

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 3219, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 478 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. 3219.

Will the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) kindly take the chair.

□ 1427

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. 3219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, with Mr. ISSA (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 63 printed in House Report 115-259 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to House Resolution 478, the further amendment printed in part A of the House Report 115-261 shall be considered as adopted.

The text of the further amendment printed in part A of House Report 115-261 is as follows:

After division D, insert the following:

DIVISION E—DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BORDER INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION ACT, 2018

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, namely:

**U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
PROCUREMENT, CONSTRUCTION, AND
IMPROVEMENTS**

For necessary expenses for U.S. Customs and Border Protection for procurement, construction, and improvements, \$1,571,239,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, which shall be available as follows:

- (1) \$784,000,000 for 32 miles of new border bollard fencing in the Rio Grande Valley, Texas.
- (2) \$498,000,000 for 28 miles of new bollard levee wall in the Rio Grande Valley, Texas.
- (3) \$251,000,000 for 14 miles of secondary fencing in San Diego, California.
- (4) \$38,239,000 for planning for border wall construction.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS**REFERENCES TO ACT**

SEC. 101. Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to “this Act” con-

tained in this division shall be treated as referring only to the provisions of this division.

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Homeland Security Border Infrastructure Construction Appropriations Act, 2018”.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 115-261, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 478, and available pro forma amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 473.

Each further amendment printed in part B of the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of House Resolution 473, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, except as provided by section 4 of House Resolution 473, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

**AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS.
GRANGER OF TEXAS**

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 478, as the designee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 40, 44, 46, 49, 50, 52, 53, and 54 printed in part B of House Report 115-261, offered by Ms. GRANGER of Texas:

**AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS**

Page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000) (increased by \$2,000,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR.
BRIDENSTINE OF OKLAHOMA**

Page 7, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL
OF CALIFORNIA**

Page 7, line 15, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$5,600,000)”.

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount inset the following: “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF
NEW YORK**

Page 7, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$6,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,000,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MAST OF
FLORIDA**

Page 7, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$598,000)”.

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$598,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. SHEA-
PORTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Page 7, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$7,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$7,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$7,000,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN OF
PENNSYLVANIA**

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 16, line 3, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. LANCE OF
NEW JERSEY**

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$100,000) (increased by \$100,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MRS.
NAPOLITANO OF CALIFORNIA**

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$194,897,000) (increased by \$194,897,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. GALLAGHER
OF WISCONSIN**

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$26,200,000)”.

Page 23, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$26,200,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF
CALIFORNIA**

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$20,000,000)”.

Page 27, line 24, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$20,000,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MS. ROSEN OF
NEVADA**

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$6,000,000)”.

Page 33, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,000,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF
SOUTH CAROLINA**

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,000,000)”.

Page 33, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$4,000,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA**

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$20,000,000)”.

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$20,000,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF
FLORIDA**

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

**AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF
FLORIDA**

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN
OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,500,000)”.

Page 37, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN OF
MINNESOTA

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY
OF MARYLAND

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$8,000,000)”.

Page 87, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. KNIGHT OF
CALIFORNIA

Page 28, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$16,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$16,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

Page 31, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. CHENEY OF
WYOMING

Page 32, line 25, before the colon, insert “, except for missile defense requirements resulting from urgent or emergent operational needs”.

Page 37, line 1, before the semicolon, insert “, except for missile defense requirements resulting from urgent or emergent operational needs”.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. PAULSEN
OF MINNESOTA

Page 33, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$12,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. EMMER OF
MINNESOTA

Page 33, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,500,000)”.

Page 34, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI
OF CALIFORNIA

Page 34, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN
OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 34, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$20,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF
MARYLAND

Page 34, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,135,000) (increased by \$4,135,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY
OF CONNECTICUT

In section 8010, strike “SSN Virginia Class Submarine” and insert “up to 13 SSN Virginia Class Submarines”.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO
OF MISSISSIPPI

Page 49, line 18, strike “up to 10”.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF
VERMONT

At the end of division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under the heading “Afghanistan Security Forces Fund” may be used to procure uniforms for the Afghan National Army.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY
OF MARYLAND

At the end of division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the closure of a biosafety level 4 laboratory.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS
OF MICHIGAN

At the end of division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide arms, training, or other assistance to the Azov Battalion.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF
CALIFORNIA

Page 80, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$6,250,000)”.

Page 37, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN
OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$24,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$27,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN OF
MINNESOTA

Page 129, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,000,000)”.

Page 143, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. RASKIN OF
MARYLAND

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 478, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, the amendments included in the en bloc were made in order by the rule for consideration of division A of H.R. 3219 and have been agreed to by both sides.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment and urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN).

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge passage of my amendment which supports the Army's un-

funded requirements request for improved munitions precision.

The continued development of missile cooling technology, which releases a refrigerant at predetermined temperatures, maintains the integrity of missile electronics when fired. This improves flight control, extends range, and provides greater targeting precision.

My amendment improves current and future missile systems, furthering our ability to reach every corner of the world in defense of our Nation.

As we grapple with threats from adversaries such as North Korea, Russia, and Iran and execute our counter-ISIL campaign, our military deserves the greatest technological edge so that our troops never find themselves in a fair fight.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment to maintain America's military technology superiority as our servicemembers bravely safeguard our Nation.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that would—it is shocking that it would have to even do this—prohibit spending money on these Afghan uniforms that met the sartorial taste of a general that corresponded to lush tropical forests. Number one, what the general wants for sartorial splendor of his troops is not our problem. Number two, his sartorial taste had to do with tropical forests, which is not what we have in Afghanistan.

I am very happy that General Mattis himself was outraged by this, and I applaud him. But it is an opportunity for us to express our outrage as well.

We all want to support our men and women in uniform, and we all want them to have good uniforms. But it is not up to an Afghan general to take taxpayer money on a vanity project that ultimately undercuts the security of our troops.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe I speak for everyone. Let's not do it.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to commend the gentleman from Vermont for his amendment and for his thoughtful approach to this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan amendment that I am leading on with Representative COMSTOCK, along with many of our colleagues on the STARBASE Caucus. I appreciate it being included in the en bloc package of amendments.

This amendment would simply increase funding for the Department of Defense's STARBASE program from 25 to \$30 million for the fiscal year 2018, bringing funding back to the fiscal year 2017 enacted level. Providing science, technology, engineering, and math, STEM education, to America's

youth is critical to the global competitiveness of our Nation.

The STARBASE program engages local fifth grade elementary students by exposing them to STEM subjects through an inquiry-based curriculum.

Serving communities from Los Alamitos, California, to Winchester, Virginia, and across the Nation, there are now 59 programs in congressional districts throughout 30 States, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. Close to 1 million fifth graders across the Nation have now had the opportunity to participate in hands-on STEM classes on military bases thanks to STARBASE.

Moreover, the Department of Defense's STARBASE program is one of the most cost-effective programs across the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Mr. DELANEY's bipartisan amendment included in this en bloc that would increase funding for the Fisher House Foundation.

Fisher House has now served our veterans and their families for 26 years providing valuable housing opportunities as veterans receive medical treatment at military and VA medical centers across the country. When I first learned of them—longer than I want to admit—there were just a few of them. Now there are 72 and many more in the pipeline. They have served 305,000 military families.

For many veterans and their families, the distance to their nearest VA medical center can be too far to travel on a routine basis, and the cost over time means many veterans are alone—nobody by their side—during their treatment or hospital stay—a situation no one should be in.

No veteran who has served their country should have to face medical care or a hospital stay without the support of their loved ones by their side. Fisher Houses provide the lodging and transportation resources to help families stay together throughout the treatment process.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE), who is a member of the full committee.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member very much for yielding to me today.

I rise during this en bloc amendment debate to discuss an issue that is raised in the amendment about the importance of the DDG-51 to our Navy. In particular, I am grateful to our committee for the clear guidance and language that was provided in the fiscal year 2017 Omnibus Appropriations Act that was passed in this body just 2 short months ago.

That language called attention to the need not only to support the DDG-51

program but to ensure we do so with a design and upgrade that is technically mature and fiscally responsible.

It was clear in that language, and in report language that is included in the bill before us today, that Congress continues to expect the Navy to comply with the direction that the additional fiscal year '16 DDG-51 ship be contracted and completed as a flight II-A ship.

Because there are concerns raised by the GAO about the new flight III design radar upgrade for the DDG-51, there needs to be a thoughtful process in place.

Again, I want to thank the chair and ranking member who have been incredibly supportive of the DDG program in the past and the work that it brings to States like Maine and across the country.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I simply, again, reiterate my support for the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, I want to make a statement regarding the passage of H.R. 3219, the Make America Secure Appropriations Act, 2018. Specifically, I would like to make a statement about my amendment, Soto Number 20, to Division A, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2018. My amendment moved \$10 million from the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide account to the Defense Health Program's Peer-Reviewed Prostate Cancer Research Program.

Prostate cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer in men and is the second most common cause of male death. In 2017, approximately 161,360 men in the U.S. will be diagnosed with prostate cancer and an estimated 26,730 will die from it.

The Prostate Cancer Research Program is a unique research program in that it prioritizes research that will lead to the elimination of death from prostate cancer while enhancing the well-being of men experiencing the impact of the disease.

I support funding prostate cancer research and thank my colleagues for their support of my amendment.

Mr. Chair, I want to make a statement regarding the passage of H.R. 3219, the Make America Secure Appropriations Act, 2018. Specifically, I would like to make a statement about my amendment, Soto Number 19, to Division A, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2018. My amendment moved \$1 million from the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide account to the Defense Health Program's Peer-Reviewed Gulf War Illness Research Program.

If we are going to spend money on medical research within the Department of Defense, the Department must adequately fund research on those diseases that originate in war and wholly affect our servicemen and women. Over a quarter of a million veterans display symptoms of this disease, and the time has come to find, and fund, a cure for it.

I support funding Gulf War illness research and thank my colleagues for their support of my amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking

Member VISCLOSKY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe and for their work in ensuring that they have resources needed to keep our Armed Forces the greatest fighting force for peace on earth.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple and straightforward and affirms an example of the national goodness that makes America the most exceptional nation on earth.

The purpose of Jackson Lee Amendment No. 1 is to provide the Secretary of Defense flexibility to allocate resources needed to provide technical assistance by U.S. military women to military women in other countries combating violence as a weapon of war, terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking.

Mr. Chair, the United States is committed to combating violent extremism, protecting our borders and the globe from the scourge of terrorism.

The United States Armed Forces possess an unparalleled expertise and technological capability that will aid not only in combating and defeating terrorists who hate our country and prey upon innocent persons, especially women, girls, and the elderly.

But we must recognize that notwithstanding our extraordinary technical military capabilities, we face adversaries who adapt very quickly because they are not constrained by geographic limitations or norms of morality and decency.

Al Qaeda, Boko Haram, Al Shabaab, ISIS/ISIL and other militant terrorists, including the Sinai's Ansar Beit al-Maqdis in the Sinai Peninsula which poses a threat to Egypt.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 1 helps provide the Department of Defense with the resources needed to provide technical assistance to countries on innovative strategies to provide defense technologies and resources that promote the security of the American people and allied nation states.

Terrorism, human trafficking, narcotics trafficking and their impact on women and girls across the globe has had a great adverse impact on us all.

According to a UNICEF report, rape, torture and human trafficking by terrorist and militant groups have been employed as weapons of war, affecting over twenty thousand women and girls.

Looking at the history of terrorism highlights the importance of providing technical assistance through our military might, as this enables us to combat terrorism which now can plague us here in the United States.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 1 will help curb terrorism abroad by making available American technical military expertise to military in other countries, like Nigeria, who are combating violent jihadists in their country and to keep those terrorists out of our country.

Time and again American lives have been lost at the hands of terrorists.

