

doing in my district; and around the country, it is teachers like Maria who are shaping the future of this country by bringing their passion and dedication to the classroom.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Maria and in thanking her for her commitment to STEM education.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5515, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1027 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1027

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 5515) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommend if applicable.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 3 p.m. on Thursday, August 2, 2018, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019.

SEC. 3. House Resolution 1020 is laid on the table.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which 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.

□ 0915

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1027 provides for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 5515, the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.

This NDAA process has once again been a textbook example of how Congress should work. After extensive

hearings in the House and the Senate, lengthy committee markups, hundreds of amendments, separate passage in both Chambers, and a conference committee, we have reached the point of final passage.

This has been a process that has followed regular order and allowed so many Members to have a role in the process. Here in the House, that is a testament to Chairman MAC THORNBERRY, Ranking Member ADAM SMITH, and their very capable staffs.

This is the earliest the House has passed the final version of the NDAA in 41 years, which is a remarkable feat. A considerable amount of time and effort has been put into this product, and I know I join other Members of the House in expressing our deep gratitude for their efforts.

This year's NDAA offers the next steps in our effort to rebuild our military and reform the Pentagon. I know many of us have been deeply troubled by the readiness crisis that struck the military over the last several years. This has resulted in training accidents and failures that took the lives of our servicemembers.

To reverse that trend, this year's NDAA allows for increased funding for training, as well as \$2.8 billion for the procurement of spare airplane parts.

In response to recent naval incidents in the Pacific, the NDAA directs the Navy to review their operational chain of command and current training plans for surface warfare officers. The strategy of peace through strength requires us to continue to produce and procure the best tools and resources possible.

In an effort to build toward President Trump's goal of a 355-ship Navy fleet, the NDAA authorizes the construction of new ships, including a Ford-class aircraft carrier, additional Virginia-class attack submarines, and three littoral combat ships.

Given the range of challenges in the nuclear domain, the NDAA supports the Nuclear Posture Review's recommendation to pursue a lower-yield ballistic warhead while also making important investments in our missile defense programs.

Very important, the NDAA authorizes a 2.6 percent pay raise for our servicemembers, which is the highest increase in 9 years. This is critical to recruiting and retaining the best and the brightest.

Additionally, this NDAA focuses on policies specific to Russia, China, North Korea, and Iran, as well as provisions relating to nonstate actors and terrorist organizations.

I am also pleased that the conference report contains a compromise final version of the Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act. Congress has come together in a strong bipartisan manner to recognize the growing threat of countries like China in weaponizing financial investment, threatening our advanced technologies, and undermining our defense industrial base.

The Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, known as CFIUS, is an interagency body led by the Treasury Department tasked with reviewing foreign investment for national security concerns. However, United States law governing CFIUS has not been modernized for more than a decade, and it is not designed to address today's modern, evolving threats.

The Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act gives CFIUS much-needed additional authority to address real national security threats without unduly burdening foreign investment in the American economy and slowing American economic growth in the process.

I could go on and on about the important reforms and priorities in this legislation, but these should give you an idea of our focus on standing up to our adversaries and supporting our servicemen and -women.

Mr. Speaker, just this past weekend, I was able to spend time with some of these fine servicemen and -women in the Pacific, where they are taking part in the RIMPAC naval exercise, the largest in the world.

It is amazing to see the work these young men and women, some of them very young, do on a daily basis. Whether it is landing planes on an aircraft carrier or steering a massive warship, these individuals are asked to carry out incredibly complicated and dangerous tasks, and they do it exceedingly well.

It is the least we can do to show these courageous and patriotic Americans we have their backs by passing this NDAA on a strong bipartisan basis.

We deal with a lot of complicated and, frankly, divisive issues in this body, but, today, on this issue, I hope we can show, for our national security and the people who devote so much to keep us safe, we can rise above the divisiveness of today's politics.

Let's pass the NDAA for the 58th straight year and make sure all our servicemen and -women know we have their backs. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 1027 and the underlying bill.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the work of the conferees this year is to be commended. I don't want the gentleman from Alabama to faint that I am saying something nice, but the bottom line is that the conferees did a great job. They worked hard and fast to get this NDAA conference report to the floor today. It has been just 2 months since we brought the rule for the House version of the bill forward for consideration.

