

□ 0915

DISPARITIES IN PAY

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the disparities in pay between men and women in this country.

Today, women are paid only 80 cents for every dollar paid to men, resulting in a gap of \$10,169 each year. The gap exists in every State, regardless of geography, occupation, education, or work patterns.

This disparity is worse for women of color. On average, Hispanic women are typically paid 53 cents; Native American women, 58 cents; and Black women, 61 cents for every dollar paid to White, non-Hispanic men.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would help to close these punishing gaps by eliminating loopholes in the Equal Pay Act.

The wage gap between America's men and women denies women \$900 billion in income each year. Across the country, this disparity directly affects children. In my district of the Virgin Islands, 32 percent of families with children live in poverty. Of that number, 76 percent are headed by a single mother.

We know that families who live in poverty have higher rates of instability and that children living in poverty perform worse in school than their counterparts. By paying each woman the \$10,000 they lose per annum to the wage gap, we can do the right thing, and the fiscally responsible thing, and raise millions of families above the poverty line.

OPPOSING BAN ON TRANSGENDER MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 252, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 124) expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 124

Whereas, on July 26, 2017, President Trump announced via Twitter that the United States Government would reverse the existing policy of allowing transgender servicemembers to serve openly in order to implement a ban on transgender people from serving in the Armed Forces;

Whereas transgender servicemembers have served openly since 2016, bravely defending our Nation with distinction while preserving unit cohesion and contributing to military readiness;

Whereas a 2016 study by the RAND Corporation found that allowing transgender

Americans to serve openly in the Armed Forces would “have minimal impact on readiness and health care costs” and “little or no impact on unit cohesion, operational effectiveness or readiness”;

Whereas thousands of transgender Americans currently serve actively in the Armed Forces and in the Reserves throughout all branches and military occupational specialties;

Whereas the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Psychiatric Association, and three former military Surgeons General each have affirmed the medical efficacy of transition-related care and have expressed opposition to President Trump's discriminatory ban;

Whereas the claims attempting to justify President Trump's ban are based on flawed scientific and medical assertions;

Whereas the Department of Defense report from 2018 falsely asserts there is “considerable scientific uncertainty” regarding the efficacy of transition-related care;

Whereas there is a global medical consensus that such care is effective, safe, and reliable;

Whereas the Department of Defense has failed to provide evidence the existing policy has impaired morale, unit readiness, or unit cohesion;

Whereas all five military Chiefs of Staff have testified publicly that the existing policy has had no adverse effect on military readiness;

Whereas, on August 1, 2017, fifty-six retired generals and admirals released a statement affirming, “This proposed ban, if implemented, would cause significant disruptions, deprive the military of mission-critical talent, and compromise the integrity of transgender troops who would be forced to live a lie, as well as non-transgender peers who would be forced to choose between reporting their comrades or disobeying policy”;

Whereas at least 18 nations allow transgender people to serve openly and effectively in their armed forces;

Whereas transgender members of the Armed Forces have fought in defense of our freedoms with honor and distinction since our Nation's founding and have been bestowed with such commendations and awards as the Bronze Star and Purple Heart for their courage and sacrifices;

Whereas President Trump's ban on transgender members of the Armed Forces targets and stigmatizes a whole class of people; and

Whereas President Trump's ban on transgender members of the Armed Forces would affect all transgender members of the Armed Forces and force them to serve under a policy that stigmatizes and devalues their contributions to our Nation's defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) strongly opposes President Trump's discriminatory ban on transgender members of the Armed Forces;

(2) rejects the flawed scientific and medical claims upon which it is based; and

(3) strongly urges the Department of Defense to not reinstate President Trump's ban on transgender members of the Armed Forces and to maintain an inclusive policy allowing qualified transgender Americans to enlist and serve in the Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 124.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is very straightforward. The Department of Defense, in cooperation with the White House, recently issued a policy, which will be implemented in a couple weeks, that would, effectively, bar transgender people from being able to serve in the military. We have this resolution to reject that policy. It is that simple and that straightforward.

We believe the policy that the Pentagon is putting forward is unfair, based on ignorance and bigotry, and will actually harm national security. We ask the House, in this resolution, to express the sense of Congress that we oppose this policy from the Pentagon.

Again, what this policy is primarily based on is ignorance and bias against the transgender community. The policies being implemented will make it virtually impossible for them to serve in the military. This is unfair discrimination, and it is also harmful to national security.

