

Without understanding and respecting these fundamental principles of sovereignty, nation-states would have their territorial integrity infringed upon, be subordinated to outside imposed actions, or come under threat from other hostile forces. That is why I cofounded the House Sovereignty Caucus here in Congress.

We must never forget that the supreme law of the land is the U.S. Constitution, Federal laws made pursuant to the Constitution and treaties made under the Constitution's authority. Upholding this supreme law is what makes America great.

Threats to U.S. sovereignty are being attempted every day. We must stay on guard against them, both from without and from within. We must uphold the supreme law of the land. If we divert from this law, we will lose our sovereignty and our freedom.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING COACH JERRY CLAY

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize 43 years of service to young men in Garland County, Arkansas, by Coach Jerry Clay, whose 269 wins as head coach at Fountain Lake High School and Lake Hamilton High School are sixth all-time on the list of most wins in Arkansas high school football.

Good coaches have the ability to teach their players to win consistently on the field. Great coaches teach their players to be winners in life. Jerry Clay is a great coach. Not only has he coached 14 conference championships and had teams compete in six State championships—winning two—many young men he coached have gone on to excel in virtually all areas of society, from doctors, to businessmen, to true American heroes like SEAL Team 6 operator Adam Brown, whose life story was chronicled in the best-seller book, "Fearless."

I will forever be grateful for the investment Jerry Clay made in my life as my coach, and I wish him many happy years in retirement.

HONORING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK AND NATIONAL EMS WEEK

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, this is National Police Week and National EMS Week, which is when we pause to reflect and honor the service and sacrifice of the brave men and women who have lost their lives in the line of duty while serving to protect us. We also pay our respects to all who continue to serve us today. All lives matter. These men and women risk their lives for the

safety and security of communities all throughout our country.

With the terrorist acts in Paris, Belgium, and around the world, we are constantly reminded of how dangerous this world can be. When these attacks occur, they are the ones who run head-on into the mayhem and chaos without fear to do everything in their power to save as many people as they can.

Unfortunately, today we are witnessing the shameful targeting of our first responders and police officers. Their authority is constantly being questioned, making an already difficult job even more dangerous. It seems we cannot go a day without hearing on the news that police officers have been shot or even killed in trying to do their jobs.

We must unite around our police officers and first responders and support them just as they support us each and every day.

TIME FOR COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, my friends, the time for immigration reform is now so as to increase our economic growth, creating good jobs for Americans; to reduce our budget deficit by over \$200 billion; to improve our national security so we know who is here and what they are doing; to make sure that people who are here legally have the ability to get jobs and so that we have the ability to screen out people who are violating our laws; to restore the rule of law; to secure our border; to unite families so we don't tear American children from their immigrant parents.

For all of these reasons and more, it is time for this body to act. Only Congress can pass comprehensive immigration reform. Only Congress can enforce our laws. Only Congress can ensure that we grow our economy, meet the needs of our labor force, grow jobs for American families, and increase wages, all through comprehensive immigration reform.

I call upon my Republican and Democratic friends to stop waiting and to act and to take up comprehensive immigration reform now.

CENTRE COUNTY VOLUNTEER OF THE YEAR WINNER CHERYL JOHNSON

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Cheryl Johnson, a resident of Centre County in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, who was recently named Centre County Volunteer of the Year by the county's Chamber of Business and Industry.

For more than 20 years, Cheryl has been the executive director of the Private Industry Council of the Central Corridor, or PICCC, a nonprofit organization which focuses on improving workplace effectiveness and preparing people for either first-time employment, making career changes, or returning to the workforce. It is estimated that PICCC and its staff impact more than 15,000 people annually in Bedford, Blair, and Centre Counties.

During her time with PICCC, Cheryl has dealt with challenges, including the county's transition from being a manufacturing economy to being one that is more service driven. As evidence to PICCC's success and the good work of other organizations, the county regularly has the lowest unemployment rate in Pennsylvania.

Cheryl's good work in Centre County extends beyond PICCC, to volunteer efforts with the United Way, Leadership Centre County, and the Juniata Valley Council Boy Scouts of America. She is an essential part of our community, and I congratulate her on earning this recognition which came as a result of her hard work.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4909, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 732 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 732

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4909) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-51, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the

Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

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

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

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

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment pursuant to this resolution, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIBBLE). The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 732 provides for the consideration of H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most important thing this House will do this year as it has been the most important thing this House has done for 54 straight years—setting the policy for defending the American people.

The resolution provides for a structured rule and makes in order 61 amendments. This is the first of the two rules the House will consider on the NDAA. The Committee on Rules is continuing to work through the over 375 submitted amendments, and it will be making more amendments in order at this afternoon's meeting.

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, which is the juris-

dictional committee for this bill, I, like many others, have spent substantial time in working through this year's NDAA. A lot of work has gone into the bill to get us to this point, and I want to recognize the work of Chairman MAC THORNBERRY, of Ranking Member ADAM SMITH, and of each of the subcommittee chairmen and ranking members. We should also recognize the very capable Committee on Armed Services staff who has devoted so much time to this legislation.

This process, as in years past, has been truly bipartisan. The bill passed out of the committee by a vote of 60-2. It is my sincere hope that this bipartisan nature will continue here on the House floor as we consider the most important thing we will do all year. Providing for the common defense is the most important function of the Federal Government, and it is one we all take very seriously.