In fact, and I don't get to say this enough, this process has been an example of how Congress should operate. Members brought their ideas forward when the original bill was being considered. The Rules Committee made amendments in order. We had some real debates here on the floor, and the conference committee has now done its job. That is how this body is supposed to work.

But under this majority, it is the exception and not the norm. Bills often come before the Rules Committee without being considered by the relevant committees first. More than half of the rules that the majority brings to the floor are unamendable.

All too often, the Rules Committee is where democracy goes to die. Regular order seems like a thing of the past. It shouldn't be that way, but, all too often, it is. That is why this process is so notable.

Mr. Speaker, why are we using this process for only things like the NDAA bill? Why not for other urgent matters, like addressing gun violence, stabilizing our healthcare market, or reforming our Tax Code? Wouldn't it be nice if Congress tackled all problems like this?

Now, this process made the NDAA bill better. Many harmful environmental provisions, thankfully, were removed. That includes language that would have prohibited the Secretary of the Interior from listing the sage-grouse under the Endangered Species Act for a decade.

I am also grateful that the conferees honored the sacrifice of the atomic veterans. The past three House versions of the NDAA included language that would award them a service medal honoring their sacrifice and service, which was carried out in secret and at great personal cost. It was adopted with near-unanimous votes. But, each time, it has been dropped in conference.

This year, though, the conferees have agreed to provide the atomic veterans a certificate of recognition and, in the manager's statement, have gone further by encouraging the Secretary of Defense to consider an appropriate medal or award to recognize radiation-exposed servicemembers.

For the life of me, I can't understand why it is so hard for the Pentagon to honor these proud veterans with a service medal. Over three-quarters of atomic vets have already passed away, many prematurely from health problems directly related to their service to our Nation. They and their families deserve a medal.

For the RECORD, I would like to say that I remain committed to making sure that they receive that recognition, and I hope the chairman and ranking member will add their voices to encouraging the Secretary of Defense to do the right thing and confer a medal that recognizes the courage, the sacrifice, and the service of the atomic veterans.

So, there are good things in this bill. That includes the increase in pay for

our Nation's military. Many members of our caucus will support this conference report as a result.

Now, you would think the majority would want more bipartisan votes. It is possible, if they undertake a process like this more often. Let's bring regular order back from the dead.

Although this bill has been strengthened, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support it because very real weaknesses remain.

This conference report still endorses President Trump's plan to develop new low-yield nuclear warheads. A ban on developing these warheads has been in place for 15 years. Lifting it now could drastically impact our strategic stability at a time when the President is already upending our foreign policy.

Now, let's also talk about what is not included here. The conference report does not have language that would finally force this Congress to debate its role abroad. That is not because an amendment wasn't offered. In fact, I put a bipartisan amendment forward with my colleagues, Representatives JONES, LEE, GARAMENDI, KILDEE, and WELCH.

The amendment was pretty simple. It said any escalation of U.S. troops in Afghanistan over the next fiscal year put forward by the President or the Pentagon would have to be debated by Congress. We would have 30 days after a report was issued for Congress to either disapprove of the escalation or allow it to move forward. That is it.

It wasn't a radical idea, at least not to me or many of my colleagues. But it must have been to Republican leadership, because they did what they always do when pressed to pass a new AUMF or to have legitimate debates on the war in Afghanistan and other wars: They blocked us from even having a debate on the House floor.

Republicans will apparently try anything to avoid a debate on this subject. We submitted a similar amendment to the Rules Committee last year during the NDAA consideration, and the majority advanced an alternative amendment that called for the administration to release a report on our strategy in Afghanistan instead.

A study is not a serious attempt at congressional oversight of our foreign policy. The Trump administration must not have thought so either, since they never even bothered to send the report to Congress. It was more than 100 days late. Magically, it appeared shortly after the House had already debated and approved the NDAA. And, frankly, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't worth the paper it was written on.

Mr. Speaker, do my Republican friends even care that Congress is abdicating our responsibilities? We should be debating our role in Afghanistan. The administration has sent more than 4,000 additional servicemembers to fight over there in this last year. There are now more than 12,000 of our constituents there today.