These victims include Christians, Muslims, journalists, health care providers, relief workers, schoolchildren, and members of the diplomatic corps and the Armed Services.

This is why the technical assistance offered by our military personnel is integral to promoting security operation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft for missions to empower local forces to combat terrorism.

Terrorists across the globe have wreaked havoc on our society and cannot be tolerated or ignored, for their actions pose a threat to our national security and the security of the world.

Mr. Chair, from the United States to Africa to Europe to Asia and the Middle East, it is clear that combating terrorism remains one of our highest national priorities.

Collectively, helping our neighbors and their military build capacity to combat terrorism, eradicate human trafficking, stop narcotics trafficking and negate their impact on women and girls across the globe serves our national interest.

I urge my colleagues to support Jackson Lee Amendment No. 1.

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

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is identical to an amendment that I offered and was adopted last year to the Defense Appropriations Act for FY2017 (H.R. 5293).

My amendment increases funding for the Defense Health Program's research and development by \$10 million.

These funds will address the question of breast cancer in the United States military.

The American Cancer Society calls several strains of breast cancer as a particularly aggressive subtype associated with lower survival rates; in this instance, it is a triple negative.

But I raise an article: "Fighting a Different Battle; Breast Cancer and the Military."

Breast cancer can affect both men and women.

The bad news is breast cancer has been just about as brutal on women in the military as combat.

Let me say that sentence again.

Breast cancer has been just about as brutal on women in the military as combat.

More than 800 women have been wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, according to the Army Times; 874 military women were diagnosed with breast cancer just between 2000 and 2011.

And according to that same study, more are suspected. It grows.

The good news is that we have been working on it, and I want to add my appreciation to the military.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 25, however, will allow for the additional research.

That research is particularly needed since women are joining the Armed Services in increasing numbers and serving longer, ascending to leadership.

Within increased age comes increased risk and incidence of breast cancer.

Not only is breast cancer striking relatively young military women at an alarming rate, but male service members, veterans and their dependents are at risk as well.

With a younger and generally healthier population, those in military tend to have a lower risk for most cancers than civilians—including significantly lower colorectal, lung and cervical—but breast cancer is a different story.

Military people in general, and in some cases very specifically, are at a significantly greater risk for contracting breast cancer, ac-

cording to Dr. Richard Clapp, a top cancer expert at Boston University who works at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on military breast cancer issues.

Dr. Clapp notes that life in the military can mean exposure to a witch's brew of risk factors directly linked to greater chances of getting breast cancer.

So, I am asking that we do the right thing. We are on the right track, we're on the right road.

But with the expansion of women in the military, it is extremely important to move forward with this amendment to help ensure that the men and women who risk their lives to protect our freedom can live longer, healthier lives.

I urge my colleagues to support Jackson Lee Amendment No. 25.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased that the En Bloc Amendment also includes Jackson Lee Amendment No. 50 that was made in order under the Rule.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 50 increases funding for the PTSD by \$5 million.

These funds should be used toward outreach activities targeting hard to reach veterans, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas, who suffer from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Mr. Chair, along with traumatic brain injury, PTSD is the signature wound suffered by the brave men and women fighting in Afghanistan, Iraq, and far off lands to defend the values and freedom we hold dear.

For those of us whose daily existence is not lived in harm's way, it is difficult to imagine the horrific images that American servicemen and women deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other theaters of war see on a daily basis.

In an instant a suicide bomber, an IED, or an insurgent can obliterate your best friend and right in front of your face.

Yet, you are trained and expected to continue on with the mission, and you do, even though you may not even have reached your 20th birthday.

But there always comes a reckoning. And it usually comes after the stress and trauma of battle is over and you are alone with your thoughts and memories.

And the horror of those desperate and dangerous encounters with the enemy and your own mortality come flooding back.

PTSD was first brought to public attention in relation to war veterans, but it can result from a variety of traumatic incidents, such as torture, being kidnapped or held captive, bombings, or natural disasters such as floods or earthquakes.

People with PTSD may startle easily, become emotionally numb (especially in relation to people with whom they used to be close), lose interest in things they used to enjoy, have trouble feeling affectionate, be irritable, become more aggressive, or even become violent.

They avoid situations that remind them of the original incident, and anniversaries of the incident are often very difficult.

Most people with PTSD repeatedly relive the trauma in their thoughts during the day and in nightmares when they sleep.

These are called flashbacks; a person having a flashback may lose touch with reality and believe that the traumatic incident is happening all over again.

Mr. Chair, the fact of the matter is that most veterans with PTSD also have other psy-

chiatric disorders, which are a consequence of PTSD.

These veterans have co-occurring disorders, which include depression, alcohol and/or drug abuse problems, panic, and/or other anxiety disorders.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 50 recognizes that these soldiers are first and foremost, human, who live their experiences.

Ask a veteran of Vietnam, Iraq, or Afghanistan about the frequency of nightmares they experience, and one will realize that serving in the Armed Forces leaves a lasting impression, whether good or bad.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 50 will help ensure that "no soldier is left behind" by addressing the urgent need for more outreach toward hard to reach veterans suffering from PTSD, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas of our country.

I thank the Chair and Ranking Member for including Jackson Lee Amendment No. 50 in the En Bloc Amendment and urge my colleagues to support the En Bloc Amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 115-261.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 34, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 478, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

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

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment today to support the DOD Cyber Scholarship Program with strong bipartisan support from my good friends, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CORREA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. LIEU, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

Mr. Chairman, since 2001, DOD has run the Information Assurance Scholarship Program in order to boost the Nation's cyber workforce through scholarship and capacity-building grants. Scholarship recipients are required to fulfill a service obligation by working in a cybersecurity position at DOD upon graduation.

Mr. Chairman, this program had been extremely successful, bringing nearly 600 students into the DOD workforce. However, due to budget constraints, the Department has reduced funding and stopped recruiting new students. This year we seek to reinvigorate the

program, calling it the DOD Cyber Scholarship Program.

As the ranking member of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, I fully understand the budget pressure the Department has been facing. However, cutting the pipeline of cyber talent into the Department is incredibly shortsighted. We face a critical workforce shortage right now, as we speak, when it comes to cybersecurity across all sectors of the economy and in government.

The challenges of building up our cyber talent is something that keeps me up at night. We know that cybersecurity is the national security issue of the 21st century and that no conflict, both today or in the future, will be fought without a cyber component as a part of it.

Now, DOD has made significant strides in preparing to defend the Nation in this new domain, standing up USCYBERCOM and improving its cybersecurity posture through programs like the wildly successful Hack the Pentagon program and DARPA's Cyber Grand Challenge. But these initiatives need talented network engineers, cybersecurity researchers, and, yes, hackers.

The Cyber Scholarship Program encourages students to look at cybersecurity as an area of academic study and then exposes them to the amazing mission set at the Department. While we may not be able to compete on a dollar-to-dollar basis with the private sector in terms of salary, public service certainly is its own reward, and DOD has the most challenging and rewarding problems facing us today and the honor that comes with protecting their fellow Americans.

We need as many digital natives to enter this exciting field and experience the rewards of public service, which is why we must reinvigorate the Cyber Scholarship Program with this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I worked with the same colleagues who joined me on this amendment to include similar funding in the National Defense Authorization Act. I would like to thank my friends, Senators KAINE, PERDUE, and ROUNDS for leading a similar effort across the Capitol in the Senate.

So I would also like to, again, thank Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their steadfast commitment to our armed services. This commonsense amendment will help ensure DOD is prepared for future fights, and I urge its adoption.

Ms. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

□ 1445

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. LANGEVIN to provide funding for the Department of Defense Cyber Scholarship Program.

Our country is facing a severe shortage of trained cyber professionals, a shortage that includes about 10,000 cybersecurity experts in government alone, and estimated to be about 1 million shortages throughout our economy by 2019.

We need to give young people the incentive to follow careers in cybersecurity to learn skills such as computer coding and ethical hacking. This amendment provides \$10 million for scholarships for associate degrees at community colleges and assists with program execution from DOD and NSA.

I cosponsored this amendment, and I want to thank Congressman LANGEVIN for offering this important piece of legislation. I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, just briefly, I thank my colleagues that were speaking in favor of my amendment. I thank the majority for accepting the amendment and supporting the effort to build up our Nation's cyber workforce.

Cybersecurity is the national security challenge of the 21st century. We are doing great things to meet those challenges. We just need to make sure our workforce can meet those needs. I know this amendment will be a major step in helping us to achieve that goal.

I thank all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and I thank the chair and ranking member for their support of this effort.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. SUOZZI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 115-261.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$34,734,000)".

Page 14, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$34,734,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 478, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in support of a bipartisan

amendment that I am offering with Congressman PETER KING and Congressman PAUL COOK.

Amendment No. 10 under the rule is to division A of the Defense Appropriations bill. The purpose of the amendment is to match the \$34 million in funding for the Navy's Environmental Restoration Account, authorized unanimously in the 2018 National Defense Authorization Act, but was not included in the appropriations process.

In my district, for almost four decades, the people of Bethpage and the surrounding areas have been dealing with an environmental crisis. Groundwater pollution, stemming from the Navy and defense contractor activity, has resulted in an underground plume of contaminated water that is moving south through Long Island's sole source of drinking water, towards Congressman KING's district.

While costly remediation efforts ensure the water is safe to consume, it doesn't change the fact that residents deserve to have this cleaned up before it spreads any further.

The contamination, known as the Navy-Grumman Plume, is one of thousands of sites at hundreds of locations that have experienced environmental degradation because of defense-related activities. Congressman PETER KING, Congressman PAUL COOK, and I have submitted this bipartisan amendment that will increase funding for the Navy's Environmental Restoration Account, which helps fund cleanup and remediation efforts for these sites.

This is not a partisan issue. The funding levels sought by this amendment received bipartisan support in the NDAA. Chairman THORNBERRY's mark and my amendment together, which was joined by Congressman COOK and Congresswoman HANABUSA, increased the authorized amount by \$42 million.

The amount sought here, \$34 million, will match the appropriated amount with the authorized funding levels. Our colleagues on both sides of the aisle supported that effort because this funding will help clean up sites from Maine to Hawaii, from Florida to Washington State, and were provided for with the appropriate pay-for.

I ask for my colleagues' support for this bipartisan amendment so we can help fund efforts across the country to help clean up environmental contamination in our districts. People in my district and regions across the country deserve to have these sites fully cleaned. It is commonsense, bipartisan, and the right thing to do. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman raising this issue.

I am supportive of efforts to ensure that the Department of Defense takes

responsibility for any potential contamination issues. That is why this bill provides more than \$1 billion for environmental restoration accounts, nearly \$48 million more than fiscal year 2017.

The bill includes an increase of \$10 million specifically to support water contamination efforts. In addition, the committee provided an additional \$57 million for those efforts in the fiscal year 2017 supplemental appropriations.

The committee has already provided a generous amount of funding to address water contamination, and the Department of Defense has assured me that they are addressing each side on a priority basis.

The amendment offered by the gentleman provides additional funding that the Department may not be able to execute, and the funding comes at the expense of the warfighter readiness account. Therefore, I must oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to the gentleman, respectfully, that it will cost billions of dollars to clean up these sites in the United States of America. The increase that we are seeking here, in a bipartisan fashion, is \$34 million to simply match the amount of money that was authorized in the NDAA.

In addition, this percentage increase that we are seeking is commensurate with the overall percentage increase in the overall NDAA budget this year from last year. So we are just simply seeking the same commensurate amount increase in this portion of the budget that there is in another portion.

We are looking to have the pay-for to come from the operations and maintenance defense-wide account, of which there is over \$33 billion. We are looking for \$34 million just to try to advance some of these cleanups.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUOZZI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would point out that the gentleman is absolutely correct. The committee worked hard to increase funding for these accounts.