The Army last year failed to meet its recruitment quotas. It is a constant challenge in the military to find the people who have the character, the capability, and the ability to serve in our military.

We have the best military in the history of the world. We need high-qualified people to serve. To single out a particular group of people, to discriminate against them and say that they cannot serve, not because they can't meet the qualifications—it is not because they can't run fast enough or shoot straight enough or work hard enough—to be a member of the military, but because of something that literally has nothing to do with their ability to do their job, is bad for national security and is unfair discrimination.

We have heard a lot from people about how difficult it is for unit cohesion to have transgender people in the military, a whole bunch of arguments. The only problem with that is the military leaders who have actually been responsible for this—and I am just going to read one quote. There are many, and some of my colleagues will say it as well.

Army Chief of Staff Milley, who is about to become the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, last year said

there are precisely zero reports of issues of cohesion, discipline, or morale as a result of transgender people serving.

There is no issue in terms of readiness, despite what the proponents of this policy will say. It is discrimination, pure and simple, and it is unnecessary.

We also hear opponents say that the policy doesn't ban transgender people from serving and, under certain circumstances, they can. But those circumstances, as described, are so limiting and restricting. Worst of all, as I will explain in a minute, in certain parts, it allows them to serve only if they are willing to deny who they are. That amounts to a ban. If you cannot be who you are and serve in the military, then that is a choice nobody should have to make.

Let's start with the fact that, right now, under this policy, anyone who wants to join the military, if they have transitioned to a different gender, either gone through the surgery or began hormone therapy, this ban says they cannot join. Again, this doesn't say anything about their fitness to serve, in terms of their physical ability or anything. If they have simply had transition surgery or gone through hormone therapy, they are barred from serving.

Worse than that, the people who are already in the military who are transgender are, to a certain extent, grandfathered in. In many different places throughout this policy, it says over and over again that they have to serve in their biological sex. A lot of people go: Well, what the heck does that mean? That gets at the essence, at the very heart, of what it means to be transgender.

This is not something that is just in people's minds. It is a physiological condition that people are born into in which they decide they are more comfortable being in the opposite gender. That is one of the cornerstone difficulties that all these people have to go through: Who am I? What gender do I want to be?

Working with therapists and working with other people, they make that determination. They decide: I know who I am, and this is who I am going to be.

This policy now says: Sorry, we don't care what your doctor says. You cannot be the gender that you know that you are. You have to deny who you are in order to stay in the military.

In many places throughout this policy, that is a consistent theme and points out what is so totally and completely wrong about this policy.

You have also heard, undoubtedly, that there are higher healthcare costs for people who are transgender. There are a number of studies out that show that actually isn't true. Yes, healthcare expense is part of people who serve in the military, and, regrettably, people who join the military have all manner of different healthcare expenses that we do have to pick up,

but there is no evidence that this has an increased cost over an average servicemember.

Furthermore, we know that the purpose of this policy is not about cost because one of the first points that I made was about how they are not now going to be allowed to join the military even if they have already gone through transition surgery or hormone therapy. So even if they are all done with that, and there is no additional medical cost to come, this policy says that they are barred and banned from joining the military.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

It makes it perfectly clear that this policy is unfair discrimination based on bigotry and ignorance, and I urge this House to reject it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a sense of Congress resolution that makes no change whatsoever in law or policy. It is a messaging bill rather than legislation that actually does something on a substantive issue.

So, one may ask, why bother opposing a bill that doesn't do anything? I have a couple answers.

Part of the answer, to me, is that we normally do not bring isolated issues in the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee to the floor.

Part of the reason that a national defense authorization bill has been signed into law every year for 58 straight years under Presidents of both parties and Congresses of both parties is that we try to look at national security as a whole as it relates to the Department of Defense. There have been a few isolated instances where something needed immediate attention, but, generally, we try to look at the whole, not bring isolated issues to the floor. I worry that doing so, even with a messaging bill, undermines that bipartisan approach that has been so successful.

Another part of the reason, Mr. Speaker, is that we also normally try to keep our troops above and beyond politics. Bringing a messaging bill that does nothing to law or policy also threatens to undermine that, and I worry about that.

On its face, the resolution, the messaging bill that is before us, includes a number of statements that are just flat wrong. It says that President Trump reversed the prior policy on transgender individuals in a tweet. In fact, well before any Presidential tweet, Secretary of Defense Mattis had put a delay on implementation of the policy that had previously been announced so that there could be a 6-month review. There was a 6-month review with experts, with uniformed and civilian people from all the services,

with medical experts, with a whole variety of folks.

