition would expand the current exclusion for “recreational vessels” from the U.S. implementing legislation for the International Convention on the Control of Harmful Anti-Fouling Systems on Ships. Specifically, civil penalties for owners of “recreational vessels” are statutorily limited to \$5,000 as compared to the \$37,500 maximum penalty for all other vessel owners.

The change in the definition could be construed to allow a foreign vessel owner to exempt itself from tonnage taxes required under 46 U.S.C. §60301, by claiming that its vessel is “being repaired” and thereby a recreational vessel exempted from tonnage taxes.

The change in the definition could also be construed to allow foreign flagged vessels to avoid the requirements to maintain a safety management system onboard under 46 U.S.C. §3201, et seq. by claiming that its vessel is “being repaired” and thereby a recreational vessel exempted from Safety Management Requirements under the International Safety Management Code.

In addition to these statutory impacts, there are numerous Coast Guard regulations not related to Longshoreman and Harbor Workers’ Compensation Act authorities that would be impacted by the change. These include:

33 C.F.R. §95.001
33 C.F.R. §151.51
46 C.F.R. §2.01–7
46 C.F.R. §4.03–50
46 C.F.R. §67.11
46 C.F.R. §136.105

This list is by no means exhaustive. Given the time for review, the Coast Guard has not been able to conduct a comprehensive review of statutory and regulatory impacts that would be implicated by this change. Furthermore, as drafted, this change would require the Coast Guard to reallocate a substantial amount of financial and personnel resources to ensure that its regulations were in alignment with the revised definition. Such an undertaking is wholly incompatible with the current fiscal climate.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

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

□ 0915

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, we have heard nothing from the Coast Guard this year in opposition to this amendment. In years past, I think the gentleman is correct, we have heard from them, but this year we have heard no opposition. In fact, a recreational vessel being repaired is the same as a recreational vessel being manufactured to use as a public vessel and should be treated the same in law.

The Coast Guard already strictly enforces the existing laws and regulations that determine whether a vessel is recreational and enforces the law against those who would unlawfully use recreational vessels for commercial purposes. So I would suggest to the gentleman that this is not something the Coast Guard opposes.

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

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

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 115–217.

Mr. HUNTER. 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 title XXXV add the following:

SEC. . . RECOURSE FOR NON-U.S. SEAMEN.

Section 57103 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) RESTRICTION.—(1) Notwithstanding section 30104, a claim for damages or expenses relating to personal injury, illness, or death of a seaman who is a citizen of a foreign nation, arising during or from the engagement of the seaman by or for a passenger vessel duly registered under the laws of a foreign nation or a vessel identified as obsolete under subsection (a) or acquired under chapter 563, may not be brought under the laws of the United States if—

“(A) such seaman was not a legal permanent resident of the United States at the time the claim arose;

“(B) the injury, illness, or death arose outside the territorial waters of the United States; and

“(C) the seaman or the seaman’s personal representative has or had a right to seek compensation for the injury, illness, or death in, or under the laws of—

“(i) the nation in which the vessel was registered at the time the claim arose; or

“(ii) the nation in which the seaman maintained citizenship or residency at the time the claim arose.

“(2) COMPENSATION DEFINED.—As used in paragraph (1), the term ‘compensation’ means—

“(A) a statutory workers’ compensation remedy that complies with Standard A4.2 of Regulation 4.2 of the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006; or

“(B) in the absence of the remedy described in paragraph (1), a legal remedy that complies with Standard A4.2 of Regulation 4.2 of the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006, that permits recovery for lost wages, pain and suffering, and future medical expenses.”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, this important amendment would help safeguard U.S. courts against crowding of court dockets by foreign maritime crewmembers. It simply clarifies where the claim must be brought when the case has no meaningful connection to the United States.

Specifically, the amendment limits the ability of foreign crewmembers working on foreign ships in foreign waters to sue in U.S. courts when a remedy is available in their home countries or the country of the ship on which they served. If no such remedy is available abroad, the amendment would allow those crewmembers to file suit in the United States, assuming they could meet the same burden needed to file any other suit.

To be clear, again, this amendment in no way restricts a foreign crewmember’s access to judicial relief if they are injured or suffer some other damage as a result of working on a foreign vessel. It simply says that they need to seek relief in their home country or the home country of the vessel on which they served before seeking relief in U.S. courts.

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

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this pernicious antilabor amendment that would do nothing but make it easier for U.S.-owned but foreign-flagged cruise ship operators to exploit and abuse the seafarers they employ.

The right for seafarers to seek maintenance and cure for injuries, illness, and damages at sea has been a part of U.S. maritime law for as long as U.S. ships have flown the flag on the high seas.

The effect of this amendment is clear: it would restrict foreign seafarers employed on foreign-flagged cruise ships from filing claims for damages or expenses related to personal injury, illness, or even death, in a U.S. court.

This provision is completely contrary to a general maritime law principle that has been around since at least the 12th century, a principle that has remained applicable because of the international nature of shipping and the plain fact that, even today, ship operators maintain considerable leverage over individual seafarers.

This provision also violates an international convention that the U.S. has ratified. Under the Shipowners’ Liability Convention, national laws or regulations have to be interpreted and enforced to ensure equality of treatment to all seafarers, irrespective of nationality, domicile, or race. This amendment would shred that international obligation.

It is also contrary to the principles and terms defining seafarers’ rights under the International Maritime Labor Convention.

It is also worth mentioning that the amendment before us may be unnecessary because, in many cases, seafarer contracts contain binding arbitration clauses.

In any event, it makes no sense to deny access to U.S. courts for foreign

seafarers seeking compassion for maintenance and cure claims. The cruise lines can easily avoid frivolous lawsuits. All they need do is honor their longstanding customary responsibility to pay for the care and recovery of the seafarers they employ when they are ill or injured.

In closing, no one has provided any evidence—much less, compelling evidence—to justify the reversal of longstanding seafarer protections. In the absence of evidence, the House should reject this unwarranted amendment.

This vote is purely to injure seafarers, purely to disobey maritime conventions to which we are a party, purely to disobey laws of the sea from the 12th century that we have obeyed since we obtained our independence from England, for no purpose other than to help often American-owned—not always—but foreign-flagged cruise ship lines.

There is no purpose for this amendment. The House should reject this amendment as it has in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON).

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, today, I join with my colleague and friend, Representative DUNCAN HUNTER, in offering an amendment to the maritime administration title in the NDAA.

The cruise industry, which is a vital source of economic opportunity for my constituents, has come to me with concerns about lawsuits it says are clogging U.S. courts and making it more difficult to conduct business and create opportunities in my district and elsewhere.

I take these concerns seriously and want to help address them, but I also want to make sure that they are protecting workers and that we don't shut off opportunities for them to be fairly compensated if they become ill or injured in the course of their employment.

The Hunter-Wilson amendment is intended to do just that. It safeguards U.S. courts against further crowding of court dockets, while not denying foreign crewmembers remedies.

This provision has been passed in the House five times in the past 3 years, and most recently, the Senate Commerce Committee included it in the maritime administration title of the Defense Authorization bill for FY 2017.

I want to thank Chairman HUNTER and Chairman SHUSTER for their work on this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support the Hunter-Wilson amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I simply associate myself with the remarks of Mr. NADLER. I think he explained the history of this law very, very well.

It is a very basic principle. People who work on these cruise ships should be compensated and taken care of if they are injured. There is no reason that the cruise line industry cannot afford to do this.

To discriminate against people who happen to be from different countries who are working on these ships makes no sense whatsoever. Our laws apply to whoever is working on the ships and should continue to do so. This is simply an effort to deny workers' rights from a cruise line industry that can more than afford to take care of the people who work there.

These are not easy jobs. I confess, I have only taken one cruise in my life, but the people who work there work very long hours, very hard, in very difficult conditions. If they are injured or sick, they should be taken care of. As Mr. NADLER said, the best way to do that is under the current common practice, which is the cruise line does take care of them and makes sure they get the healthcare they need until they are able to work. But if that is not done, the right to sue in court to protect your rights as a worker should not be taken away.

I do not believe that we have a problem in this country that workers are being too highly compensated and have too many rights. We don't need to take away the few that they have.

I urge opposition to this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2¾ minutes remaining.

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

This amendment limits the ability of foreign crewmembers working on foreign ships in foreign waters to sue in U.S. courts when a remedy is available in their home country or the country of the ship on which they serve. That is it.

They can still sue. Trial lawyers around the world can rejoice because these crewmembers can come back to their home countries and they can sue and sue and sue. They just can't do it in the U.S. if it didn't happen in U.S. waters. It is that simple.

Again, a foreign mariner operating on a foreign ship in foreign or international waters should avail themselves of the courts in their home country or the vessel's home country before using U.S. courts. That is it.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, it sounds nice to say they can go home to their country from which they came, where presumably the foreign-flagged ship operates, but that is not the case. These are often American-owned ships or European-owned ships, and they are flagged in a country of convenience—Liberia, Panama, or wherever—where the worker may have no connection whatsoever,

where the ship, for that matter, has no real connection other than flying the flag of convenience, and where there may not be a very decent court system.

That is why the practice has been, since before our independence—it has worked well the entire history of our country—that a foreign citizen working on a ship that calls in the United States, if denied the maintenance and cure that the ship is supposed to take care of someone on the high seas, then they can sue in an American court. We have always done this. There has been no showing of hardship whatsoever.

Yes, some rich cruise line operators would like, perhaps, to get rid of this obligation, but that is no excuse. This is an antilabor, an antihuman amendment. It ought to be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I urge its defeat, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in House Report 115-217.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 564. ATOMIC VETERANS SERVICE MEDAL.

(a) SERVICE MEDAL REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall design and produce a military service medal, to be known as the “Atomic Veterans Service Medal”, to honor retired and former members of the Armed Forces who are radiation-exposed veterans (as such term is defined in section 1112(c)(3) of title 38, United States Code).

(b) DISTRIBUTION OF MEDAL.—

(1) ISSUANCE TO RETIRED AND FORMER MEMBERS.—At the request of a radiation-exposed veteran, the Secretary of Defense shall issue the Atomic Veterans Service Medal to the veteran.

(2) ISSUANCE TO NEXT-OF-KIN.—In the case of a radiation-exposed veteran who is deceased, the Secretary may provide for issuance of the Atomic Veterans Service Medal to the next-of-kin of the person.

(3) APPLICATION.—The Secretary shall prepare and disseminate as appropriate an application by which radiation-exposed veterans and their next-of-kin may apply to receive the Atomic Veterans Service Medal.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGovern-

Emmer amendment, which would simply create a service medal to be awarded to atomic veterans or their surviving family members in honor of their service and sacrifice to our Nation.

Between 1945 and 1962, about 225,000 members of our Armed Forces participated in hundreds of nuclear weapons tests. Now known as atomic veterans, these GIs were placed in extremely dangerous areas and were constantly exposed to potentially dangerous levels of radiation in the performance of their duties. They were sworn to secrecy, unable to even talk to their doctors about their past exposure to radiation.

Thankfully, Presidents Bill Clinton and George H.W. Bush recognized the atomic veterans' value and service and acted to provide specialized care and compensation for their harrowing duty.

In 2007, our allies, Great Britain, New Zealand, and Australia, enacted their versions of this amendment by authorizing a medal to honor their atomic veterans who served with the United States.

Regrettably, the Pentagon remains silent on honoring the service of our atomic veterans, arguing that to do so would diminish the service of other military personnel who are tasked with dangerous missions. Mr. Chairman, this is a pitiful excuse.

Tragically, more than 75 percent of atomic veterans have already passed away, never having received this recognition. They served honorably and kept a code of silence. Because of that, it most certainly led to many of these veterans passing away prematurely.

Past administrations and Congresses have dealt with the thornier issues of legality in compensation. What remains is recognizing these veterans' duty, honor, and faithful service to our Nation. Time is running out. That is what this amendment seeks to do.

I call upon my House colleagues to support this amendment that I, along with my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), have introduced. We owe it to our veterans to recognize their selfless service to our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding. I appreciate the opportunity to work with him on this issue.

During my time in Congress, I have been privileged to meet with many of our Nation's veterans. The men and women in our Armed Forces are true heroes and truly the best our Nation has to offer. Yet far too often, they do not get the recognition and credit they deserve. This is especially true when it comes to our Nation's atomic veterans.

From 1945 to 1962, nearly a quarter of a million of our servicemembers played a role in the testing of nuclear weapons, earning them the title, "atomic veterans."

□ 0930

Since 1990, our Federal Government has taken different approaches to try and recognize and thank our atomic veterans, but we have never given official recognition through an award or medal. Today, that will change with the support of the men and women in this Chamber.

With the McGovern-Emmer amendment, we have an opportunity to finally acknowledge the incredible sacrifice these courageous individuals made more than half a century ago. Our amendment will require the Department of Defense to issue a service medal to the veterans or surviving families of those members of our Armed Forces who participated in aboveground nuclear weapons testing, were part of the U.S. military occupation forces in or around Hiroshima and Nagasaki before 1946, or were held as POWs in or near Hiroshima or Nagasaki.

This amendment has been included in the House NDAA bill for the past 2 years and is supported by the National Association of Atomic Veterans. These veterans left their homes, left their families, and put their lives on the line to protect the freedoms and liberties we enjoy each and every day.

I am honored to work with Mr. MCGOVERN and our colleagues here in the House to ensure these brave soldiers get the recognition they deserve.

Again, I want to thank Congressman MCGOVERN for his efforts on this issue as well as to thank Chairman THORNBERRY, Ranking Member SMITH, and the entire staff of the House Armed Services Committee for their work on the underlying bill, and I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I have supported it in the past. And as Mr. EMMER just mentioned, the House has supported it in the past in each of the last 2 years.

I admire the persistence of the gentleman from Massachusetts in pursuing this issue. I think it is the right thing to do. Unfortunately, we have not yet been able to convince our colleagues across the Capitol or the Pentagon to do this. I know of no opposition to the amendment.

I think the House should continue to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. EMMER for his support, and I want to thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their support in the past.

As the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has stated, the House

has, by voice vote, approved this twice before in the NDAA bills. Unfortunately, the Senate has chosen to not respect the wishes of the House, so I think it is important that we show a strong bipartisan vote on this. So I will ask for a recorded vote because I think it is important to send a signal to the Senate that we are serious about this and we are serious about honoring our Atomic Veterans.

Mr. Chair, 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 amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 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. 3 consisting of amendment Nos. 16, 49, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71 printed in House Report 115-217, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. DESJARLAIS OF TENNESSEE

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

SEC. 3124. ANNUAL REPORTS ON UNFUNDED PRIORITIES OF THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

(a) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than 10 days after the date on which the budget of the President for a fiscal year is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall submit to the Secretary of Energy and the congressional defense committees a report on the unfunded priorities of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

(b) ELEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each report under subsection (a) shall specify, for each unfunded priority covered by such report, the following:

(A) A summary description of such priority, including the objectives to be achieved if such priority is funded (whether in whole or in part).

(B) The additional amount of funds recommended in connection with the objectives under subparagraph (A).

(C) Account information with respect to such priority.

(2) PRIORITIZATION OF PRIORITIES.—Each report shall present the unfunded priorities covered by such report in order of urgency of priority.

(c) UNFUNDED PRIORITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term "unfunded priority", in the case of a fiscal year, means a program, activity, or mission requirement that—

(1) is not funded in the budget of the President for the fiscal year as submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31;

(2) is necessary to fulfill a requirement associated with the National Nuclear Security Administration; and

(3) would have been recommended for funding through the budget referred to in paragraph (1) by the Administrator in connection with the budget if—

(A) additional resources had been available for the budget to fund the program, activity, or mission requirement; or

(B) the program, activity, or mission requirement has emerged since the budget was formulated.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT
OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Page 185, after line 19, insert the following new section:

SEC. 605. APPLICATION OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING TO MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 403(b) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting “AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS” after “THE UNITED STATES”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and the Virgin Islands” after “the United States”;

(3) in paragraphs (2), (3)(A), and (6), by inserting “or the Virgin Islands” after “the United States” each place it appears.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 403(c) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting “OR THE VIRGIN ISLANDS” after “THE UNITED STATES”;

(2) in paragraphs (1), (2), (3)(A)(i), and (3)(B), by inserting “or the Virgin Islands” after “the United States” each place it appears.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to payments under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, beginning on January 1, 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. BERA OF CALIFORNIA

The amendment as modified is as follows:
Insert after section 724, the following:

SEC. 725. REPORT.

For each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2021, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the Department of Defense’s—

(1) activities and programs with respect to infectious disease;

(2) priority areas with respect to infectious disease; and

(3) current policy and planning documents with respect to infectious disease.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

SEC. 7. PROVISION OF SUPPORT BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS REGARDING ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORD SYSTEM.

(a) SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense may support the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to the extent the Secretaries jointly consider feasible and advisable, in the development and implementation of an electronic health record system that—

(1) is derivative of the Military Health System Genesis record currently being developed and implemented by the Secretary of Defense; and

(2) achieves complete interoperability with the Military Health System Genesis.

(b) ANNUAL REVIEW.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary Veterans Affairs shall jointly conduct an annual review of the

efforts undertaken by the Secretaries to achieve complete interoperability between the electronic health record of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Military Health System Genesis.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) REPORTS.—Not later than 60 days after completing each annual review under subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to the Committees on Armed Services and the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the review.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of the following:

(A) Milestones reached as part of the schedule of development and acquisition as developed by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(B) Costs associated with development and implementation.

(C) Actions, if any, of the Secretary of Defense in supporting the Secretary of Veterans Affairs pursuant to subsection (a) with respect to the development and implementation of an electronic health record system and in achieving complete interoperability with the Military Health System Genesis.

(D) Status of the adoption of the national standards and architectural requirements identified by the Interagency Program Office of the Departments and in collaboration with the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(d) TERMINATION.—The requirements under subsection (b) and (c) shall terminate on the date on which the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs jointly certify to the Committees on Armed Services and the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the electronic health records of both the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs are completely interoperable.

(e) INTEROPERABILITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “interoperability” refers to the ability of different electronic health records systems or software to meaningfully exchange information in real time and provide useful results to one or more systems.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

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

SEC. 7. INCREASED COLLABORATION WITH NIH TO COMBAT TRIPLE NEGATIVE BREAST CANCER.

The Office of Health of the Department of Defense shall work in collaboration with the National Institutes of Health to—

(1) identify specific genetic and molecular targets and biomarkers for triple negative breast cancer; and

(2) provide information useful in biomarker selection, drug discovery, and clinical trials design that will enable both—

(A) triple negative breast cancer patients to be identified earlier in the progression of their disease; and

(B) the development of multiple targeted therapies for the disease.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 725. ENCOURAGING TRANSITION OF MILITARY MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS INTO EMPLOYMENT WITH VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a program to encourage an individual who serves in the Armed Forces with a military occupational specialty relat-

ing to the provision of health care to seek employment with the Veterans Health Administration when the individual has been discharged or released from service in the Armed Forces or is contemplating separating from such service.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(1) create any additional authority not otherwise provided in law to convert a former member of the Armed Services to an employee of the Veterans Health Administration; or

(2) circumvent any existing requirement relating to a detail, reassignment, or other transfer of such a former member to the Veterans Health Administration.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY
OF TEXAS

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

SEC. 8. REPEAL OF CERTAIN AUDITING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 190 of title 10, United States Code, as proposed to be added by section 820(b)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2274), is amended by striking subsection (f).

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. PITTENGER
OF NORTH CAROLINA

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

SEC. 870A. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING WITH CERTAIN TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROVIDERS.

(a) LIST OF COVERED CONTRACTORS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall develop a list of covered contractors, to be updated as frequently as the Director determines appropriate, and shall make such list available to the Secretary of Defense.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS.—The Secretary of Defense may not enter into a contract with a covered contractor on the list described under subsection (a).

(c) REMOVAL FROM LIST.—To be removed from the list described in subsection (a), a covered contractor may submit a request to the Director in such manner as the Director determines appropriate. Upon certification of the request, the Director shall remove the covered contractor from the list.

(d) WAIVER.—The President may waive the requirements of subsection (b) if the President determines that the waiver is justified for national security reasons.