Also, I would point out, representing the First Congressional District of Indiana, I am intimately familiar with the problems these environmental sites have.

There is much to do, many resources we need to look for, and I would support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to close by saying that I do appreciate the hard work that has been done by so many on both sides of the aisle in this particular area. We all appreciate how important the cleanup of these environmental sites are. The people in my district have been suffering with this for 40 years, and we are trying to bring attention to the issue and trying to get the resources focused on this.

We have met with people from the Navy, from the Army Corps of Engineers, from the EPA, from the DEC, and from local State officials in the State of New York that are interested. Congressman PETER KING and Congressman PAUL COOK both understand how important it is that we try and send the signal that we are trying to have a commensurate increase in this account with the overall increase in the budget.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI).

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

Mr. SUOZZI. 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 New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. BRENDAN F. BOYLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 115-261.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$60,000,000)".

Page 14, line 13, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$30,000,000)".

Page 15, line 8, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$30,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 478, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is a bit of a complex issue, so I will do my best to explain. It is, unfortunately, an issue that my constituents and a number in the suburban Philadelphia area have been dealing with now for the last 2½ years.

The chemicals with the acronyms PFOS and PFOA are part of a class of manmade, highly fluorinated chemicals that are highly persistent in our environment.

In the 1970s, the Department of Defense began using a firefighting foam with the acronym AFFF. Unfortunately, that firefighting foam to extinguish petroleum fires contained these chemical compounds. These chemicals have subsequently been linked to problems in liver, thyroid, and pancreatic function, as well as changes in hormone levels.

Some studies have shown developmental issues in children, decreased fertility, increased cholesterol, immune system deficiencies, and an increased cancer risk. Production of AFFF has ceased, but stockpiles remain.

Today, the Department of Defense is evaluating and testing the drinking water systems of hundreds of communities nationwide due to PFOA and PFOS contamination on or surrounding these defense installations across the country that used AFFF.

So far, water contamination has been found near 27 military bases in 16 States. This includes the community that I represent and that my colleagues share in representing. In my district alone, families surrounding Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, as well as the Horsham Air Guard Station, suffer from the uncertainty of wondering whether their child's or their spouse's illness is caused by the military's contamination on the base in their local community.

They have paid for endless stockpiles of bottled water and higher utility fees, as their communities have taken steps to reduce the water system's exposure. I commend the steps the military has taken to date, but more can and must be done.

I know that our communities in the Philadelphia area are, sadly, just the tip of the iceberg. This past year alone, since the EPA tightened its lifetime health advisory under the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Department has completed testing of 480 drinking water systems at locations where the Department supplies drinking water. It continues to conduct preliminary assessments and site inspections under CERCLA to identify sites where PFOA and PFOS may have been released by the Department of Defense.

The Department spent approximately \$200 million just last year in response to PFOA and PFOS contamination nationwide. This funding has been used to conduct preliminary assessments and site inspections, test drinking water systems, and provide mitigation such as bottled water or drinking water filtration systems where water system tests indicated PFOA and PFOS are above the EPA advisory levels.

Unfortunately, though, the Department has been funding this response using existing funds that were originally programmed for other response actions.

In order to support near-term outreach and engagement in local communities that have this impacted drinking water system and adequately prepare for long-term remediation of what is likely to be billions of dollars' and many years' worth of response, I worked with the House Armed Services Committee to increase its authorization for the Navy and Air Force environmental remediation accounts by an additional \$30 million each in the NDAA the House passed earlier this month. My amendment would bring the

appropriation in line with that authorization.

This funding is a necessary response to an ongoing environmental issue that is only going to get worse and more expensive for the Department, not to mention the countless innocent communities impacted across the country, both in Republican and Democratic districts.

□ 1500

I want to thank my Republican neighbors PAT MEEHAN and BRIAN FITZPATRICK for working with me on this issue in a truly bipartisan manner. I hope the House comes together in a similar manner today to strengthen our Department of Defense's response to drinking water contamination it is causing in the communities we represent.

Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), my neighbor and colleague from Bucks County.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, with my limited time, I just want to say Brendan said it well. He has done a fabulous job working with Congressman MEEHAN and me, all of whom have districts that have been impacted by this real tragedy, and I stand in full support.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I share many of the gentleman's concerns, and I appreciate him raising this issue. I support environmental remediation efforts that ensure that drinking water is safe in communities across the Nation. That is why this bill includes \$1 billion for environmental restoration.

The amount represents \$48 million more than the fiscal year 2017 level and includes \$10 million above the request to specifically address PFC contamination. In addition, we include an additional \$57 million for drinking water cleanup in the fiscal year 2017 supplemental appropriations.

This committee has included significant funding to address drinking water contamination issues, and I am concerned that the Department will not be able to execute the additional \$60 million offered by this amendment; therefore, I oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. 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 Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part B of House Report 115-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$30,000,000)".

Page 22, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$30,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 478, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman and ranking member for their collaborative effort to bring this bill forward.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3219. Nothing is more important than the safety of our men and women in uniform, and I believe that we in Congress are committed to ensuring our armed services receive the best equipment possible. This equipment includes platforms like the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle, or JLTV. This vehicle is the centerpiece of the Army and Marine Corps' tactical wheeled vehicle modernization strategy and closes an existing critical capability gap for both services.

The JLTV demonstrates many significant improvements over the current vehicle fleet, including strengthened protection for passengers against current and future battlefield threats, more payload capacity, and better automotive performance.

This is basically what replaces years ago what you would call your Jeep. Anybody who talks to veterans or hears about people being injured and all, so many of them died or were seriously injured driving in a vehicle that hit an explosive. These vehicles are going to be a dramatic improvement over what we have now as far as saving lives in our troops.

As long as we have troops in Afghanistan, it is important that, as quickly as possible, we deliver the best equipment possible. To achieve that goal, Congress should maintain its support for the existing JLTV acquisition plan.

Recently, we in the House passed the National Defense Authorization Act of

2018. My amendment to this appropriations bill would simply transfer funds from the operations and maintenance account in the bill and then appropriate those funds to the JLTV program to bring them in line with what we in the House authorized in the NDAA.

The JLTV program supports American jobs with more than 300 suppliers from 30 States. Pure and simple, the JLTV platform will save lives and improve our troops' effectiveness in the field. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROTHMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his amendment. The amendment proposes to add funding back to the JLTV program, cutting the House defense bill due to a lack of information provided by the Army budget justification.

The cut to the JLTV program reflects the committee's concern with the Army's failure to provide the full budget justification information for an \$804 million program. Failure to provide this information makes it impossible for the committee to exercise its fiscal oversight responsibilities.

However, the JLTV program is important to the warfighter and is executing well. I do not oppose this amendment.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the Appropriations Committee for the hard work they have done.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. DUNN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in part B of House Report 115-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 34, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$30,000,000) (increased by \$30,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 478, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

Mr. Chair, throughout the country, there are remote areas where the men and women of our armed services prepare for war in order to protect the peace.

Although these places are often overlooked, our investments in military test and training ranges are returned

to the Nation many times over in the projection of American military supremacy around the globe protecting the homeland and preserving international order.

In the Southeast, the Joint Gulf Range Complex facilities are for testing and training of supersonic and hypersonic weapons systems, including combat training and live-fire exercises of the frontline fighters like the F-22 and F-35.

The 325th Fighter Wing and the 53rd Weapons Evaluation Group at Tyndall Air Force Base, the 96th Test Wing at Eglin Air Force Base, and the Special Operations Command at Hurlburt Field make extensive use of the Joint Gulf Range Complex.

There is no comparable area in the United States near an established base with instrumentation infrastructure that can support advanced testing and joint training exercises like this. However, deployment of the instrumentation necessary to collect the data during the training on these fifth- and sixth-generation weapons systems is not in keeping with the U.S. Air Force needs. Instrumentation limitations have restricted the F-35 and F-22 training missions to the northernmost portion of the range. According to a study by the 96th Test Wing at Eglin Air Force Base, this limitation causes congestion and has obstructed at least 80 missions per year.

This amendment, which I am offering with my Florida colleagues, Mr. TOM ROONEY, Mr. MATT GAETZ, and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY, will accelerate investments approved by Congress to deploy new infrastructure along the Joint Gulf Range Complex. The amendment will maximize the utility of this vast range, which is a true national treasure for combat training and advanced testing and evaluation.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, the committee has no objection. The amendment's funding for major test facilities is critical to ensuring our military retains its competitive lead over our competitors. We are prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), my colleague and friend.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank our colleagues in the House for their agreement.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the brave men and women of the greatest military on Earth and to ensure that they are properly equipped for any and all challenges on the horizon. I support

increased investments in our military test and training ranges with help from our Armed Forces to deal with the world's challenges.

In my district, the Gulf Test Range provides approximately 120,000 square miles of overwater airspace. It is used for high-altitude, supersonic air combat training, air-to-air missile testing, drone targeting, hypersonic weapons testing, space launches, and much more. It is critical training space for our Armed Forces, including the Air Force Special Operations Command, the 96th Test Wing, the 33rd Fighter Wing, and others. This is why I ask my colleagues to support the amendment to increase funding for the test range program.

I thank the Congressman from Florida, Dr. DUNN, for his leadership, for the men and women in the military. I thank Chair GRANGER for her agreement to this amendment. I thank the minority party.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chair, I have no further comments or remarks; however, I would like to encourage my colleagues to support this amendment to enhance military readiness and national security.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in part B of House Report 115-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 37, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000) (increased by \$25,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 478, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, the American people are becoming more and more aware of the degenerative disease known as chronic traumatic encephalopathy, CTE, due to the crisis in the NFL. The NFL, of course, has been trying to sweep this under the rug.

Very recently, the Journal of the American Medical Association, a premier journal that is peer-reviewed, provided a study that found severe neurological damage in the vast majority of former football players' brains that were donated for research after they developed mental symptoms during life. Eighty-seven percent of all football players' brains showed CTE, but a truly horrible figure, 99 percent of the brains of NFL players showed CTE.

However, the dangers of CTE are not confined to football. Our servicemen

and -women are subject to similar—or, oftentimes, even worse—dangers in the line of duty for the service they provide to our Nation.

Last year, I was honored to host Dr. Bennet Omalu for the State of the Union. He is the doctor portrayed in the film "Concussion," exposing the impact of CTE on professional football players. He began his research covering his own expenses and exposing a cover-up of the suicides of former athletes. However, his research and the research of others is limited by the funding, which is why I am offering this amendment.

Today we have an opportunity to prevent a similar kind of coverup among our service agencies. This amendment would dedicate \$25 million in funding as part of the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs to award grants to medical researchers and universities to support early detection of CTE.

□ 1515

This amendment would not increase spending, but take the funding already allocated and put some of it—a very small part of it—towards CTE.

Every hour, we lose another veteran to suicide. We have made great strides towards supporting PTSD research, but the exposure to IEDs and other blasts and blows to the head, may be doing similar damage, which goes unseen until it is too late. By diagnosing CTE early among servicemembers, perhaps we can begin to change the troubling trend of suicides among our veterans.

You may hear arguments today that this amendment is not necessary, since DOD is already spending \$125 million on TBI research. But this research is on short-term trauma, not on long-term effects of repeated head injuries and, what are called, subconcussive blows. Servicemembers at risk of CTE may not even have acute trauma. CTE can result from minor events over a long period of time.

You may also hear that Congress shouldn't dictate the DOD research. But it is absolutely Congress' role to have input into DOD spending, and there is a huge need that is not being filled. And we already are requiring that they do TBI research as it is.

Now, some have suggested: Well, there has been some projects funded. Of the \$125 million of funding, the amount of money going to CTE projects has been, since 2012, only five projects, for a grand total cost of \$2.9 million. And not one dime has been spent since 2013.