Mr. Speaker, don't my Republican colleagues want to have a say over

whether their constituents are sent to fight abroad? We are 17 years into this war. There is no end in sight. The least we could do is spend 10 minutes debating our foreign policy on the House floor.

There are reports that the President is frustrated with his Afghan policy, that he may call for a review of our role there. Well, Mr. Speaker, shouldn't Congress have a role in that new strategy? Maybe the Republicans are afraid to take on President Trump. They send angry tweets and critical press releases sometimes, but when it comes to actually doing something, they lose their nerve.

Just take ZTE. Many members of the majority were outraged when the President announced plans to prop up this Chinese tech company. President Trump tweeted: "Too many jobs in China lost." Apparently, his policy of "America First" quickly became "China First."

His move came after the Secretary of Commerce had banned U.S. companies from exporting any parts to ZTE. President Trump undercut his own Commerce Secretary, urging him to reverse this ban. It was an about-face from an administration that has become defined by saying one thing one day and doing another the next.

Republicans joined Democrats on both sides of the Capitol in pledging to reimpose the penalties the President reversed. Language banning government agencies from using or procuring technology made by ZTE were included in both the House and Senate bills. The Senate had stronger language, which I was hoping would be included here. If it were, I think it would pass. But a funny thing happened as this report was hashed out. Republicans went with the watered down House language instead.

Mr. Speaker, actual leadership requires standing up and doing something and going against the President when he is wrong. But this majority has proven again and again and again that they aren't willing to do that, no matter what the President says or does.

We saw that after President Trump cozied up to Vladimir Putin in Helsinki. He stood with a dictator over the American intelligence community. It was a disgrace, and the majority did nothing.

They even blocked our attempt to get a simple debate on the Quigley amendment. That would have provided funds to strengthen our election system against future hacking by bad foreign actors like Russia.

Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with this President? What is wrong with my friends on other side of the aisle? We should be passing amendments to protect our election system. We ought to be passing the Engel resolution, condemning what the President did.

This is already the most closed Congress in history. Most bills that come to the floor can't even be amended by anybody, Republican or Democrat.

□ 0930

It is “my way or the highway” with this majority. That is bad enough, Mr. Speaker. But now we can’t even debate protecting our democracy, just like we can’t debate our military’s role abroad.

We have gone from being the people’s House to being more like Putin’s House. It is disgusting, quite frankly. The last time I checked, this was still America, where Congress is supposed to actually debate. Let’s act like it.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken about the need for bills to go through the committee and conference process. That happened here. The NDAA report was crafted in a bipartisan manner.

I can’t vote for the underlying bill for all of the reasons I have discussed. That includes the lack of an AUMF. But when the process is better, we should recognize that. For that reason, I will be voting for this rule. I hope that we consider more bills through a similar process.

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 appreciate the remarks of the gentleman.

I would remind the gentleman that this so-called closed Congress has passed over 600 bills. Record numbers of bills have been passed by this Congress. This is a remarkably productive Congress, and all of us should take pride in the fact that over 80 percent of those bills were passed in a bipartisan fashion. So we have every reason to be proud of the work that we have done here not just this year, but last year as well.

I also want to address what the gentleman had to say about an AUMF. We, indeed, as a Congress have a role to play in the foreign defense policy of this country. The bill that underlies this resolution that we have today is the National Defense Authorization Act. It is several hundred pages of policy that is set by the Congress. So we are participating in a very active fashion, both in oversight and in helping set this policy.

I am very proud of the work that the members, Democrats and Republicans, in the House Armed Services Committee have done. This bill shows that Congress has a constitutional role that we are fulfilling. And I believe the very strong, bipartisan vote we are going to see on the bill demonstrates that all of us, or at least most of us, the vast majority of us, feel the same way.

I want to say this very clearly. The young men and women who serve us every day abroad and put their lives at risk deserve from us not partisan divisiveness on this day, they deserve our unity. They deserve to hear from us that we are not going to sit and have some partisan bickering but that we have their back. If we can’t do that on this day, then we need to all go home this August and reexamine our consciences.

There are other days and other times to debate other issues, but on this day,

let’s stand up as one House and as one country for the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman from Alabama that he may want to defend a process where the majority of bills that have come to this floor have come under a process where nobody can offer an amendment. I think that is undemocratic. I think that goes against what this House is supposed to be about. It is one of the reasons why so many of the bills that come through here, quite frankly, are deeply flawed, because everybody is shut out of the process.