(e) COVERED CONTRACTOR DEFINED.—The term “covered contractor” means a provider of telecommunications or telecommunications equipment that has been found by the Director to have knowingly assisted or facilitated a cyber attack carried out by or on behalf of the government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea or persons associated with such government.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to contracts of a covered contractor entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS
OF FLORIDA

At the end of title VIII (page 323, after line 4), add the following new section:

SEC. 871. ASSESSMENT AND AUTHORITY TO TERMINATE OR PROHIBIT CONTRACTS FOR PROCUREMENT FROM CHINESE COMPANIES PROVIDING SUPPORT TO THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall conduct an

assessment of trade between the People's Republic of China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including elements deemed to be important to United States national security and defense.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required by paragraph (1) shall—

(A) assess the composition of all trade between China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including trade in goods and services;

(B) identify whether any Chinese commercial entities that are engaged in such trade materially support illicit activities on the part of North Korea;

(C) evaluate the extent to which the United States Government procures goods or services from any commercial entity identified under subparagraph (B);

(D) provide a list of commercial entities identified under subparagraph (B) that provide defense goods or services for the Department of Defense; and

(E) evaluate the ramifications to United States national security, including any impacts to the defense industrial base, Department of Defense acquisition programs, and Department of Defense logistics or supply chains, of prohibiting procurements from commercial entities listed under subparagraph (D).

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the assessment required by paragraph (1). The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(b) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may terminate existing contracts or prohibit the award of contracts for the procurement of goods or services for the Department of Defense from a Chinese commercial entity listed under subsection (a)(2)(D) based on a determination informed by the assessment required under subsection (a).

(c) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a notification of, and detailed justification for, any exercise of the authority in subsection (b) not less than 30 days before the date on which the authority is exercised.

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 860A. EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS FROM INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS.

Subparagraph (B) of section 1908(b)(2) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by inserting “3131 to 3134,” after “sections”.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MRS. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title VIII, insert the following:

SEC. 8 ____ INCLUSION OF SBIR AND STTR PROGRAMS IN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Subsection (c) of section 2418 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “issued under” and inserting the following: “issued—

“(1) under”;

(2) by striking “and on” and inserting “, and on”;

(3) by striking “requirements.” and inserting “requirements; and”;

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) under section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638), and on compliance with those requirements.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 345, after line 13, insert the following new section:

SEC. 924. COMPLETION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE 2310.07E REGARDING MISSING PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall make the completion of Department of Defense Directive 2310.07E a top priority in order to improve the efficiency of locating missing persons.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “missing person” has the meaning given such term in section 1513 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title IX, insert the following:

SEC. 9 ____ RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEVELOPMENTAL TEST AND EVALUATION WITHIN THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

(a) BRIEFING ON PLANS TO ADDRESS DEVELOPMENTAL TEST AND EVALUATION RESPONSIBILITIES WITHIN THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on a strategy to ensure that there is sufficient expertise, oversight, and policy direction on developmental test and evaluation within the Office of the Secretary of Defense after the completion of the reorganization of such Office required under section 901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2339).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The briefing required by paragraph (1) shall address the following:

(A) The structure of the roles and responsibilities of the senior Department of Defense official responsible for developmental test and evaluation.

(B) The location of the senior Department of Defense official responsible for developmental test and evaluation within the organizational structure of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

(C) An estimate of personnel and other resources that should be made available to the senior Department of Defense official responsible for developmental test and evaluation to ensure that such official can provide independent expertise, oversight, and policy direction and guidance Department of Defense-wide.

(D) Methods to ensure that the senior Department of Defense official responsible for developmental test and evaluation will be empowered to facilitate Department of Defense-wide efficiencies by helping programs to optimize test designs.

(E) Methods to ensure that an advocate for test and evaluation workforce will continue to exist within the acquisition workforce.

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

(1) developmental testing is critical to reducing acquisition program risk by providing valuable information to support sound decision making;

(2) major defense acquisition programs often do not conduct enough developmental testing, so too many problems are first identified during operational testing, when they are expensive and time-consuming to fix; and

(3) in order to ensure that effective developmental testing is conducted on major de-

fense acquisition programs, the Secretary should—

(A) carefully consider where the senior Department of Defense official responsible for developmental test and evaluation is located within the organizational structure of the Office of the Secretary of Defense; and

(B) ensure that such official has sufficient authority and resources to provide oversight and policy direction on developmental test and evaluation Department of Defense-wide.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF OF CALIFORNIA

Page 359, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 1026. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PROVIDING FOR TIMELY VICTIM AND FAMILY TESTIMONY IN MILITARY COMMISSION TRIALS.

It is the sense of Congress that in the interests of justice, efficiency, and providing closure to victims of terrorism and their families, military judges overseeing military commissions in United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, should consider making arrangements to take recorded testimony from victims and their families should they wish to provide testimony before such a commission.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF OF CALIFORNIA

Page 359, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 1026. AUTHORITY TO USE VIDEO TELECONFERENCING TECHNOLOGY IN MILITARY COMMISSION PROCEDURES.

Section 949d of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) USE OF VIDEO TELECONFERENCING.—The military judge may provide for the participation of the accused, defense counsel, trial counsel, and any other participants by video teleconferencing for any matter for which the military judge may call the military commission into session. Any party who participates through the use of video teleconferencing shall be considered as present for purposes of subsection (a)(2).”.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF OF CALIFORNIA

Page 359, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 1026. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF MILITARY COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS.

Section 949d(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) In the case of any proceeding of a military commission under this chapter that is made open to the public, the military judge may order arrangements for the availability of the proceeding to be watched remotely by the public through the internet.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

Page 469, after line 17, add the following new paragraphs:

(6) The projected casualties and costs associated with the deployment of members of the Armed Forces to Afghanistan.

(7) The objectives of deployment of members of the Armed Forces to Afghanistan, including a time line to achieve such objectives as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY OF MARYLAND

Page 375, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 1040. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CLOSE BIOSAFETY LEVEL 4 LABORATORIES.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated in this Act may be used to support the closure or transfer of a biosafety level 4 laboratory until the heads

of the Federal agencies that use the laboratory jointly certify to the covered congressional committees that the closure or transfer of the lab would not have a negative effect on biological defense capabilities and would not result in a lapse of biological defense capabilities.

(b) COVERED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term “covered congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives;

(2) the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and House of Representatives;

(3) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives;

(4) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(5) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(6) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(7) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(8) the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MRS. COMSTOCK OF VIRGINIA

Page 378, strike lines 19 through 23.

Page 396, after line 4, insert the following:

(5) STARBASE PROGRAM REPORT.—By inserting after paragraph (64), as added by paragraph (4), the following new paragraph:

“(65) Section 2193b(g).”

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 383, lines 2 through 8, strike subsection (b) of section 1051.

Page 396, after line 11, insert the following:

(y) PRESERVATION OF NATIONAL GUARD YOUTH CHALLENGE REPORT.—Effective as of December 23, 2016, and as if included therein as enacted, section 1061(i) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(34) Section 509(k) of title 32, United States Code.”

Page 396, line 12, strike “(y)” and insert “(z)”.14JY8.

Page 396, line 13, strike “subsections (w) and (x)” and insert “subsections (w), (x), and (y)”.

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. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding, and I now look forward to entering into a discussion with Mr. POLIQUIN for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITTMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the leadership of the Armed Services Committee in the Seapower Subcommittee on both sides of the aisle to accept this amendment and its important modifications to the underlying bill provision limiting the availability of funds for prior fiscal year DDG–51 Arleigh Burke class destroyers.

My revised amendment, Mr. Chair, is agreed to by the committee and, im-

portantly, removes the additional, or third, fiscal year 2016 DDG–51 ship from the provision’s proposed requirements.

Additionally, sir, and again, as agreed to by the committee, it states the sense of Congress that the Navy should bear the majority of the share-line risk for the fiscal year 2017 DDG–51 Flight III destroyer contract, which will represent the first ships to integrate the Air and Missile Defense Radar, which is 30 times more effective and better than the legacy radar system.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Maine for working with the committee to improve the provision, while maintaining progress towards strengthening our fleet in the critical ballistic missile defense mission and capability. Your amendment helps us do just that, while ensuring that we maintain the health and critical skill workforces at our two proven vital destroyer shipbuilders, including Bath Iron Works in Maine.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITTMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Chairman WITTMAN for their support on my important amendment. Bath Iron Works is a critical national security asset to our country. It is a source of great pride for all Mainers, and the shipyard employs some 6,000 of our most talented, hardworking citizens who care greatly about their contributions every day to keeping America safe and keeping America strong.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for including my amendment in this en bloc package.

My amendment will authorize Procurement Technical Assistance Centers to assist small business owners in pursuing funding opportunities during all phases of the SBIR and STTR programs.

These Federal programs enable small businesses to perform research and development that advances the national interests and has the potential for commercialization.

My central Florida district is primed to benefit from these programs since it is home to a large and growing number of small firms that harness the power of technology, produce innovative products for customers in the public and private sector, and, in the process, create well-paying jobs and generate broad-based economic growth.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to also thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Chairman SESSIONS for making my amendment in order and allowing floor consideration.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It prohibits telecommunications companies that provide material support for North Korea cyber attacks from contracting with our Defense Department.

While my amendment is simple in nature, it strikes at the heart of what I believe to be the cornerstone of North Korea policy.

For far too long, China has enabled the North Korean Government to pursue nuclear development, global provocation, and egregious human rights violations. The Chinese Government is simply not a good faith partner on the issue of North Korea.

For example, there have been multiple public reports indicating that China’s largest government-affiliated telecommunications firm, Huawei, has been subpoenaed by the Commerce Department as part of an ongoing investigation into whether it broke our export control laws by conducting business with North Korea.

Additionally, earlier this year, a similar Chinese Government-affiliated firm, ZTE, was hit with a record-breaking billion-dollar fine in connection with comparable North Korea-related export violations.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is one of many steps that our Congress needs to take to demonstrate to China we will no longer tolerate its alliance and partnership with North Korea.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE). Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the majority for including my amendment in this bloc.

My amendment is straightforward, Mr. Chairman. It recognizes that any U.S. strategy for Syria must acknowledge and respond to the tremendous suffering of civilians, including the millions who have been forced from their homes, who face starvation, cholera, a lack of access to adequate healthcare and education, not as an afterthought, but as an active imperative.

The Trump administration has already used the suffering created by the use of chemical weapons as a reason for expanding U.S. involvement in Syria and to launch attacks against the Syrian Government. My amendment would ask the administration for a description of the legal authority relied upon or needed for the use of U.S. military force in Syria, information which is even more critical now, given the recent attacks by U.S. forces against the Syrian Government and reports that we may continue to send more troops into Syria.

It is foolhardy and unwise for us to think that the suffering being imposed upon innocent civilians in Syria should not be a consideration in any U.S. response or strategy outlining how military forces or aid will be used there. The humanitarian crisis spawned by

conflict directly impacts our national security efforts. We ignore it at our own peril.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY, and I rise today in strong support of the Lamborn amendment requiring a report on Iran's use of commercial aircraft to support terrorist groups in rogue regimes around the Middle East.

The Lamborn amendment delivers a simple message to Iran, to Assad, and all companies considering selling aircraft to the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, and that is: Congress is watching.

Congress is watching midnight flights take off from military bases in Iran and land in war-torn Damascus carrying terrorists, guns, and explosives, which will only be used to shed more innocent blood in the Syrian civil war.

Congress is watching as Boeing and Airbus shake hands and cut deals with former leaders of Iran's National Revolutionary Guard Corps like Hossein Alaee, CEO of Aseman Airlines, who has called to destroy U.S. naval ships sailing in international waters.

Congress is watching as iconic American and European companies are choosing to fuel Iran's terror campaign around the world.

Mr. Chair, Congress is watching, and Congress will act to ensure that Western companies do not become complicit in the Syrian massacre.

Please support the Lamborn amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for agreeing to include my amendment en bloc in the NDAA.

The amendment that we have is a transitioning of the Virgin Islands Active Guard and Reserve from overseas housing allowance to basic allowance for housing.

We know that, in 2013, the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness reported that a change would be feasible and would not be difficult to allow Virgin Islands Active Guard and Reserve members to be part of the basic housing allowance.

Congress didn't intend inequitable and unfair treatment to the Virgin Islands Active Guard and Reserve members, and this amendment provides an equitable solution to the disparate treatment of the housing allowance for Virgin Islands Active Guard and Reserve members.

We are grateful for the support and are thankful that our servicemembers will now, in their housing, be treated the same as those in the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

As we all know, North Korea has targeted the United States with cyber attacks, and they are well on their way to being able to strike the United States with conventional and nuclear weapons. These two amendments would prohibit the Department of Defense from contracting with telecom companies found to be complicit with North Korean cyber attacks or Chinese companies found to be providing support for the North Korean regime. There is no reason that we should be contracting with countries that are enemies of the United States.

I also support the amendment offered by my friend from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP). Without a doubt, NATO is the greatest military alliance in the world, but that alliance works most effectively when the members of those various countries are pulling their weight and fulfilling their commitments in regard to their own defense budgets. This amendment calls on the President to encourage NATO allies to fulfill their commitments and to recognize those who are currently doing so.

I wholeheartedly agree with these amendments, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

□ 0945

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, my first amendment simply declares that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated in this bill can be used to deploy members of the Armed Forces to participate in the ongoing civil war in Yemen.

By passing this amendment, we ensure that no hero, no patriot in a U.S. military uniform will be put in harm's way in a conflict that can only be settled by the parties involved.

My second amendment simply cuts off funds to any so-called friendly rebels in Iraq or Syria who make a mockery of our good intentions by misusing American arms and resources, and, in far too many instances, using them against us.

We have already spent trillions of dollars, lost thousands of precious lives in these endless wars of choice in the Middle East. It is time to put a stop to it, time to start investing in America and the American people. So I urge the adoption of these amendments en bloc.

I would only add that the President, in his last campaign, had a message that we need to embrace, and I think the en bloc group of amendments takes us in that direction. He pointed out we spend \$6 trillion in Iraq and Afghanistan alone. For one of those trillion, we could have graduated every kid in America from college debt-free. For another one of those trillion, there is

your trillion dollars for infrastructure to fix the trains that are coming off the track and the bridges that are falling down. For another one of those trillion, we could have found a cure for cancer or Alzheimer's or diabetes, and we still would have had \$3 trillion for deficit reduction.

I applaud this committee for all the work that they are doing and the direction that they are taking us back to in getting us out of these endless wars of choice and start reinvesting in America, the American people, and the American infrastructure. That creates good jobs and the quality of life that we embrace.

To be sure, we must have a strong national security. There are evil people and evil forces out there that we need to protect ourselves against, but that doesn't mean we have to get involved in every civil war and every war of choice in the world.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this en bloc package. I especially want to thank the chairman for including my amendment as part of the other very positive amendments that he has included in this en bloc package.

My amendment would condition the allocation of certain funds to Pakistan upon a certification from the Secretary of Defense that Pakistan is not using its military or its funds or equipment provided by the United States to repress minority groups, and to make sure that they do not repress these minority groups who are seeking their own political or religious freedom.

At a time of high budgets, we should reserve our aid for friends and allies, and end assistance to Pakistan in particular, which does not meet the standards of decency and freedom that the American people believe have to be part of any decision that we make here.

Pakistan has acted as an adversary not only to the United States, but has been aiding our enemies and repressing its own people. Let us not forget that Pakistan harbored Osama bin Laden. This is the prime mover, the man who organized the slaughter of 3,000 Americans.

We are fools if we continue to support a regime like that in Pakistan today that represses its own people and is using what we give them to actually do things that make us less safe as a people and put us in jeopardy with the terrorists around the world.

Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for including my amendment to the en bloc package.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for including this amendment in the en

bloc package, because I remain concerned about the lack of a clear plan or strategy in Syria.

As the Syrian opposition supported by U.S. and coalition forces fight to liberate Raqqa from ISIS control, we are confronted with the complex and critical question of what comes next. Freeing Syrians from the brutality of ISIS is but one part of a complex, grinding civil war that began with the Assad regime's heinous violence against civilians and has endured for over 6 years, with over 400,000 Syrians killed, 6 billion Syrians displaced within Syria, and over 4.5 million forced to flee as refugees.

We now have over 500 U.S. troops deployed to Syria to advise and assist Syrian opposition forces. However, we have yet to have a clear, comprehensive political strategy that describes what the end goals are for U.S. involvement and how we hope to achieve those goals.

This amendment requires just that, and follows a similar effort I led with General and Representative JOHN BACON on Iraq that received bipartisan support in the Armed Services Committee last year.

This amendment requires a comprehensive political and military strategy for U.S. policy in Syria to be submitted by the Departments of Defense and State to Congress and the American people within 90 days of enactment.

We owe it to our troops, those young men and women whom we ask to risk their lives in Syria today, to tell them what their job is, what it entails, what the end goal is, and why it is worth the risks that they take every single day.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for yielding and for his great work leading us on the NDAA.

I would like to address two amendments that are coming up in en bloc packages.

First of all, on Iran, my amendment to the NDAA, No. 361, requires the President, along with various agencies, to provide the House with a report regarding Iran's use of commercial aircraft for illicit activities. I am doing this with Representative ROSKAM.

Diligent research from think tanks, such as the Foundation for Defense of Democracies and the American Enterprise Institute, have demonstrated the need for the intelligence community to provide Congress with a report of their activities.

In total, Iran Air, Mahan Air, Pouya Air, Cham Wings Airlines, and the Iranian Air Force operated at least 404 flights from Iran to Syria since the Iran nuclear deal was adopted on July 14, 2015.

Now, this report does not block the sale of commercial aircraft to Iran, but asks the intelligence community to take a serious look at these sales so

Congress can determine if they should continue.

The other amendment I would like to address, Mr. Chairman, is No. 364 on boost-phase missile defense. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for including this amendment, which was co-sponsored by Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FRANKS, and Mr. WILSON from South Carolina, to advance boost-phase missile defense programs.

As you know, ballistic missiles are at their most defenseless when they are in their boost phase, the initial phase of flight. They are at their slowest, and they have not yet deployed decoys and countermeasures that would make it more difficult to shoot them down in later phases of flight.

This amendment will make Americans safer as we move towards advancing this absolutely critical technology.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, neither do I have other speakers on this en bloc package, and 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.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 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. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, and 91, printed in House Report 115-217, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER OF NEW JERSEY

Page 386, beginning on line 11, strike subsection (1).

Page 396, after line 11, insert the following: (Y) ANNUAL REPORT ON SUPPORT TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES CONDUCTING COUNTER-TERRORISM ACTIVITIES.—Effective as of December 23, 2016, and as if included therein as enacted, section 1061(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) Section 1022(c).”

Page 396, line 12, strike “(y)” and insert “(z)”.

Page 396, lines 12 through 13, strike “subsections (w) and (x)” and insert “subsections (w), (x), and (y)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

SEC. 1058. STUDY ON HEALTH EFFECTS OF EXPOSURE TO PERFLUOROCTANE SULFONATE AND PERFLUOROCTANOIC ACID FROM FIREFIGHTING FOAM USED AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Administrator of the

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, shall carry out a study on any health effects experienced by individuals who are exposed to perfluorooctane sulfonate and perfluorooctanoic acid from firefighting foam used at military installations or former military installations, including exposure through a well that provides water for human consumption that the Secretary determines is contaminated with perfluorooctane sulfonate and perfluorooctanoic acid from such firefighting foam.

(b) DESIGN OF STUDY.—The Secretary shall ensure that the study under subsection (a) meets the following criteria:

(1) The study includes a review of relevant literature.

(2) The study includes community input through community advisory groups or focus groups.

(3) The study identifies existing research regarding health effects relating to exposure described in subsection (a).

(4) The study includes protocols based on expertise from epidemiologists.

(5) The study identifies and characterizes one or more sources of water contamination and collects preliminary information on the magnitude and distribution of such exposure.

(6) Based on the information learned under paragraphs (1) through (5), the study determines the specific health effects and perfluorooctane sulfonates and perfluorooctanoic acids to evaluate.

(7) The study includes biomonitoring from a sample of community members, including with respect to specific subgroups considered at risk for such exposure.

(8) The study collects data on possible biological changes potentially associated with such exposure.

(9) The study includes detailed exposure and health questionnaires.

(10) The study includes the review of medical records.

(11) The study analyzes data for an association between such exposure and potential health effects.

(c) SUBMISSION.—Not later than five years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees the study under subsection (a). The Secretary shall make such study publicly available pursuant to section 122a of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. BRENDAN F. BOYLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

SEC. 10 . . . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CYBERSECURITY COOPERATION WITH UKRAINE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) There is a strong history of cyber attacks in Ukraine.

(2) The United States supports Ukraine and the European Deterrence Initiative.