It is time for us to accept that science is real here. JAMA has just put out a stunning report that suggests that this is a very serious problem, and it is time for us to combat this issue.

Creating dedicated grants for the early detection of CTE has the potential to prevent suicides among our servicemembers and will have, I think, a very important impact on how we look at CTE in the future and how we make sure that our servicemembers are properly protected.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's concern to provide adequate funding for this very important research, and we have spoken about it. I am a strong supporter of funding for research in this area, and that is why the bill already provides \$125 million toward grants for PTSD and traumatic brain injury research, including CTE, which has previously received millions of dollars in research grants under this program.

A previous amendment would create a new research program, focused solely on CTE research. And since CTE research is already eligible under the PTSD-TBI research program, it is much more appropriate to add funding to the PTSD-TBI program, rather than create a new research program. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly join with the chair in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment and share the chair's concern over the issue raised. However, I don't think the approach is an appropriate one in that we would carve out another budget line.

Given my anticipation that we will not have a full 12-month fiscal year for this money to be spent, I am very concerned that we will find enough projects for this money to be spent on. In the meantime, they would then be eliminated from the existing line for other possible research.

Mr. Chairman, I would look to work with the gentlewoman to address this issue in a fulsome fashion, but not in this manner.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank both of my colleagues for their expression of support for the concept of making sure that CTE is studied.

I am just hopeful that we can guarantee, through this amendment, that of that \$125 million, some portion of it is set aside for CTE research. The fact that only \$2.9 million has gone to CTE research since 2012, and not a dime since 2013, makes me worry that it is not a high priority within the Department.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in part B of House Report 115-261.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 8094 and 8095.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 478, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will strike sections 8094 and 8095 of the bill that prohibit the transfer of Guantanamo detainees to the United States and prohibit the use of funds to construct or modify facilities in the United States for Guantanamo detainees. These provisions are designed to further delay the transfer of detainees out of Guantanamo.

Guantanamo is costing us a fortune. It costs the American taxpayer \$10 million a year to keep a single detainee in Guantanamo, and only \$78,000 to keep a detainee in a Federal maximum security prison in the United States. That is a waste of \$440 million a year.

Perhaps, most importantly, it is a question of values. What is most offensive is not that the prisoners are at Guantanamo, as opposed to some prison in the United States, but that we are holding people without any hearing, without any due process, essentially forever. That is against all American values.

Mr. Chairman, we have debated Guantanamo amendments every year, multiple times a year. The last time was 2 weeks ago. It is an issue I care deeply about, and I offer this amendment again. However, yesterday, the President took an action that is so egregious, and so offensive, that I feel compelled to use a portion of my time to address it directly.

Yesterday's attack by the Commander in Chief on our military's Active-Duty transgender personnel is appalling. Transgender individuals are part of the fabric of America and have always been part of our military, whether we have historically acknowledged them or not.

The arguments against allowing transgender servicemembers to serve openly in our military are the same arguments that have been used against every other group that has been prohibited from serving in our country's history—including Black and Latino men, women, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. Each time the doors of our military open farther to better reflect the diversity of our Nation, the same tired and discredited arguments are brought back: that any individual in the new group, regardless of his or her ability, is unfit to serve and that their service will disrupt unit cohesion.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

Not only should all willing and able Americans be allowed and encouraged to serve—they already do. A report prepared for the Department of Defense estimates thousands of transgender individuals serve today, without issue.

The President must not impose blanket bans that prejudice servicemembers based on their identity, rather than their own merits. President Trump is attacking people who have shown a willingness—indeed, an eagerness—to risk their lives in the service of our country. It is apparent that the decision to ban transgender people from military service was taken without consulting Secretary of Defense Mattis, who seemed surprised by the tweets, or the military, which seems at a loss as to how to implement the order.

Even if this bigoted order is motivated by political opportunism, it disgraces our country and must be rescinded.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, these important revisions have been included in several appropriations bills for several years running. They represent a strong and enduring consensus in Congress that Guantanamo should remain open and that detainees should not be transferred to the United States for any reason.

Striking these provisions would have unknown consequences for U.S. communities. It is impossible to know how many detainees might be brought here, where they might be held, and the impacts on communities and facilities holding them. It is also impossible to know what the potential costs could be.

Putting detainees in U.S. prisons, as the administration originally proposed, would be disruptive and, potentially, disastrous. Former FBI Director Mueller has stated: "To transfer detainees to local jails could affect or infect other prisoners or have the capability of affecting events outside the prison system."

The idea of bringing detainees for trials in the U.S. quickly collapsed as local jurisdictions voiced their strong opposition.

As everyone here is aware, several detainees who have been released from Guantanamo have gone back to the fight and killed and wounded Americans. The threat is real, and Guantanamo is already equipped to handle the detention and military trial of these individuals, as appropriate.

Any proposal that results in these detainees being sent to the United States, for any reason, is simply the wrong policy.

I, therefore, oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I thank him for his continued leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, which would remove a provision that prevents the Department of Defense from closing the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The continued use of this facility does not make our country safer and only serves to undermine our national security.

Well respected military leaders and national security officials have said that Guantanamo remains a propaganda tool for terrorist groups that is used to incite violence against Americans.

In 2015, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, which is composed of 57 member states, including all NATO allies, concluded that Guantanamo serves as an obstacle to counterterrorism cooperation and that the facility should be closed.

In addition, the cost of housing detainees and maintaining the facility continues to be a financial drain on the Department of Defense.

According to Human Rights First, Guantanamo costs the U.S. approximately \$445 million per year to operate. The average cost per detainee at Guantanamo is more than \$10 million.

At the same time, the cost per prisoner at the Federal supermax prison in Colorado, which houses such terrorists as 9/11 conspirator Zacarias Moussaoui, World Trade Center bomber Ramzi Yousef, and Boston Marathon bomber Dzhokhar Tsarnaev, is \$78,000.

Mr. Chairman, this should not be a partisan issue. National security experts on both sides of the aisle have concluded that keeping Guantanamo open is harmful to American interests.

Secretaries of State from previous Republican administrations, including Henry Kissinger, James Baker, and Colin Powell, have all said that closing Guantanamo would improve America's image around the world.

Former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey and Admiral Mike Mullen, have both said that the detention facility needs to be closed.

Former President George W. Bush has said that the detention facility has "become a propaganda tool for our enemies and a distraction for our allies."

Senator JOHN MCCAIN, the man whose credibility on the horrors of war is unimpeachable, has repeatedly said that he favors closing the detention fa-

cility because of the imagine of the United States that it projects to the rest of the world.

Closing the Guantanamo Bay detention facility will strengthen our national security and show the rest of the world the principle of equal justice under law is inviolable.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to send an important message about the values discussed and support the Nadler amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the ranking member, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I feel compelled to rise in support of the gentleman's amendment, as it relates to the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, and would simply make a few brief remarks.

This is, I believe, a very substantive and serious issue facing a constitutional government, our government of laws.

I would point out that it is a sad state of affairs if somewhere in the United States of America we cannot find a secure facility to detain 41 individuals at this late date, given the fact that President Bush released over 500 people from Guantanamo, and President Obama released 197.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply close by observing that, within the last week, the Attorney General of the United States of America could not find a justification to have an alleged terrorist, who recruits for al-Qaida, having been extradited from Spain, an Algerian, placed in Guantanamo. That person, as I understand it, as I speak at this moment, is being detained in the United States of America. That is what should happen with the other 41 people.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

Mr. NADLER. 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 New York will be postponed.

□ 1530

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in part B of House Report 115-261.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in part B of House Report 115-261.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 42 printed in part B of House Report 115-261.

Mr. FOSTER. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the procurement, the deployment, or the research, development, test, and evaluation of a space-based ballistic missile intercept layer.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 478, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I just have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I have a question on the procedure. I understand that Mr. FOSTER is recognized. Did I lose track of an amendment for Mr. POLIS?

The Acting CHAIR. That amendment was called, and the gentleman was not present.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. And Mr. POE?

The Acting CHAIR. That amendment was also called, and the gentleman was not present.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the information. Sorry for the interruption very much.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018 tasks the Missile Defense Agency with developing a space-based ballistic missile intercept layer.

There is no doubt that a space-based missile defense, if it is technologically feasible and economically justifiable, would make an important contribution to our national security. So would the Star Trek transporter or the warp drive, but as a scientist and, in fact, the only Ph.D. scientist in the U.S. Congress, I think that we need to do our homework before investing hundreds of billions of dollars into attempting to develop this system. As such, my amendment would prohibit the use of funds to attempt to develop a space-based missile intercept layer.

It has been more than 30 years since President Reagan called for defending the United States against a first strike by developing a strategic defense system, commonly known as Star Wars.

The idea of a space-based version of this has gone in and out of fashion for the last 30 years, but every time this space-based concept has been looked at by technologically competent outside experts, it was deemed to be unworkable, impossibly expensive, vulnerable to countermeasures, easy for an opponent to destroy, easy to overwhelm with a small number of enemy missiles, or all of the above. This approach was judged technologically unworkable in

1983, and the status quo has not changed.

In order to reach a ballistic missile during the first few minutes of flight, a large number of interceptors must be stationed in low-altitude orbit. A report conducted by the American Physical Society in 2003 concluded that in order to ensure full coverage, a fleet of 1,000 or more orbiting satellites would be required to intercept just a single missile.

To put that in perspective, the United States currently has slightly more than 600 satellites in Earth orbit, which includes commercial, scientific, and military satellites. Moreover, the amount of launch that is required to put this material into orbit in a reasonable amount of time would greatly exceed the current U.S. launch capability.

The National Academies of Sciences estimated that it would cost at least \$300 billion—in 2003 dollars—for just such a limited capability. And just last year, in his testimony to the House Armed Services Committee, the former Director of the Missile Defense Authority, Admiral Syring, concluded the same thing.

Setting aside the high cost, a space-based missile defense system has inherent vulnerabilities that greatly limit its effectiveness. Even with thousands of interceptors deployed, only a few would be within range to target an incoming missile, and those could be easily overwhelmed by the launch of several missiles from one location. And because interceptors must be stationed in low-altitude orbit, they are easily detected, tracked, and destroyed.

Finally, there is a more fundamental question that we must ask ourselves. And that is: Is it wise to deploy weapons in space, especially when the required technology is becoming widely available around the world?

Deploying such a system would strain strategic relationships around the globe and almost certainly trigger a space arms race.

There is no doubt that ensuring our Nation's defense and national security are of paramount priority, but spending hundreds of billions of dollars on a system which will not work, without having serious debate and at least some concept for how this might be remotely practical or affordable, is indefensible.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on my amendment.

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the space-based missile defense layer that we debate today will be one of the most significant technological advancements in our missile defense capability since Ronald Reagan first brought this possibility to the Nation.

Mr. FOSTER's amendment would prevent the next revolution in missile defense as we seek to expand our umbrella protection into space, the ultimate high ground.

Mr. Speaker, the most critical priority of this Congress is the defense of the Nation. If we fail that task, little else we might do will be of any consequence.

To prohibit the development of the next generation missile defense capabilities because other countries will object is to grant our potential adversaries a veto over our national security. Mr. FOSTER's amendment would do just that.

It should be noted that every significant missile defense milestone ever achieved by this Nation has been over the objections of gentlemen like Mr. FOSTER and his supporters. They have been wrong about missile defense for decades, and they have a consistent record of demonstrably bad judgment on this issue. They have imposed their philosophy on the science and physics involved. Theirs is a broken record which began playing back in the 1970s. If we had listened to them, we would have no missile defense today and we would all be completely vulnerable to the likes of North Korea.

The reason it was called Star Wars was because they derisively renamed Mr. Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative to Star Wars and said it was impossible because it would be hitting a bullet with a bullet. But, Mr. Chairman, today we not only hit a bullet with a bullet, we hit a dot on the side of a bullet with a bullet.