There are many different threats and challenges around the globe, and we and the servicemen and -women who protect us need to be ready for each of those threats; so you will be hearing a lot about readiness over the next couple of days as we consider this bill because just having a soldier or an airman or a sailor is not enough—they have to be ready to do the job that we assign to them. Readiness means that they have been trained appropriately, that they have the equipment they need, and that they have the support they need to carry out their vital role.

Look around the world as we sit here today: North Korea is threatening us with nuclear weapons. They say they have miniaturized the nuclear weapon. They have the missile technology not only to shoot it from land, but to launch it from submarines.

China, every day, is pushing out further and further with these artificial islands in the South China Sea, claiming, virtually, the entire South China Sea as theirs that they can control and against the claims of other countries in the region—a part of the world where over \$5 trillion in trade moves to and fro, which is something that has a direct impact on the well-being of the American people.

Look at what is happening in Europe. Russia has taken the Crimea. They are involved in actions in the eastern part of Ukraine today. They threaten NATO allies—countries with which we have an Article V obligation to defend if any country attacks them—and Russia is threatening those countries today.

Then in the Middle East, as many of us know, we have a resurgent Iran. After the deal that the President struck with Iran last year, Iran now has access to tens of billions of dollars. As the major state supporter of terrorism in the world, they are using that money to fund terrorist groups like Hezbollah and Hamas, which cause so much havoc and destruction and death. We have this terrible situation in Syria, a continually bad situation in Iraq, failed states in Yemen and Libya.

Our military—our defense forces—are called upon to address all of those—to protect us, to protect the American people. That is why getting this bill right is so important. That is why taking it seriously is so important. Whether it is fighting terrorism in Iraq or in Afghanistan, deterring Russian aggression in Europe, or projecting force in the Pacific, our military has their hands full, and this bill is critical to ensuring that they are ready for what is coming to them and to us. Let us make sure we understand. Experts far beyond my background have said that the United States has never faced this level—this complexity—of threat to our national security since the end of World War II.

This bill is also an important oversight tool for Congress as we work to ensure accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness from our Nation's military. The NDAA authorizes spending at a level of \$574 billion for national defense base requirements and an additional \$36 billion for overseas contingency operations. This matches the total funding level of \$610 billion that was requested by President Obama. These spending levels are needed to make critical investments that will begin to restore our military readiness.

It seems like every day a new and alarming report comes out about the dire situation our military is in: planes can't fly due to deferred repairs; troops aren't adequately trained; there is a lack of naval vessels in critical theaters. These stories have begun the sad reality for our military in recent years, and we are putting the lives of our servicemembers at risk.

□ 1230

To be clear, none of these are the fault of our servicemembers who continue to rise to the challenge and do more with less. But we, as a Congress, have to fix this problem.

The NDAA will put us back on track by strengthening our commitment to our military men and women. It fully funds the 2.1 percent pay raise for our troops and restores funding for training and maintenance programs, while also helping rebuild crumbling facilities.

The bill is also reform oriented. You are going to hear a lot about reform over these next 2 days. It includes long-needed reforms to the acquisition process and the Uniform Code of Military Justice, as well as boosting healthcare programs to ensure high quality and access to care. All told, there are five components of reform in this bill.

I also want to briefly touch on a few issues up front that I know my colleagues will likely bring up. First, this rule self-executes an amendment by Chairman SESSIONS of the Rules Committee that would strike a provision of the bill relating to women and Selective Service.

This is an issue that the Armed Services Committee has not debated. No hearings have been held. It was added

to the NDAA by an amendment in the dead of night. This rule removes that provision and allows Congress to properly study the issue.

Wherever you stand on the issue of including women in the draft, the American people should have the benefit of a full hearing, a full consideration of that issue. Jamming this thing into this bill and considering it without going through that is not right for the American people, whichever side they stand on. Making that the way this bill stands today is the right thing to do before we make a substantial change.

I also know the President has some concerns about the way this year's NDAA funds our military. The bill funds the overseas contingency operation until April 2017, when a new President will have time to assess the security situation, and then they could submit a supplemental budget request based on their priorities.

This is common for the first year of a new administration. Indeed, in 2008, then-Senator Barack Obama, then-Senator John Kerry, and then-Senator JOE BIDEN all supported a similar strategy. So I find it very odd that they now oppose that same strategy.

The bottom line is that this bill adequately funds our military while meeting critical needs for military readiness and supporting overseas operations. Let's not let politics get in the way here. There is enough political theater taking place in the Presidential election.

On this issue, this critical issue of national security, let's come together as Democrats and Republicans and show the American people that we can work together on behalf of our military and our national defense.

I urge my colleague to support House Resolution 732 and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule providing for general debate on H.R. 4909, the NDAA, or National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

For 54 straight years, the United States Congress has come together in a bipartisan fashion to craft policies and recommendations for the United States Armed Forces and to put these into law. As has been indicated, of course, this is one of the most consequential and substantial items that we have. It is one of our responsibilities here in the United States Congress.

Personally, I have found objections to some of the policies in the bill. Of course, I commend the work of the men and women on the Armed Services Committee on this legislation. I am going to highlight some of the problems that exist and why many of us on both sides of the aisle will likely be opposing the legislation.

Many of my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee currently serve or

have served in the Armed Forces. They are dedicated public servants, and they have worked hard on this bill. Of course, the bill includes the rest of us as well.