It is serious and thoughtful, despite some of the characterizations that have been made from time to time. I recommend that Members actually read it, because I think they will be impressed. They may not agree with all of the recommendations, but they will see the serious and thoughtful approach that the Department took to this issue.

As a result of this review, the previous policy was modified. It didn't go back to the way it was. Again, those details are in the report.

The resolution before us today says that the Mattis policy is a ban. It is not. The D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals found, on January 4, 2019, that it is factually inaccurate to call it a blanket ban. In reversing the lower court, the court of appeals said: "The district court made an erroneous finding that the Mattis plan was the equivalent of a blanket ban on transgender service."

This resolution before us says that there is a global medical consensus on transgender care. But the World Professional Association for Transgender Health says that they offer flexible clinical guidelines that cannot possibly reflect all the differences and situations which exist.

Mr. Speaker, turning to the substance of the matter for a second, to me, the heart of the issue is contained in the very first sentence to the Department report, which was issued in February 2018. The first sentence says: "It is a bedrock principle of the Department of Defense that any eligible individual who can meet the high standards for military service without special accommodations should be permitted to serve."

Any eligible individual who can meet the standards without special accommodation should be permitted to serve. That is what I believe, Mr. Speaker. I think that is what this policy attempts to achieve.

Now, it is a fair point to say it went too far this way or it didn't go far enough this way. We can have those substantive, serious debates at an appropriate time and place. But a messaging bill is not going to get that job done.

I would say, finally, Mr. Speaker, that our committee heard the day before yesterday a reminder that only 29 percent of Americans aged 17 to 25 are eligible for military service. Only 29 percent meet the physical, mental, and legal requirements to be eligible for military service, even if they want to. That means 71 percent are not eligible, for whatever reason.

There could be, and maybe there should be, a debate that the standards are too high, that we need to lower the standards, that we need to make some changes in the standards so that more people are eligible. But the point is, our view of military service is that anyone who meets those standards should be allowed to serve. If someone

cannot meet those standards, for whatever reason, through no fault of their own, then they are not able to serve. They can serve in a different way, but not in military service.

□ 0930

I think, again, Mr. Speaker, if we were to really be discussing the substance of the issue rather than a messaging bill, then we could talk about the high standards for military service without special accommodation and there would be a substantive discussion. That is not what we are doing today. It is a messaging bill, and that is too bad because there are serious issues that need to be discussed.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I will agree, this is a messaging bill, and the message is this is a bad policy. That is what the House is doing.

I will also agree that, when it comes to crafting the right policy in this area, it should be done in committee, and it will be done in committee. That is why we didn't bring that out here on the floor.

But I think it is important for the House of Representatives to make it clear how wrong we think this policy is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, equal has always been our Nation's North Star.

Endowed by our creator, inscribed by Jefferson in our Declaration of Independence, engraved above the doors to the highest court in our land, codified in our Constitution after a war tore our country apart, it is that pursuit of equality, that journey for a more perfect Union, that sets America apart.

At times, we have stumbled. We have enslaved men, women, and children because of the color of their skin. We have segregated those same families in the first breaths of their freedom.

We have stigmatized fellow Americans based on their race, their ancestry, their god, the nation of their birth, the hand that they hold, and their very identity.

Some willing to die for our freedom fought wars only to meet a government that offered them a handshake and a return to second-class citizenship.

Today, this House has a chance to not repeat the mistakes of our past, to move one step closer to that sacred promise by telling brave trans men and women in uniform that they cannot be banned from military service because of who they are—because that is the very foundation for this policy: targeted discrimination against transgender Americans.

Supporters will say otherwise. It is about unit cohesion, they say—except for the fact that the five chiefs of staff for the military branches have testified that they are aware of exactly zero in-

stances of a transgender servicemember negatively impacting discipline or morale.

It will degrade our military, they say—except that 56 retired generals and flag officers told us that it is the ban that would degrade readiness, “even more than the failed Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy” did.

It is science, they say—except that the Department of Defense relied on data nearly half a century old and ignored plenty of other studies.

Just ask the American Medical Association, the American Psychology Association, the American Psychiatric Association.

It is about cost, they say—except that the military spends ten times more annually on erectile dysfunction medication than we have on trans-related care in the past 3 years combined.