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

(1) the United States reaffirms support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine; and

(2) the United States should assist Ukraine in improving its cybersecurity capabilities.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

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

SEC. . . APOLLO I MEMORIAL.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On January 27, 1967, NASA Astronauts Command Pilot Virgil I. “Gus” Grissom, Senior Pilot Edward H. White II, and Pilot

Roger B. Chaffee were killed in an electrical fire that broke out inside the Apollo I Command Module on Launch Pad 34 at the Kennedy Space Center in Cape Canaveral, Florida.

(2) Command Pilot Virgil Grissom was selected by NASA in 1959 as one of the original seven Mercury astronauts. He piloted the Liberty Bell 7 spacecraft on July 21, 1963, on the second and final Mercury suborbital test flight, served as command pilot on the first manned Gemini flight on March 23, 1965, and was named as Command Pilot of the first Apollo flight. He began his career in the United States Army Air Corps and was a Lieutenant Colonel in the United States Air Force at the time of the accident, and he is buried at Arlington National Cemetery.

(3) Senior Pilot Edward H. White II was selected by NASA as a member of the second astronaut team in 1962. He piloted the Gemini-4 mission, a 4-day mission that took place in June 1965, during which he conducted the first extravehicular activity in the United States human spaceflight program. He was named as Command Module Pilot for the first Apollo flight. He began his career as a cadet in United States Military Academy at West Point and was a Lieutenant Colonel in the United States Air Force at the time of the accident.

(4) Pilot Roger B. Chaffee was selected by NASA as part of the third group of astronauts in 1963. He was named as the Lunar Module Pilot for the first Apollo flight. He began his career as a ROTC cadet before commissioning as an ensign in the United States Navy, he was a Lieutenant Commander in the United States Navy at the time of the accident, and he is buried at Arlington National Cemetery.

(5) All 3 astronauts were posthumously awarded the Congressional Space Medal of Honor.

(6) As Arlington National Cemetery is where we recognize heroes who have passed in the service of our Nation, it is fitting on the 50th anniversary of the Apollo I accident that we acknowledge those astronauts by building a memorial in their honor.

(b) CONSTRUCTION OF MEMORIAL TO THE CREW OF THE APOLLO I LAUNCH TEST ACCIDENT AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY.—

(1) CONSTRUCTION REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army shall, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, construct at an appropriate place in Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, a memorial marker honoring the three members of the crew of the Apollo I crew who died during a launch rehearsal test on January 27, 1967, in Cape Canaveral, Florida.

(2) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 4201 for management support, Space and Missile Center (SMC) civilian workforce (Line 152), as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, \$50,000 shall be available for the construction required under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 451, after line 6, insert the following:
SEC. 1073. NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COUNTERING VIOLENT EXTREMIST GROUPS.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than June 1, 2018, the President shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on a comprehensive, interagency national strategy for countering violent extremist groups.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The comprehensive, interagency national strategy required by paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) Identification and prioritization of the threats, including a description of capability and intent posed to the United States and United States interests, from violent extremist groups and their ideologies, by region and affiliated group, including any state-sponsors for such groups.

(B) Identification of the interagency tools for combating and countering violent extremist groups, including—

(i) countering violent extremist group messaging and ideological support;

(ii) combating terrorist group financing; intelligence gathering and cooperation;

(iii) law enforcement activities; sanctions; counterterrorism and counterintelligence activities;

(iv) support to civil-society groups, commercial entities, allies and counter radicalization activities of such groups; and

(v) support by the Armed Forces of the United States to combat violent extremist groups.

(C) Use of, coordination with, or liaison to international partners, non-governmental organizations, or commercial entities that support United States policy goals in countering violent extremist ideologies and organizations.

(D) Synchronization processes for these use of these interagency tools against the priority threats, including the roles and responsibilities of the Global Engagement Center, as well as the National Security Council in coordinating the interagency tools.

(E) Recommendations for improving coordination between Federal Government agencies, as well as with State, local, international, and non-governmental entities.

(F) Other matters as the President considers appropriate.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the submission of the strategy required by subsection (a), the President shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an assessment of the strategy, including—

(1) the status of implementation of the strategy;

(2) progress toward the achievement of benchmarks or implementation of any recommendations; and

(3) any changes to the strategy since such submission.

(c) FORM.—Each report required by this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1073. ADEQUACY OF THE REPORT ON THE VULNERABILITIES OF THE DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE.

(a) COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ON VULNERABILITIES OF, AND CONCENTRATION OF PURCHASES IN, THE DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE.—

(1) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and at least annually until September 30, 2023, before March 31, thereafter the President shall issue to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive report combining

all of the elements of the reports described in paragraph (4) and any other relevant reports on the adequacy of, vulnerabilities of, and concentration of purchases in the defense industrial sector.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In preparing a report under paragraph (1), the President shall consult with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the National Security Agency and such other cabinet officials and heads of Federal departments and agencies? as the President determines to be appropriate.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report issued under paragraph (1) shall be in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(4) LIST OF REPORTS.—Each report issued under paragraph (1) shall contain all relevant information and analysis from the following reports, as well as such other relevant information as the President determines to be appropriate:

(A) The report described under section 721(m) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565(m)), relating to concentrations of purchases of the defense industrial base.

(B) The report described under section 723(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4568(a)), relating to offsets in defense production.

(C) The report described under section 2504 of title 10, United States Code, relating to annual industrial capabilities.

(D) The “Report on Defense Industrial Base” described under section 842(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991.

(E) The “Study of Field Failures Involving Counterfeit Electronic Parts” described under section 238 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

(F) The “Report on Alternative Capabilities to Procure and Sustain Nonstandard Rotary Wing Aircraft Historically Procured Through Rosoboronexport” described under section 1249 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

(G) The report described under section 843 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, relating to rare earth materials critical to national security.

(H) The “Biennial Report on Nuclear Triad” described under section 1054 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

(I) The “Report on Solid Rocket Motor Industrial Base” described under section 1050 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008.

(J) The “Assessment of United States Defense Industrial Base Capabilities” described under section 812 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

(K) The report related to “Monitoring and Enforcement of Mitigation Agreements Related to Foreign Investment in the United States” described under House Report 113-102.

(L) The additive manufacturing recommendation described in House Report 113-446.

(M) The “Assessment of the directed energy industrial base” described in House Report 114-102.

(b) COMPREHENSIVE DATABASE OF PROPOSED TRANSACTIONS OR PURCHASES IN THE DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE INVOLVING A FOREIGN PERSON.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF DATABASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish and keep current a database of proposed transactions that would result in all

of, a substantial part of, or a controlling interest in, a U. S. corporation, or the U. S. assets of a foreign corporation, being owned or controlled by a foreign person, in the defense industrial base and any manufacturing or intellectual property related to the defense industrial base.

(B) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—Except as provided under subparagraph (C), the President shall ensure that the information contained in the database is kept confidential.

(C) ACCESS TO DATABASE.—The President shall—

(i) ensure that access to information in the database is strictly controlled;

(ii) make the database available to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, and the National Security Agency, with such limitations as the President may determine appropriate;

(iii) require that records are kept each time a person accesses information in the database; and

(iv) require that any person receiving information from the database continues to preserve the confidentiality of the information.

(2) MANDATORY FILING REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any proposed transaction described under paragraph (1)(A), the proposed purchaser and proposed seller in such proposed transaction shall file, and keep current, a report with the database containing a description of the proposed transaction.

(B) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR PROPOSED TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT-CONTROLLED CORPORATION.—If, with respect to proposed transaction described in subparagraph (A), any foreign person is a foreign government-controlled corporation, the report required under subparagraph (A) shall also disclose whether such foreign government-controlled corporation is—

- (i) a Chinese corporation;
- (ii) a Russian corporation;
- (iii) an Iranian corporation; or
- (iv) a North Korean corporation.

(C) CIVIL PENALTY.—Any person who willfully violates a provision of this paragraph shall be fined not more than \$100,000 per violation.

(c) DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE TECHNOLOGIES CONTROLLED.—

(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that statutes and mechanisms to control the export of critical technologies or related intellectual property must be kept up-to-date, reflecting changes in the defense industrial base, technology, and the global market, in order to adequately protect United States national security.

(2) REPORT.—Annually, until September 30, 2023, before March 31, the President shall deliver to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing any need for reforms of policies governing the export of technology or related intellectual property, along with any proposed legislative changes the President believes are necessary.

(d) SEPARATE REPORTS REQUIRED.—The reports required under subsections (a)(1) and (c)(2) may be issued concurrently, but shall be issued as separate reports.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services, the

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) DATABASE.—The term “database” means the database established pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(A).

(3) DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE.—The term “defense industrial base” shall have the meaning given the term “national technology and industrial base” within the context of section 2503 of title 10, United States Code.

(4) DEFINITIONS RELATED TO CORPORATIONS.—

(A) CORPORATION.—The term “corporation” means a corporation, partnership, or other organization.

(B) FOREIGN CORPORATION.—The term “foreign corporation” means a corporation organized under the laws of a foreign country.

(C) U.S. CORPORATION.—The term “U.S. corporation” means a corporation organized under the laws of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 10. FEDERAL CHARTER FOR SPIRIT OF AMERICA.

(a) FEDERAL CHARTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part B of subtitle II of title 36, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 2003 the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 2005—SPIRIT OF AMERICA

“Sec.

“200501. Organization.

“200502. Purposes.

“200503. Powers.

“200504. Duty to maintain tax-exempt status.

“200505. Annual report.

“§ 200501. Organization

“(a) FEDERAL CHARTER.—Spirit of America (in this chapter “the corporation”), a non-profit corporation, is a federally chartered corporation.

“(b) EXPIRATION OF CHARTER.—If the corporation does not comply with the provisions of this chapter, the charter granted by this chapter expires.

“(c) SCOPE OF CHARTER.—Nothing in the charter granted by this chapter shall be construed as conferring special rights or privileges upon the corporation, or as placing upon the Department of Defense any obligation with respect to the corporation.

“§ 200502. Purposes

“The purposes of the corporation are as provided in its constitution and bylaws and include the following patriotic, charitable, and inspirational purposes:

“(1) To respond to the needs of local populations abroad, as identified by members of the Armed Forces and diplomats of the United States abroad.

“(2) To provide privately-funded humanitarian, economic, and other nonlethal assistance to address such needs.

“(3) To support the safety and success of members of the Armed Forces and diplomats of the United States abroad.

“(4) To connect the people of the United States more closely to the members of the Armed Forces and diplomats of the United States abroad, and to the missions carried out by such personnel abroad.

“(5) To demonstrate the goodwill of the people of the United States to peoples around the world.

“§ 200503. Powers

“The corporation may—

“(1) adopt and amend a constitution, by-laws, and regulations to carry out the purposes of the corporation;

“(2) adopt and alter a corporate seal;

“(3) establish and maintain offices to conduct its activities;

“(4) enter into contracts;

“(5) acquire, own, lease, encumber, and transfer property as necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of the corporation;

“(6) establish, regulate, and discontinue subordinate State and territorial subdivisions and local chapters or posts;

“(7) publish a magazine and other publications (including through the Internet);

“(8) sue and be sued; and

“(9) do any other act necessary and proper to carry out the purposes of the corporation as provided in its constitution, by-laws, and regulations.

“§ 200504. Duty to maintain tax-exempt status

“If the corporation fails to maintain its status as an organization exempt from taxation under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the charter granted under this chapter shall terminate.

“§ 200505. Annual report

“The corporation shall submit an annual report to Congress on the activities of the corporation during the prior fiscal year. The report shall be submitted at the same time as the report of the audit required by section 10101 of this title. The report may not be printed as a public document.”

(2) TABLES OF CHAPTERS.—The table of chapters at the beginning of title 36, United States Code, and at the beginning of subtitle II of such title, are each amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 2003 the following new item:

“2005. Spirit of America 200501.”

(b) DISTRIBUTION OF CORPORATION ASSISTANCE ABROAD THROUGH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

(1) ACCEPTANCE AND COORDINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The Department of Defense (including members of the Armed Forces) may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense and in accordance with guidance issued by the Secretary—

(A) accept from Spirit of America, a federally-chartered corporation under chapter 2005 of title 36, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), humanitarian, economic, and other nonlethal assistance funded by private funds in the carrying out of the purposes of the corporation; and

(B) respond to requests from the corporation for the identification of the needs of local populations abroad for assistance, and coordinate with the corporation in the provision and distribution of such assistance, in the carrying out of such purposes.

(2) DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL POPULATIONS.—In accordance with guidance issued by the Secretary, members of the Armed Forces abroad may provide to local populations abroad humanitarian, economic, and other nonlethal assistance provided to the Department by the corporation pursuant to this subsection.

(3) SCOPE OF GUIDANCE.—The guidance issued pursuant to this subsection shall ensure that any assistance distributed pursuant to this subsection shall be for purposes of supporting the mission or missions of the Department and the Armed Forces for which such assistance is provided by the corporation.

(4) DOD SUPPORT FOR CORPORATION ACTIVITIES.—In accordance with guidance issued by the Secretary, the Department and the Armed Forces may—

(A) provide transportation, lodging, storage, and other logistical support—

(i) to personnel of the corporation (whether in the United States or abroad) who are carrying out the purposes of the corporation; and

(ii) in connection with the acceptance and distribution of assistance provided by the corporation; and

(B) use assets of the Department and the Armed Forces in the provision of support described in subparagraph (A).

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

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

SEC. 10 . AIR TRANSPORTATION OF CIVILIAN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONNEL TO AND FROM AFGHANISTAN.

(a) **POLICY REVIEW.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a policy review regarding the use of commercial air transportation or alternative forms of air transportation to transport civilian personnel of the Department of Defense to and from Afghanistan.

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 90 days after the completion of the policy review required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results of such review.

(c) **UPDATED GUIDELINES.**—Not later than 90 days after the completion of the policy review required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall issue updated guidelines, based on the report submitted under subsection (b), regarding the use of commercial air transportation or alternative forms of air transportation to transport civilian personnel of the Department to and from Afghanistan.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON OF OHIO

Page 451, after line 6, insert the following:
SEC. 10 . COLLABORATION BETWEEN FAA AND DOD ON UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS.

(a) **COLLABORATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Secretary of Defense are encouraged to collaborate on sense-and-avoid capabilities for unmanned aircraft systems.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The collaboration described in paragraph (1) should include the following:

(A) Sharing information on safely integrating unmanned aircraft systems and manned aircraft in the national airspace system.

(B) Building upon the experience of the Department of Defense, including the Air Force, to inform the Federal Aviation Administration's development of civil standards, policies, and procedures for integrating unmanned aircraft systems in the nation airspace system.

(C) **Informing.**—

(i) development of airborne and ground-based sense-and-avoid capabilities for unmanned aircraft systems; and

(ii) research and development on unmanned aircraft systems, especially with respect to matters involving human factors, information assurance, and security.

(b) **PARTICIPATION BY FAA IN DOD ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration is encouraged to participate, and provide assistance for participation, in test and evaluation efforts of the Department of Defense, including the Air Force, relating to airborne and ground-based sense-and-avoid capabilities for unmanned aircraft systems.

(2) **PARTICIPATION THROUGH CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE AND TEST SITES.**—Participation under paragraph (1) may include provision of assistance through unmanned aircraft systems test sites.

(c) **UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “unmanned

aircraft system” has the meaning given that term in section 331 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–95; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note).

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRBACHER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 473, line 15, strike “and”.
Page 473, line 17, strike the period at the end and insert a semicolon.

Page 473, after line 17, insert the following:
(C) in paragraph (3), strike “and” at the end;

(D) in paragraph (4), strike the period at the end and insert “; and”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:
“(5) Pakistan is not using its military or any funds or equipment provided by the United States to persecute minority groups seeking political or religious freedom, including the Balochi, Sindhi, and Hazara ethnic groups and minority religious groups, including Christian, Hindu, and Ahmadiyya Muslim.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Page 473, line 15, strike “and”.
Page 473, line 17, strike the period at the end and insert a semicolon.

Page 473, after line 17, insert the following:
(C) in paragraph (3), strike “and” at the end;

(D) in paragraph (4), strike the period at the end and insert “; and”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:
“(5) Pakistan is not providing military, financial, or logistical support to specially designated global terrorists operating in Afghanistan or Pakistan.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 474, line 21, insert after “objectives” the following: “, including the funding estimated to be needed each year by the Department of Defense and by the Department of State (including the United States Agency for International Development)”.

Page 475, after line 15, insert the following:

(9) A description of the legal authority needed to introduce United States ground combat forces in Syria or needed to accomplish long term and short term military objectives in Syria and a description of the capabilities and willingness of the Syrian government (and its allies) to use chemical or other weapons of mass destructions against its citizens and potentially United States and associated military forces Syria.

(10) A description of all necessary contact between the United States and the governments of Russia and other state actors in order to achieve the United States strategy in Syria.

Page 475, after line 22, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1221A. REPORT ON IMPACT OF HUMANITARIAN CRISIS ON ACHIEVEMENT OF UNITED STATES SECURITY OBJECTIVES IN SYRIA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than February 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 1221(c)) a report that provides an assessment of the impact of the humanitarian crisis in Syria on the achievement of goals of the United States in the region, such as destroying and dismantling the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant and peace and stability in Syria and the broader region.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The assessment under subsection (a) shall include a description of—

(1) the response of the United States to the short-term and long-term humanitarian crisis in Syria caused by attacks on the people of Syria by its government, including at-

tacks on hospitals and other medical and educational facilities; and

(2) how the United States intends to support the needs of refugees and internally displaced populations and intends to improve access to humanitarian aid for areas where such aid has been blocked.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN OF MINNESOTA

Page 555, after line 12, insert the following:

(e) **NO AUTHORIZATION FOR DEPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act are authorized to be made available to deploy members of the Armed Forces to participate in the ongoing civil war in Yemen.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of title XI, add the following:
SEC. 1109. BRIEFING ON DIVERSITY IN THE CIVILIAN WORKFORCE ON AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall brief the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives on efforts to increase diversity in the civilian workforce on each Air Force installation, including regional and State demographics regarding diversity.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGOS OF ARIZONA

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

SEC. 12 . REPORTS ON DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES COMBAT FORCES TO SYRIA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall submit to Congress a report on the deployment of United States combat forces to Syria, including number of troops, extent of deployment, and purpose of deployment.

(b) **DEADLINE.**—The President shall submit the report required under subsection (a) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 90 days thereafter through the end of calendar year 2020.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 12 . REPORT ON USE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN OF COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT AND RELATED SERVICES FOR ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Committee on Financial Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report on use by the Government of Iran of commercial aircraft and related services for illicit activities.

(b) **ELEMENTS OF REPORT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include a description of the extent to which—

(1) the Government of Iran is using commercial aircraft, including aircraft of Iran Air, or related services to transport illicit cargo to or from Iran, including military goods, weapons, military personnel, military-related electronic parts and mechanical equipment, or rocket or missile components; and

(2) the commercial aviation sector of Iran, including Iran Air, is providing financial, material, or technological support to the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, Iran's

Ministry of Defense and Armed Forces Logistics, the Bashar al Assad Regime, Hezbollah, Hamas, Kata'ib Hezbollah, or any other Foreign Terrorist Organization or entities designated as a specially designated national and blocked person on the list maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury.

(c) SUNSET.—This section shall cease to be effective on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Iran has ceased providing support for acts of international terrorism.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN OF MINNESOTA

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

SEC. 12 . LIMITATION ON FUNDING.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the Counter-ISIS Train and Equip Fund are authorized to be made available to provide assistance to any recipient of such funds that the Secretary of Defense has reported, pursuant to a quarterly progress report submitted pursuant to section 1209 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3541), as having previously misused training or equipment provided by the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 12 . REPORT ON DEFENSE COOPERATION BETWEEN SERBIA AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committees on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the defense and security relationship between Serbia and the Russian Federation.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A list of Russian weapons systems and other military hardware and technology valued at \$1,000,000 or more that have been provided to Serbia since 2012.

(2) A description of the participation by Serbian armed forces in Russian military training or exercises since 2012.

(3) A list of any defense and security cooperation agreements between Serbia and Russia entered into since 2012.

(4) An assessment of how the countries bordering Serbia assess the risk the Serbian armed forces pose to their national security.

(5) An assessment of intelligence cooperation between Serbia and Russia.

(6) An assessment of defense and security cooperation between Serbia and the United States.