Over 375 amendments have been offered to improve this bill. The Rules Committee will be meeting this afternoon to determine how many of those we make in order, and I hope that the Rules Committee makes in order a great number of these amendments. Of course, the first step under this rule is to make a few dozen amendments in order, and we will continue that work in the Rules Committee shortly.

Mr. Speaker, for all the hard work that the Armed Services Committee has done, what we have before us this week is, unfortunately, an argument that needs to be resolved in the Budget Committee.

What we have is effectively an accounting trick that drives us deeper into debt and increases the budget deficit to pay for 1 year of increased defense spending. To this point, I object to having this budget debate even in the context of a defense bill.

But by disregarding the proper use of what is called the overseas contingency operations account and by flouting the Budget Control Act agreed upon by Republicans and Democrats, unfortunately, this Armed Services bill has been overtaken by a debate on the Federal budget.

What we have before us is a bill that will increase the deficit and increase the debt above and beyond the spending levels the Democrats and Republicans agreed to. The free-spending Republican Party continues to throw taxpayer dollar after taxpayer dollar.

Do they just intend to drive up the debt or do they intend to increase your taxes? When we increase our deficit, it means increased taxes. Effectively, this Republican bill is a tax increase on future American families, like my kids.

So this week we see a debate about the inability of the Republicans to pass a budget or adhere to a budget when they do agree to one.

If the debate over our armed services was not such a serious topic, I would say that this was a very clever, elaborate budget scheme. And it is clever. It is far too clever, more so than the traditional budget gimmicks that we have been presented with.

I am going to explain to you exactly what this tax-and-spend Republican plan is. The bill authorizes \$540 billion in discretionary base budget authority that includes \$523 billion for the DOD and \$19.5 billion for the Department of Energy's defense work.

But since the United States has been embroiled in conflict abroad since 2001, several administrations have requested and Congress has always granted another pot of money known as the overseas contingency fund.

This year the bill provides \$59 billion for what we call overseas contingency. Now, together with the \$543 billion

base, plus the \$59 million in overseas contingency, that equals the President's budget request.

Now, as a reminder, the Republicans haven't actually produced a budget this year; so, it is hard to make a comparison. All we can do is compare it to the President's budget because there is no House budget and there is no Republican budget. We haven't even seen one to be able to act on it or have a debate.

Traditionally, we bring before the body several budgets and whichever one gets the most votes is the budget of the House. There are usually several budgets from the Democratic side, several budgets from the Republican side.

In years past, there have even been bipartisan budgets which I have been honored to support. This year, however, Republicans are not even allowing the House of Representatives to consider, no less pass, a budget.

So what the NDAA does is it takes this overseas contingency account, which many consider to be a slush fund for Pentagon operations, and it takes \$18 billion of that to pay for base operations.

Some of that \$18 billion goes to fund the Pentagon's unfunded priorities or what we might call their wish list or items that they couldn't fit into the agreed-upon budget control number of \$543 billion.

So this busts through the deficit, increases the debt. It is a Republican plan to tax and spend, tax and spend, tax and spend, like they always do through accounting tricks that they are doing right here in the defense budget.

So the Pentagon gets more of the big-ticket items they want. Taxpayers are left paying the bill to the detriment of our economy, to the detriment of job creation, so that our own kids have to pay future taxes, putting our Nation deeper and deeper in debt, which I should point out to my friends is a national security issue.

When we are economically beholden to other nations like China or Saudi Arabia, that is as great, if not greater, a national security threat than the one we combat with the tanks and Armed Forces that this bill seeks to authorize. So it is very important to take that into account.

If we look at what are the reasons that we defeated the Soviet Union during the cold war, they overinvested in their defense relative to their GDP, which effectively hurt their economy and made their economic model unsustainable because they were allocating too much to defense to try to keep up with where we were.

If we mortgage our future to the Chinese and Saudi Arabians, how are we increasing our security, Mr. Speaker? In fact, we are decreasing our security to fund current consumption for 1 year at the price of mortgaging our future to foreign adversaries.

By stealing \$18 billion from the overseas contingency account, the NDAA guarantees that we run out of money

for overseas operations sometime in April 2017. And, of course, this Congress would never let money run out for operations against ISIS and Afghanistan and elsewhere.

So, of course, when it comes down to it, this bill will come before Congress in April and Congress will make sure that we have the money we need to fight ISIS because they looted from this bill the money that was designed to fight ISIS to pay for items on the Pentagon's wish list. So that is what is happening here.

Rather than appropriating money to combat ISIS and Afghanistan and other countries for the full year, they are just doing it for a few months. They are taking some of that money, putting it into the base, mortgaging our future, putting burdens on taxpayers, and making us economically at risk of being dominated by the countries that we continue to borrow from.

Look, that is why the Secretary of Defense and that is why the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, are completely against this way of budgeting. It is fiscally irresponsible.

As the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee testified at the Rules Committee yesterday, this old gimmick probably violates the bipartisan Budget Control Act. When you do that, that is where the budget debate gets going. Congress has set limits on how much we can spend on defense versus nondefense.

So when we run out of money next year under this NDAA plan, we are going to be forced to spend more. I mean, who before us is not going to spend the money we need to combat ISIS?

Of course Congress will spend more. This is a plan to set up Congress to spend more. Of course, Congress will spend more regardless of who controls Congress.

That is why budgets matter. That is why this arcane and esoteric gimmick in this bill matters. It is why we should have these debates in the Budget Committee. It is why this Congress should pass a budget. It is why we should let the national defense bill be about defense rather than mortgaging our future.