It is not a ban, they say. Ask any one of the brave transgender servicemembers or veterans in the gallery today exactly what this ban means.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, in a country that celebrates freedom, this policy tells our servicemembers that they do not have the freedom to be who they are. Where is the freedom in that?

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of the House to support this resolution.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about a sharp, young patriot from my district.

She worked hard, earned straight A's, and was accepted into law school to join the JAG Corps. She, however, was denied entry into the military because she had bunions on her feet.

She is an amazing woman and a long-distance runner, but DOD's policy was clear that, due to the risk of future surgery, she could potentially be temporarily undeployable and, so, was denied entrance into military service. She did not meet the physical-mental-medical standards.

Another constituent was denied service because he had asthma. He, too, wanted to serve his country, but the health risk outweighed the benefits to the military. He did not meet the physical-mental-medical standards.

DOD's military exception standards state:

Individuals must be free of medical conditions or physical defects that may require excessive time lost from duty for necessary treatment or hospitalization.

Our all-volunteer military is the greatest military force in the world, and we must allow it—we must allow it—to make the best medical and military judgment about what medical conditions should qualify or disqualify an individual from serving. We should not carve out exceptions for an entire population.

Military service is a privilege, not a right. That is why Secretary Mattis reviewed and issued a new policy on transgender service and the medical condition of gender dysphoria.

The policy is not a ban, and it allows transgender servicemembers to serve in their biological sex. The Mattis policy does not kick anyone out of the military for being transgender, nor does it give preferential treatment to transgender persons. All persons, unless grandfathered or granted a waiver, must serve in their birth gender.

It is a fair policy, allowing transgender individuals to serve openly as long as they are willing to serve in their biological sex and they can meet the medical behavioral standards.

This resolution we are voting on today is riddled with inaccuracies. First, as I just stated, the policy is not a ban.

Second, it claims there is a global medical consensus that transgender care is effective, safe, and reliable. That is not true. RAND, the Mayo Clinic, CMS, and others have all determined that there is not enough quality evidence to be able to say that. And there are valid concerns.

There are costs as well. The Department of Defense announced already that they have spent \$8 million on those individuals who have identified as transgender last year, and that money has been spent on psychotherapy, on sex change operations. That is money that could have been spent on bullets, body armor for our troops.

Third, the resolution claims there is not an adverse effect on military readiness. This is false. The individual readiness of those undergoing treatment for gender dysphoria will be impacted. It takes over 260 days just to recover from the surgery.

Individual readiness directly impacts the readiness of our forces, so the diagnosis and treatment for transgender personnel takes them away from their jobs for an indeterminate amount of time. This lost deployment time means someone else will have to step forward and go in their place. This is unfair.

The military has valid reasons for excluding people with certain medical conditions from service. It is not the job of Congress to dictate what medical conditions the military should accept.

We should not degrade the efficiency and lethality of our Armed Forces. This resolution is riddled with false claims, and I urge my colleagues to oppose its passage.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding time and, really, for his leadership on this very important issue as to who we are as a nation, how we honor our oath to protect and defend the American people, and, in doing so, recognizing the contribution of all who want

to serve our country. I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for his leadership.

I also acknowledge the leadership of our colleague JOE KENNEDY, sponsor of this legislation, for his relentless leadership and his forming and chairmanship of the Transgender Caucus that has been so important in making clear, in our policy, that we respect the dignity and worth of every person.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women who step forward to serve in the U.S. military are patriots, all of them, people of great strength and courage whose sacrifice keeps us safe. We owe those heroes our must humbled gratitude and our most steadfast support, and I want to thank our trans friends for their service, their courage, their patriotism in serving our country.

Instead of honoring their service, the President continues to insist on his cruel transgender servicemember ban. This is an act of cruelty.

Let us all salute, again, Congressman JOE KENNEDY, a champion for equality, fairness, and dignity in this Congress, for his firm, moral leadership on this resolution to oppose the President's bigoted ban.

The resolution that our distinguished chairman, Mr. SMITH, and our colleague, JOE KENNEDY, are putting forth is bipartisan because protecting transgender servicemembers is a matter of patriotism and it transcends politics.

The President's ban, as I said, is cruel and arbitrary, a decision designed to humiliate the transgender Americans who are risking and giving their lives for the United States of America.

There is no moral justification for this ban, which violates every value of our American democracy and betrays our fundamental belief in fairness, dignity, and respect.

There is no medical justification for this ban, which the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, and the American Psychiatric Association all oppose.