(7) An assessment of how military relations between Serbia and Russia affect United States defense and security cooperation with Serbia and cooperation between Serbia and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MS. CHENEY OF WYOMING

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

SEC. 12 . PLAN TO RESPOND IN CASE OF RUSSIAN NONCOMPLIANCE WITH THE NEW START TREATY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the President shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report—

(1) describing the options available in response to a failure by Russia to achieve the reductions required by the New START Treaty before February 5, 2018; and

(2) including the assessment of the Secretary of Defense whether such a failure would constitute a material breach of the New START Treaty, providing grounds for the United States to withdraw from the treaty.

(b) OPTIONS DESCRIBED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall specifically describe options to respond to such a failure relating to the following:

(1) Economic sanctions.

(2) Diplomacy.

(3) Additional deployment of ballistic or cruise missile defense capabilities, or other United States capabilities that would offset any potential Russian military advantage from such a failure.

(4) Redeployment of United States nuclear forces beyond the levels required by the New START Treaty, and the associated costs and impacts on United States operations.

(5) Legal countermeasures available under other treaties between the United States and Russia, including under the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002.

(c) NEW START TREATY.—In this section, the term “New START Treaty” means the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed at Prague April 8, 2010, and entered into force February 5, 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. WALKER OF NORTH CAROLINA

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

SEC. 12 . REPORT ON NAVAL PORT OF CALL EXCHANGES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than September 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the following:

(1) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability regarding ports of call by the United States Navy at ports on the island of Taiwan.

(2) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability of the United States to receiving ports of call by the Republic of China navy in Hawaii, Guam, and other appropriate locations.

(b) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

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

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

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 yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman MAC

THORNBERRY for his extraordinary leadership and for the opportunity to speak on amendment No. 76.

In the past few years, we have seen a clear rise in how terrorist and extremist groups use propaganda and sophisticated messaging operations to increase their reach to recruit new members, execute attacks, and raise funds.

These violent extremist organizations represent a new type of threat to the United States and our families, and we must identify how existing agencies should work together to address the threat.

This amendment requires the President to submit a comprehensive inter-agency strategy for countering violent extremist groups that pose a threat to American families or their interests. Any plan would identify how to counter the violent messaging, combat terrorist financing, support existing law enforcement activities, support counterradicalization organizations, and offer military support.

Additionally, the amendment provides for accountability by requiring an annual assessment of the progress made implementing and achieving the strategy. The time is now to bring a whole-government approach to combat violent extremism. This strategy will serve a vital role in this effort.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this amendment and the en bloc package.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I have no other speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chair, my amendment proposes to increase the authorized funding for the Counterdrug Program by \$10 million.

For 30 years, the National Guard has successfully performed drug interdiction and counterdrug activities to support our local communities and our national security. The National Guard partners with local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies, and community organizations to effectively combat the supply and demand for illegal drugs. The National Guard Counterdrug Program works.

In the past 4 years, the West Virginia National Guard successfully seized more than \$500 million of illegal drugs, black market drugs that are devastating our communities and towns. And as our Nation copes with the devastating drug epidemic, we must fund programs to stop drug trafficking and keep drugs out of our communities.

For more than a decade, Congress has consistently provided funding above the budget request. It is important that we continue that support.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and his hardworking staff that helped to make this amendment possible. I urge adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, perfluorinated compounds, namely PFOA and PFOS, have been found in public and private drinking water wells in communities surrounding over 600 military installations nationwide, including several in my own district, impacting 70,000 Pennsylvanians.

While the military does not dispute its responsibility for the water contamination, the response thus far has been unacceptable. For all of our constituents, they all have the right to safe, clean drinking water, and they deserve to know if PFOS or PFOA have compromised their long-term health.

The bipartisan amendment I have introduced instructs the Secretary of Defense to consult with the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to carry out a study on any health effects experienced by those exposed to PFOS and PFOA at military installations or former military installations.

While this study alone will not fix the serious concerns about water contamination, it will provide us with critical information about the health impact these unregulated chemicals may have, and aid the Federal Government in conjunction with State and local agencies to reverse the contamination and protect the health and welfare of our residents.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for yielding time.

Mr. Chair, Pakistan has been supporting all kinds of terrorist groups for years, including those with American blood on their hands. But instead of penalizing Pakistan, the government has been rewarding them with hundreds of millions of dollars in U.S. aid. Some of that money goes to support terrorists.

Previously, we placed conditions on military aid to Pakistan, but these conditions are only focused on Pakistan cracking down on one terrorist group, the Haqqani Network. Meanwhile, Pakistan is aiding and abetting a long list of terrorists in the region, including the Taliban in Afghanistan.

□ 1000

My amendment No. 100 places a new condition on any aid to Pakistan. The condition requires the administration to certify that Pakistan is not providing military, financial, or logistical support to any terrorists operating in Pakistan or Afghanistan.

This forces Pakistan to make a long overdue choice: either go after terrorists or lose millions of dollars of American aid.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for his leadership on this matter.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was formed in the ashes of World War II, bringing decades of considerable peace and prosperity. Still, there are powers today that wish to challenge the order from which millions throughout the world have benefited.

My amendment to the NDAA, amendment No. 98, is a straightforward and simple amendment. It would call on all NATO allies to fulfill their mutual defense commitments, secure national and regional security interests, and recognize our NATO allies who are achieving those objectives.

The underlying bill takes steps to strengthen our national defense on many fronts. It improves our overseas contingency operations, provides significant resources to rebuild our military, and increases funding for initiatives to deter Russian aggression.

My amendment builds upon those principles. As we begin to rebuild our military capability, it is time for our allies to do the same, especially when it pertains to our NATO alliance.

For far too long, the United States has shared an unequal financial burden in contributing to the global and regional security that NATO provides. With new challenges from an increasing belligerent Russian state, instability across the Middle East and North Africa, and emerging cybersecurity threats, it is time for all allies to honor their commitment and invest in defense spending.

In order for NATO to be completely effective, all NATO members must meet their GDP commitment for defense spending and investment. This is out of fairness—for our effort to evenly share this responsibility and fairness to American taxpayers.

My amendment calls on the President to demand that our NATO allies honor their mutual defense commitment they agreed to by committing 2 percent of their gross domestic product to defense spending and research and to secure their national and regional security interests. Only 5 of 29 member nations currently honor these commitments. While 24 NATO members fail to meet their NATO commitment, my amendment also recognizes the few NATO allies who actually achieve those objectives.

Full commitment from our NATO allies will make a notable difference in our effort to achieve peace around the globe. We must share equally the necessary burden of peace through strength.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr.

SCOTT) will control the time of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

There was no objection.

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

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

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Congressman LAMBORN's amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act to require the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Director of National Intelligence to report to Congress on the use of commercial aircraft by the Government of Iran for illicit activities. I am proud to be the lead Democratic co-sponsor of this bipartisan amendment, along with Reps. LAMBORN, ROSKAM, ZELDIN, and SHERMAN.

As we are all aware, U.S. firms have reached multi-billion-dollar agreements to sell or lease hundreds of aircraft to Iran, supposedly to help bring the country's fleet into the 21st century. I am deeply concerned, however, that these aircraft, intended for civilian use, could instead be used for nefarious purposes, such as transporting fighters to Syria or weapons to Iran's proxies, Hamas and Hezbollah.

Iran is the world's leading sponsor of terrorism, with a longstanding record of human rights violations. Its support of radical groups throughout the Middle East poses a threat both to our greatest ally in the region, Israel, and also to U.S. interests. For this reason, we must keep a watchful eye on Iran's actions, including how it uses dual use exports from the United States.

If Iran is indeed only using American-made commercial aircraft for legitimate purposes, there should be no concern that a report confirming this would have an adverse effect on American trade. If Iran is using aircraft to conduct illicit activities, we must be made aware, and we must hold Iran accountable.

I am also proud to have co-sponsored another amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act that will help hold Iran accountable for its actions. This bipartisan amendment, offered by my Nevada colleague, Rep. KIHUEN, would extend a presidential reporting requirement to ensure that we have an integrated strategy between the Administration and Congress to deter Iran's nuclear weapons program.

Two years ago today, the United States, China, France, Germany, Russia, the United Kingdom, the European Union, and Iran agreed to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), which aimed to ensure that Iran's nuclear program would be exclusively peaceful and that Iran would never obtain a nuclear weapon. I was not a Member of Congress when the JCPOA came to the floor for Congressional approval, but had I been, I would have opposed the agreement. However, I have said since before I first came to Congress that now that the JCPOA is the law of the land, the United States must demand that Iran abide by it completely, and that any cheating or subversion should be dealt with swiftly.

Both the Lamborn and Kihuen Amendments that I have co-sponsored are manifestations of this principle. If Iran is directly violating the JCPOA by developing a nuclear weapons program, the Administration and Congress must be ready to respond. And if Iran is violating

the spirit of the JCPOA by taking advantage of new streams of commerce to wage war in the Middle East, it should not matter what financial ties U.S. companies have to the regime.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote for the National Defense Authorization Act, which includes both the Lamborn and Kihuen Amendments.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Armed Services Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their support of my amendment to direct the Secretary of Defense to report on military cooperation between Serbia and Russia. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Aderholt, for cosponsoring the amendment.

Countries of the Balkans are a part of Europe. Period. From the former Yugoslavia, three have already entered NATO and two are now part of the European Union. In the wider Balkans, even more countries have joined NATO and the EU and others want to be part of both . . . all, except for Serbia, that is, which is unwilling to put itself on a path to future NATO membership.

Frankly, Serbia is not only keeping NATO at arms' length. As we speak, it is continuing to rearm with Russian weapons. In a deal reached on December 21 of last year, Russia agreed to give Serbia six surplus MiG-29 'Fulcrum' fighter aircraft, 30 T-72 tanks, and 30 BRDM-2 armored reconnaissance vehicles. Rather than forcing Belgrade to pay for these items worth more than \$600 million on the open market, the Kremlin just gave them to Belgrade. And, now Serbia is seeking Russian-made S-300 anti-aircraft missiles. If I were sitting in one of Serbia's neighbors, most of which are NATO members, I don't think I would be comfortable with Belgrade's tilt toward Moscow.

Even more, only last month, Serbia joined Russia and Belarus in what the countries' called 'Slavic Brotherhood' drills very close to NATO-member Poland. This is only the latest in a series of military exercises where Serbian forces are training with Russian troops. According to RFE/RL, "The first were held in 2015 in Russia's Krasnodar Krai, which is close to Western-leaning Georgia and Ukraine's Russian-controlled Crimean Peninsula. The second were held in November 2016 in Serbia, while NATO was staging a civil emergency drill in neighboring Montenegro."

If Serbia wants to become part of the West, this isn't the way to get there. Frankly, I'm growing increasingly concerned with the choices Belgrade is making on military and security matters. This is why I wrote today's amendment. We need to take a closer look at Russian-Serbian military ties and judge their implications for US national security policy, Serbia's membership in NATO's Partnership for Peace, and the impact on Serbia's neighbors.

I know that Vice President PENCE is meeting with Serbian President Vucic on Monday. This occasion represents a good opportunity to present our U.S. concerns about Belgrade's direction on security policy and a variety of other matters.

Mr. Chair, again, I thank the Chairman and Ranking member for their support, and I look forward to seeing the report required by the amendment.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I am proud to have introduced the Apollo I Memorial Amendment to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. This year is the 50th Anniversary of the *Apollo I* spacecraft fire that claimed the lives of three American heroes. With this Amendment we ensure that these three courageous astronauts, who gave their lives in service to our great nation, will be appropriately honored.

On January 27, 1967, Astronauts Virgil I. "Gus" Grissom, Edward H. White II, and Roger B. Chaffee were killed in an electrical fire that broke out inside their *Apollo I* Command Module on Launch Pad 34 at the Kennedy Space Center in Cape Canaveral, Florida. The accident led to a detailed internal investigation and congressional hearings. As a result of their sacrifice, NASA made needed changes to the Apollo program which ultimately resulted in the successful *Apollo 11* landing on the moon two years later.

My Amendment requires the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), to construct a memorial marker at Arlington National Cemetery in their honor. This marker corrects an unfortunate omission, namely, that these three fearless astronauts, who were set to be the ones to fly the first Apollo mission into space, have not received a memorial at Arlington as was done for the Space Shuttle *Challenger* and *Columbia* crews. As Arlington National Cemetery is where we recognize heroes who have passed in the service of our Nation, it is fitting that on the 50th anniversary of the launchpad accident we acknowledge the sacrifice of the *Apollo I* Astronauts.

Mr. Chair, it is past time to install a memorial marker at Arlington so that current and future Americans never forget their sacrifice as we continue to reach for the stars.

Before closing, I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who supported the original bill from which this Amendment was drawn, H.R. 703, the Apollo Memorial Act. I would also like to express my deep appreciation to both Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH of Indiana and Mr. POSEY of Florida who both offered to cosponsor this Amendment.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will continue to come together to support this amendment honoring these heroes.

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.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 5 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. 5 consisting of amendment Nos. 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, and 107 printed in House Report 115-217, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 12 . NOTICE OF CHANGES TO THE LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORKS GUIDING THE UNITED STATES' USE OF MILITARY FORCE AND RELATED NATIONAL SECURITY OPERATIONS.

(a) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a change is made to any of the legal or policy frameworks described in the report entitled "Report on the Legal and Policy Frameworks Guiding the United States Use of Military Force and Related National Security Operations" prepared by the national security departments and agencies and published on December 5, 2016, the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of such change, including the legal, factual, and policy justification for such change.

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

- (1) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;
- (2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;
- (3) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and
- (4) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 12 . REPORT ON MILITARY ACTION OF SAUDI ARABIA AND ITS COALITIONS PARTNERS IN YEMEN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit the appropriate congressional committees a report on military action of Saudi Arabia and its coalitions partners in Yemen.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include a description of the following:

- (1) The extent to which the Government of Saudi Arabia and its coalition partners in Yemen are abiding by their "No Strike List and Restricted Target List".
- (2) Roles played by United States military personnel with respect to operations of such coalition partners in Yemen.
- (3) Progress made by the Government of Saudi Arabia in improving its targeting capabilities.
- (4) Progress made by such coalition partners to implement the recommendations of the Joint Incident Assessment Team and participation if any by the United States in the implementation of such recommendations.
- (5) Progress made toward implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2216 (2015) or any successor United Nations Security Council resolution relating to the conflict in Yemen.

(c) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(d) TERMINATION.—This section shall terminate on—

- (1) the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(2) the date on which the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State jointly certify to the appropriate congressional committees that the conflict in Yemen has come to a conclusion, whichever occurs earlier.

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

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY OF NEW YORK

Page 525, line 19, strike the period and insert “, including respect for human rights.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. GALLAGHER OF WISCONSIN

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

SEC. 12 . ASSESSMENT ON UNITED STATES DEFENSE IMPLICATIONS OF CHINA’S EXPANDING GLOBAL ACCESS.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall assess the foreign military and non-military activities of the People’s Republic of China which could affect the regional and global national security and defense interests of the United States.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required by paragraph (1) shall evaluate the following:

(A) China’s use of military and non-military means in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region and globally, including tourism, media, influence campaigns, investment projects, infrastructure, and access to foreign ports and military bases, and whether such means could affect United States national security or defense interests, including operational access.

(B) The implications, if any, of such means for the military force posture, access, training, and logistics of both the United States and China.

(C) The United States strategy and policy for mitigating any harmful effects resulting from such means.

(D) The resources required to implement such strategy and policy, and the mitigation plan to address any gaps in capabilities or resources necessary for such implementation.

(E) Measures to bolster the roles of allies, partners, and other countries to implement such strategy and policy.

(F) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State determines to be appropriate.

(3) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the assessment required under subsection (b).

(B) FORM.—The report required by this paragraph may be submitted unclassified or classified form.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. YOHO OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 12 . NORMALIZING THE TRANSFER OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND DEFENSE SERVICES TO TAIWAN.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any requests from the Government of Taiwan for defense articles and de-

fense services should receive a case-by-case review by the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, that is consistent with the standard processes and procedures in an effort to normalize the arms sales process with Taiwan.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense receives a Letter of Request from Taiwan with respect to the transfer of a defense article or defense service to Taiwan, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(A) the status of such request;

(B) if the transfer of such article or service would require a certification or report to Congress pursuant to any applicable provision of section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776), the status of any Letter of Offer and Acceptance the Secretary of Defense intends to issue with respect to such request; and

(C) an assessment of whether the transfer of such article or service would be consistent with United States obligations under the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96-8; 22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.).

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall specify the following:

(A) The date the Secretary of Defense received the Letter of Request.

(B) The value of the sale proposed by such Letter of Request.

(C) A description of the defense article or defense service proposed to be transferred.

(D) The view of the Secretary of Defense with respect to such proposed sale and whether such sale would be consistent with defense plans.

(3) FORM.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(c) BRIEFING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees with respect to the security challenges faced by Taiwan and the military cooperation between the United States and Taiwan, including a description of any requests from Taiwan for the transfer of defense articles or defense services and the status, whether signed or unsigned, of any Letters of Offer and Acceptance with respect to such requests.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(2) DEFENSE ARTICLE; DEFENSE SERVICE.—The terms “defense article” and “defense service” have the meanings given such terms in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

(3) LETTER OF REQUEST; LETTER OF OFFER AND ACCEPTANCE.—The terms “Letter of Request” and “Letter of Offer and Acceptance” have the meanings given such terms for purposes of Chapter 5 of the Security Assistance Management Manual of the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

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

SEC. 12 . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE REGION.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the security, stability, and prosperity of the Western Hemisphere region are vital to the national interests of the United States;

(2) the United States should maintain a military capability in the Western Hemisphere region that is able to project power, build partner capacity, deter acts of aggression, and respond, if necessary, to regional threats or to threats to the national security of the United States by the activities of Iran, China, Russia, North Korea, transnational criminal organizations, or terrorist organizations in the region;

(3) continuing efforts by the Department of Defense to commit additional assets and increase investments to the Western Hemisphere are necessary to maintain a robust United States commitment to the region;

(4) the Secretary of Defense should—

(A) assess the current United States force posture in the Western Hemisphere to ensure that the United States maintains an appropriate forward presence in the region;

(B) prioritize—

(i) intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance;

(ii) maritime patrol aircraft to support detection and monitoring missions;

(iii) efforts to disrupt and degrade transregional and transnational threat networks; and

(iv) when possible, efforts to support the mission of the Department of Homeland Security, as requested, in monitoring individuals identified by the Secretary of Homeland Security as “special interest aliens” or as “foreign terrorist fighters”; and

(C) enhance regional force readiness through joint training and exercises; and

(5) the United States should continue to engage in the Western Hemisphere by strengthening alliances and partnerships, working with regional institutions, addressing the shared challenges of illicit trafficking of humans, drugs, and other contraband, transnational criminal organizations, and foreign terrorist fighters, and supporting the rule of law and democracy in the region.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF MICHIGAN

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

SEC. 12 . SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO INCREASES IN DEFENSE CAPABILITIES OF UNITED STATES ALLIES.

It is the sense of Congress that the President, in furtherance of increased unity, equitable sharing of the common defense burden, and international stability, should—

(1) encourage all member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (“NATO allies”) to fulfill their commitments to levels and composition of defense expenditures as agreed upon at the NATO 2014 Wales Summit and NATO 2016 Warsaw Summit;

(2) call on NATO allies to finance, equip, and train their armed forces to fulfill their national and regional security interests; and

(3) recognize NATO allies that are meeting their defense spending commitments or otherwise providing adequately for their national and regional security interests.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

SEC. 12xx. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT THE ARMS TRADE TREATY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—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 fund a Secretariat or any

other international organization established to support the implementation of the Arms Trade Treaty, to sustain domestic prosecutions based on any charge related to the Treaty, or to implement the Treaty until the Senate approves a resolution of ratification for the Treaty and implementing legislation for the Treaty has been enacted into law.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the Department of Defense from assisting foreign countries in bringing their laws, regulations, and practices related to export control up to United States standards.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 12. CULTURAL HERITAGE PROTECTION COORDINATOR.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall designate an employee of the Department of Defense to serve concurrently as the Coordinator for Cultural Heritage Protection (in this section referred to as the “Coordinator”).

(b) **DUTIES.**—The Coordinator shall have the following duties:

(1) The Coordinator shall be responsible for coordinating existing obligations of the Department of Defense for the protection of cultural heritage, including the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, and other obligations for the protection of cultural heritage.

(2) The Coordinator shall convene a coordinating committee of entities within the Department of Defense that have the responsibility or capacity for protecting cultural heritage.