Look, if it wasn't enough to have this budget smoke-and-mirrors debate in the defense bill, this year's NDAA also has a debate about whether we should let taxpayer dollars subsidize discrimination and whether we should encourage corporate misconduct.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to dwell long on the subsidization of discrimination and encouraging corporate misconduct, but I can't fathom why there would be a place in this bill about national defense for provisions that allow Federal contractors to discriminate against LGBT employees. That is unacceptable, bizarre, and contrary to meeting the security needs of our Nation.

Also included in this bill is an exemption from the President's Fair Pay and

Safe Workplace Executive Order. The place to debate that is in another committee I serve on, the Education and the Workforce Committee, not the national defense bill. Those need to be removed.

Of course, this bill also strikes the Selective Service registration for women. The committee mark included women in Selective Service. Personally, I cosponsor a bill with Representative MIKE COFFMAN to eliminate Selective Service that would save money. And, of course, in my entire lifetime, there has not been a draft.

If we are going to have a Selective Service system, of course, it needs to include women. Women serve in every single combat role. It needs to include everybody so we can mobilize manpower and womanpower most effectively. But, unfortunately, that has been stripped out of this bill.

I believe we should take a hard look at doing away with Selective Service entirely. Of course, at the very least, we should include both men and women at the age of 18.

To move forward without any real debate on this issue and to strike that section without meaningful floor debate is bad policy, bad procedure. It is an offense to the committee which put it into the bill and yet another reason I plan on opposing the bill.

There are other pieces of this bill which I and many Democrats and Republicans object to. There is a lot of time to go into those, which I will do depending on how many speakers we have.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I was listening very carefully to my colleague, and I heard him talk about what is being proposed in this bill as being accounting tricks and cover. I am going to repeat again that what this bill is doing is exactly what then-Senator Obama, then-Senator Kerry, then-Senator BIDEN voted for in 2008.

There is nothing new here. We are going into another President, and we are giving that President an opportunity to take a look at the situation and come back to us and tell us what they want.

He said that this will drive up the deficit. It only drives up the deficit if we are not willing to work together to cut in other places because national defense is more important than anything else we do.

If we don't want to drive up the deficit—and I sure don't want to drive up the deficit—let's talk about some serious cuts to other parts of the budget that aren't nearly as important as national defense.

He called the overseas contingency account a slush fund. It is a fund directly requested by President Obama. It was requested by the President before him. It is something we have done for a while. It is adequately accounted for. There is plenty of oversight over it. So it is not a slush fund at all.

The gentleman from Colorado said that we should be careful about overinvesting as the Russians did relative to GDP. If you look at what the defense spending is as a percentage of the American GDP, for the last several years it has gone down. It is so much lower than it was even just a few years ago. In fact, we now know it is dangerously low because of what our adversaries—Russia, China, et cetera—are doing.

□ 1245

He talked about that this bill somehow encourages corporate misconduct. This bill has more reforms in it than we have seen in years that are going to require more and more people to toe the line, as they should when we are spending the taxpayers' money.

He said that there is something in this bill that might have something to do with LGBT discrimination. No, sir. Mr. Speaker, what is in this bill, what is going to be proposed for this bill, is something that gets to people's religious freedom. We don't treat religious freedom seriously enough in this body. We act as if it is somehow now a secondary right. Well, it is a primary right. It has always been a primary right, and we should always stand up for it in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Alabama for his good work on this rule and on this bill.

I want to talk about the critical part of the bill and an amendment that was proposed and then withdrawn, and that has to do with Iran's heavy water production. The reason this amendment was withdrawn and won't be under consideration in the Committee on Rules for discussion later today is because it deserves to have stand-alone treatment. It is that important.

Heavy water is used to produce weapons-grade plutonium. Its distinctive properties make it a critical component in the production of nuclear weapons. Now, the nuclear deal that some of the Senators voted for—not by two-thirds by any means—forbids Iran from stockpiling more than 130 tons of heavy water during the initial years of the deal, and they will be allowed to produce 90 tons later. But they are required, under the deal, to redesign and rebuild their Arak facility to support its "peaceful" needs and research.

So Iran did agree to keep pace with international technological advancement trends and rely only on light water, not heavy water, for future nuclear power, yet they have been producing heavy water nevertheless.

The Wall Street Journal has exposed the proposed purchase of Iran's overproduced heavy water, stating that the administration is encouraging "Tehran to stick to the nuclear agreement reached last year."

So apparently the administration is seeking to entice others to purchase

Iran's overproduced heavy water by making the first purchase. U.S. Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz said: "That will be a statement to the world: 'You want to buy heavy water from Iran, you can buy heavy water from Iran. It's been done. Even the United States did it.'" So we are enabling Iran to violate the terms of the deal, and we are going out and buying this, using taxpayer dollars nevertheless.

Now, if the Iranians cannot or simply will not keep the deal, we have to come up with a better deal, not bail them out of aspects of the deal that they don't want to comply with. So this proposed purchase by the administration violates the intention of the deal and the will of the American people. We can't let this administration or the speech writer Ben Rhodes or their fabricated echo chamber deceive us any longer.

By the way, this speech writer, Ben Rhodes, admitted in a New York Times article published just the other day that they took things they knew not to be true and misled the American people on purpose to get the deal passed.