This is the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America. Nearly 60 percent of the bills that have come to the floor have come under closed rules. Now, you expect that in Russia, you expect that in China or Turkey, but you don’t expect that in the people’s House.

It is unbelievable to me that my friends defend this process. When you throw in bills that don’t need a rule, the suspension bills—post offices and a lot of bills that, quite frankly, are inconsequential—you can rack up the numbers.

The bottom line is the Rules Committee has become a place where good ideas are blocked on a regular basis, and not just Democratic ideas, but a lot of Republican ideas.

I respect the Members of this House, both Republicans and Democrats, enough to be able to say that, if they have good ideas, they ought to be brought to the floor. They ought not be blocked in the Rules Committee behind closed doors and never even know why they are blocked. But that is the pattern here. It has to stop.

Maybe it is going to take an election for it to stop, but this is unacceptable. I think most people around the country who are paying attention to what is going on here are fed up.

And just one other thing. When I talk about the need to debate the war in Afghanistan and these other wars where we put American lives in jeopardy, that is not partisan bickering. Most of these amendments have been bipartisan. What we are responding to is many of our constituents who have been deployed halfway around the world who come back and say: What the hell are you doing? Do you guys have any idea what is going on over here? Why aren’t you talking about this? Why aren’t you debating it?

We have been in a war for 17 years and we can’t even have a debate. We can’t even have 10 minutes on the war in Afghanistan or our growing involvement in military conflicts around the world. It is outrageous.

You can defend it if you want. It is irresponsible. And the fact that this Congress won’t debate these issues, that is moral cowardice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed one of the most disgraceful displays by an American President on foreign soil in our Nation’s history when President Trump refused to stand behind our intelligence community and to, instead, side with Vladimir Putin. Putin, he sided with Putin.

Then on Tuesday, via Twitter, the President changed his tune and said, “I’m very concerned that Russia will be fighting hard to have an impact in the upcoming election.” I guess apparently embracing the intelligence community again. And then he tweeted another tweet, basically saying that Russia is not involved in meddling in an election.

I have to tell you, this President is messed up when it comes to the issue of Russia meddling in our election. I don’t know what the Russians have on him, if anything, but the behavior out of this President is not normal, and it should concern every single person, no matter what your party affiliation is.

Russia attacked our country. They meddled in our election. Everybody knows it. And we have a President of the United States who is going out of his way to cover it up, to make it seem like it never happened, to dodge the issue. We cannot count on him to protect our election system; let’s just be honest about that.

We need to step up in a bipartisan way. We need to hold Russia accountable for its election meddling, and we need to insist that these attacks on our democracy stop. Russia is not our ally. They are not a competitor. They are not our friends. We have to start acting like that.

I am going to ask that if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative ENGEL’s and Representative CONNOLLY’s bill, H.R. 6494, the SECURE Our Democracy Act. Their bill would punish foreign entities who interfered with our elections, going back to 2015, and punish future attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the White House cannot be counted on to protect our elections. All they are interested in is protecting the President. We need to do the right thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because we will soon have a chance to vote on legislation that would punish those who attacked American democracy in 2016

and would deter anyone who tries to do so in the future.

The bill I introduced with Mr. CONNOLLY, the SECURE Our Democracy Act, would slap tough sanctions on anyone found to interfere with an American election from overseas. It goes back to 2015, so it would include those who tried to put their thumb on the scale in favor of Donald Trump.

We first introduced this bill in January of 2017, when it was becoming clear that Russia had waged a cyber warfare campaign against our election. Our updated version of this bill includes new congressional oversight provisions.

Why?

Because even if this bill passes, we don't trust the President to do the right thing, quite frankly. We don't believe he will do what it takes to protect our democracy, even after his own administration has told us over and over that Russia is at it again. After standing next to Vladimir Putin and accepting his lies over the unanimous conclusion of our intelligence community, how could we?

So when the next vote is called, my friends on the other side of the aisle have a choice to make. Will they vote to say to Putin, to our chief adversary, that we won't tolerate his attacks on our democracy, or will they again cede Congress' oversight role and continue to cover up for the President, who cozies up to Putin, who sides with him over our allies, and who continues to deny what everyone else knows is a fact?

