

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

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

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

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

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

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

The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Then finally, the gentleman's comments about the need for us to make

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Come on, enough.

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1330

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

are in charge, so they can do whatever they want to do.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just take 1 minute to address something the gentleman from Alabama raised a while ago, and that is: Why would we

be raising the issue of apprenticeships and workforce training as part of the Defense Authorization bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1345

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, how outrageous is that?

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

The F-35, the President has trumpeted how he brought down the price of this bloated program. But just a few days ago it was revealed that the bill for this program is actually going

to jump 7 percent. You probably won't be seeing this on the President's Twitter feed, but the Pentagon now says it needs another \$63 billion for the program.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So we can talk about how things in Syria that President Obama did, things

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

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

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

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

JULY 10, 2017.

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

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

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

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,

Washington, DC, July 13, 2017.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please contact Ian Thompson, legislative representative.

Sincerely,

FAIZ SHAKIR,
National Political Director.

IAN THOMPSON,
Legislative Representative.

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

the way the Rules Committee conducted itself last night.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I just want to say, finally, Mr. Speaker, I have been raising this issue not just when Republicans have been

President, but when Democrats have been President. I really believe that Congress has forfeited its constitutional responsibilities. We have abrogated our constitutional responsibilities. We have acquiesced time and time again to Democratic and Republican administrations when it comes to war.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1400

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's

ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 354]

YEAS—234

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

NAYS—187

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

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

NOT VOTING—12

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

□ 1425

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

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 355]

AYES—230

Abraham	Banks (IN)	Bilirakis
Aderholt	Barletta	Bishop (MI)
Allen	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Amodeli	Barton	Black
Babin	Bergman	Blackburn
Bacon	Biggs	Blum

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

NOES—190

Deutch	Dingell	Doggett
Dingell	Doyle, Michael	F.
Doggett	Ellison	Engel
Doyle, Michael	Engel	Eshoo
F.	Eshoo	Espallat
Ellison	Esty (CT)	Evans
Engel	Foster	Frankel (FL)
Eshoo	Frankel (FL)	Fudge
Espallat	Gabbard	Gallo
Esty (CT)	Gallagher	Garamendi
Evans	Gomez	Gonzalez (TX)
Foster	Gottheimer	Green, Al
Frankel (FL)	Green, Gene	Grijalva
Fudge	Grijalva	Gutiérrez
Gabbard	Hanabusa	

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1435

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

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

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

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

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

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