We must not authorize funds to purchase heavy water from Iran. Because this issue is so important, I will work with leadership to make sure that we consider this later as stand-alone legislation.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against this rule that repeals a provision that was added to the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act, after a bipartisan, recorded vote in committee which expands the Selective Service System to include women. That provision was in line with the Secretary of Defense's decision to eliminate the ban on women serving in direct ground combat positions and the recognition that women are much needed across all aspects of military capability.

This rule precludes Congress from having an open and transparent debate about this very important issue that impacts women's equality. If we want a full hearing, is there no better place than on the floor of this House? This rule would prevent that.

Gender equality is achieved when women and men enjoy the same rights, opportunities, and responsibilities across all sectors of society, including military service, and when the abilities, aspirations, and talents of women and men are equally valued. Including women in the draft is a step toward that equality.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, this position is shared by both Army Chief of Staff Mark Milley and Marine Commandant Robert Neller.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule that denies the current reality of

military service, limits gender equality, ignores a bipartisan vote, and does not allow for an open and transparent debate on the floor of the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, I completely agree with my colleague who just spoke that, if we are going to do this, we should have a full debate on it. But we should also let the American people be heard.

Because of the way this happened in committee, there was no public hearing beforehand. There was no notice to the American people that this was going to be considered. So the most important people we need to hear from on this haven't been heard from, and they need to be heard from.

The way to do that is for us to announce that we are considering this; have full public hearings in committee; and then, after having full public hearings, the committee makes a decision and brings something to this floor for us to debate. But for us to bring up an issue of that magnitude without having gone through the process of letting the American people be truly heard here, that is not appropriate.

So while I understand exactly what my colleague just said—I was there for the committee meeting. I know that there was a vote on it. It was a vote after we had no debate in committee, no hearings, no opportunity for the American people to be heard—if we are going to take an issue like this and bring it to the floor of this House, we need to do all of that or we wouldn't be doing our job. So I respectfully disagree with her. I think the self-executing amendment by Chairman SESSIONS is appropriate, and I would urge my colleagues to support that.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say in response to my friend that the committee did a lot of work through the night and voted on a number of issues that Members raised, and many of the items that they voted on were not subject to their own hearings. What we are seeing here is a failure of Speaker RYAN to follow through on his pledge for regular order.

What is regular order? There is a committee markup of the bill for good or bad. Sometimes the chairman has things in that bill he or she doesn't want. Other times it is exactly like they want it. That gets reported out to the Committee on Rules, and other Members have a chance to change it. If any Member of this body wanted to remove women from the Selective Service, which was in the HASC markup, they would simply offer an amendment to do so. That is the normal process. There would be debate and there would be a vote.

Instead of that process, there is a mysterious self-executing amendment in the rule itself; so the rule, itself, controverts the actual bill that the HASC reported out. It actually changes

the very bill that the committee worked on without a vote, without debate, and that is the opposite of regular order, the opposite of the process that allows Members to fully debate and vet these issues.

This rule actually stifles the debate on this very issue that the HASC weighed in on. It is my understanding it is in the Senate bill, to include women in Selective Service as well. I think it will likely be in any conference report that comes out. But for whatever reason, rather than having the debate and vote on the floor, it is being hidden behind a procedural trick in a self-executing rule.

I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) to discuss the bill and the rule.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on important provisions contained within the National Defense Authorization Act.

I have said many times that too little attention has been given to a long-term political strategy in our fight against ISIL. That is why I worked with colleagues from both sides of the aisle to include an amendment now contained in the bill that requires the administration to develop an integrated political and military strategy to defeat ISIS. Without this strategy, we risk repeating mistakes of the past.

We largely defeated al Qaeda in Iraq militarily in 2009 but failed to follow through on the root causes and ensure the success of Iraqi politics going forward. It created a political vacuum that ISIS grew into. We cannot afford to make that mistake again.

Second, we should all be able to agree that our military personnel and veterans deserve the best health care in the world. That is why I am proud to report the bill also contains provisions I worked on with several Members to address the increased rates of suicide in our military. Since 2012, suicide has been the leading cause of death in our military. In the past 3 years alone, the suicide rate has been nearly 50 percent greater than in the civilian population.

The Department of Defense needs to take an aggressive approach in solving this crisis. My amendment included in the bill would identify trends and instances of suicides and require better proactive and reactive mental health care for active personnel.

Finally, I want to call attention to the urgent need to continue the Special Immigrant Visa program for Afghans who worked for U.S. forces. A bipartisan amendment before the Committee on Rules now would remove the unfortunate narrowing of eligibility requirements included in the mark, which would prevent hundreds of Afghans whose lives are at risk because of their work for our country from even being considered for resettlement in the United States.

The narrowing of eligibility intentionally excludes hundreds of Afghans who worked for the U.S. State Department, USAID, and U.S. security contractors in a number of capacities,

many of whom face well-documented death threats due to their work with our government, regardless of whether that was with frontline troops or on an American base. By narrowing eligibility, the program would erode the expectations of hundreds of Afghan staff whose lives remain in danger because of their work for the U.S. mission and also make it more difficult to hire and retain qualified Afghan staff who are essential to achieving our diplomatic and assistance goals. For that risk and sacrifice, the very least we can do is offer them a chance to stay alive, to keep living, rather than abandoning them to the same enemies they united with us to destroy.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Massachusetts and all the points that he has made. Indeed, there were a number of bipartisan amendments that were added to the bill during that very long day and night that we spent considering it, which just points out the bipartisan nature of what we are doing here.