(c) **COORDINATING COMMITTEE.**—The coordinating committee convened pursuant to subsection (b)(2) shall—

(1) meet not less than annually;

(2) coordinate with the Cultural Heritage Coordinating Committee convened by the Department of State; and

(3) solicit consultation and coordination with other Federal agencies and nongovernmental organizations, including the U.S. Committee of the Blue Shield, as well as other expert and stakeholder organizations, as appropriate for the national security interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 1623. REPORT ON SPACE-BASED NUCLEAR DETECTION.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report on space-based nuclear detection.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A description of the space-based nuclear detection program (including the space-based atmospheric burst reporting system).

(2) The strategic plan, including with respect to current and planned space platforms, to host the relevant payloads for such program.

(3) The current and planned national security requirements for space-based nuclear detection, including—

(A) an attribution of such requirements to specific missions of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; and

(B) how such requirements compare to past requirements.

(4) How current and future funding for the space-based nuclear detection program is being provided by each such department or agency to meet each mission requirement.

(c) **FORM.**—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

SEC. 16. DEFINITION OF DETERRENCE IN THE CONTEXT OF CYBER OPERATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) develop a definition of the term “deterrence” as such term is used in the context of the cyber operations of the Department of Defense; and

(2) assess how the definition developed under paragraph (1) affects the overall cyber strategy of the Department.

(b) **INCLUSION OF OTHER ACTIVITIES.**—The definition of the term “deterrence” developed under subsection (a) may include activities, capability efforts, and operations other than cyber activities, cyber capability efforts, and cyber operations.

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MR. FRANKS OF ARIZONA

Page 687, line 13, strike “Tamir interceptors” and all that follows through “such interceptors” on line 15 and insert “system components for the Iron Dome Defense short-range rocket defense program, through the coproduction of such system components”.

Page 689, line 6, strike “to procure” and all that follows through “System,” on line 7 and insert “for the David’s Sling Weapon System Program, of which not more than \$120,000,000 may be used to procure the David’s Sling Weapon System.”.

Page 689, line 11, strike “for the” and all that follows through “Program,” on line 12 and insert “for the Arrow Weapon System, including the Arrow 3 Upper Tier System, of which not more than \$120,000,000 may be used to procure the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor System.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 1694. BOOST PHASE BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE.

(a) **INITIAL OPERATIONAL DEPLOYMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that an effective interim kinetic or directed energy boost phase ballistic missile defense capability is available for initial operational deployment not later than December 31, 2020.

(b) **PLAN.**—Together with the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to achieve the requirement in subsection (a). Such plan shall include—

(1) the budget requirements;

(2) a robust test schedule;

(3) a plan to develop an enduring boost phase ballistic missile defense capability, including cost and test schedule.

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Add at the end of title XVI the following new subtitle:

Subtitle H—Advancing America’s Missile Defense Act of 2017

SEC. 1699D. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Advancing America’s Missile Defense Act of 2017”.

SEC. 1699E. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CURRENT STATE OF UNITED STATES MISSILE DEFENSE, FUTURE INVESTMENT, AND ACCELERATING CAPABILITIES TO OUTPACE CURRENT THREATS.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should use the upcoming Ballistic Missile Defense Review (BMDR) and the Missile Defeat Review (MDR) to accelerate the development of new and existing means to sustain and increase the capacity, capability, and reliability of the ground-based midcourse defense element of the ballistic missile defense system and other missile defense programs.

(b) **ACCELERATION OF DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN ADVANCED MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGIES TOWARD FIELDING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To the degree practicable, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall use the policies of the Department of Defense to accelerate the development, testing, and fielding of the redesigned kill vehicle, the multi-object kill vehicle, the C3 booster, a space-based sensor layer, an airborne laser on unmanned aerial vehicles, and a potential additional missile defense site, including the completion of any outstanding environmental impact statements (EISs) for an additional missile defense site on the East Coast or in the Midwest regions of the United States.

(2) **PRIORITY.**—The Director shall prioritize the development of capabilities listed in paragraph (1) subject to annual authorization and appropriation of funding.

(3) **DEVELOPMENT.**—The Director shall use sound acquisition processes and program management to develop the capabilities set forth in paragraph (1).

SEC. 1699F. AUTHORIZATION TO INCREASE CURRENT GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE CAPACITY BY 28 GROUND-BASED INTERCEPTORS.

(a) **INCREASE IN CAPACITY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall, subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for National Missile Defense, increase the number of United States ground-based interceptors by up to 28.

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Unless otherwise directed or recommended by the BMDR, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on infrastructure requirements and costs associated to increase the number of ground-based interceptors at Missile Field 1 and Missile Field 2 at Fort Greely to 20 ground-based interceptors each.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An analysis of the strategic, operational, and tactical benefits of adding additional ground-based interceptors at each missile field.

(B) A detailed description of the infrastructure needed and costs associated with expanding each missile field.

(C) An identification of any environmental, technical, or logistical barriers to expanding each missile field.

(D) Any analysis of alternatively using Missile Field 4 and Missile Field 5 to increase the number of ground-based interceptors.

(3) **FORM.**—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1699G. MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY REPORT ON INCREASING NUMBER OF GROUND-BASED INTERCEPTORS UP TO 100.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that it is the policy of the United States to maintain and improve, with the allies of the United States, an effective, robust layered missile defense system capable of defending the citizens of the United States residing in territories and States of the United States, allies of the United States, and deployed Armed Forces of the United States.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise directed or recommended by the BMDR, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the costs and benefits of increasing the capacity of the ground-based midcourse defense element of the ballistic missile defense system.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An identification of potential sites—new or existing—to allow for the increase of up to 100 ground-based interceptors.

(B) An analysis of the strategic, operational, tactical, and cost benefits of each site.

(C) A description of any environmental, legal, or tactical challenges associated with each site.

(D) A detailed description of the infrastructure needed and costs associated with each site.

(E) A summary of any completed or outstanding environmental impact statements (EIS) on each site.

(F) An operational evaluation and cost analysis of the deployment of transportable ground-based interceptors, including an identification of potential sites, including in the eastern United States and at Vandenberg Air Force Base, and an examination of any environmental, legal, or tactical challenges associated with such deployments, including to any sites identified in subparagraph (A).

(G) A determination of the appropriate fleet mix of ground-based interceptor kill vehicles and boosters to maximize overall system effectiveness and increase its capacity and capability, including the costs and benefits of continued inclusion of capability enhancement II (CE-II) Block 1 interceptors after the fielding of the redesigned kill vehicle.

(H) A description of the planned improvements to homeland ballistic missile defense sensor and discrimination capabilities and an assessment of the expected operational benefits of such improvements to homeland ballistic missile defense.

(I) The costs and benefits of supplementing ground-based midcourse defense elements with other, more distributed, elements, including both Aegis ships and Aegis Ashore installations with Standard Missile-3 Block IIA and other interceptors in Hawaii and at other locations for homeland missile defense.

(3) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1699H. EVALUATION AND EVOLUTION OF TERRESTRIAL GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SENSORS.

(a) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise directed or recommended by the BMDR, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, in coordination with the Secretary of the Air Force, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the status of the integrated layers of missile defense radars.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed analysis of the expected improvements resulting from the integration of the Long Range Discrimination Radar into the missile defense system architecture of the United States, including—

(i) any adjustments to homeland missile defense tactics, techniques, and procedures;

(ii) possible adjustments to ground-based midcourse defense shot-doctrine and required interceptor capacity;

(iii) possibilities for direct integration with Fort Greely's Command and Control node; and

(iv) impacts on regional missile defense systems including Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense, Aegis Ashore, and Terminal High Altitude Area Defense.

(B) A detailed comparison of the capabilities of Long Range Discrimination Radar and the COBRA DANE radar, including—

(i) the unique capabilities of each radar;

(ii) the overlapping capabilities of each radar; and

(iii) the advantages and disadvantages of each radar's location.

(C) A modernization plan and costs for the long-term continued operations and maintenance of the COBRA DANE radar or a plan to replace its capability if COBRA DANE cannot remain operational, and the costs associated with each plan.

(b) ASSESSMENT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Director submits the report under subsection (a)(1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) complete a review of the plan required by subsection (a)(2)(C); and

(2) submit to the congressional defense committees a report on such review that includes the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General.

(c) FORM.—The reports submitted subsections (a) and (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1699I. AUTHORIZATION FOR MORE GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE TESTING.

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

(1) at a minimum, the Missile Defense Agency should continue to flight test the ground-based midcourse defense element at least once each fiscal year;

(2) the Department of Defense should allocate increased funding to homeland missile defense testing to ensure that our defenses continue to evolve faster than the threats against which they are postured to defend while pursuing a robust acquisition process;

(3) in order to rapidly innovate, develop, and field new technologies, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency should continue to focus testing campaigns on delivering increased capabilities to the Armed Forces as quickly as possible; and

(4) the Director of the Missile Defense Agency should seek to establish a more prudent balance between risk mitigation and the more rapid testing pace needed to quickly develop and deliver new capabilities to the Armed Forces.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise directed or recommended by the BMDR, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall submit to the congressional defense committees a revised missile defense testing campaign plan that accelerates the development and deployment of new missile defense technologies.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed analysis of the costs and benefits of accelerating each following programs:

(i) Redesigned kill vehicle.

(ii) Multi-object kill vehicle.

(iii) Configuration-3 booster.

(iv) Lasers mounted on small unmanned aerial vehicles.

(v) Space-based missile defense sensor architecture.

(vi) Such additional technologies as the Director considers appropriate.

(B) A new deployment timeline for each of the programs in listed in subparagraph (A) or a detailed description of why the current timeline for deployment technologies under those programs is most suitable.

(C) An identification of any funding or policy restrictions that would slow down the deployment of the technologies under the programs listed in subparagraph (A).

(D) A risk assessment of the potential cost-overruns and deployment delays that may be encountered in the expedited development process of the capabilities under paragraph (1).

(c) REPORT ON FUNDING PROFILE.—The Director shall include with the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the budget of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code) a report on the funding profile necessary for the new testing campaign plan required by subsection (b)(1).

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 711, beginning line 3, strike "Except as provided in subsection (b), the" and insert "The".

Page 711, strike lines 7 through 15 and insert the following:

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Service Acquisition Executive responsible for each covered Distributed Common Ground System shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that the procurement process for increments of the system procured after the date of the enactment of this Act will be carried out in accordance with section 2377 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

At the end of title XXII, add the following new section:

SEC. 2207. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2016 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2201(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (division B of Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 1150) for construction of an Aegis Ashore Missile Defense Complex at RedziKowo Base, Poland, the Secretary of the Navy may construct a 6,180 square meter multipurpose facility, for the purposes of providing additional berthing space, using amounts available for the project pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204 of such Act.

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 inform my friend from Washington I have no speakers on this en bloc package, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I don't have any speakers either, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I urge support, and 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.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 6 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. 6 consisting of amendment Nos. 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, and 121 printed in House Report 115-217, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. SIMPSON OF IDAHO

Insert after section 2822 the following new section (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

SEC. 2823. LAND CONVEYANCE, MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE, IDAHO.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Air Force may convey to the City of Mountain Home, Idaho (in this section referred to as the "City") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 4.25 miles of railroad spur located near Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, as further described in subsection (c), for the purpose of economic development.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) CONSIDERATION REQUIRED.—As consideration for the land conveyed under subsection (a), the City shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the fair market value of the land, as determined by an appraisal approved by the Secretary. The City shall provide an amount that is acceptable to the Secretary, whether by cash payment, in-kind consideration as described under paragraph (2), or a combination thereof.

(2) IN-KIND CONSIDERATION.—In-kind consideration provided by the City under paragraph (1) may include the acquisition, construction, provision, improvement, maintenance, repair, or restoration (including environmental restoration), or combination thereof, of any facility or infrastructure under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

(3) TREATMENT OF CONSIDERATION RECEIVED.—Consideration in the form of cash payment received by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the separate fund in the Treasury described in section 572(a)(1) of title 40, United States Code.

(c) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall publish a final map and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a), except that the Secretary may correct minor errors in the map and legal description after its initial publication.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description under this subsection shall be on file and available for public inspection.

(d) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) PAYMENT AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Air Force may require the City to cover the costs to be incurred by the Sec-

retary, or to reimburse the Secretary for the costs incurred by the Secretary, in carrying out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, the costs of environmental documentation, and other administrative costs relating to the conveyance (other than costs for environmental remediation of the property conveyed). If amounts are collected from the City in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the City.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received under paragraph (1) as reimbursement for costs incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance, or to an appropriate fund or account currently available to the Secretary for the purposes for which the costs were paid. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(e) RESERVATION OF USE BY SECRETARY.—After the conveyance under subsection (a), the City shall allow the Secretary of the Air Force to temporarily use, for urgent reasons of national defense and at no cost to the Secretary, all or a portion of the property conveyed under subsection (a).

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Air Force may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

Insert after section 2825 the following new section (and redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly):

SEC. 2826. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN DEED RESTRICTIONS AND REVERSIONS ASSOCIATED WITH CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY OF FORMER DEFENSE DEPOT OGDEN, UTAH.

(a) NEGOTIATIONS TO REMOVE RESTRICTIONS AND REVERSIONS.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall enter into negotiations with the City of Ogden, Utah, and Weber County, Utah, on agreements to remove deed restrictions and reversionary provisions on the remaining property of the former Defense Depot Ogden.

(b) CONTENTS OF AGREEMENT.—The agreements entered into pursuant to subsection (a) shall include such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the Secretary of the Interior and the City of Ogden and Weber County (as the case may be), except that the following terms and conditions shall apply:

(1) The Secretary may not remove the deed restrictions and reversionary provisions on the property of the former Defense Depot Ogden until there is a ratified agreement between the Secretary and the City of Ogden or Weber County (as the case may be) to encumber other specific properties owned by the City or County with the same appropriate reversionary interests in favor of the United States as are in effect with respect to the property of the former Defense Depot Ogden as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The properties of the City of Ogden or Weber County (as the case may be) that are encumbered pursuant to paragraph (1) shall have approximately equal value to the property of the former Defense Depot Ogden for

which the deed restrictions and reversionary provisions are removed under the agreement.

(3) The City of Ogden and Weber County shall pay the costs (except any costs for environmental remediation of the property) to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such reasonable and customary administrative expenses incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the agreement with respect to the City or County (as the case may be), including survey and appraisal costs. If amounts are collected from the City of Ogden or Weber County in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the agreement with respect to the City or County, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the City or County.

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MRS. BUSTOS OF ILLINOIS

Add at the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII the following:

SEC. 28 — CERTIFICATION RELATED TO CERTAIN ACQUISITIONS OR LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY.

Section 2662(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, as well as the certification described in paragraph (5).”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) For purposes of paragraph (2), the certification described in this paragraph with respect to an acquisition or lease of real property is a certification that the Secretary concerned—

“(A) evaluated the feasibility of using space in property under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense to satisfy the purposes of the acquisition or lease; and

“(B) determined that—

“(i) space in property under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense is not reasonably available to be used to satisfy the purposes of the acquisition or lease;

“(ii) acquiring the property or entering into the lease would be more cost-effective than the use of the Department of Defense property; or

“(iii) the use of the Department of Defense property would interfere with the ongoing military mission of the property.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. BRAT OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII (page 854, after line 24), add the following:

SEC. 2818. IMPROVED PROCESS FOR DISPOSAL OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY LOCATED OVERSEAS.

(a) PETITION TO ACQUIRE SURPLUS PROPERTY.—2687a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) PETITION PROCESS FOR DISPOSAL OF OVERSEAS SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a process by which a foreign government may request the transfer of surplus real property or improvements under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense in the foreign country.

“(2) Upon the receipt of a petition under this subsection, the Secretary shall determine within 90 days whether the property or improvement subject to the petition is surplus. If surplus, the Secretary shall seek to enter into an agreement with the foreign government within one year for the disposal of the property.

“(3) If real property or an improvement is determined not to be surplus, the Secretary

shall not be obligated to consider another petition involving the same property or improvement for five years beginning on the date on which the initial determination was made.”.

(b) **ADDITIONAL USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OVERSEAS MILITARY FACILITY INVESTMENT RECOVERY ACCOUNT.**—Section 2687a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “property disposal agreement,” after “forces agreement,”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) military readiness programs.”.

(c) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—Section 2687a(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) A report under paragraph (1) also shall specify the following:

“(A) The number of petitions received under subsection (g) from foreign governments requesting the transfer of surplus real property or improvements under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense overseas.

“(B) The status of each petition, including whether reviewed, denied, or granted.

“(C) The implementation status of each granted petition.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. RICE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Add at the end of subtitle G of title XXVIII the following new section:

SEC. 2863. PERMITTING MACHINE ROOM-LESS ELEVATORS IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall issue modifications to all relevant construction and facilities specifications to ensure that machine room-less elevators (MRLs) are not prohibited in buildings and facilities throughout the Department of Defense, including modifications to the Unified Facilities Guide Specifications (UFGS), the Naval Facilities Engineering Command Interim Technical Guidance, and the Army Corps of Engineers Engineering and Construction Bulletin.

(b) **CONFORMING TO BEST PRACTICES.**—In addition to the modifications required under subsection (a), the Secretary may issue further modifications to conform generally with commercial best practices as reflected in the safety code for elevators and escalators as issued by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

(c) **DEADLINES.**—The Secretary shall promulgate interim MRL standards not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall issue final and formal MRL specifications not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a report to the congressional defense committees on the integration and utilization of MRLs, including information on quantity, location, problems, and successes.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

Add at the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, the following new section:

SEC. 3124. PLUTONIUM CAPABILITIES.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Secretary of Defense, and the

Comptroller General of the United States a report on the recommended alternative endorsed by the Administrator for recapitalization of plutonium science and production capabilities of the nuclear security enterprise. The report shall identify the recommended alternative endorsed by the Administrator and contain the analysis of alternatives, including costs, upon which the Administrator relied in making such endorsement.

(b) **CERTIFICATION.**—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense receives the notification under subsection (a), the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council shall submit to the congressional defense committees the written certification of the Chairman regarding whether the recommended alternative endorsed by the Administrator—

(1) is acceptable to the Secretary of Defense and the Nuclear Weapons Council and meets the requirements of the Secretary for plutonium pit production capacity and capability;

(2) is likely to meet the pit production timelines and milestones required by section 4219 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2538a);

(3) is likely to meet pit production timelines and requirements responsive to military requirements;

(4) is cost effective and has reasonable near-term and lifecycle costs that are minimized, to the extent practicable, as compared to other alternatives, and has tested and documented the sensitivity of the cost estimates for each alternative to risks and changes in key assumptions;

(5) contains minimized and manageable risks as compared to other alternatives;

(6) can be acceptably reconciled with any differences in the conclusions made by the Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation of the Department of Defense in the business case analysis of plutonium pit production capability issued in 2013; and

(7) has documented the assumptions and constraints used in the analysis of alternatives.

(c) **FAILURE TO CERTIFY.**—If the Chairman is unable to submit the certification under subsection (b), the Chairman shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the Administrator written notification describing why the Chairman is unable to make such certification and what steps the Administrator should take to improve the plan of the Administrator to recapitalize plutonium pit production capacity and capability to enable certification.

(d) **ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than 120 days after the date on which the Comptroller General receives the notification under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing containing the assessment of the Comptroller General of the analysis of alternatives conducted by the Administrator to select a preferred alternative for recapitalizing plutonium science and production capabilities.

AMENDMENT NO. 114 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

Add at the end of subtitle B of title XXXI, the following new section:

SEC. 3124. PLAN FOR VERIFICATION, DETECTION, AND MONITORING OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND FISSILE MATERIAL.

(a) **FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(A) A January 2014 Defense Science Board report found that “The nuclear future will not be a linear extrapolation of the past. . . [and] [t]he technologies and processes designed for current treaty verification and inspections are inadequate to future monitoring realities”.

(B) Section 3133 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) required an interagency plan for nuclear monitoring of nuclear weapons and fissile material, and section 3132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) required an update of such plan. In both instances, the reports submitted failed to answer the congressional requirements, and instead provided only a brief summary of the National Security Council structure and processes.

(2) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that verification, detection, and monitoring of nuclear weapons and fissile material should be a priority for national security, and that the reports submitted to date do not reflect this priority, or the current and planned initiatives related to nuclear verification and detection.

(b) **PLAN.**—The President, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall develop a plan for verification and monitoring relating to the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons, components of such weapons, and fissile material.