And there is no military justification for this ban which would undermine our military readiness and make America less strong and safe, and that is according to our own military.

After the President first unleashed his ban, 56 retired generals and flag officers issued a statement asserting that the ban "would cause significant disruptions, deprive the military of mission-critical talent, and compromise the integrity of transgender troops who would be forced to live a lie, as well as non-transgender peers who are forced to choose between reporting their comrades or disobeying policy. As a result," they go on to say, "the proposed ban would degrade readiness even more than the failed Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy."

Other military leaders have spoken out to denounce this ban: Former Joint Chief of Staff, Mike Mullen; Army Chief of Staff, General Mark Milley; Commandant of the United States

Coast Guard, Karl Schultz; Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Jon Richardson; Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Robert Neller.

Yet the President has chosen to ignore the expertise of these military leaders, making clear that prejudice, not patriotism, drives his decisions.

The President's ban, again, is cruel. No one with the strength and bravery to serve in the U.S. military should be turned away because of who they are.

The House will continue to fight this discriminatory action, which has no place in our country. We will never allow hate and prejudice to dictate our national security. I hope we have a resounding "yes" vote to reject the President's ban today.

Again, I thank the distinguished chairman, Mr. SMITH, and our colleague JOE KENNEDY for his leadership and courage.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, at some point someone has got to tell me what "engaging in personalities" means. I have served in this body for a long time. I still don't know what that means.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with our transgender servicemembers and to stand against President Trump's proposed ban of transgender people serving in the military.

Transgender troops have been serving openly since 2016—at home, overseas, and in combat zones—without incident.

□ 0945

When I met with transgender servicemembers last month, I was impressed to learn that by serving openly—I want to make a note of that—by serving openly, the quality of their service improved, and, in fact, the obstacles—and there are many obstacles, Mr. Speaker—the obstacles they have overcome informed their greater ability to do their job. Their impressive records speak for themselves, and there is no doubt that each of the servicemembers I met with have served their country with distinction.

As already stated, this ban is blatant discrimination poorly disguised as concerns over readiness, unit cohesion, and medical costs associated with transitioning. We already know that there have been zero reports of issues regarding unit morale or cohesion since the ban was lifted in 2016, a fact that has been supported by the chief of staff of every service. The cost of medically transitioning has also been proven to have minimal impact on the military's healthcare budget.

This administration is resorting to misinformation; misinformation to exclude capable, qualified people from service to their country.

At a time when the Army is failing to meet recruitment goals, and the Navy and Air Force opted to lower their quota in order to reach their own recruitment goals, we cannot be turning away dedicated, able-bodied recruits simply because they happen to be transgender.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution with vigor.

Last month, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel within the Armed Services Committee held a hearing. It was the first time in the history of this Congress that five transgender members of the military were allowed to testify.

Four of them are trans female. One of them is trans male. All five of them have served our country with distinction. All five of them have served more than 12 years in the military. One of them is a West Point graduate. All of them have served either in Iraq, Afghanistan, multiple deployments, and in submarine service.

To the servicemember, all I saw was pride to be in the military, pride to serve their country, pride to put themselves on the line.

The testimony from the administration was like a twisted pretzel. They offered a weak and dithering defense of their cruel policy. Two things became clear at this hearing:

First, the administration policy is a ban. Make no mistake about it. Those who are in the military and serving as transgender can continue to do so. No one can come into the military who is transgender. If you are in the military and transgender and have not identified, you cannot identify. So it is a ban.

Captain Alivia Stehlik put it best:

Currently, soldiers are allowed to seek care no matter what, trans related or not. If the policy changes, soldiers will no longer be able to seek care, because if you say, I am trans and get a diagnosis of gender dysphoria, regardless of your job performance, you are ineligible and will be terminated.

The policy is a solution in search of a problem. Worse, it discriminates against our servicemembers.

Second, the hearing demonstrated resoundingly that the last 2½ years of open service have been unequivocally successful.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, transgender servicemembers have been there for us. It is time for us to be there for them.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. I thank the ranking member for his service, and his leadership as chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to reject the President's executive order and to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution introduced by my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). His resolution simply states what millions and millions of Americans know to be true, that the Trump administration's ban on transgender people serving their country in our military is discriminatory. It reflects bias. It reflects prejudice. Indeed, it reflects bigotry.