The technology is here. We have demonstrated it time and time again. It is important to defeat this amendment for the sake of the Constitution, for the sake of the United States of America.

Ms. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I join Mr. FRANKS in his remarks, and I urge rejection of this amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that Ronald Reagan never illuminated the possibility of this to the American public, because the possibility never existed.

What we have today is not a missile defense system. It has failed in the great majority of tests. It has been tested against a very small fraction of the countermeasures that are elementary to deploy against it.

I hope that no one involved in the missile defense system is telling President Trump that we have an effective antimissile system today, because if he gambles counting on any defense from that system, he is putting our country at risk.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining amount of my time to the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I simply would want to rise in support of his amendment. I would point out that in 2010, the Ballistic Missile Defense Review made no request for space-based interceptors. Currently, this is a matter under review by the Department. I think we should allow that review to be concluded before we expend moneys.

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I think I would just say that the opponents to missile defense, especially to space-based missile defense, have hilariously overstated the cost of this system.

A regionally deployed system would cost in the range of \$20 billion over 30 years, and the cost would go down, as launch costs often do.

It is important to keep in mind that when two airplanes hit two buildings, it cost us \$2 trillion.

What would that cost have been like if it had been a nuclear warhead that hit New York?

I would just suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is important that we do all that we possibly can to make sure that that does not indeed occur.

I don't know what price we put on national security, but the systems that we are talking about, our GMD system—our Ground-based Midcourse Defense system—was just tested against an ICBM target recently, and it was successful.

We have had 14 out of 14 successful tests with our THAAD system—our Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system. The technology has been proven time and again.

We should not undersell the United States of America. We can build the system. We will build it. It will help us get to the left of the launch. It will help us to be able to have a boost-phase defense against missiles when they are in their most vulnerable position and over enemy territory.

This is vital for the American national security, for our future, for our children, and for our children's children. I would hope that we would defeat this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in part B of House Report 115-261.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 10004. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to plan for, begin, continue, complete, process, or approve a public-private competition under the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 478, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would prohibit the Department of Defense from conducting what is called new A-76 studies. I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, as well as Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. DONOVAN of New York, Mr. COOK of California, Mr. RATCLIFFE of Texas, Mr. LOEBACK of Iowa, Mr. KILMER of Washington, Ms. SHEA-PORTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

These flawed A-76 studies are relying on a process that both the GAO and the inspector general of the Department of Defense determined could not demonstrate any savings to the American taxpayer. That is why A-76 studies have been subject to a congressional moratorium since 2010. The amendment I am offering today would continue that moratorium.

The fundamental flaw inherent in the A-76 process is the erroneous underlying methodology used to determine whether or not Federal civilian jobs would be outsourced. 2003 was the last time this process was updated.

Mr. Chairman, the inspector general's report notes that it simply fails to keep track of costs and savings. It has no anchor in reality, and incorporates an arbitrary 12 percent overhead factor cost for Federal employees as opposed to contractors.

The inspector general concluded that: "... multimillion-dollar decisions are based, in part, on a factor not supported by data . . . Unless DOD develops a supportable rate or an alternative method to calculate a fair and reasonable rate, the results of future competitions will be questionable."

Decisions involving taxpayer money should never be based on such a faulty process, especially when American jobs are at risk as well.

We are debating the appropriation of hundreds of billions of dollars, the lion's share of our country's discretionary spending. This is as it should be. We should spare no expense to provide the best care for our veterans. We should not haggle over the national defense, but when we spend this much money, we have a responsibility to do it carefully and based on actual data.

□ 1545

As legislators, we should exercise care to ensure that we represent the in-

terests of our constituents as well as possible. A flawed process based on pseudocalculations has no basis, no place in that reputation.

Ultimately, the A-76 process uses faulty, antiquated methodology to determine whether Federal civilian jobs should be outsourced, a matter we simply cannot approach so haphazardly. Both the GAO and the inspector general of the DOD concluded the process could not demonstrate any savings for the American taxpayer. This A-76 process is outdated, antiquated, and simply not anchored in reality.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I support competition, and these competitions, as a whole, have been beneficial to the Department of Defense.

The OMB has reported that, regardless of whether the Federal Government or the private contractor win the competition, the act of competition alone has saved or generated a cost savings up to 10 to 40 percent—10 to 40 percent, just having the competition.

This amendment would block opportunities for the defense industrial base, protect the status quo within the DOD civilian workforce, prevent cost savings at the DOD, and negate the natural innovation that comes from competition.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Ms. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. GRANGER. I want to thank the gentleman for his valuable contributions to the Defense Subcommittee. I join him in opposition to this amendment that would limit the Defense Department's flexibility to achieve efficiency and save taxpayer dollars.

I urge rejection of the amendment.

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, this body owes a duty to our warfighters, a duty to the taxpayers, and a duty to the civilian workforce. Allowing these flawed A-76 studies to move forward, it really is a breach to all three groups.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, to maintain the moratorium currently in place on these A-76 studies and protect our military readiness from a process in desperate need of radical revision.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I would say we have a duty to taxpayers to perform the best we can, to give the best product to our warfighters at the best price. I urge a "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in part B of House Report 115-261.

Mr. DAVIDSON. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used with respect to Yemen in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), including for the introduction of United States armed or military forces into hostilities in Yemen, into situations in Yemen where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into Yemeni territory, airspace, or waters while equipped for combat, in contravention of the congressional consultation and reporting requirements of sections 3 and 4 of such Resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 478, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to encourage my colleagues to support this amendment which simply says that none of these funds may be used in contravention of the War Powers Act in Yemen.

We are involved in a critical effort to defeat enemies of our country who took action on 9/11. Al-Qaida and their affiliates have been declared enemies, an authorized force, for nearly 16 years now. And in Yemen, al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula has found sanctuary.

Unfortunately, we also find ourselves in conflict with other enemies there. It is clear that the Houthis, who are Shia, are not affiliates of al-Qaida. In fact, they are engaged in a civil war there.

Over the years, we have sold arms and munitions, built a great alliance with a good ally in Saudi Arabia, and they are involved there. An enemy of the United States, Iran, is also involved as supporters of the Houthis, and so it is important to maintain our relationship with our ally Saudi Arabia.

It is important to recognize the strategic, operational, and tactical threats posed by Iran and their proxies like the Houthis, but it is also important that

we restore the emphasis of Article I of our Constitution and our clear duty in Congress to authorize our Nation's wars. So this amendment simply says nothing outside of the War Powers Act may be engaged in without further future authorization.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, the gentleman proposes an amendment that cuts all funding for the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces in the hostilities in Yemen. U.S. Forces need the flexibility to enter any theater where terrorists target the United States. Just 2 months ago, American Special Operations Forces conducted a ground raid against al-Qaida's Yemen branch, killing seven suspected militants.

We consulted leadership at the Department of Defense regarding this amendment. The Department recommends a more thorough legal review of the implications of this amendment.

Further, the Joint Staff asserts that a U.S. provision of limited support to the Saudi-led coalition might be construed in this context as participation in civil war, in which case, removal of such support could have a damaging effect on the U.S. relationship with Saudi Arabia and create further implications for regional security.

With Special Operations fighting terrorism around the globe to protect our safety, does Congress want to show its lack of support?

This amendment is poorly timed and overly restrictive and has many unforeseen complications. Therefore, the committee strongly opposes this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding and join her in opposition; although, I must tell you I am always very reserved about opposing an amendment put forth by a Notre Dame graduate.

But, in all seriousness, I would say that I do appreciate the gentleman's concern with the evolving situation in Yemen in that we do not want to get involved in a proxy war between Saudi Arabia and Iran.

I am also in agreement with much of the intent behind the amendment and certainly agree that Congress has relinquished much of its oversight role over Presidential decisions about sending U.S. Armed Forces into hostilities provided under the War Powers Act. That is why I am a strong supporter of efforts to develop a new Authorization for Use of Military Force for the global war on terror. Congress needs to, finally, after 16 years, carry out its constitutional duty and stop hiding from this very important debate that the gentleman has raised in his amendment.

However, I do have concerns that the gentleman's amendment, as written, is overly broad and would place undue restrictions on U.S. Forces within the Middle East to respond to legitimate threats within Yemen.

So, again, very reluctantly, I join with the chairwoman in opposition, and I appreciate her yielding.

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

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I respect the arguments of my colleagues in support of our national command authority. I wholeheartedly support that. In fact, I wore our Nation's uniform for nearly 12 years, served in Ranger Regiment, though I was not involved as a combat veteran.

I would not want to do anything to limit our ability to fight and win the war on terror. Indeed, the sole intent of this is to keep us laser-focused where we can. Resources are scarce, and the need to focus on defeating our enemies who have already been authorized by combat to engage in combat is critical.

In fact, it does alarm me to see that there is some concern that this is overly broad and limiting, as it is the law of the land. The War Powers Act is recognized as something that does give our Commanders flexibility. It gives them 90 days to engage in combat anywhere where there is a clear and present danger to the national security of the United States.

That could very well happen in that region of the country. The waters are tight. The threats are real. As I said, there are strategic, operational, and tactical concerns at play.

But this is nothing different than what President Eisenhower foresaw. In an enduring conflict, he said: "We face a hostile ideology global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method."

"Unhappily, the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle—with liberty at stake. Only thus shall we remain, despite every provocation, on our charted course toward permanent peace and human betterment."

I couldn't say it better, so I borrowed President Eisenhower's words.

I hope we can respect our Constitution, as our duty under it, the oath we have sworn to support and defend it, to limit the scope of our war to things that are Congress-authorized and not passive-aggressively through funding and cutting the checks, but through full authorization. We do not have such authorizations with respect to the Houthis, whether they are in Yemen or other Iranian proxies outside the scope of the War Powers Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part B of House Report 115-261.

Mr. DESANTIS. 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 division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to purchase heavy water from Iran.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 478, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple limitation amendment: No funds made available by this act may be used to purchase heavy water from the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Why are we doing this?

If you remember, the JCPOA provided Iran with \$150 billion in sanctions relief, even had the appalling spectacle of planes hauling in \$1.7 billion in cold, hard cash, dropped off in Tehran. So this regime has been flush with money as a result of the nuclear deal done during the Obama administration.

One of the frustrating things about that was that, even after that deal is enacted, even after all this money is flowing as a result of the deal, the Obama administration—this was not even required by the deal—sent millions of dollars to Iran in order to get heavy water. And that was not required by the deal. That was a gratuitous transaction, but it certainly provided more economic—an even greater economic lifeline to Iran.

This is still, to this day, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. They are fomenting discord all around the Middle East, in Lebanon, in Syria. They fund Hamas in the Gaza Strip. They are supporting the Houthis in Yemen. They have major control over portions of Iraq, and the Shiite militias that they back are running rampant.

Remember, they were probably the leading source of U.S. servicemember deaths in Iraq during the Iraq campaign. They funded Shiite militias. They had their Quds Force from Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps on the ground in Iraq; and certainly, hundreds of our servicemembers, some estimates say as many as 1,500 servicemembers, were killed from some of these Iranian proxies. They have never been held accountable for that.

□ 1600

Now this administration came in saying the Iran deal was a bad deal. They haven't left the deal. They haven't really done anything to fight back against the deal, and I hope that will happen. But in the meantime, I want to make sure that this administration is not repeating the mistakes of the Obama administration. No more taxpayer dollars to the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly would acknowledge that Iran is up to very nefarious purposes as far as sponsoring terrorism internationally.

I also acknowledge the gentleman referenced the previous administration more than once during his remarks as far as the issue before the House today.

In 2016, last year, heavy water was purchased by the Department of Energy and the State Department, but I would point out this is 2017 with a different administration, and essentially the amendment is a solution to a problem that does not exist.