(c) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan developed under subsection (b) shall include the following:

(1) A plan and road map for verification, detection and monitoring, with respect to policy, operations, and research, development, testing, and evaluation, including—

(A) identifying requirements;

(B) costs and funding requirements over 10 years for such nuclear verification, detection and monitoring; and

(C) identifying and integrating roles, responsibilities, and planning for such nuclear verification, detection and monitoring.

(2) A detailed international engagement plan for building cooperation and transparency, including bilateral and multilateral efforts, to improve inspections, detection, and monitoring.

(3) A detailed description of—

(A) current and planned research and development efforts to improve monitoring, detection, and in-field inspection and analysis capabilities, including persistent surveillance, remote monitoring, and rapid analysis of large data sets, including open-source data; and

(B) measures to coordinate technical and operational requirements early in the process.

(4) Engagement of relevant departments and agencies of the Federal Government and the military departments (including the Open Source Center and the United States Atomic Energy Detection System), national laboratories, industry, and academia.

(d) **DESIGNATION OF DOE.**—The President shall designate the Department of Energy as the lead agency for development of the plan under subsection (b).

(e) **BRIEFING.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator for Nuclear Security, shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees an interim briefing on the plan under subsection (b).

(f) **LIMITATION.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Defense for supporting the Executive Office of the President, \$10,000,000 may not be obligated or expended until the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the plan under subsection (g)(1).

(g) **SUBMISSION.**—

(1) **DEADLINE.**—Not later than April 15, 2018, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the plan developed under subsection (b).

(2) **FORM.**—The plan under subsection (b) shall be transmitted in unclassified form, but, consistent with the protection of intelligence sources and methods, may include a classified annex.

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

(1) The congressional defense committees.
 (2) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(3) The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(4) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(5) The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 115 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 3139. PLAN TO FURTHER MINIMIZE THE USE OF HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM FOR MEDICAL ISOTOPES.

(a) **PLAN.**—The Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall develop and assess a plan, including with respect to the benefits, risks, costs, and opportunities of the plan, to—

(1) take additional actions to promote the wider utilization of molybdenum-99 and technetium-99m produced without the use of highly enriched uranium targets, such as, at a minimum, by—

(A) eliminating the availability of highly enriched uranium for Mo-99 by buying back U.S.-origin highly enriched uranium in raw or target form from global Mo-99 suppliers; and

(B) restricting or placing financial penalties on the import of Mo-99 produced with highly enriched uranium targets;

(2) work with global molybdenum suppliers and regulators to reduce the proliferation hazard from reprocessing waste from medical isotope production containing U.S.-origin highly enriched uranium; and

(3) ensure an adequate supply of molybdenum-99 and technetium-99 at all times, and both assess and mitigate any risks to such supply during a transition to production without the use of highly enriched uranium.

(b) **SUBMISSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than April 1, 2018, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the plan and assessment under subsection (a).

(2) **FORM.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

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

(A) the congressional defense committees;
 (B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(C) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 116 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title XXXV add the following:

SEC. . FOREIGN SPILL PROTECTION.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Foreign Spill Protection Act of 2017”.

(b) **LIABILITY OF OWNERS AND OPERATORS OF FOREIGN FACILITIES.**—

(1) **OIL POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS.**—

(A) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 1001 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2701) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (26)(A)—

(I) in clause (ii), by striking “onshore or offshore facility, any person” and inserting “onshore facility, offshore facility, or foreign offshore unit or other facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, any person or entity”; and

(II) in clause (iii), by striking “offshore facility, the person who” and inserting “offshore facility or foreign offshore unit or other facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, the person or entity that”; and

(ii) in paragraph (32)—

(I) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (F) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively;

(II) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) **FOREIGN FACILITIES.**—In the case of a foreign offshore unit or other facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, any person or other entity owning or operating the facility, and any leaseholder, permit holder, assignee, or holder of a right of use and easement granted under applicable foreign law for the area in which the facility is located.”; and

(III) in subparagraph (G), as so redesignated, by striking “or offshore facility, the persons who” and inserting “, offshore facility, or foreign offshore unit or other facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone, the persons or entities that”.

(B) **ACTIONS ON BEHALF OF FUND.**—Section 1015(c) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2715(c)) is amended, in the third sentence, by adding before the period at the end the following: “or other facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone”.

(2) **FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS.**—Section 311(a)(11) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(a)(11)) is amended—

(A) by striking “and any facility” and inserting “any facility”; and

(B) by inserting “, and, for the purposes of applying subsections (b), (c), (e), and (o), any foreign offshore unit (as defined in section 1001 of the Oil Pollution Act) or any other facility located seaward of the exclusive economic zone” after “public vessel”.

(c) **CONTINUATION PAY.**—For providing continuation pay under section 356 of title 37, United States Code, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the “Retired Pay” account under the heading “Department of Homeland Security—Coast Guard” in the applicable appropriations Acts for the Department of Homeland Security—

(1) \$3,286,277 for fiscal year 2018; and

(2) \$3,713,232 for fiscal year 2019.

AMENDMENT NO. 117 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 12. STRATEGY FOR SYRIA AND IRAQ.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy for Syria and Iraq.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The strategy required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the political and military objectives and end states for Syria and Iraq.

(2) A description of the plan for achieving the political and military objectives and end states for Syria and Iraq, including—

(A) with respect to Syria, a plan for political transition;

(B) with respect to Iraq—

(i) a plan for political reform and reconciliation among ethnic groups and political parties; and

(ii) an assessment of the required future size and structure of the Iraqi Security Forces, including irregular forces; and

(C) a description of the roles and responsibilities of United States allies and partners and other countries in the region in establishing regional stability.

(3) A description of the military conditions that must be met for the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria to be considered defeated.

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

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 118 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 409, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1058. REPORT ON THE NATIONAL BIODEFENSE ANALYSIS AND COUNTERMEASURES CENTER.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2017, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate Congressional committees a report, prepared in consultation with the officials listed in subsection (b), on the National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center (referred to in this section as the “NBACC”) containing the following information:

(1) The functions of the NBACC.

(2) The end users of the NBACC, including those whose assets may be managed by other agencies.

(3) The cost and mission impact for each user identified under paragraph (2) of any potential closure of the NBACC, including an analysis of the functions of the NBACC that cannot be replicated by other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(4) In the case of closure of the NBACC, a transition plan for any essential functions currently performed by the NBACC to ensure mission continuity, including the storage of samples needed for ongoing criminal cases.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—The officials listed in this subsection are the following:

(1) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

(2) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(3) The Attorney General.

(4) The Director of National Intelligence.

(5) As determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the leaders of other offices that utilize the NBACC.

(c) **FORM.**—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(d) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—For purposes of this section, the term “appropriate Congressional Committees” means the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committees on Judiciary of the Senate and the

House of Representatives, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 119 OFFERED BY MRS. COMSTOCK OF VIRGINIA

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

SEC. 16 . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON NEW COMMERCIAL SATELLITE SERVICING ACTIVITIES.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Government funding and support is an important element in fostering the development of a robust marketplace of new commercial satellite servicing activities; and

(2) the Federal Government should ensure that in its actions it does not unduly or artificially distort competition in the market for new commercial satellite servicing activities.

AMENDMENT NO. 120 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON OF OHIO

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

SEC. 12 . PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CONDUCT MILITARY OPERATIONS IN YEMEN.

(a) PROHIBITION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 may be made available to conduct military operations in Yemen.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the following:

(1) Activities carried out in full compliance with the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note).

(2) The provision of humanitarian assistance.

(3) The defense of United States Armed Forces.

(4) Support for freedom of navigation operations.

AMENDMENT NO. 121 OFFERED BY MR. MARINO OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of title VIII (page 323, after line 4), add the following new section:

SEC. 871. REPORT ON SOURCING OF TUNGSTEN AND TUNGSTEN POWDERS FROM DOMESTIC PRODUCERS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the procurement of tungsten and tungsten powders for military applications.

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

(1) An overview of the quantities and countries of origin of tungsten and tungsten powders that are procured by the Department of Defense or prime contractors of the Department for military applications.

(2) An evaluation of the effects on the Department if domestic-produced tungsten and tungsten powders are given priority.

(3) An evaluation of the effects on the Department if tungsten and tungsten powders are required to be procured from only domestic producers.

(4) An estimate of any costs associated with domestic sourcing requirements related to tungsten and tungsten powders.

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 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment No. 80 as en bloc No. 4.

My amendment encourages collaboration between the FAA and DOD on unmanned aircraft systems so that the FAA may leverage the unique capabilities and insights of the DOD. These are important activities as the FAA moves forward with incorporating unmanned systems into the national airspace.

The efforts highlighted in my amendment are already ongoing activities between the FAA and the DOD, but more work needs to be done, as documented in a 2014 joint report to Congress.

The Air Force Research Laboratory located at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, AFRL, in particular, has expertise in these sense-and-avoid technologies. AFRL is planning to conduct unmanned aircraft research activities at Springfield, Ohio's, Air National Guard base in Ohio's Eighth District, upon FAA approval.

I am proud of our airmen and the work conducted at both Springfield and Wright-Patterson and to offer this amendment to help the FAA make good use of the capabilities located there.

I also rise in support of my amendment No. 120 as part of this en bloc package.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DAVIDSON. My amendment is critical for ensuring Congress reclaims its war-making powers by prohibiting funding for U.S. operations in Yemen that are not in compliance with the 2001 AUMF. I am concerned about any U.S. operations in Yemen that are outside the scope of the current AUMF and have no identifiable authorization from Congress.

My amendment is very simple. If the military operation is within the scope of the 2001 AUMF, it is permissible. If it has not been authorized by Congress, then it is not permissible.

I look forward to working with the chairman and my colleagues in the Senate to ensure this provision is adopted in the final NDAA conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this bill. I want to begin by thanking the chairman and all of the members of the committee. As has been noted many times, this is the most bipartisan committee in Congress; and I think, once again, even in difficult circumstances, we have proved that this year. That is, in large part, due to the leadership of Chairman THORNBERRY. I thank him for that.

I also thank our staff, which does an unbelievable job. There are hundreds, if not thousands of amendments, that come at them. They manage that. You see the very few that actually come

through either in committee or on the floor. They work through literally thousands of ideas and do an amazing job, so I really want to thank our staff for their great work.

In particular, I want to thank Vickie Plunkett. This will be her last markup. She is retiring. She has done a fabulous job for our staff. She basically exemplifies everything I just said about how great our staff is, how they work in a bipartisan manner and do a great job to serve our country. So, I thank Vickie for her incredible service to our committee and to the country.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good bill that we should support because, make no mistake about it, what the chairman and many others have said is true: we face a complex threat environment. The U.S. national security is at risk.

I take Mr. NOLAN from Minnesota's point that spending a lot of money on wars that we didn't need to engage in does cost us at home, and that point is valid, but so is the point that we face threats we must confront.

North Korea is testing intercontinental ballistic missiles. It is no doubt that their goal is to develop a nuclear missile, capable of striking the U.S.

Being from the West Coast—and they always say that it could hit Seattle. I don't know why they don't talk about any other city on the West Coast. It could hit a lot of different places. We need to be worried about that. We need to be prepared to stop that.

Russia continues to undermine not just our elections, but democracy itself, across Europe, and even down in the Middle East and Africa. We need to be prepared to confront that.

We face a terrorist threat. 9/11 killed 3,000 people in this country because we weren't ready to prevent it. The groups that supported that attack have not gone away; they have metastasized.

Now, I will completely agree with some of my friends on the left, who think that the terrorism threat is often overblown. I think it is often also a mistake to demonize the Muslim religion. And even though I know some people don't do that, they simply want to confront groups like al-Qaida and ISIS, Steve Bannon, who works right next to the White House, has said that Islam is a totalitarian ideology of subjugation, it is not a religion. He thinks all Muslims are a threat.

To the extent that we adopt a national security policy that views the world that way, we make the problem worse. That is what ISIS wants; that is what al-Qaida wants. They want a clash of civilizations. We should not want that. They have killed more Muslims than any other religion on Earth. Muslims have the biggest stake in this. We must work with them, not against them, to confront that terrorist threat that ISIS and al-Qaida and others present.

On the broader budget issue, as I mentioned a couple of times, the first 6 months of this year, we had a number

of folks in the Pentagon come over and spell out all kinds of nightmare scenarios about every bad thing that could conceivably happen—some of ones that I mentioned, and hundreds of others that I haven't. And I understand that. That is their job. Their job is to worry about what could come at us.

But, past a certain point, that isn't helpful. We need a plan, we need a strategy to confront this, and we need to make choices. That is the one thing that I am still concerned about with this bill. It really doesn't make choices. It continues to spend money in a variety of different places, without a recognition of finite resources and choices that need to be made about how to confront the threats that are most dangerous to us—how to spend that money in the best way possible. That is something that I think we need to work on going forward.

We also have the budget problem that I described. And I won't give the same full speech that I gave before, but I will simplify it and say that there is a consensus in Congress and in the country that we need to balance the budget without raising taxes and without cutting any programs that people might like. That doesn't work. It simply is not possible. It doesn't add up.

That is why we don't have a budget resolution. Any budget resolution that the Republican Congress could put on the floor will fail to meet some of the promises that they, and others, have made. We have got to be honest about that, because this bill, again, is \$72 billion over the budget caps. It is actually \$91 billion over the budget caps, if you add in—well, sorry, \$81 billion over the budget caps, if you add in the money that we took from OCO to put into the base.

So, if we do not raise the budget caps, this goes away and leaves us, once again, in the land of uncertainty for the Department of Defense. We have to make choices on the budget going forward so that we don't leave the Defense Department in the lurch, not knowing how much money that they are going to have. So, we still don't have a budget resolution in front of us.

And, lastly, I do want to point out that the rest of the budget does matter. The chairman and I have had a little bit of an argument about this: we are the Armed Services Committee, we should pay attention to that; you know, don't sacrifice our troops for the sake of domestic—he always says political priorities. That is the one word in his argument that I find not really appropriate.

There is nothing political about it. It is a policy choice. It is basically deciding what domestic priorities are important.

And, make no mistake about it, the discretionary budget is a zero-sum game. I mentioned yesterday the President's budget: a \$54 billion plus-up for defense, and \$54 billion cut from non-defense discretionary. So don't tell me

that one thing doesn't have anything to do with the other.

But even the so-called budget resolution, the budget agreement that the House Republicans have come up with, but have not yet dared to put to a vote, has a \$72 billion plus-up for defense, and a \$5 billion cut for domestic spending. So, again, the two are absolutely connected.

What are we talking about with domestic spending? I won't go through all of it. I will just mention a couple of things.

Yesterday, I mentioned our infrastructure. Bridges are collapsing all across the country. I saw a big story yesterday about how the Memorial Bridge is about to fall down. We have incredible infrastructure needs that lead to the strength of our country that are connected, just like national defense is to the strength of this Nation.

But another example, the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center—it is close to my district, it is in Seattle—is doing incredible research right now, that figured out how to not use chemotherapy but actually go in, take out the white blood cells that aren't working, get them to work, and send them back in to successfully fight cancer. This has worked for blood cancers. They just started studies on lung cancer. But, basically, we could cure cancer, without going through the hell of chemo. The President's budget would cut Fred Hutchinson's funding by over two-thirds.

I don't think curing cancer is a political agenda. That is a very real need that has an incredible impact on the lives of Americans, just like national security. It is like making sure that North Korea doesn't hit us with a nuclear weapon, making sure that terrorist groups don't attack us. Curing cancer, stopping bridges from collapsing, these are priorities.

□ 1015

Because we are not making budget choices, these are priorities that get pushed aside. And if you plus-up defense and take it from nondefense discretionary, then you are having that very real impact.

Now, I am not going to say it has to be dollar for dollar. I think it probably should be, but we can negotiate around that. But to simply gut the nondefense discretionary budget to plus-up defense does not make this country safer.

We heard yesterday, hey, in a time of war, you make domestic sacrifices. And we have all read about World War II, all the domestic sacrifices that were made at that time. I get that.

But you know what else you do in a time of war? Well, you don't cut taxes. You raise them. Prior to 2001, we had never gone to war without raising taxes or issuing war bonds or, basically, asking for more money. But that, of course, we cannot do.

Again, I will say I care enough about the national security of this country, I

would raise taxes to pay for it instead of simply adding to the deficit or stopping the ability of somebody like the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center from finding a cure for cancer. That is the choice that I would make. These choices are not being made in this budget resolution, and I think that places us at risk.

Lastly, the nondefense discretionary budget is the State Department, it is USAID, it is the Department of Homeland Security. If you are going to have a national security strategy, it can't just be the military. And you know who will tell you that more often than anybody? The military. They don't want to bear the entire burden.

General Secretary Mattis had the best quote on this. If you are going to cut diplomacy, if you are going to cut development, you better give me four more divisions because that is how many more wars I am going to have to fight.

So to say we are going to add all this money to defense, and defense is so important, and if you are against it because of other priorities, then you just don't care about the troops, is incredibly disingenuous because all of these other things matter to the national security of this country. And all we are getting out of the majority right now is an effort to plus-up defense at the expense of everything else.

I say an effort because they haven't actually voted on it yet. It hasn't actually happened. And it is more likely than not that this bill—good, though, it is—and the great work that has been done on a number of different policy divisions that don't have anything to do with the money, the good work on acquisition reform to try to make sure we get more for the money that we spend, all of that is in jeopardy because this bill has at least \$72 billion in it over the budget caps that is, more likely than not, not going to be there come October 1 or the end of this year.

So if we don't make the choices on the budget that reflect the priorities of the entire country, that actually reflect the budget numbers, then we are doing a disservice to the men and women who serve our country.

It is a good bill. It is going to be better once we figure out the budget issues and actually start making the choices that are necessary to make us stronger in every aspect of society.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the gentleman from Washington when he expresses his appreciation to the members of our committee. Each one of the 62 members of our committee has contributed to the bill that is here before us today and, as the Chair knows, we have had more amendments considered over the last 3 days than ever before for a National Defense Authorization bill. So Members of the whole body have contributed in many ways.

I also agree with the gentleman that our staff on both sides of the aisle, led by Jenness Simler and Paul Arcangeli, have done a terrific job in helping to manage this process and to shape and guide what has been historic levels of interest by Members on particular provisions.

Mr. Chairman, I think that you would find among our committee virtually, if not unanimous, agreement on two points. One is we live in an increasingly dangerous world. The second one is we have done deep damage to our military because of the budgets cuts, the continuing resolutions, the erratic nature of funding over the last few years.

Certainly, the members of our committee who go out and actually talk to the people who serve have heard, seen, witnessed firsthand airplanes that can't fly, ships that can't sail, training that has not gone on, movers—we are trying to save money for the military, so we are hiring cut-rate movers, and members of the military are experiencing incredible damage to their household goods as they are shuffled about from place to place involuntarily. Sometimes there are movers with criminal records who can't actually get on the military base they are supposed to be delivering to. I mean, just example after example of how these cuts have affected the men and women who serve.

And as Secretary Mattis says, the only reason we are doing so well around the world is because they have sucked it up and borne the burden. Deep damage that this bill starts to reverse.

I appreciate all the Members who support fixing our planes, getting the training, having ships that sail, better missile defense, all the things that are in this bill.

I am not going to engage in a detailed discussion about the budget. The gentleman and I discuss this frequently.

I would just say, Mr. Chairman, I believe the first obligation of the Federal Government is to defend the country. Article I, section 8 says that Congress has the power and the responsibility to raise and support armies, provide and maintain navies, provide the rules and regulations for the military forces of the United States. That is our job, and I think that is our first job.

So I agree that some of the cuts that have been proposed in other domestic programs, discretionary programs, are inappropriate, and we ought to evaluate each of them on their merits. And that continues to be my point when it comes to defense.

We evaluate our obligations to the country and to the men and women who serve, based on the merits of this argument. We don't tie it to other domestic programs. We do not say we are only going to increase defense to fix our planes if we can increase the EPA an equal amount. We don't tie it to other things.

The obligations to the men and women who risk their lives stand on their own, and that, at least in my view, is our first obligation.

Now, when we start talking about budgets, we get into all sorts of conversations about how mandatory spending is really where more than two-thirds of the budget is; how that is what has been growing; how defense is down to about 16 percent of the budget, and as it has been shrinking, the deficit has been going up. Obviously, defense is not the cause when it comes to deficits.

We can also, when we talk about tax, start talking about economic growth and this lackluster growth that the economy has suffered, at least over the last 8 years, and the need to get things going to help with the deficit.