Make no mistake: The next vote is our opportunity to punish the criminals who interfered in our election, to send a message that there will be consequences for anyone who does so in the future. After this vote, every Member will be on the record, letting the world know where they stand.

So I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: vote to defeat the previous question. Vote to show Russia and Putin that we won't stand by while they continue to attack American democracy.

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

Mr. Speaker, a vote against the previous question is a vote against this bill, which is there to defend America and support our servicemen and -women.

Make no mistake about it: You can't change the subject. The subject is the defense of the country. The subject is standing behind our servicemen and -women.

Now, let's make this clear. It was under the previous administration that Russia meddled in our elections, not under this administration. It was under the previous administration that Russia illegally seized Crimea. It was under the previous administration that we refused to arm the Ukrainians, who were simply trying to defend themselves. We are now arming them. This administration is doing that.

I remember in the Presidential election of 2012, the Republican nominee

for President said that the biggest threat to the United States of America is Russia, and he was laughed at. They are not laughing now.

This bill provides what we need to have to pushback against Russia, to arm the people who want to fight against Russia, and to stand with our servicemen and -women. To try to distract from that with some debate over a previous question on something that has nothing to do with defending this country, I wish we wouldn't do that in this House.

But I understand we have to make some partisan points before we leave here for August, and I am disappointed we are making those partisan points. We have an opportunity to stand up as one body and as one nation for our servicemen and -women.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just correct the gentleman on one thing. Voting against the previous question is not voting against the bill. What it means is that we can walk and chew gum at the same time. It means that we can not only debate and vote on the defense conference report, but we can also debate Mr. ENGEL's and Mr. CONNOLLY's bill. The gentleman is on the Rules Committee. He should know that. If we want to have this debate, we ought to vote "no" on the previous question.

And, by the way, we are talking about defending our country. Russia attacked us, in case you forgot, and we are trying to protect that from happening again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) to discuss our proposal for the previous question.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just say to my friend from Alabama, he wraps himself in the uniform of our brave men and women who serve this country overseas and here at home as if there is a zero-sum game here. He either chooses them or he chooses to address the threat from Russia, but he can't do both. And I say to my friend: You go to those men and women and explain to them how our President of the United States could sit next to an adversary—a thug, a killer, someone who interfered in our election—and explain to them, out fighting for their country, the Commander in Chief wouldn't do it. You explain to them how that same Commander in Chief actually opined that maybe Crimea should be given up.

What are we fighting for? What are our values?

This is relevant. We need to defeat the previous question so that we can consider a debate about the role of Russia in interfering with the most sacred thing Americans do: vote.

Our bill would sanction any foreign individual or entity found to have un-

lawfully meddled with a Federal election and would bar entry to this country and freeze U.S.-based assets of anyone involved in such interference.

□ 0945

President Trump's performance at the Helsinki Summit with Vladimir Putin underscores the need for this legislation, the very opposite of what my friend from Alabama is asserting.

Time and again, the President refuses to acknowledge the unanimous conclusion of all 17 U.S. intelligence agencies that that happened; that Russia was a threat and directly interfered with our 2016 elections.

Mr. Trump's own Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, recently said: "The warning lights are blinking red again. Today, the digital infrastructure that serves this country is literally under attack."

That is not some liberal Democrat. That is a former Republican Senator and the Republican appointee of a Republican President warning us this is a clear and imminent threat. So this is directly relevant.

Defeating the previous question will allow us to have that discussion on the floor, because we love our country and we want to have a good answer to the men and women in uniform, my friend from Alabama keeps on invoking; that America hasn't given up. We are not going to roll over and play dead to our adversaries.

We are going to candidly, on a bipartisan basis, acknowledge the threat to this country. And we are going to resist it, because we recognize their service and their willingness to put themselves on the line. Are we, is the question.