The current administration has recertified Iran's compliance with the agreement twice. Iran does not have a nuclear weapon and is subject to intense scrutiny by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

But importantly to the point raised today, I would suggest that the Department of Energy consistently has indicated at the time of the 2016 heavy water purchase from Iran that the United States would not be a regular buyer of Iranian heavy water.

Since that purchase, the United States has not purchased any additional heavy water from that country. In fact, the U.S. has, through refraining from purchases of excess supply, forced Iran to ship excess heavy water abroad so that it can continue to adhere to the agreement entered into.

It seems highly unlikely that the current administration would now seek out an opportunity to purchase this heavy water.

Again, I believe the gentleman has a solution to a problem that does not exist, and I am opposed to his amendment.

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, I would just say, if you want money to go to purchase heavy water from Iran, then obviously you should oppose the amendment. But if you don't think that is a good idea, then it doesn't hurt us to have this in here, given what has happened in the past.

I wish I had 100 percent confidence that we would not be repeating mistakes. I hope that is where we go, but

I have not yet seen the real robust action to turn the tide away from a deal that has put Iran on the path to a nuclear bomb. The danger with the deal was always less that Iran would cheat on the deal. I think they probably are, but the danger is they get a bomb by keeping the deal.

This is a major problem. This is one small area of this to protect the taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DESANTIS. 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 Florida will be postponed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, as we begin to conclude debate on H.R. 3219, the Make America Secure Appropriations Act, I am sure I join with Ranking Member NITA LOWEY in thanking all the Members of the House for the manner in which this debate has been conducted over the last couple of days.

I thank the subcommittee chairs, the ranking members, and the Members who presented well over 120 amendments that were made in order.

Let me reiterate why this package of appropriations bills is so important. From 2010 to 2014, defense spending was cut 21 percent in real terms. We heard that from Chairman THORNBERRY of the Armed Services Committee. Yet, as we know, the world did not get 21 percent safer.

In fact, we ask more of our military than ever before, and we need to support them here at home and abroad.

Today—and I said this earlier in the debate—we have the oldest Air Force in history, the Navy's fleet is smaller than it has been in decades, and the Army has just three combat brigade teams fully prepared to fight.

Moreover, we have too many aircraft that can't fly, too many ships that cannot sail, too many troops who cannot deploy. We need better equipment and training for our warfighters, and we need more of the warfighters. We need a cyber component that is really effective.

In April—it seems like years ago—we began to rebuild our Armed Forces with the fiscal year 2017 consolidated appropriations bill. Today, this legislation we are considering continues that critical work.

Mr. Chairman, this four-bill package is carefully crafted to fund our critical

military priorities, reinforce our nuclear deterrent, support veterans, make our borders more secure, and strengthen protection for our constituents and for Members.

Once again, I thank Chairwoman KAY GRANGER; Chairmen MIKE SIMPSON, CHARLIE DENT, KEVIN YODER; all chairmen and their ranking counterparts; and our remarkable staff for bringing us to the finish line this afternoon, earlier than we thought.

I also thank the rest of the Members and the staff of the Appropriations Committee for their extraordinary efforts over the past several months. It was full speed ahead, and they performed in a remarkable way.

I would like to note the work of our clerk Nancy Fox and her team, Jim Kulikowski, Carol Murphy, Shannon O'Keefe, Stephen Sepp, Maureen Holohan, Jennifer Hing, Marta Dehmlow Hernandez, Tammy Hughes, Rachel Kahler, David Roth.

And in my personal office: Katie Hazlett.

And those who work with Mrs. LOWEY—and this may be the short list—Shalanda Young, Chris Bigelow, Adam Berg, and Becky Leggieri.

May I say that I didn't mean to leave out Chairman CARTER of the Homeland Security Committee for the work that he has done.

My colleagues, each and every one of these bills deserves to be sent to the President's desk. I look forward to completing our work on all 12 appropriations bills when we return from the recess, or perhaps even before then.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in part B of House Report 115-261.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish we were considering bills under regular order, but I hope that in the weeks ahead we can work together to raise the budget caps and enact bipartisan bills we can all support.

I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, my friend; and KAY GRANGER, the chair; and, of course, PETE VISCLOSKY for your hard work on this bill.

However, this is not the regular way to proceed. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill which would waste \$1.6 billion on Trump's border wall, use fraudulent defense numbers, gut critical investments in clean energy, include poison pill riders, and leave the remaining spending bills with no path forward.

Mr. Chairman, as I conclude, I thank again all of the Members, all of my hardworking staff on both sides of the aisle. On this bill, I urge a "no" vote.

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

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida to the end that the Chair puts the question de novo.

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

There was no objection.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 115–261 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. SUOZZI of New York.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 38 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 43 by Mr. CARTWRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. SUOZZI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 211, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

AYES—214

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

Grijalva	Lynch	Schakowsky
Gutiérrez	Maloney,	Schiff
Hanabusa	Carolyn B.	Schneider
Hastings	Maloney, Sean	Schrader
Heck	Mast	Scott (VA)
Higgins (NY)	Matsui	Scott, David
Himes	McCollum	Serrano
Hoyer	McEachin	Sewell (AL)
Huffman	McGovern	Shea-Porter
Jackson Lee	McNerney	Sherman
Jayapal	Meehan	Shuster
Jeffries	Meeks	Simpson
Johnson (GA)	Meng	Sinema
Johnson, E. B.	Moore	Sires
Jones	Moulton	Slaughter
Kaptur	Murphy (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Katko	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Keating	Neal	Soto
Kelly (IL)	Nolan	Speier
Kennedy	Norcross	Stefanik
Khanna	O'Halleran	Suozi
Kihuen	O'Rourke	Swalwell (CA)
Kildee	Pallone	Takano
Kilmer	Panetta	Tenney
Kind	Pascrell	Thompson (CA)
King (NY)	Payne	Thompson (MS)
Krishnamoorthi	Pelosi	Tiberi
Kuster (NH)	Perlmutter	Titus
Langevin	Peters	Tonko
Larsen (WA)	Pingree	Torres
Larson (CT)	Pocan	Tsongas
Lawrence	Polis	Vargas
Lawson (FL)	Price (NC)	Veasey
Lee	Quigley	Vela
Levin	Raskin	Velázquez
Lewis (GA)	Reed	Visclosky
Lieu, Ted	Rice (NY)	Walz
Lipinski	Richmond	Wasserman
LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz
Loeb sack	Rosen	Waters, Maxine
Lofgren	Roybal-Allard	Watson Coleman
Lowenthal	Ruiz	Welch
Lowey	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)
Lujan Grisham,	Rush	Yarmuth
M.	Sánchez	Young (IA)
Luján, Ben Ray	Sarbanes	Zeldin

NOES—211

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

Poe (TX)	Russell	Upton
Poliquin	Rutherford	Valadao
Posey	Sanford	Wagner
Ratcliffe	Schweikert	Walberg
Reichert	Scott, Austin	Walden
Renacci	Sensenbrenner	Walker
Rice (SC)	Sessions	Walorski
Roby	Shimkus	Walters, Mimi
Roe (TN)	Smith (MO)	Weber (TX)
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Wenstrup
Rohrabacher	Smucker	Westerman
Rokita	Stewart	Williams
Rooney, Francis	Stivers	Wilson (SC)
Rooney, Thomas	Taylor	Wittman
J.	Thompson (PA)	Womack
Ross	Thornberry	Woodall
Rothfus	Tipton	Yoder
Rouzer	Trott	Yoho
Royce (CA)	Turner	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Cummings	Napolitano	Ryan (OH)
Fortenberry	Palmer	Scalise
Hollingsworth	Roskam	

□ 1641

Messrs. POE of Texas, COLLINS of New York, MCCARTHY, RICE of South Carolina, HARRIS, JOYCE of Ohio, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, CASTRO of Texas, KATKO, LOWENTHAL, ELLISON, BEYER, COOPER, SIMPSON, TIBERI, GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Messrs. WALZ, COSTA, FLEISCHMANN, O'ROURKE, and YOUNG of Iowa changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The next amendment votes will be 2-minute votes. Members are advised to stay on the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. BRENDAN F. BOYLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 256, noes 169, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

AYES—256

Abraham	Bergman	Brown (MD)
Adams	Beyer	Brownley (CA)
Aguilar	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Bacon	Bishop (GA)	Bustos
Banks (IN)	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Barletta	Blunt Rochester	Byrne
Barragán	Bonamici	Capuano
Bass	Boyle, Brendan	Carbajal
Beatty	F.	Cárdenas
Bera	Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)

Cartwright	Jayapal	Polis	Gohmert	Lewis (MN)	Roe (TN)	Cartwright	Hoyer	Payne
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Price (NC)	Gosar	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Castor (FL)	Huffman	Pelosi
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley	Gowdy	Long	Rohrabacher	Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Raskin	Granger	Loudermilk	Rokita	Chu, Judy	Jayapal	Peters
Ciciline	Jones	Reed	Graves (GA)	Love	Rooney, Francis	Ciciline	Jeffries	Pingree
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Rice (NY)	Graves (LA)	Lucas	Rooney, Thomas J.	Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Clarke (NY)	Katko	Richmond	Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer	Ross	Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Clay	Keating	Rogers (AL)	Green, Gene	Marchant	Rouzer	Clay	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Griffith	Marshall	Rutherford	Cleaver	Keating	Quigley
Clyburn	Kelly (PA)	Rosen	Grothman	Massie	Scott, Austin	Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Raskin
Coffman	Kennedy	Rothfus	Guthrie	McCarthy	Sessions	Cohen	Kennedy	Rice (NY)
Cohen	Khanna	Roybal-Allard	Handel	McCaul	Shimkus	Connolly	Khanna	Richmond
Comstock	Kihuen	Royce (CA)	Harper	McClintock	Simpson	Conyers	Kihuen	Roybal-Allard
Conaway	Kildee	Ruiz	Harris	McHenry	Smith (MO)	Cooper	Kildee	Rush
Connolly	Kilmer	Ruppersberger	Hensarling	Meadows	Smith (NE)	Costa	Kilmer	Sánchez
Conyers	Kind	Rush	Herrera Beutler	Messer	Stewart	Courtney	Kind	Sanford
Cook	King (NY)	Russell	Hice, Jody B.	Mitchell	Stivers	Crowley	Krishnamoorthi	Sarbanes
Correa	Knight	Sánchez	Higgins (LA)	Moolenaar	Taylor	Davis (CA)	Kuster (NH)	Schakowsky
Costa	Krishnamoorthi	Sanford	Hill	Mullin	Tiberi	Davis, Danny	Langevin	Schiff
Costello (PA)	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes	Holding	Newhouse	Tipton	DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Courtney	Lamborn	Schakowsky	Hudson	Noem	Trott	DeGette	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Crist	Langevin	Schiff	Huizenga	Norman	Wagner	Delaney	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Schneider	Hultgren	Nunes	Walden	DeLauro	Lee	Scott, David
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Schrader	Jenkins (KS)	Olson	Walker	DelBene	Levin	Scott, David
Curbelo (FL)	Latta	Schweikert	Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo	Walorski	Demings	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Scott (VA)	Johnson (LA)	Paulsen	Weber (TX)	DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	Lawson (FL)	Scott, David	Johnson (OH)	Pearce	Webster (FL)	Deutch	Loebach	Sherman
Davis, Rodney	Lee	Sensenbrenner	Johnson, Sam	Perry	Westerman	Dingell	Lofgren	Slaughter
DeFazio	Levin	Serrano	Jordan	Peterson	Williams	Doggett	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sewell (AL)	Joyce (OH)	Pittenger	Wilson (SC)	Doyle, Michael F.	Lowey	Soto
Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter	Kelly (MS)	Poe (TX)	Wittman	Duncan (TN)	Lujan Grisham, M.	Speier
DeLauro	Lipinski	Sherman	King (IA)	Poliquin	Womack	Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Loebach	Shuster	Kinzinger	Posey	Woodall	Engel	Lynch	Takano
Demings	Lofgren	Sinema	Kustoff (TN)	Ratcliffe	Yoho	Eshoo	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Dent	Lowenthal	Sires	Labrador	Reichert	Young (IA)	Espallat	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Lowe	Slaughter	LaHood	Renacci		Esty (CT)	McEachin	Titus
Deutch	Lujan Grisham, M.	Smith (NJ)	LaMalfa	Rice (SC)		Evans	McGovern	Tonko
Dingell	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (TX)	Lance	Roby		Foster	McNerney	Torres
Doggett	Lynch	Smith (WA)				Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael F.	MacArthur	Smucker	Cummings	Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Fudge	Meng	Vargas
Dunn	Maloney	Soto	Fortenberry	Palmer	Scalise	Gabbard	Moore	Veasey
Ellison	Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean	Speier	Hollingsworth	Roskam		Garamendi	Moulton	Vela
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Stefanik				Gomez	Murphy (FL)	Velázquez
Eshoo	Marino	Suozi				Green, Al	Nadler	Visclosky
Espallat	Mast	Swalwell (CA)				Grijalva	Neal	Walz
Esty (CT)	Matsui	Takano				Gutiérrez	Nolan	Wasserman
Evans	McCollum	Tenney				Hanabusa	Norcross	Schultz
Faso	McEachin	Thompson (CA)				Hastings	O'Rourke	Waters, Maxine
Fitzpatrick	McGovern	Thompson (MS)				Heck	Pallone	Watson Coleman
Fleischmann	McKinley	Thompson (PA)				Higgins (NY)	Panetta	Welch
Foster	McMorris	Thornberry				Himes	Pascrell	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Rodgers	Titus						Yarmuth
Franks (AZ)	McNerney	Tonko						
Fudge	McSally	Torres						
Gabbard	Meehan	Tsongas						
Galleo	Meeks	Turner						
Garamendi	Meng	Upton						
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Valadao						
Gomez	Moore	Vargas						
Gonzalez (TX)	Moulton	Veasey						
Goodlatte	Murphy (FL)	Vela						
Gottheimer	Murphy (PA)	Velázquez						
Green, Al	Nadler	Visclosky						
Grijalva	Neal	Walberg						
Gutiérrez	Nolan	Walz						
Hanabusa	Norcross	Wasserman						
Hartzler	O'Halleran	Schultz						
Hastings	O'Rourke	Waters, Maxine						
Heck	Pallone	Watson Coleman						
Higgins (NY)	Panetta	Welch						
Himes	Pascrell	Wenstrup						
Hoyer	Payne	Wilson (FL)						
Huffman	Pelosi	Yarmuth						
Hunter	Perlmutter	Yoder						
Hurd	Peters	Young (AK)						
Issa	Pingree	Zeldin						
Jackson Lee	Pocan							