Lots of issues to discuss, but the issue before us today is how we fulfill our responsibilities to the men and women who serve and to the country that is relying on us to protect them from missiles, to help protect them from terrorist attacks, to support the men and women who are actually performing those missions.

I think this bill advances that cause. A number of Members on both sides of the aisle have contributed to it. I think and hope it deserves the support of most all Members of the House, and I urge support for this en bloc package.

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, as we prepare to vote on the final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act I am extremely concerned about the lack of discussion and debate on the issue of Russia.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have heard from the leaders of our military and there is no question about the threat Russia poses to our national security.

It is alarming to me that a number of amendments, which purpose was to gain better situational awareness on various Russian activities, were not debated on the floor this week.

Despite the fact that Russia has continuously attacked and interfered with our country's democratic process, while continuing to threaten the democracy and sovereignty of other states, this body has decided to avoid a robust discussion on the concerning actions of Russia.

Mr. Chair, it is obvious that we have not adequately addressed the threat Russia poses to our nation.

Reasonable amendments like mine that would have assessed Russia's disinformation and propaganda activities along with its support for separatist activities were not made in order. Mr. Chair, why would we not want more information on these concerning activities?

My amendment would have also assessed the suppressive democratic conditions in Russia. Is this body no longer concerned about human rights?

I believe it is the responsibility of Congress to fully understand and assess the threats other countries pose on our national security.

I have no doubt that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will agree with me that Russia has demonstrated to be a threat to the

security of our nation. As such why aren't we doing more to address this threat?

Mr. Chair, this Congress needs to have a discussion on how we can most effectively combat the aggressive actions of Russia, and it is disappointing that we were unable to do this during the consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to cut waste and strengthen our military installations.

This amendment would require the Department of Defense to ensure that there is not usable space available on a military installation before entering into expensive leases or purchasing additional property.

To put this into context, you wouldn't lease space in a parking lot if you already had room in your own garage to park your car.

This amendment is needed because, while asking for another round of base realignments and closures, the Department of Defense leased more than 6,000 buildings in fiscal year 2015 instead of using available space that it already owns.

That sounds like a waste to me.

My Congressional district is home to the Rock Island Arsenal, and we're proud to have it as part of our community.

It houses the Army's only remaining foundry and employs more than 6,000 hardworking people.

But like many of our military installations, it has room for more.

We should be using facilities like the Arsenal to their full potential, especially when it means we can reduce overall costs.

That's why I'm offering this amendment today.

I want to thank my bipartisan cosponsors Congressmen PAUL GOSAR, DAVE LOEBSACK and WALTER JONES for their support of this amendment.

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.

AMENDMENT NO. 122 OFFERED BY MS. TENNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 122 printed in House Report 115-217.

Ms. TENNEY. 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 VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 860A. ADDITION OF DOMESTICALLY PRODUCED STAINLESS STEEL FLATWARE TO THE BERRY AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2533a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) Stainless steel flatware.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2533a(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to contracts entered into after the date occurring one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chairman, my constituents are discouraged. They are fed up with political elites who have failed to represent them, and with special interest groups who, too often, put impractical dogma before practical policy.

In the Rust Belt region I represent in upstate New York, the impact of this has been devastating: devastating job losses, economic stagnation, and the massive out-migration of people and jobs, the largest in the Nation.

In my district, Mr. Chairman, decline has bred despair, which has spurred a host of other problems. In light of all this, I was elected to Congress with a strong mission to reverse the tide and to revitalize our upstate communities to the greatness and innovation they once experienced.

I am the voice for my constituents who have been left behind, and I am fighting to bring my district back on path toward individual prosperity and economic revival.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment uniquely achieves both. There is nothing new or groundbreaking about my amendment. Simply put, it reinstates a domestic sourcing provision for stainless steel flatware that was in law for 30 years without issue. My amendment adds stainless steel flatware back into the Berry amendment.

For 30 years, American-made flatware was covered under Berry. However, the provision was removed in 2006 after Oneida Limited, the only Berry-compliant manufacturer, ceased domestic operations.

In the void left by Oneida's departure came Sherrill Manufacturing, a company in my district that, since 2008, has produced 100 percent American-made flatware. And since 2008, Sherrill has been among the top providers of flatware to the Department of Defense and GSA, fulfilling more than \$6.8 million in Federal contracts over an 8-year period.

All these products are being produced in the formerly closed factory using refurbished Oneida Limited equipment, and also providing jobs for many of the same employees who lost their jobs from Oneida's closure after decades of service to that same closed factory. In fact, GSA has repeatedly found Sherrill's flatware to be offered at fair and reasonable prices, which is why the agency already purchases flatware from Sherrill, independent of any domestic sourcing requirement.

Some domestic sourcing requirements may raise costs. No evidence has been submitted to support the claim that my amendment will do that. This alone should allay any concerns that taxpayers would be on the hook for overly expensive flatware, should my amendment be adopted. But if it isn't enough, then there is this:

My amendment retains all existing waivers under Berry, which means that, if Sherrill's flatware becomes too

expensive or is of poor quality or insufficient quality, the DOD can find other sources.

Ultimately, Mr. Chairman, whenever we can create domestic sourcing opportunities that reduce our military's dependence on imported goods and strengthen domestic supply chains without significantly raising procurement costs, we should. And this is what my amendment does.

Reinstating the Berry amendment's domestic sourcing requirement represents a clear continuity in Federal procurement policy, not a stark divergence. As I said, this provision was in effect for 30 years.

Thus far, there is one Berry-compliant manufacturer that happens to be in my district and there should not be a problem with that, as we hope many more producers return to the United States, where their businesses were founded to provide robust competition.

I also support this amendment for the simple reason that it is good policy. It gives a leg up to a robust domestic supply chain that spans five States while reducing our military's logistical dependence on imports.

Moreover, for the 30-year history of the Berry amendment's flatware provision, there was only ever one domestic producer. Under the Berry amendment, this is all that is required. And in Sherrill's case, we know it is a producer that has a track record of offering flatware at market rates.

Mr. Chairman, in districts like mine across the country that have rusted-out factories that line the landscapes of far too many of my communities, today we have an opportunity to fix this problem and restore the once great Empire State and our Nation to the manufacturing strength it once enjoyed. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan measure.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), my colleague, for some comments.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and I want to make one thing perfectly clear. American taxpayers want their tax dollars to go to putting Americans to work. This amendment means buy American and hire American. So I just want everyone to be clear. We hear a lot about Buy American, Hire American. This is what this amendment would do, and I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I have tremendous respect and admiration for the gentlewoman from New York and her efforts to represent her district, her people,

and try to make life better. It kind of relates to some of the conversations Mr. SMITH and I were just having about tax policy, about industrial policy, about regulations, about how we have, in this country, become less competitive internationally than we should.

However, I must oppose this amendment because the bottom line is that it is not a matter of national security where the DOD buys its knives, forks, and spoons.

□ 1030

If Members needed further evidence of the wide range of issues which we deal with in the National Defense Authorization Act, this bill is a key example.

I think the gentlewoman accurately described the history. The Berry amendment was passed in 1940 to make sure that food and textiles were procured from the United States to support our military efforts.

In the 1970s, they put in a specialty metals provision, and attached to that was a comma that said "including flatware." So then it turned out there wasn't anybody here at home that made flatware because of these international competitive issues, and DOD came to us more than a decade ago and said, "Would you please get rid of that portion of the Berry amendment?" and we did.

Now the question is: Are we going to start adding back specific sorts of items which DOD may buy and say you can only buy it from one place, whether or not it is critical to our country's national security?

Now, the gentlewoman mentioned that GSA is buying some spoons and knives and so forth from this manufacturer, and that is great. If we do, I hope that happens, and I hope more jobs come to her district. But to put into Federal law that the only place the Department of Defense can buy its knives and forks and spoons is from this one company, I think, starts to get us into micromanagement of industries and takes us away from the focus of this bill, which should be the troops, what is the best thing for them.

So with all my admiration for the gentlewoman, I oppose this amendment. We cannot go down the road of adding category after category after category of items to help our districts at the expense of our troops and the best use of dollars when it is not a matter of vital national security. I just don't think that the knives and forks we use qualify as vital national security.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

The amendment was rejected.

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. 13 by Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 17 by Mr. BYRNE of Alabama.

Amendment No. 18 by Mr. HUNTER of California.

Amendment No. 43 by Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. FRANKS OF ARIZONA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 217, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 372]

AYES—208

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

Palazzo	Ross
Palmer	Rothfus
Pearce	Rouzer
Perry	Royce (CA)
Pittenger	Rutherford
Poe (TX)	Schweikert
Poliquin	Scott, Austin
Posey	Sensenbrenner
Ratcliffe	Sessions
Reed	Shimkus
Renacci	Shuster
Rice (SC)	Simpson
Roby	Smith (MO)
Roe (TN)	Smith (NE)
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)
Rohrabacher	Smucker
Rokita	Stefanik
Rooney, Francis	Stewart
Rooney, Thomas J.	Taylor
Roskam	Tenney
	Thompson (PA)

NOES—217

Adams	Gallego
Aguilar	Garamendi
Amash	Gomez
Barragán	Gonzalez (TX)
Bass	Gottheimer
Beatty	Green, Al
Bera	Green, Gene
Beyer	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez
Blumenauer	Hanabusa
Blunt Rochester	Hastings
Bonamici	Heck
Boyle, Brendan F.	Higgins (NY)
Brady (PA)	Hill
Brown (MD)	Himes
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer
Buchanan	Huffman
Bustos	Jackson Lee
Butterfield	Jayapal
Capuano	Jeffries
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN)	Joyce (OH)
Cartwright	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Katko
Castro (TX)	Keating
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)
Ciциlline	Kennedy
Clark (MA)	Khanna
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen
Clay	Kildee
Clyburn	Kilmer
Cohen	Kind
Collins (NY)	Krishnamoorthi
Comstock	Kuster (NH)
Connolly	Langevin
Conyers	Larsen (WA)
Cooper	Larson (CT)
Correa	Lawrence
Costa	Lawson (FL)
Costello (PA)	Lee
Courtney	Levin
Crist	Lewis (GA)
Crowley	Lewis (MN)
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted
Curbelo (FL)	Lipinski
Curbelo (CA)	LoBiondo
Davis, Danny	Loeb
DeFazio	Lofgren
DeGette	Lowenthal
Delaney	Lowe
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham,
DelBene	M.
Demings	Lujan, Ben Ray
Dent	Lynch
DeSaulnier	Maloney,
Deutch	Carolyn B.
Dingell	Maloney, Sean
Doggett	Matsui
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum
Ellison	McEachin
Engel	McGovern
Eshoo	McNerney
Españalat	Meehan
Esty (CT)	Meng
Evans	Moore
Faso	Moulton
Fitzpatrick	Murphy (FL)
Foster	Nadler
Frankel (FL)	Neal
Fudge	Newhouse
Gabbard	Nolan
	Norcross
	O'Halleran

Thornberry	Tiberi
Tipton	Tipton
Valadao	Valadao
Wagner	Wagner
Walberg	Walberg
Walker	Walker
Walorski	Walorski
Walters, Mimi	Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)	Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)	Webster (FL)
Wenstrup	Wenstrup
Westerman	Westerman
Williams	Williams
Wilson (SC)	Wilson (SC)
Wittman	Wittman
Womack	Womack
Woodall	Woodall
Yoder	Yoder
Yoho	Yoho
Young (IA)	Young (IA)
Zeldin	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Bilirakis	Jones	Napolitano
Cleaver	Labrador	Scalise
Cummings	Meeks	

□ 1057

Messrs. THOMPSON of Mississippi, VARGAS, Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. NEWHOUSE, TROTT, FITZPATRICK, PETERSON, Mrs. TORRES, Messrs. FASO, and LANGEVIN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California changed her vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) 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 235, noes 189, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 373]

AYES—235

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

McCarthy Rice (SC) Stefanik
 McCaul Roby Stewart
 McClintock Roe (TN) Stevens
 McHenry Rogers (AL) Taylor
 McKinley Rogers (KY) Tenney
 McMorris Rohrabacher Thompson (PA)
 Rodgers Rokita Thornberry
 McSally Rooney, Francis Tiberi
 Meadows Rooney, Thomas Tipton
 Meehan J. Trott
 Messer Ros-Lehtinen Turner
 Mitchell Roskam Upton
 Moolenaar Ross Valadao
 Mooney (WV) Rothfus Wagner
 Mullin Rouzer Walberg
 Murphy (PA) Royce (CA) Walden
 Newhouse Ruiz Walker
 Noem Ruppertsberger Walorski
 Norman Russell Walters, Mimi
 Nunes Rutherford Weber (TX)
 Olson Schweikert Webster (FL)
 Palazzo Scott, Austin Wenstrup
 Palmer Sensenbrenner Westerman
 Paulsen Sessions Williams
 Paulsen Shimkus Wilson (SC)
 Perry Shuster Wittman
 Pittenger Simpson Womack
 Poe (TX) Sinema Woodall
 Poliquin Sinema Woodall
 Posey Smith (MO) Yoder
 Ratcliffe Smith (NE) Yoho
 Reed Smith (NJ) Young (AK)
 Reichert Smith (TX) Young (IA)
 Renacci Smucker Zeldin

NOES—189

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

Walz Waters, Maxine Wilson (FL)
 Wasserman Watson Coleman Yarmuth
 Schultz Welch
 NOT VOTING—9
 Bilirakis Jones
 Cleaver Labrador Meeks
 Cummings Lamborn Napolitano
 Scalise

□ 1101

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

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the ayes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 244, noes 181,
 not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 374]

AYES—244

Abraham DesJarlais Jackson Lee
 Aderholt Deutch Jenkins (KS)
 Allen Diaz-Balart Jenkins (WV)
 Amash Donovan Johnson (LA)
 Amodei Duffy Johnson (OH)
 Arrington Duncan (SC) Johnson, E. B.
 Babin Duncan (TN) Johnson, Sam
 Bacon Dunn Jordan
 Banks (IN) Emmer Kelly (MS)
 Barletta Estes (KS) Kelly (PA)
 Barr Farenthold King (IA)
 Barton King (NY) King (NY)
 Bergman Ferguson Kinzinger
 Biggs Fleischmann Knight
 Bishop (MI) Flores Kuster (NH)
 Bishop (UT) Fortenberry Kustoff (TN)
 Black Foxx LaHood
 Blackburn Frankel (FL) LaMalfa
 Blum Franks (AZ) Lamborn
 Bost Frelinghuysen Lance
 Brady (TX) Gaetz Latta
 Brat Gallagher Lewis (MN)
 Bridenstine Garamendi LoBiondo
 Brooks (AL) Garrett Long
 Brooks (IN) Gianforte Loudermilk
 Buchanan Gibbs Love
 Buck Gohmert Lucas
 Bucshon Goodlatte Luetkemeyer
 Budd Gosar MacArthur
 Burgess Gowdy Marchant
 Byrne Granger Marino
 Calvert Graves (GA) Marshall
 Carter (GA) Graves (LA) Marshall
 Carter (TX) Graves (MO) Mastie
 Castor (FL) Griffith McCarthy
 Chabot Grothman McCaul
 Cheney Guthrie McClintock
 Coffman Handl McHenry
 Cole Harper McKinley
 Collins (GA) Harris McMorris
 Collins (NY) Hartzer Rodgers
 Comer Hastings Sallie
 Comstock Hensarling Meadows
 Conaway Herrera Beutler Meehan
 Cook Hice, Jody B. Messer
 Costello (PA) Higgins (LA) Mitchell
 Cramer Hill Moolenaar
 Crawford Holding Mooney (WV)
 Culberson Hollingsworth Mullin
 Curbelo (FL) Hudson Murphy (FL)
 Davidson Huizenga Newhouse
 Davis, Rodney Hultgren Noem
 Denham Hunter Norman
 Dent Hurd Nunes
 DeSantis Issa Olson

Palazzo Royce (CA) Upton
 Palmer Russell Valadao
 Paulsen Rutherford Vargas
 Pearce Sanford Vela
 Perry Schweikert Wagner
 Pittenger Scott, Austin Walberg
 Poe (TX) Sessions Walden
 Poliquin Shea-Porter Walker
 Posey Shimkus Walorski
 Ratcliffe Shuster Walters, Mimi
 Reed Simpson Wasserman
 Reichert Smith (MO) Schultz
 Renacci Smith (NE) Weber (TX)
 Rice (SC) Smith (TX) Webster (FL)
 Roby Smucker Wenstrup
 Roe (TN) Soto Westerman
 Rogers (AL) Stefanik Williams
 Rogers (KY) Stewart Wilson (SC)
 Rohrabacher Stivers Wittman
 Rokita Taylor Womack
 Rooney, Francis Tenney Thompson (MS)
 Rooney, Thomas Thompson (PA)
 J. Thornberry
 Ros-Lehtinen Tiberi Yoho
 Roskam Tipton Young (AK)
 Ross Rothfus Young (IA)
 Rouzer Turner Zeldin

NOES—181

Adams Gabbard Nolan
 Aguilar Gallego Norcross
 Barragán Gomez O'Halleran
 Bass Gonzalez (TX) O'Rourke
 Beatty Gottheimer Pallone
 Bera Green, Al Panetta
 Beyer Green, Gene Pascrell
 Bishop (GA) Grijalva Payne
 Blumenauer Gutiérrez Peltosi
 Blunt Rochester Hanabusa Perlmutter
 Bonamici Heck Peters
 Boyle, Brendan Higgins (NY) Peterson
 F. Himes Pingree
 Brady (PA) Hoyer Pocan
 Brown (MD) Huffman Polis
 Brownley (CA) Jayapal Price (NC)
 Bustos Jeffries Quigley
 Butterfield Johnson (GA) Raskin
 Capuano Joyce (OH) Rice (NY)
 Carbajal Kaptur Richmond
 Cárdenas Katko Rosen
 Carson (IN) Keating Roybal-Allard
 Cartwright Kelly (IL) Ruiz
 Castro (TX) Kennedy Ruppertsberger
 Chu, Judy Khanna Rush
 Cicilline Cicilline Kihuen
 Clark (MA) Kildee Ryan (OH)
 Clarke (NY) Kilmer Sánchez
 Clay Kihuen Sarbanes
 Clyburn Kildee Schakowsky
 Cohen Kilmer Schiff
 Connolly Kind Schneider
 Conyers Krishnamoorthi Schrader
 Cooper Kuster (NH) Scott (VA)
 Correa Langevin Scott, David
 Costa Larsen (WA) Sensenbrenner
 Courtney Larson (CT) Lee
 Crist Lawrence Levin Sewell (AL)
 Crowley Lawson (FL) Lewis (GA)
 Cuellar Lieu, Ted Sherman
 Davis (CA) Crowley Lipinski Sinema
 Davis, Danny Davis (CA) Loeb sack Sires
 DeFazio Davis, Danny Lofgren Slaughter
 DeGette DeFazio Lowenthal Smith (NJ)
 Delaney DeFazio Lowey Smith (WA)
 DeLauro Lujan Grisham,
 DelBene M. Suozzi
 Demings Luján, Ben Ray Swalwell (CA)
 DeSaulnier Lynch Takano
 Dingell Maloney, Carolyn B. Thompson (CA)
 Doggett Dingell Titus
 Doyle, Michael Carolyn B. Tonko
 F. Maloney, Sean Torres
 Ellison Matsui Tsongas
 Engel McCollum Veasey
 Eshoo McEachin Velázquez
 Espallat McGovern Vargas
 Esty (CT) McNerney Vela
 Evans Meng Visclosky

NOT VOTING—8

Bilirakis Jones Napolitano
 Cleaver Labrador Scalise
 Cummings Meeks

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1105

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 234, noes 190,
not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 375]

AYES—234

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

Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
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

□ 1108

Ms. PELOSI changed her vote from
“aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr.
MCGOVERN) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0,
not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

AYES—424

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
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
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
Kilhue
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal

Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
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
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
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