I urge the defeat of the previous question and support for the bill Mr. ENGEL and I have introduced to try to address this very grave subject.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would remind my friends on the other side of the aisle that today Russia faces more sanctions than they have faced since the end of the Cold War; more sanctions today than under the previous administration. This Congress and this President is pushing back against Russia. I am proud of what we are doing to push back on him, and we may not be done with that yet. We may need to do more. I stand ready to do more.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman's proud of the President's performance in Helsinki, but I assure you, the majority of Americans were disgusted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to, first, thank the House and Senate conferees for their work. This fiscal year 2019 Defense Authorization Act takes the crucial next steps to rebuild our military by making greater investments in training,

equipping, and providing for our forces. This bipartisan bill is essential to helping our troops prepare and respond to the complex security challenges we are facing around the world.

But as we authorize the largest budget for defense since World War II, it is imperative that President Trump lead responsibly so we can ably defend ourselves and the values we stand for around the world.

That includes: Enhancing U.S. defense posture in Europe and confronting Russian aggression.

We provide record funding for the European Deterrence Initiative that deepens our commitment to our NATO allies.

We strengthen our ability to combat ongoing Russian cyber campaigns that seek to undermine our democracy.

And we prevent the administration from recognizing Putin's illegal annexation of Crimea.

It requires the President to spend our defense dollars wisely.

We should be focusing on increasing readiness and extending our warfighting edge, which is why the NDAA increases funding for training in each service, modernizes range and test facilities and boosts spending on maintenance and spare parts.

And we invest in modern equipment that have the capabilities to confront Russia and China and other emerging threats.

We must also support the men and women who choose to wear the uniform. That is why we are providing our servicemembers with the largest pay raise in nearly a decade.

And we are overhauling the Transition Assistance Program to provide servicemembers better-tailored resources as they prepare to enter civilian life.

But we must do more to ensure that we extend and preserve the ability to honorably serve to every person in our armed forces, such as:

The men and women deserving a harassment-free workplace.

The Dreamer promised citizenship.

Or the transgender American who wants to continue serving.

The array of national security threats facing the United States is more complex and diverse and the strategic environment has never been more competitive. The Defense Authorization Act gives our military service components the tools and resources for the United States to maintain its military advantage, counter adversaries, and defend the international order that has created a safer and more prosperous world.

Congress has done its job. Now the President must make the tough choices to implement the national defense strategy and truly safeguard our national security.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with serious concerns about the missed opportunity in this legislation to take strong action against the Chinese firm, ZTE.

Our telecommunications systems are the backbone of our national security operations, and those systems need to be protected to ensure the safety of our citizens.

Not only did ZTE violate U.S. sanctions by illegally selling components to North Korea and Iran, it also paid full bonuses to the employees who engaged in illegal conduct, and then lied to U.S. authorities about it.

Instead of sending a strong message to ZTE, the NDAA Conference Committee stripped language from the Senate bill to ban ZTE from doing business with all U.S. firms and replaced it with watered-down language that merely prohibits ZTE from doing business with the U.S. Government.

This effectively gives ZTE a free pass for its past violations, and prioritizes a foreign company's interests over the security of the American people. This is wrong. Deal-making with ZTE is bad policy, and it sends a clear message to our adversaries that America is not willing to enforce our own sanctions.

Earlier this year, I wrote to Secretary Ross raising my concerns with reports that the administration was backtracking on its recently imposed 7-year ban on ZTE. To my dismay, and I think to many others, the administration lifted the ban.

The Senate-passed version of the bill would have restored the ban in full. So I am distressed that my colleagues have succumbed to pressure from the White House and watered down critically needed security protections.

We are all public servants of the American people. The number one responsibility we have is to protect and defend them.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. ESHOO. We must not make deals with foreign entities that have a proven history of compromising our telecommunications sector and treating our laws with disdain. When we know for a fact that a certain company or country does not have our national interests at heart, we have no business doing business with them, period.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentlewoman that in this bill, ZTE is prohibited from doing any business with the United States Government, and any company that does business with the ZTE is prohibited from doing business with the United States Government.

If we did what she suggested we do, we would have to find some way to save a billion dollars out of mandatory spending under the Defense Department. There is very little mandatory spending over at the Defense Department.

Let me tell you what it is. It is the retirement. It is what we require people to pay for their TRICARE, the people who have already served in the armed services. We have to make them pay more money for their healthcare.

I don't want to penalize those people who have already served our country. I stand with them. For that reason, I think this bill is plenty strong against ZTE. I think we have reached a good compromise here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, the military burns their trash, including computers, plastic, and medical waste, in open-air burn pits, creating smoke with toxic chemicals like metals and carcinogens that pose serious health risks to our troops.