NOES—169

Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Denham
Allen	Buck	DeSantis
Amash	Bucshon	DesJarlais
Amodei	Budd	Diaz-Balart
Arrington	Burgess	Donovan
Babin	Calvert	Duffy
Barr	Carter (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Barton	Carter (TX)	Duncan (TN)
Biggs	Chabot	Emmer
Bishop (MI)	Cheney	Estes (KS)
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Farenthold
Black	Collins (GA)	Ferguson
Blackburn	Collins (NY)	Flores
Blum	Comer	Foxx
Bost	Cooper	Frelinghuysen
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Gaetz
Brat	Crawford	Gallagher
Bridenstine	Culberson	Garrett
Brooks (AL)	Davidson	Gianforte

NOT VOTING—8

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1646

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Messrs. HUNTER and RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 252, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

AYES—172

Adams	Bishop (GA)	Brown (MD)
Amash	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Barragán	Blunt Rochester	Bustos
Bass	Bonamici	Butterfield
Beatty	Boyle, Brendan F.	Capuano
Bera	Brady (PA)	Carbajal
Beyer		Carson (IN)

NOES—252

Abraham	Correa	Graves (MO)
Aderholt	Costello (PA)	Green, Gene
Aguilar	Cramer	Griffith
Allen	Crawford	Grothman
Amodei	Crist	Guthrie
Arrington	Cuellar	Handel
Bacon	Culberson	Harper
Banks (IN)	Curbelo (FL)	Harris
Barletta	Davidson	Hartzler
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Hensarling
Barton	Denham	Herrera Beutler
Bergman	Dent	Hice, Jody B.
Biggs	DeSantis	Higgins (LA)
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Hill
Bishop (MI)	Diaz-Balart	Holding
Bishop (UT)	Donovan	Hudson
Black	Duffy	Huizenga
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Blum	Dunn	Hunter
Bost	Emmer	Hurd
Brady (TX)	Estes (KS)	Issa
Brat	Farenthold	Jenkins (KS)
Bridenstine	Faso	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (AL)	Ferguson	Johnson (LA)
Brooks (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Johnson, Sam
Buck	Flores	Jones
Bucshon	Foxx	Jordan
Budd	Franks (AZ)	Joyce (OH)
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Katko
Byrne	Gaetz	Kelly (MS)
Calvert	Gallagher	Kelly (PA)
Cárdenas	Gallego	King (IA)
Carter (GA)	Garrett	King (NY)
Carter (TX)	Gianforte	Kinzinger
Chabot	Gibbs	Knight
Cheney	Gohmert	Kustoff (TN)
Coffman	Gonzalez (TX)	Labrador
Cole	Goodlatte	LaHood
Collins (GA)	Gosar	LaMalfa
Collins (NY)	Gottheimer	Lamborn
Comer	Gowdy	Lance
Cooper	Granger	Latta
Cramer	Graves (GA)	Lawson (FL)
Crawford	Graves (LA)	Lewis (MN)

Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen

NOT VOTING—9

Babin
Cummings
Fortenberry

Hollingsworth
Napolitano
Palmer

Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema

Roskam
Ryan (OH)
Scalise

Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Dunn
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes

Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)

Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieue, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi

NOES—172

Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
DeSantis

Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Hunter
Russell
Rutherford
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westerman
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
Lamborn

Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis

NOT VOTING—8

Cummings
Fortenberry
Hollingsworth

Napolitano
Palmer
Roskam

Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Sanford
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shinkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stivers
Taylor
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yoder
Yoho

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

□ 1651

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

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR.
CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.
CARTWRIGHT) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the noes 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 253, noes 172,
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

AYES—253

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Barletta
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera

Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost

Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Bridenstine
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield

Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)

Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
DeSantis

DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foss
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert

Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. DENHAM
changed their 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. POE
of Texas) having assumed the chair,
Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of
the Committee of the Whole House on
the state of the Union, reported that
that Committee, having had under con-
sideration the bill (H.R. 3219) making
appropriations for the Department of
Defense for the fiscal year ending Sep-
tember 30, 2018, and for other purposes,
and, pursuant to House Resolution 478,
he reported the bill, as amended by
that resolution and by House Resolu-
tion 473, 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 or-
dered.

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. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Yes, I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike division E.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. 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.

In last year's election, no campaign rhetoric was more infamous than the President's promise to "build a great, great wall on our Southern border" and "make Mexico pay for it."

The reality is the funding would come from U.S. taxpayers, not from Mexico, as the President promised. This motion to recommit strikes the \$1.6 billion appropriation for construction of nearly 74 miles of border wall.

Beyond the initial 74 miles, we have no idea of how many miles of border wall the President plans to build or how much it will cost because we have not received the required report on the long-term plan and justification for border security investments.

Even with the plan, we will need time to evaluate whether investments in the border wall are more cost effective than alternatives and more urgent than clearly established unmet needs.

With \$1.6 billion, we could buy two of the four heavy Coast Guard icebreakers we need to protect U.S. interests in the Arctic. This purchase would help minimize the danger highlighted in a National Academies of Science report, which concluded the Coast Guard requires four new heavy icebreakers to protect U.S. interests in the Arctic, where Russia has an ever-increasing presence.

The Coast Guard is ready to solicit proposals for new icebreakers in fiscal year 2018. In this bill there is no funding for essential icebreakers. There is no acquisition funding for them in the Homeland Security bill.

The \$1.6 billion could also be used for investments in additional scanning technology in the hiring of thousands of Customs officers at every U.S. port of entry. This would reduce wait times for travelers, better facilitate the flow of commerce, and contribute to economic growth in many of our districts. It would also enhance our ability to intercept contraband and illegal narcotics mostly smuggled directly into the U.S. through our ports of entry, not where the wall would be built.

The bill before us does not adequately address these and other areas of security vulnerabilities.

As Members of Congress, protecting our Nation and the American public is our greatest responsibility. It is our obligation to act in their best interest and to invest their tax dollars wisely. If the only Homeland Security item in this bill remains the funding for 74 miles of border wall, we will fail to meet our obligations.

Unfortunately, the President's border wall is now a proxy for the broader immigration debate. There is a false and misleading assumption that building a border wall will solve the immigration challenges we face. The reality is we will never be able to fix our broken immigration system with an enforcement-only approach that turns a blind eye to the desperate circumstances that compels so many to make the often deadly journey to the U.S.

We will never be able to address our immigration challenges by treating as criminals the millions of undocumented people in this country, many of whom are our neighbors and friends.

For years or even decades, the vast majority have called the U.S. their home. They have paid their taxes, acted responsibly, contributed to their communities, and worked hard to provide opportunity for their family.

Immigration enforcement is as much a moral issue as it is a legal one. Our Statue of Liberty has always been a welcoming symbol of hope for those who, like now, are fleeing poverty, oppression, famine, war, and violence in their home country. Many of our ancestors come from somewhere else, often within certain legal status, and made significant contributions to help our country become the greatest in the world. Today's immigrants continue to contribute to that noble legacy.

What we truly need is comprehensive immigration reform that protects our homeland and reflects our American values. Democrats stand ready to work with Republicans to achieve that goal, but Democrats will not support the use of taxpayer dollars for an ill-conceived border wall that has more to do with a campaign promise than the security of our homeland.

In spite of the President's assurances, Mexico is not paying for this wall. The American taxpayer is. My motion to recommit would prevent that from happening. I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Senate is now considering what is called a "skinny bill" on the Affordable Care Act.

The Senators are being told that they are voting for that bill to send it over here so it can go to conference and be perfected.

The Rules Committee has just met and a provision was offered to the mar-

tial law, which means that we can take something up right away, that what we can take up is to go to conference. That was rejected by the Rules Committee.

There is a suspicion that I have—and I see the majority leader on the floor—that there may be an intent to send the bill immediately back to the Senate and have it go to the President without 72 hours of consideration, without hearings, without scoring. I would hope the majority leader could give us assurances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, as we gather here, nearly 250,000 men and women in uniform are deployed in nearly 177 countries in all corners of the globe. Another 2 million Active Guard and Reserve are standing watch back here at home in the United States.

They are doing their jobs. We should do our jobs by providing them with everything they need to complete their mission. They are trusting us to do our jobs.