Abraham	Cheney	Español
Adams	Chu, Judy	Estes (KS)
Aderholt	Cicilline	Esty (CT)
Aguilar	Clark (MA)	Evans
Allen	Clarke (NY)	Farenthold
Amash	Clay	Faso
Amodei	Clyburn	Ferguson
Arrington	Coffman	Fitzpatrick
Babin	Cohen	Fleischmann
Bacon	Cole	Flores
Banks (IN)	Collins (GA)	Fortenberry
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Foster
Barr	Comer	Foxx
Barragán	Comstock	Frankel (FL)
Barton	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Bass	Connolly	Frelinghuysen
Beatty	Conyers	Fudge
Bera	Cook	Gabbard
Bergman	Cooper	Gaetz
Beyer	Correa	Gallagher
Biggs	Costa	Gallo
Bishop (GA)	Costello (PA)	Garamendi
Bishop (MI)	Courtney	Garrett
Bishop (UT)	Cramer	Gianforte
Black	Crawford	Gibbs
Blackburn	Crist	Gohmert
Blum	Crowley	Gomez
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Gonzalez (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Culberson	Goodlatte
Bonamici	Curbelo (FL)	Gosar
Bost	Davidson	Gottheimer
Boyle, Brendan F.	Davis (CA)	Gowdy
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Granger
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Graves (LA)
Brat	DeFazio	Graves (MO)
Bridenstine	DeGette	Green, Al
Brooks (AL)	Delaney	Green, Gene
Brooks (IN)	DeLauro	Griffith
Brown (MD)	DelBene	Grijalva
Brownley (CA)	Demings	Grothman
Buchanan	Denham	Guthrie
Buck	Dent	Gutiérrez
Bucshon	DeSantis	Hanabusa
Budd	DeSaulnier	Handel
Burgess	DesJarlais	Harper
Bustos	Deutch	Harris
Butterfield	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Byrne	Dingell	Hastings
Calvert	Doggett	Heck
Capuano	Donovan	Hensarling
Carbajal	Doyle, Michael F.	Herrera Beutler
Cárdenas	Duffy	Hice, Jody B.
Carson (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Higgins (LA)
Carter (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Higgins (NY)
Carter (TX)	Dunn	Hill
Cartwright	Ellison	Himes
Castor (FL)	Emmer	Holding
Castro (TX)	Engel	Hollingsworth
Chabot	Eshoo	Hoyer
		Hudson

NOT VOTING—9

Bilirakis
Cleaver
Cummings

Jones
Labrador
Meeks

Napolitano
Perlmutter
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Huffman	McKinley	Schakowsky
Huizenga	McMorris	Schiff
Hultgren	Rodgers	Schneider
Hunter	McNerney	Schrader
Hurd	McSally	Schweikert
Issa	Meadows	Scott (VA)
Jackson Lee	Meehan	Scott, Austin
Jayapal	Meng	Scott, David
Jeffries	Messer	Sensenbrenner
Jenkins (KS)	Mitchell	Serrano
Jenkins (WV)	Moolenaar	Sessions
Johnson (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Sewell (AL)
Johnson (LA)	Moore	Shea-Porter
Johnson (OH)	Moulton	Sherman
Johnson, E. B.	Mullin	Shimkus
Johnson, Sam	Murphy (FL)	Shuster
Jordan	Murphy (PA)	Simpson
Joyce (OH)	Nadler	Sinema
Kaptur	Neal	Sires
Katko	Newhouse	Slaughter
Keating	Noem	Smith (MO)
Kelly (IL)	Nolan	Smith (NE)
Kelly (MS)	Norcross	Smith (NJ)
Kelly (PA)	Norman	Smith (TX)
Kennedy	Nunes	Smith (WA)
Khanna	O'Halleran	Smucker
Kihuen	O'Rourke	Soto
Kildee	Olson	Speier
Kilmer	Palazzo	Stefanik
Kind	Pallone	Stewart
King (IA)	Palmer	Stivers
King (NY)	Panetta	Suozi
Kinzinger	Pascrell	Swalwell (CA)
Knight	Paulsen	Takano
Krishnamoorthi	Payne	Taylor
Kuster (NH)	Pearce	Tenney
Kustoff (TN)	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
LaHood	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
LaMalfa	Perry	Thompson (PA)
Lamborn	Peters	Thornberry
Lance	Peterson	Tiberi
Langevin	Pingree	Tipton
Larsen (WA)	Pittenger	Titus
Larson (CT)	Pocan	Tonko
Latta	Poe (TX)	Torres
Lawrence	Poliquin	Trott
Lawson (FL)	Polis	Tsongas
Lee	Posey	Turner
Levin	Price (NC)	Upton
Lewis (GA)	Quigley	Valadao
Lewis (MN)	Raskin	Vargas
Lieu, Ted	Ratcliffe	Veasey
Lipinski	Reed	Vela
LoBiondo	Reichert	Velázquez
Loebsock	Renacci	Visclosky
Lofgren	Rice (NY)	Wagner
Long	Rice (SC)	Walberg
Loudermilk	Richmond	Walden
Love	Roby	Walker
Lowenthal	Roe (TN)	Walorski
Lowey	Rogers (AL)	Walters, Mimi
Lucas	Rogers (KY)	Walz
Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher	Wasserman
Lujan Grisham,	Rokita	Schultz
M.	Rooney, Francis	
Luján, Ben Ray	Rooney, Thomas	Waters, Maxine
Lynch	J.	Watson Coleman
MacArthur	Ros-Lehtinen	Weber (TX)
Maloney,	Rosen	Webster (FL)
Carolyn B.	Roskam	Welch
Maloney, Sean	Ross	Wenstrup
Marchant	Rothfus	Westerman
Marino	Rouzer	Williams
Marshall	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)
Massie	Royce (CA)	Wilson (SC)
Mast	Ruiz	Wittman
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Womack
McCarthy	Rush	Woodall
McCaul	Russell	Yarmuth
McClintock	Rutherford	Yoder
McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Yoho
McEachin	Sánchez	Young (AK)
McGovern	Sanford	Young (IA)
McHenry	Sarbanes	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—9

Bilirakis	Graves (GA)	Meeks
Cleaver	Jones	Napolitano
Cummings	Labrador	Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1112

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

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

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 440, he reported the bill, as amended by House Resolution 431, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico moves to recommit H.R. 2810 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of subtitle D of title X, insert the following new section 1039:

SEC. 1039. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDING OF A BORDER WALL.

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 used to plan, develop, or construct any barriers, including walls or fences, along the international border of the United States.

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

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

The National Defense Authorization Act has passed Congress 56 years in a

row, and that is a testament to the collaborative, bipartisan work the Armed Services Committee has done to support our troops who put themselves in harm's way every single day to defend our country.

This year, the House Armed Services Committee adopted an amendment introduced by Congressman GALLEGRO to ensure that none of the funds meant to support our troops and safeguard our Nation's security can be used for building President Trump's border wall.

The amendment was debated, amended, and ultimately adopted without objection by every single member of the Armed Services Committee.

If you ask the people who know the border the best, whether it is companies, lawmakers, border communities, trade groups, economists, or law enforcement officials—both Republicans and Democrats—most agree that building a wall is unnecessary, impractical, ineffective, and, frankly, a complete waste of time and taxpayer money.

Furthermore, the United States already maintains approximately 650 miles of border fence in areas that most effectively stop the unauthorized entry of people, vehicles, drugs, arms, and other illicit items.

Instead of a costly border wall between the U.S. and Mexico, the Armed Services Committee chose to fully fund military healthcare, raise the pay of military personnel, and improve our Nation's cybersecurity.

They agreed that President Trump's ongoing effort to build a wall is wasteful and has absolutely nothing to do with advancing U.S. national security interests.

I want to emphasize that this amendment incorporated both Democratic and Republican ideas, and passed unanimously in a bipartisan manner. But late Tuesday night, House Republican leadership stripped Congressman GALLEGRO's amendment from the NDAA with the use of a glaringly undemocratic, procedural gimmick to help Trump fulfill his campaign promise.

Republican leadership's actions to unilaterally open the door for funding the wall through the use of this defense bill is an insult to every single member of the Armed Services Committee, to our democratic principles, and to the spirit of bipartisanship.

They chose to undermine the unanimous judgment of the Armed Services Committee without the courage to test their proposal with a vote or even a debate on the floor.

You may hear my colleague on the other side of the aisle claim that prohibiting the construction of the wall doesn't fall within the jurisdiction of the Defense Department. However, I am not sure why the 8 members of the Rules Committee believe that they are more qualified to judge what should be included in the NDAA than the 61 members of the Armed Services Committee or the 435 Members of this deliberative body as a whole.

Further, I am not sure why the Rules Committee thought that a discriminatory amendment preventing the Department of Defense from providing medically necessary healthcare services to transgendered military personnel was more appropriate for debate than preventing Trump from usurping funds intended for our troops.

You may also hear that my Republican colleagues claim that President Trump can't use any funds in the NDAA to start construction of the wall anyway. But that is not true. Under title 10, the Secretary of Defense could transfer funding for that purpose this afternoon if he wanted, all without approval of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the only way this body can guarantee that Trump cannot use Department of Defense funds to construct the border wall is to put that prohibition in the bill explicitly. The only way we can do that is by passing my motion to recommit to restore Congressman GALLEGOS's bipartisan amendment in the bill and ensure that our troops are not robbed to pay for a border wall.

But I want to be clear: the adoption of this amendment will not prevent passage of the underlying bill. If the amendment is adopted, it will be incorporated into the bill and the bill will immediately be voted upon.

We all have an opportunity to stand united to support our Nation's servicemembers and to protect hard-earned taxpayer dollars from the President's political pipe dream.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this is a procedural motion that, in my view, should be rejected.

We could spend all day and night arguing provisions that prohibit what is not in the bill. There is nothing in this bill that authorizes a border wall. The focus of the bill is the men and women who serve our Nation in the military and the national security of the United States. And that is what I want to take a moment to talk about.

I would suggest that all of us think back just to the events of the last 10 days. On July 4, North Korea launched what most observers believe is an intercontinental ballistic missile capable of reaching parts of the United States. And we know they already have nuclear weapons.

On July 9, Iraqi Prime Minister al-Abadi went into Mosul to celebrate the ousting of ISIS with U.S. advisers, U.S. airpower, and U.S. intelligence.

Also, this week, the Chinese navy conducted drills in the Mediterranean on their way to conduct joint exercises with the Russians in the Balkans.

This is just a taste of the world we live in, and there are provisions in this

bill that address every one of these incidents, from more missile defense to getting more ships in the water faster and cheaper, to supporting our efforts against ISIS, al-Qaida, and terrorist groups.

But there is another event this week that I hope we all keep in mind. On Monday, July 10, a KC-130 crashed on its way across the country, resulting in the death of 15 marines and one sailor. We do not know what caused this crash, but the early evidence indicates that there was a catastrophic failure when it was cruising at altitude.

It will be fully investigated. But in the meantime, I think we always have to remember that, even on routine training missions, even on routine deployments, the men and women who serve are risking their lives for us. We owe them the best equipment, in the best shape, with the best training that our Nation can provide. Unfortunately, that is not what they have been getting.

This year, our committee has heard testimony that, under the budget caps, the Army is outranged, outgunned, and outdated. More than half the Navy aircraft cannot fly. More than half the planes in the Air Force qualify for an antique license in the State of Virginia. More than half the planes the Navy has can't fly. Unfortunately, accident rates are going up.

Sometimes I have heard the argument that: Well, we are not going to give them any more money until they can pass an audit or they can do this and that or the other thing.

But as everybody rushes out to get on their airplanes, just think about this: What if the board of directors of your airline decided that they are not going to spend any more money repairing planes until there is a bookkeeping problem solved in headquarters?

Yet that is exactly what we have been doing to our military. We have not been giving them the planes and other equipment in good repair.

Every year for 55 straight years, Congresses and Presidents of both parties have passed into law a National Defense Authorization Act. There is a lot of credit to go around, including the Members on both sides of this aisle who have contributed to this product. I am very grateful for what they have done. But what I am really grateful for are the men and women who serve and inspire us, the men and women who are counting on us.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say, whatever our differences on other issues, which we will have time to debate in another time and place, whatever our differences about what is in or not in this bill, we need to put those differences aside and continue to support the men and women who serve and defend us. Let's not let them down.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was 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 passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 235, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

AYES—190

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

NOES—235

Abraham	Amash	Babin
Aderholt	Amodei	Bacon
Allen	Arrington	Banks (IN)

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

NOT VOTING—8

Bilirakis	Jones	Napolitano
Cleaver	Labrador	Scalise
Cummings	Meeks	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1132

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on July 12 through 14, 2017. I regrettably had to attend and preside over the

funeral of a good friend and civic leader in Kansas City.

Had I been present I would have voted as follows on H.R. 23:

“Yes” on rollcall 351 On Motion to Recommit with Instructions: Gaining Responsibility on Water Act

“No” on rollcall 352 On Passage: Gaining Responsibility on Water Act

“No” on rollcall 353 Motion to Adjourn

“No” on rollcall 354 On ordering the Previous Question

“No” on rollcall 355 On Agreeing to the Resolution H. Res. 440

For H.R. 2810 Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

“No” on rollcall 356 Conaway Amendment 2

“No” on rollcall 357 Polis, Lee Amendment

“Yes” on rollcall 358 Jayapal/Pocan Amendment 5

“Yes” on rollcall 359 Nadler Amendment 6

“Yes” on rollcall 360 Blumenauer Amendment 8

“Yes” on rollcall 361 Aguilar Amendment 10

“No” on rollcall 362 Rogers (AL) Amendment 88

“Yes” on rollcall 363 Garamendi Amendment 12

“Yes” on rollcall 364 Blumenauer Amendment 13

“No” on rollcall 365 McClintock Amendment 14

“Yes” on rollcall 366 Garamendi/Hunter amendment 1

“No” on rollcall 367 Buck amendment 3

“No” on rollcall 368 Buck/Perry amendment 4

“No” on rollcall 369 Hartzler amendment 10

“No” on rollcall 370 Gosar amendment 5

“Yes” on rollcall 371 Rooney, Murphy amendment 6

“No” on rollcall 372 Franks Amendment 13

“No” on rollcall 373 Lamborn Amendment 15

“No” on rollcall 374 Frankel, Byrne Amendment 17

“No” on rollcall 375 Hunter, Wilson Amendment 18

“Yes” on rollcall 376 McGovern, Emmer Amendment 43

“Yes” on rollcall 377 Motion to Recommit H.R. 2810

“Yes” on rollcall 378 Final Passage of H.R. 2810

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, because of a funeral of a family member, I was not present on Friday, July 14, for votes during National Defense Authorization Act of 2017. Had I been here I would have voted in the following manner.

Rollcall Vote 372—“Yea”

Rollcall Vote 373—“Yea”

Rollcall Vote 374—“Yea”

Rollcall Vote 375—“Yea”

Rollcall Vote 376—“Yea”

Rollcall Vote 377—MTR—“Nay”

Rollcall Vote 378—Final Passage—“Yea”

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS ON H.R. 218, H.R. 2910, AND H.R. 2883

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee issued announcements outlining the amendment process for three measures that likely will be before the Rules Committee next week.

An amendment deadline has been set for Tuesday, July 18, at 10 a.m., for

H.R. 218, the King Cove Road Land Exchange Act; H.R. 2910, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act; and H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

The text of these measures is available on the Rules Committee website. Feel free to contact me or a member of the Rules Committee if Members have any questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 344, noes 81, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

AYES—344

Abraham	Comer	Gibbs
Aderholt	Comstock	Gonzalez (TX)
Aguilar	Conaway	Goodlatte
Allen	Connolly	Gosar
Amodei	Cook	Gottheimer
Arrington	Cooper	Gowdy
Babin	Correa	Granger
Bacon	Costa	Graves (GA)
Banks (IN)	Costello (PA)	Graves (LA)
Barletta	Courtney	Graves (MO)
Barr	Cramer	Green, Al
Barton	Crawford	Green, Gene
Beatty	Crist	Grothman
Bera	Cuellar	Guthrie
Bergman	Culberson	Hanabusa
Beyer	Curbelo (FL)	Handel
Biggs	Davidson	Harper
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Hartzler
Bishop (MI)	Davis, Danny	Hastings
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Heck
Black	Delaney	Hensarling
Blackburn	DeLauro	Herrera Beutler
Blum	DeBene	Hice, Jody B.
Blunt Rochester	Demings	Higgins (LA)
Bost	Denham	Higgins (NY)
Boyle, Brendan	Dent	Hill
F.	DeSantis	Himes
Brady (PA)	DesJarlais	Holding
Brady (TX)	Deuth	Hollingsworth
Brat	Diaz-Balart	Hoyer
Bridenstine	Dingell	Hudson
Brooks (AL)	Doggett	Huizenga
Brooks (IN)	Donovan	Hultgren
Brown (MD)	Duffy	Hunter
Brownley (CA)	Duncan (SC)	Hurd
Buchanan	Dunn	Issa
Buck	Emmer	Jackson Lee
Bucshon	Engel	Jenkins (KS)
Budd	Estes (KS)	Jenkins (WV)
Burgess	Esty (CT)	Johnson (LA)
Bustos	Evans	Johnson (OH)
Byrne	Farenthold	Johnson, E. B.
Calvert	Faso	Johnson, Sam
Carbajal	Ferguson	Jordan
Cárdenas	Fitzpatrick	Joyce (OH)
Carter (GA)	Fleischmann	Kaptur
Carter (TX)	Flores	Katko
Cartwright	Fortenberry	Keating
Castor (FL)	Foster	Kelly (MS)
Castro (TX)	Fox	Kelly (PA)
Chabot	Frankel (FL)	Kihuen
Cheney	Franks (AZ)	Kilmer
Clay	Frelinghuysen	Kind
Clyburn	Gaetz	King (IA)
Coffman	Gallagher	King (NY)
Cole	Gallego	Kinzinger
Collins (GA)	Garamendi	Knight
Collins (NY)	Gianforte	Krishnamoorthi

Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCauley
McCollum
McEachin
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messner
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman

Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner

Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suzuki
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

□ 1139

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill 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."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 356 through No. 378 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on the Conaway Amendment, "yea" on the Polis Amendment, "yea" on the Jayapal Amendment, "yea" on the Nadler Amendment, "yea" on the Blumenauer Amendment, "yea" on the Aguilar Amendment, "no" on the Rogers Amendment, "yea" on the Garamendi Amendment, "yea" on the Blumenauer Amendment No. 13, "no" on the McClintock Amendment, "yea" on the Garamendi Amendment, "no" on the Buck Amendment, "no" on the Perry Amendment, "no" on the Harzler Amendment, "no" on the Gosar Amendment, "no" on the Rooney Amendment, "no" on the Franks Amendment, "no" on the Lamborn Amendment, "no" on the Byrne Amendment, "no" on the Hunter Amendment, and "yea" on the McGovern Amendment. I would have also voted "yea" on the Motion to Recommit. I would have also voted "no" on final passage of H.R. 2810—National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2018.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO MAKE TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING CHANGES TO H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of H.R. 2810, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill, and that the instruction in amendment No. 35 printed in House Report 115-217 be changed from page 125 to page 121, and that the instruction in amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-212 be changed from page 569, line 12, to page 569, line 14.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inquire of the majority leader the

schedule for the week to come, and I yield to my friend, Majority Leader MCCARTHY from California.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider three bills that help modernize our energy infrastructure and fully utilize America's natural resources.

First will be H.R. 2910, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act, sponsored by Representative BILL FLORES. This bill would ensure better coordination between FERC and other agencies in the permitting of new pipelines, while improving accountability by requiring more public disclosures.

Next would be H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act, sponsored by Representative MARKWAYNE MULLIN. This important bill establishes a uniform and transparent process for constructing electric transmission facilities and cross-border pipelines.

And third, H.R. 806, the Ozone Standards Implementation Act, sponsored by Representative PETE OLSON, which streamlines the compliance process and ensures reasonable implementation of the 2015 air quality standards.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 218, the King Cove Land Exchange Act, sponsored by Representative DON YOUNG. This land exchange will provide the residents of King Cove a safe and reliable transportation route to necessary medical care.

I look forward to passing these critical bills in the House.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, additional legislative items are possible in the House.

Mr. Speaker, if I could take a moment and wish Chairman THORNBERRY a happy birthday tomorrow. I think passing his bill today was that birthday gift from all.

I will notify Members of any changes to our schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for that information.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that that may be the most expensive birthday present anybody ever has gotten, when you mentioned Mr. THORNBERRY. The chairman has done very well, and I congratulate him on his work and on

NOES—81

Adams
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Butterfield
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
DeFazio
DeGette
DeSaulnier
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Eshoo
Españat
Fudge
Gabbard
Garrett

NOT VOTING—8

Bilirakis
Cleaver
Cummings

Gohmert
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Harris
Huffman
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McGovern
Meng
Moore
Nadler
Neal

Pallone
Payne
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Raskin
Richmond
Sánchez
Schakowsky
Schradler
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

Napolitano
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.