On the committee, we try to work together to find the right way forward for the defense of America. When colleagues on either side of the aisle offer something that is common sense and we think will work, we work together to make sure it gets in the bill, and that is what he just alluded to.

He also alluded to an amendment that he hopes will be added as a result of the Committee on Rules meeting this afternoon. We are going to be considering an awful lot of amendments this afternoon. There are over 60 amendments that we have made in order in this rule, bipartisan amendments, so this is a very strong effort on our part to make sure that this is a bipartisan bill; and as a bipartisan bill, it deserves bipartisan support.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly ironic that the gentleman is touting the bipartisan amendments. It is one of those bipartisan amendments that adds women in the Selective Service that is stripped out of the HASC bill, of the committee's bill right here in this rule, through a self-executing amendment.

So this rule, if it were to pass—and I hope it doesn't. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle vote "no." This rule undoes one of those very bipartisan amendments that the gentleman is touting.

I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I thank the Committee on Armed Services for the hard work they did to produce this bill. I am not going to support it.

The most important function that we have is to make certain that America is secure. Our defense authorization bill is a major component of that, but I believe this bill fails in some fundamental respects.

Number one, the budget is very large. We are approaching \$700 billion. But throwing money at a problem does not solve a problem. What we are doing as we throw more money at a problem without making hard decisions is we generate and accept as inevitable an immense amount of inefficiency.

Number two, there is an overreliance on the OCO funding. First of all, OCO, off budget, should be debated, and it should be appropriated. It should be subject to all budget caps. But to then begin using it not just for overseas contingency operations but to actually invest in major weapons systems is a gross mistake that is just going to lead to a weaker budgeting system that is essential, in my view, to our national security.

□ 1115

Of that OCO funding, money would be used for weapon systems like the F/A-18E Super Hornet and the F-35. The \$35 billion in the OCO authorization is for war requirements, including dollar amounts in the millions.

Now, the other issue with respect to OCO—and another failure in this bill—is we are once again continuing to have military operations—this country is at war—without having any debate on an Authorization for Use of Military Force. That should be part of it.

Third, we have significant issues in NATO. As the Speaker and my colleague, the chairman, know, NATO is absolutely essential to our defense. But the time for the United States to be bearing as big a burden for that defense has come to a conclusion.

We will bear the majority of the expense, but the commitment on our NATO allies is to reach 2 percent of their gross domestic product in defense spending. If our NATO allies are not doing that, we are asking the American taxpayer to do it. These are mature democracies. They have stable economies. It is about time that we asked for this to absolutely happen.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WELCH. The real fundamental question for us is whether or not in this defense budget we are going to ask what are the fundamental strategic necessities of the United States to be in a strong posture to defend itself.

The approach of just throwing more money and maintaining weapons systems that our military is not even asking for, of blinking on the question of personnel review—all of these things are just postponed for another day. They need to be faced today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank the committee for its work, but I will not be supporting this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Vermont. He and I and a group of Members of this body met recently with members of the German

Bundestag and the Russian Duma to talk about these very issues, and it was a most enlightening trip for all of us. By the way, all of us went as American citizens, as Members of the United States Congress, not as Democrats or Republicans.

One of the most troubling things that we learned from that trip is that the Russians continue to invest at a significantly higher level than we are in terms of their increases every year and their military activities. That is why they have been so successful in Ukraine, why they have been so successful recently in Syria. So this bill begins to turn back around so that we are investing properly.

If I thought that we were throwing money at the problem, if my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and the Armed Services Committee thought we were just throwing money at the problem, this bill would not have received a 60-2 vote in committee, I can tell you that.

The inefficiencies the gentleman talked about we are very concerned about. That is why there is so much reform in this bill. There are five different components that deal with reform. We can't expect American taxpayers to pay for any part of the government that is inefficient, including our military.

He brought up the Authorization for Use of Military Force. We had a big debate about this in committee, and I asked my staff: Why can't we consider an Authorization for Use of Military Force in our committee? I think we should.

I was told and we found out by reading the War Powers Act, a law passed by Congress in 1973, that, under that law, jurisdiction for the Authorization for Use of Military Force is vested in the Foreign Affairs Committee, not in the Armed Services Committee, so we could not consider that when it came before the committee.

And then, finally, as to his comments about NATO, I share a lot of his concerns. I think many of us do. There is nothing wrong and everything right with expecting our NATO allies to meet their 2 percent obligation. Most of them are not doing that.

I do believe the administration is working with them to get them to that point, but I don't think we should ever miss an opportunity to keep the heat on them to do that. Ultimately, the defense that we provide over in Europe through NATO is the defense of those countries.

So I think it is appropriate that the gentleman brought up that point. I hope the administration will continue to do that, and I hope that we will continue to back any effort that is taken by this administration or the next to do that.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to take some time to highlight some of the terrible

environmental provisions that run counter to our national security imperative to create a more sustainable society that are in this bill or that have been submitted as amendments to this bill.

For instance, there has been an amendment that would block implementation of the collaborative Federal land use plans and prevent listing of the sage-grouse under the Endangered Species Act for the next decade.

We have had extensive hearings in another committee I serve on, the Natural Resources Committee. This has nothing to do with defense. In fact, we hold up the collaborative Federal land use plan as an example of how to avoid listing this species and, yet, make sure that we can maintain a viable habitat.