Defeat the motion to recommit, support national security, and vote "yes" on final passage.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 234, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

AYES—193

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

Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Raskin	McMorris	Roe (TN)	Taylor	Jordan	Mullin	Shimkus
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Rice (NY)	Rodgers	Rogers (AL)	Tenney	Joyce (OH)	Murphy (PA)	Shuster
Doggett	Lawrence	Richmond	McSally	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)	Katko	Newhouse	Simpson
Doyle, Michael F.	Lawson (FL)	Rosen	Meadows	Rohrabacher	Thornberry	Kelly (MS)	Noem	Sinema
Ellison	Lee	Roybal-Allard	Meehan	Rokita	Tiberi	Kelly (PA)	Norman	Smith (MO)
Engel	Levin	Ruiz	Messer	Rooney, Francis	Tipton	King (IA)	Nunes	Smith (NE)
Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Ruppersberger	Mitchell	Rooney, Thomas J.	Trott	King (NY)	O'Halleran	Smith (NJ)
Españillat	Lieu, Ted	Rush	Moolenaar	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner	Kinzinger	Olson	Smith (TX)
Esty (CT)	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)	Mooney (WV)	Ross	Upton	Knight	Palazzo	Smucker
Evans	Loeb sack	Sánchez	Mullin	Rothfus	Valadao	Kustoff (TN)	Palmer	Stefanik
Foster	Lofgren	Sarbanes	Murphy (PA)	Rouzer	Wagner	Labrador	Paulsen	Stewart
Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal	Schakowsky	Newhouse	Royce (CA)	Walberg	LaHood	Pearce	Stivers
Fudge	Lujan Grisham, M.	Schiff	Noem	Russell	Walden	LaMalfa	Perry	Taylor
Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray	Schneider	Norman	Rutherford	Walker	Lamborn	Pittenger	Tenney
Gallo	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Schrader	Nunes	Sanford	Walorski	Lance	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Scott (VA)	Olson	Schweikert	Walters, Mimi	Latta	Poliquin	Thornberry
Gomez	Matsui	Scott, David	Palazzo	Scott, Austin	Weber (TX)	Lewis (MN)	Posey	Tiberi
Gonzalez (TX)	McCollum	Serrano	Palmer	Sensenbrenner	Webster (FL)	LoBiondo	Ratcliffe	Tipton
Gottheimer	McEachin	Sewell (AL)	Paulsen	Sessions	Wenstrup	Long	Reed	Trott
Green, Al	McGovern	Shea-Porter	Pearce	Shimkus	Westerman	Loudermilk	Reichert	Turner
Green, Gene	McNerney	Sherman	Perry	Shuster	Williams	Love	Renacci	Upton
Grijalva	Meeks	Sinema	Pittenger	Simpson	Wilson (SC)	Lucas	Rice (SC)	Valadao
Gutiérrez	Meng	Sires	Poe (TX)	Smith (MO)	Wittman	Luetkemeyer	Roby	Wagner
Hanabusa	Moore	Slaughter	Poliquin	Smith (NE)	Womack	Marchant	Roe (TN)	Walberg
Hastings	Moulton	Smith (WA)	Posey	Smith (NJ)	Woodall	Marino	Rogers (AL)	Walden
Heck	Murphy (FL)	Soto	Ratcliffe	Smith (TX)	Yoder	Marshall	Rogers (KY)	Walker
Higgins (NY)	Nadler	Speier	Reed	Smucker	Yoho	Mast	Rohrabacher	Walorski
Himes	Neal	Suoizzi	Reichert	Stefanik	Young (AK)	McCarthy	Rokita	Walters, Mimi
Hoyer	Nolan	Swallow (CA)	Renacci	Stewart	Young (IA)	McCaul	Rooney, Francis	Weber (TX)
Huffman	Norcross	Takano	Rice (SC)	Stivers	Zeldin	McClintock	Rooney, Thomas J.	Webster (FL)
Jackson Lee	O'Halleran	Thompson (CA)	Roby			McHenry	J.	Wenstrup
Jayapal	O'Rourke	Thompson (MS)				McKinley	Ros-Lehtinen	Westerman
Jeffries	Pallone	Titus	Cummings	Hollingsworth	Roskam	McMorris	Ross	Williams
Johnson (GA)	Panetta	Tonko	Fortenberry	Napolitano	Scalise	Rodgers	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)
Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell	Torres				McSally	Rouzer	Wittman
Jones	Payne	Tsongas				Meadows	Royce (CA)	Womack
Kaptur	Pelosi	Vargas				Meehan	Russell	Woodall
Keating	Perlmutter	Veasey				Messner	Rutherford	Yoder
Kelly (IL)	Peters	Vela				Mitchell	Schweikert	Yoho
Kennedy	Peterson	Velázquez				Moolenaar	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)
Khanna	Pingree	Visclosky				Mooney (WV)	Sensenbrenner	Young (IA)
Kihuen	Pocan	Walz					Sessions	Zeldin
Kildee	Polis	Wasserman						
Kilmer	Price (NC)	Schultz						
Kind	Quigley	Waters, Maxine						
Krishnamoorthi		Watson Coleman						
Kuster (NH)		Welch						
Langevin		Wilson (FL)						
		Yarmuth						

NOES—234

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

NOT VOTING—6

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1713

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 192, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

YEAS—235

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

NAYS—192

Adams	Duncan (TN)	Lowenthal
Aguilar	Ellison	Lowe
Amash	Engel	Lujan Grisham, M.
Barragán	Eshoo	Luján, Ben Ray
Bass	Españillat	Lynch
Beatty	Esty (CT)	Maloney, Carolyn B.
Bera	Evans	Maloney, Sean
Beyer	Foster	Massie
Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	Matsui
Blunt Rochester	Fudge	McCollum
Bonamici	Gabbard	McEachin
Boyle, Brendan F.	Gallo	McGovern
Brady (PA)	Garamendi	McNerney
Brown (MD)	Gomez	Meeks
Brownley (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Meng
Bustos	Green, Al	Moore
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Moulton
Capuano	Grijalva	Murphy (FL)
Carbajal	Gutiérrez	Nadler
Cárdenas	Hanabusa	Neal
Carson (IN)	Hastings	Nolan
Cartwright	Heck	Norcross
Castor (FL)	Higgins (NY)	O'Rourke
Castro (TX)	Himes	Pallone
Chu, Judy	Hoyer	Panetta
Cicilline	Huffman	Pascarell
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Payne
Clarke (NY)	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Clay	Jayapal	Perlmutter
Cleaver	Jeffries	Peters
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree
Connolly	Jones	Pocan
Conyers	Kaptur	Polis
Cooper	Keating	Price (NC)
Correa	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Costa	Kennedy	Raskin
Courtney	Khanna	Rice (NY)
Crowley	Kihuen	Richmond
Cuellar	Kilmer	Rosen
Davis (CA)	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Danny	Krishnamoorthi	Ruiz
DeFazio	Kuster (NH)	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Langevin	Rush
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Sánchez
DelBene	Lawrence	Sanford
Demings	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes
DeSaulnier	Lee	Schakowsky
Deutch	Levin	Schiff
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Schneider
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
Doyle, Michael F.	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
	Loeb sack	
	Lofgren	

Scott, David	Swalwell (CA)	Velázquez
Serrano	Takano	Visclosky
Sewell (AL)	Thompson (CA)	Walz
Shea-Porter	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman
Sherman	Titus	Schultz
Sires	Tonko	Waters, Maxine
Slaughter	Torres	Watson Coleman
Smith (WA)	Tsongas	Welch
Soto	Vargas	Wilson (FL)
Speier	Veasey	Yarmuth
Suozy	Vela	

NOT VOTING—6

Cummings	Hollingsworth	Roskam
Fortenberry	Napolitano	Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1719

Miss RICE of New York changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 430 through No. 435 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on the Souzzi Amendment. I would have also voted “yea” on the Boyle Amendment. I would have also voted “yea” on the Nadler Amendment. I would have also voted “yea” on the Cartwright Amendment. I would have also voted “yea” on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 3219. I would have also voted “nay” on the Final Passage of H.R. 3219—“Make America Secure Appropriations Act, 2018.”

WOUNDED OFFICERS RECOVERY ACT OF 2017

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3298) to authorize the Capitol Police Board to make payments from the United States Capitol Police Memorial Fund to employees of the United States Capitol Police who have sustained serious line-of-duty injuries, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Wounded Officers Recovery Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. PAYMENTS FROM UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE MEMORIAL FUND FOR EMPLOYEES KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY OR SUSTAINING SERIOUS LINE-OF-DUTY INJURIES.

(a) AUTHORIZING PAYMENTS FROM FUND.—Section 2 of Public Law 105–223 (2 U.S.C. 1952) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting “AND CERTAIN OTHER UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE EMPLOYEES” before the period at the end;

(2) by striking “Subject to the regulations” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—Except to the extent used or reserved for use under subsection (b) and subject to the regulations”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) PAYMENTS FOR EMPLOYEES KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY OR SUSTAINING SERIOUS LINE-OF-DUTY INJURIES.—In addition to the amounts paid under subsection (a), and in accordance with the regulations issued under section 4(b), amounts in the Fund may be paid to—

“(1) families of employees of the United States Capitol Police who were killed in the line of duty; or

“(2) employees of the United States Capitol Police who have sustained serious line-of-duty injuries.”.

(b) REGULATIONS OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.—Section 4 of Public Law 105–223 (2 U.S.C. 1954) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Capitol Police Board” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—The Capitol Police Board”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) REGULATIONS GOVERNING PAYMENTS FOR EMPLOYEES KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY OR SUSTAINING SERIOUS LINE-OF-DUTY INJURIES.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Capitol Police Board shall issue specific regulations governing the use of the Fund for making payments to families of employees of the United States Capitol Police who were killed in the line of duty and employees of the United States Capitol Police who have sustained serious line-of-duty injuries (as authorized under section 2(b)), including regulations—

“(1) establishing the conditions under which the family of an employee or an employee is eligible to receive such a payment;

“(2) providing for the amount, timing, and manner of such payments; and

“(3) ensuring that any such payment is in addition to, and does not otherwise affect, any other form of compensation payable to the family of an employee or the employee, including benefits for workers' compensation under chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code.”.

(c) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO INCIDENT OF JUNE 14, 2017.—The second sentence of section 1 of Public Law 105–223 (2 U.S.C. 1951) is amended by striking “deposit into the Fund” and inserting “deposit into the Fund, including amounts received in response to the shooting incident at the practice for the Congressional Baseball Game for Charity on June 14, 2017,”.

Mr. HARPER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUSSIAN ENERGY THREATS

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the growing threat to our overseas military facilities posed by the Russian Federation.

Today, one of the serious risks to our bases in Europe is Russia's corner on

oil and natural gas. One such facility is the Army's new medical complex in Germany, planned to be located near Ramstein Air Base, where I was the installation commander.

It would be financially irresponsible and strategically reckless to spend \$1 billion for a state-of-the-art hospital, only to have the design of the new facility compromise the very reason it exists by relying on Russia as its primary source of fuel. There are local mixed-fuel energy supply options readily available, and it would be inexcusable not to make them part of the design of this project. This is good strategy, good economics, and just plain common sense.

We can't allow ourselves to be put in a situation where Russia has the ability to cut off energy to our forward bases, especially when we could have averted this tragic vulnerability ahead of time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House and Senate to join me in exercising aggressive oversight of this threat to our national security.

POISON PILL RIDER ON A BORDER WALL IS JUST SHAMEFUL

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, our constituents sent us here to discuss our differences honestly and openly and come together to pass bipartisan legislation addressing our Nation's most pressing issues.

Every year I have been in Congress, I have voted in favor of bipartisan, clean funding bills to give our troops a pay raise and fund our military in the VA. I took those votes proudly, working with Democrats and Republicans.

Today, I am outraged Republican leadership played politics with this critical funding. To include a poison pill rider that wastes \$1.6 billion in taxpayer dollars on an ineffective border wall is just shameful. We all know this wall will not make us any safer. Even law enforcement officials oppose this funding.

I am very disappointed GOP leaders would link President Trump's divisive campaign rhetoric with what should unite all Americans: supporting our troops and veterans.

Because of procedural trickery, debate was not allowed. That would have allowed a bipartisan agreement on a clean bill supporting our troops and our veterans.

Shameful.

BUILD THE WALL

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, the House delivered on one of the President's promises to increase security in the United States to