Our servicemembers and veterans are developing severely debilitating pulmonary diseases, like pulmonary fibrosis and constrictive bronchiolitis, leaving them oxygen-dependent. And other young veterans are dying from rare cancers in the brain, pancreas, blood cells, and other locations.

I am an emergency medicine physician and a public health expert. In public health and in medicine, it is practice that if there is a high enough suspicion of a harm that causes a severe enough illness, then we need to act on that suspicion, remove the harm, and treat the person.

We can't wait 10 or 20 years for the perfect research study. We must act now. We must do that by simultaneously and immediately addressing these 4 points: First, stop our troops' exposure to dangerous burn pits out in the battlefield.

Second, educate doctors, veterans, and servicemembers to help doctors understand the risks of being exposed to burn pits, and to help veterans and servicemembers understand the early signs of potential serious illness so they can get treatment early.

Third, take care of burn pit exposed veterans and servicemembers at the VA and DOD, and ensure illnesses caused by burn pit exposure are recognized in their claims for disability benefits.

Fourth, do more research that is needed to identify all the different health impacts exposure to burn pits can cause.

The conference report for Fiscal Year 2019 National Defense Authorization Act includes two of my amendments

that will help address the first 2 points: Stopping the use of burn pits. And educating veterans and their caregivers about the health risks that could be connected to exposure to burn pits.

My first amendment directs the Department of Defense to conduct a feasibility study on ending the use of dangerous burn pits by using incinerators and other technology.

My second amendment requires the Department of Defense to conduct an annual education and outreach campaign to veterans exposed to burn pits and who are qualified to enroll in the burn pit registry.

The burn pit registry will improve our understanding of the different health effects of exposure to burn pits and help our ability to communicate with veterans and increase their awareness of subtle changes in their health so that they could understand the early signs of potential serious illness.

The Government must acknowledge the dangers of burn pits and the suffering of burn pit exposed veterans with severe illnesses. The Government has a responsibility to immediately provide them with the care and benefits they have earned while defending our freedoms.

I want to thank the conferees and the ranking member and chairman of the Armed Services Committee for their support of my amendment and for including these amendments in the final conference report.

Congress must continue to work together to provide solutions for our veterans and servicemembers exposed to these dangerous chemicals, toxins, carcinogens, and the smoke of burn pits.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased the gentleman's amendments were included in the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, while I oppose the underlying conference report, for reasons that I have already articulated, I do support the rule because it reflects a good process where committees were respected, where the ranking members were respected. We went through a conference committee, which is something almost unheard of in this body, and so I think many of us, myself included, are reasonable when the majority behaves reasonably.

But the bottom line is, there are a lot of issues that need to be addressed that aren't being addressed, and they are not being addressed because the Rules Committee routinely blocks good ideas from coming to the floor. So the only way we have an opportunity to bring up important issues is through procedural motions like defeating the previous question so we can bring up the Engel-Connolly bill, so we could actually stand up to Russia.

So we are going to vote for the rule. We are asking you to stand up to Russia. I don't think that that is a bad exchange.

So vote "no" on the previous question. Let's stand up to Russia before we go home. Let's do the right thing. Let's show the President that we have a spine, that we disagree with what he did and we are going to do the right thing here.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we are here to talk about not only defending the United States of America from all of our adversaries, Russia, especially, but to stand behind the men and women in uniform. And, yes, I do associate myself with them.

□ 1000

I am not one of them, but I am one of their supporters. And I hope that the vast majority of us in this body will stand up with them and be their supporters today both on the previous question on the rule and also on the bill when it comes before the body.

If we really want to push back against Russia, we will stop the games, and we will pass the rule, and we will pass the bill. That is how we stand up against Russia. Having a bitter, partisan debate before we do so only helps our enemies.

Let's stand together on this issue. We will come back after the break in August and debate the other issues, but let's send a clear message to those brave young men and women, that we have their back. We can do that by doing our duty today.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1027 and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1027 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 4. 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. 6494) to expose and deter unlawful and subversive foreign interference in elections for Federal office, 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 Foreign Affairs. 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

arises 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6494.