I think it was a great success. I think it is ridiculous that we are talking about amending a national defense bill to undo something that we have had extensive hearings on in the Natural Resources Committee and is held up by all parties involved as a huge success.

In addition, there is going to be an amendment offered to sell off over 800,000 acres of the Desert National Wildlife Refuge in Nevada. It would be transferred to the Air Force, which has not requested a transfer. The Air Force has not requested this land for any military use; yet, there is a bill to impose the management of these lands on the Air Force.

It would represent a harmful public land sell-off precedent. It is important habitat for desert bighorn sheep, mule deer, mountain lions, and other wildlife.

As we mentioned, the Air Force has not requested the stewardship of these lands. Of course, it would put a costly new burden on the Air Force to the detriment of our national security.

In addition, there are two provisions already in the NDAA that will remove or block Federal endangered species protections for the American burrowing beetle and the lesser prairie chicken.

Again, I am happy to have those debates. But what on Earth do they have to do with national defense, and why are they in the committee bill?

Section 2866 would block ESA protections for the lesser prairie chicken for 6 years and then impose arbitrary restrictions on whether the Secretary of the Interior can relist the lesser prairie chicken, regardless of its biological status, even if there is only a handful left or it is nearing extinction.

Section 2866 would also immediately and permanently remove the burrowing beetle for protection under the Endangered Species Act and prevent it from receiving any protections in the future.

Our biodiversity is a source of strength. To somehow have a backdoor attempt—if you can't get these things through the proper regular order of the Natural Resources Committee, to somehow say that the burrowing beetle has something to do with national defense is a great stretch of our rules of

germaneness that we have here in the body of this House.

More perilously, more dangerously, there is language in the House NDAA bill that is a repeal of section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. The purpose of this law is to reduce the Department of Defense's dependence on oil from hostile regimes of the world.

So it is a disparate element of advanced lower carbon fuels to promote energy security. Repealing this provision is something the Department of Defense does not want. It would be unwise for our clean energy future.

So this bill actually detracts from the current language in the repeal of section 526. It reduces our energy security as a Nation, renders us to be more reliant on foreign powers for our oil, just as the budgetary tricks in this bill will force us to borrow more from China and Saudi Arabia to spend this year.

Finally, there is some damaging language about aquatic invasive species, which, of course, cost billions of dollars annually when we deal with the zebra mussels in lakes in Colorado, damaging shipping, damage to industrial and government facilities. Invasive species cause great irreversible damage to coastal and inland waters, including some in my district.

Once a nonnative species invades a lake or river, it is basically impossible to eliminate, as we know. S. 373, the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act, or VIDA, would discard the Clean Waters Act goal of stopping further invasive species and replace it with a law that would instead put ineffective standards for removing invasive species from ships' ballast water discharges that bear no relation to protection of water quality.

So, again, this bill will strip out very important measures that would prevent the dissemination of invasive species. Even in the lakes in my district, including in Grand County, we have had a devastating impact of the zebra mussel invasive species both on local habitat as well as directly on recreational ships and boaters.

There is not a direct military aspect to where we are, but, again, this applies to both military and shipping and is a great cost to the American economy when these invasive species threaten us.

Again, these are issues people may differ on. I am happy to have that debate. In fact, it is a little bit of déjà vu. I feel like I have had that debate on the Natural Resources Committee. We have debated many of these same things.

But instead of bills being reported out of that committee and coming to the floor, apparently, the NDAA is seen by some as a catchall to attack our environmental safeguards. That is wrong. That actually detracts from our national security. It makes us more reliant on foreign oil. It is the wrong direction for the bill, the wrong direction for national defense.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I wish we didn't have to deal with environmental issues on the Armed Services Committee, but, unfortunately, we have military bases all across the United States where they are being limited in what they want to do, what they could potentially do, by other Federal agencies that are using their powers to tell our defense folks that they can't do things that are important to carrying out their military mission.

So I heard my colleague, and I know of his service on the Natural Resources Committee and the good work of that committee. But when you have those agencies beginning to impinge on our ability to deliver on national defense, I think that is under the jurisdiction of our committee. We have gotten waivers to be able to take these issues up from those committees, including the Natural Resources Committee.

Look, I am not saying the sage-grouse or the beetle is not important, but they are not more important than the defense of the United States of America. We have dealt with these issues in a responsible way. I hope and pray that the time will come when we won't ever have to talk about that in the Armed Services Committee again.

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

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

I still remain hard pressed to see how the burrowing beetle or the lesser prairie chicken are somehow a security issue that needs to be addressed in the National Defense Authorization Act.

Look, there are a number of other flaws with the bill. It greatly overfunds our nuclear weapons activities, which will cost taxpayers hundreds of billions over the next 10 years. I have offered an amendment to reduce this.

This is for a stockpile of weapons that could be greatly reduced and still maintain the capability of destroying the world many times over, however useful that capability may be.

I think it should be good enough that we have enough capability to destroy the world three or four times instead of seven times. God forbid, we don't have enough capabilities to destroy the entire world and wipe out life.

This bill does not include, as had been mentioned, an Authorization for Use of Military Force for our ongoing operations in Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere. Despite repeated calls to write an updated authorization, despite the belief of many Members on both sides of the aisle, the current war is illegal.

This Congress has taken zero meaningful action to date. We should change that or at least debate changing that this week.

As I said before, when you have a national security bill that mortgages our future, makes us more reliant on foreign oil, you wonder at what point you

should stop calling it a national security bill and start calling it a national insecurity bill.

The vision that my constituents have, the vision that I have, for a safe and secure America is not one with bloated budget deficits and borrowing from China and Saudi Arabia. It is not one where we cut off our own renewable energies program so we can rely more on foreign oil. It is not one where we borrow more from our kids' future and mortgage them. That is not the secure America that we should seek as a United States Congress.

These are the kinds of questions that we should be debating in the defense bill. But instead of focusing on these real questions of how to improve our armed services and how to provide for the national defense, the general debate we will see under this rule will dedicate a large portion to debate on the budget and the looting of this overseas contingency fund, which Congress will have to come back and backfill in April, therefore mortgaging our future and increasing our national debt to fund.

Instead of actually passing a budget, this Congress is having a backdoor budget debate, debating it now. It is the wrong way to do things.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would shed light on the secret money in politics.

The DISCLOSE Act, authored by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, would require outside groups to disclose the source of the contributions they are using to fund their campaigns.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule with the self-executing language which undoes the committee language, in violation of regular order. Vote "no" on the rule.

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

□ 1315

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate and respect the gentleman from Colorado and his earnestness and all of what he has said today; and I do agree with him that there are many things that we need to debate on this floor and that we will be debating on this floor over the next 2 days.

But let's make sure we don't lose sight of the central thing we are here to do, and that is to protect and defend the people of the United States.

Yes, there are going to be some extraneous issues, issues that we wish we

didn't even have to talk about; but at the end of the day, we are going to come back to that central function, that most important function that we have, and that is defending the people of the United States.

Because of things that have happened before today, the readiness of our Armed Forces, the people we charge with the direct responsibility of defending us, the readiness has come down steadily. Planes can't fly. Armed vehicles can't drive. Weapons don't function. We don't have enough training for our troops.

So we have listened to all of the uniformed commanders that have come before our committee and heard the dire circumstances we face all across the national defense of this country, and this bill begins to turn that around.

It is not a big enough turnaround. We have got a lot of work to do to get back to where we need to be, but this begins that process of getting our Armed Forces ready in a way that is meaningful and responsible for them but also will create the actual effect of protecting the American people.

We have put into this bill very important reforms, reforms that we have been needing to look at for a long time, that will require our military to be more efficient, save taxpayer dollars, but also make them more effective in their jobs.

This bill does what we, as a House, are charged with doing, and that is setting responsible policy for defending the United States of America.

I hope that everyone, as we debate the amendments and the underlying bill over the next 2 days, will keep central in their mind that that is what this is all about and that we will strive to do this in a bipartisan fashion, as we have done on the Committee on Armed Services and as we have done on the Committee on Rules.

This needs to be a bipartisan bill. This needs to be a bipartisan vote. If we really care about this country, if we really care about those men and women in uniform, then it is important for us to understand that we have a bipartisan responsibility to make sure that we provide for them and provide for the defense of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 732 and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 732 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

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

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 430) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, and other entities, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed

with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 430.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4957. An act to designate the Federal building located at 99 New York Avenue, N.E., in the District of Columbia as the "Aries Rios Federal Building".

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-135)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to

Burma that was declared on May 20, 1997, is to continue in effect beyond May 20, 2016.

The Government of Burma has made significant progress across a number of important areas since 2011, including the release of over 1,300 political prisoners, a peaceful and competitive election, the signing of a Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement with eight ethnic armed groups, the discharge of hundreds of child soldiers from the military, steps to improve labor standards, and expanding political space for civil society to have a greater voice in shaping issues critical to Burma's future. In addition, Burma has become a signatory of the International Atomic Energy Agency's Additional Protocol and ratified the Biological Weapons Convention, significant steps towards supporting global non-proliferation. Despite these strides, the situation in the country continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States.

Concerns persist regarding continued obstacles to full civilian control of the government, the ongoing conflict and human rights abuses in the country, particularly in ethnic minority areas, and military trade with North Korea. In addition, Burma's security forces, operating with little oversight from the civilian government, often act with impunity. We are further concerned that prisoners remain detained and that police continue to arrest critics of the government for peacefully expressing their views. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to Burma.

Despite this action, the United States remains committed to working with both the new government and the people of Burma to ensure that the democratic transition is irreversible.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 2016.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

ZIKA VECTOR CONTROL ACT

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 897) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 897

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Zika Vector Control Act".

SEC. 2. USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.

Section 3(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 402(s) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Administrator or a State may not require a permit under such Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under this Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.

"(B) SUNSET.—This paragraph shall cease to be effective on September 30, 2018."

SEC. 3. DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.

Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(s) DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.—

"(1) NO PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a permit shall not be required by the Administrator or a State under this Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.

"(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the following discharges of a pesticide or pesticide residue:

"(A) A discharge resulting from the application of a pesticide in violation of a provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act that is relevant to protecting water quality, if—

"(i) the discharge would not have occurred but for the violation; or

"(ii) the amount of pesticide or pesticide residue in the discharge is greater than would have occurred without the violation.

"(B) Stormwater discharges subject to regulation under subsection (b).

"(C) The following discharges subject to regulation under this section:

"(i) Manufacturing or industrial effluent.

"(ii) Treatment works effluent.

"(iii) Discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, including a discharge resulting from ballasting operations or vessel biofouling prevention.

"(3) SUNSET.—This subsection shall cease to be effective on September 30, 2018."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 897.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 897, the Zika Vector Control Act.