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 226, nays 183, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

YEAS—226

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham | Fortenberry | Marchant |
| Aderholt | Fox | Marshall |
| Allen | Frelinghuysen | Massie |
| Amash | Gaetz | Mast |
| Amodel | Gallagher | McCarthy |
| Arrington | Garrett | McCaul |
| Babin | Gianforte | McClintock |
| Bacon | Gibbs | McHenry |
| Banks (IN) | Goodlatte | McKinley |
| Barletta | Gosar | McMorris |
| Barr | Gowdy | Rodgers |
| Barton | Granger | McSally |
| Bergman | Graves (GA) | Meadows |
| Biggs | Graves (LA) | Messer |
| Bilirakis | Graves (MO) | Mitchell |
| Bishop (MI) | Green, Gene | Mooleenaar |
| Bishop (UT) | Griffith | Mooney (WV) |
| Brady (TX) | Grothman | Mullin |
| Brat | Guthrie | Newhouse |
| Brooks (AL) | Handel | Noem |
| Brooks (IN) | Harper | Norman |
| Buchanan | Harris | Nunes |
| Buck | Hartzler | Olson |
| Bucshon | Hensarling | Palazzo |
| Budd | Herrera Beutler | Palmer |
| Burgess | Hice, Jody B. | Paulsen |
| Byrne | Higgins (LA) | Pearce |
| Calvert | Hill | Perry |
| Carter (GA) | Holding | Pittenger |
| Carter (TX) | Hollingsworth | Poe (TX) |
| Chabot | Huizenga | Poliquin |
| Cheney | Hultgren | Posey |
| Cloud | Hunter | Ratcliffe |
| Coffman | Hurd | Reed |
| Cole | Issa | Reichert |
| Collins (GA) | Jenkins (KS) | Renacci |
| Collins (NY) | Jenkins (WV) | Rice (SC) |
| Comer | Johnson (LA) | Roby |
| Comstock | Johnson (OH) | Roe (TN) |
| Conaway | Johnson, Sam | Rogers (AL) |
| Cook | Jordan | Rogers (KY) |
| Costello (PA) | Joyce (OH) | Rohrabacher |
| Cramer | Katko | Rooney, Francis |
| Crawford | Kelly (MS) | Rooney, Thomas |
| Culberson | Kelly (PA) | J. |
| Curbelo (FL) | King (IA) | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Curtis | King (NY) | Roskam |
| Davidson | Kinzinger | Ross |
| Denham | Knight | Rothfus |
| DeSantis | Kustoff (TN) | Rouzer |
| DesJarlais | LaHood | Royce (CA) |
| Diaz-Balart | LaMalfa | Russell |
| Donovan | Lamborn | Rutherford |
| Duffy | Lance | Sanford |
| Duncan (SC) | Latta | Scalise |
| Duncan (TN) | Lesko | Schweikert |
| Dunn | Lewis (MN) | Scott, Austin |
| Emmer | LoBiondo | Sensenbrenner |
| Estes (KS) | Long | Sessions |
| Faso | Loudermilk | Shimkus |
| Ferguson | Love | Shuster |
| Fitzpatrick | Lucas | Simpson |
| Fleischmann | Luetkemeyer | Smith (MO) |
| Flores | MacArthur | Smith (NE) |

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott

Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—183

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Eshoo
Españal
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

NOT VOTING—19

Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Ellison

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarelli
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suozy
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5515, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1027, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5515) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1027, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 25, 2018, at page H7202.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1030

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 5515.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is therefore objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to express my appreciation to the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. SMITH, not only for his work on this conference, but also for his work throughout the process of bringing this bill to fruition. However strongly he and I may disagree on some particular issues, it is always clear that he seeks, first and foremost, to do the right thing for our military personnel and our country's national security, and I very much appreciate the opportunity to work with him.

Second, I want to thank all the members of the conference committee and of the House Armed Services Committee. Each of them has contributed to this final product, although I suspect none of them is pleased with everything that is or is not in it.

It is the result of a negotiation between House and Senate Members with a variety of interests. Taken as a whole, however, I think all Members who participated, whether in committee, in conference, or here on the floor, can be proud of the result.

□ 1025

Ms. WILSON of Florida changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. CHENEY and Mr. MACARTHUR changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.