Martin Luther King tried to teach us that what we said in the Declaration of Independence, we ought to live out. He said that all of us—and, certainly, he would have included women as we did yesterday in our Paycheck Fairness Act—are created equal in the image of God.

Martin Luther King said that we ought to judge one another on the content of our character. The President's order does not do that. The President's order is based upon a prejudiced view of somebody because of a distinction that is not the content of their character nor the quality of their performance.

I was proud to be a sponsor of and brought to this floor as majority leader, the repeal of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell legislation. That has enhanced our national security, not diminished it.

The President's resolution states what millions and millions of Americans know to be true: that the Trump administration's ban on transgender people serving their country in our military is discriminatory; that it denigrates the service of patriotic Americans. That is a facet of their character. They are patriotic, and they want to serve, and the service judges them able to do so.

This resolution, millions of Americans understand, undermines our national defense at a time of serious global threats. This resolution rightfully calls on the Trump administration not to implement such a ban on April 12. To do so would be a blow to our country and the principles it represents.

Let me remind my colleagues that there was a time when we said African Americans ought not to serve with White Americans together because that would undermine morale and undermine the security of our country. That was a manifestation of prejudice and bigotry, not of intellectual honesty, content of character.

Have we not yet learned that lesson? Are we not big enough to live out the premise that all men and women are created equal? This resolution seeks to redeem the best of America's principles, not the worst of our discriminatory past.

I was proud to bring legislation to the floor as majority leader that ended Don't Ask, Don't Tell, and it was overwhelmingly supported in this House

and in the Senate, and passed. It has been a benefit, not a detriment.

In the years since, we have seen our military strengthen by the open service of many LGBT Americans who have contributed a great deal to keeping America safe and advancing our national security interests around the world.

To say to transgender servicemembers in uniform that they must leave their units, not because they are not performing well, not because they are not needed, but because of who they are, not the content of their character, not their service, not their performance, but because of who they are, would be a shameful action for our country and deprive us of their talent and contributions.

To deny transgender Americans the opportunity to put on that uniform and wear the flag of the country they wish to serve—as I do every day—would be to diminish that flag, that Declaration of Independence, that Constitution of the United States of which we are so proud.

I hope my colleagues in this body will join in sending a clear message that the House, not Republicans or Democrats, that the people's House reflects the values, the service, and patriotism of our transgender fellow Americans.

Let us today reflect the best of our values, not the worst of our values. Pass this resolution. Make America proud of its Declaration of Independence and its Constitution, and of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s admonition to make our judgments based upon content of character.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran, I rise in support of this resolution. When this country first debated the possibility of African Americans, women, or LGBT people serving in our military, the same doubts, the same reports, and the same concerns were raised regarding their service.

One of these misleading claims is that allowing transindividuals to serve could harm our military readiness. Mr. Speaker, allowing patriotic Americans who are willing, capable, and ready to serve their country does not harm readiness.

I will tell you what does: diverting military personnel and billions of dollars in military construction funding to build an unnecessary wall to respond to a nonmilitary fabricated emergency.

I want to ask my friends who support this shameful service ban whether they believe they have the right to deny an individual their right to be who they are, to limit opportunities because of their gender identity? Are these the values America was founded upon?

We as a nation are much better than this. During the repeal of Don't Ask,

Don't Tell, critics invoked fear upon America saying that it would disrupt unit morale and readiness. Today, 9 years later, we have the most powerful and capable military in the world.

For almost 3 years, transgender troops have been able to serve openly. During that time, there has been no evidence of lack of military readiness or unit cohesion. Unfortunately, in return for their service, we are requiring they suppress their identity. This is absolutely unacceptable and discriminatory.

I believe former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey responded best when he stated:

"The service of the men and women who volunteer and who meet our standards of service is a blessing, not a burden."

□ 1000

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my vehement opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals because the Trump administration considers transgender identity to be some medically disqualifying condition. Gender identity is not a medical condition; it is who we are as individuals.

Since President Truman desegregated the military, we have torn down barriers to the equal treatment and opportunity of every American to serve. Women now serve in combat roles defending our Nation as Rangers, infantrymen and submariners. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual Americans serve our country openly and with distinction.

In 2016, the Pentagon lifted the ban on transgender Americans, allowing them to serve without having to hide their true identity. The fact that thousands of transgender servicemembers are currently serving, meeting, and exceeding standards and are deployed worldwide speaks volumes about their dedication and contributions to our Nation. We need their skills, their experience, their courage, and their patriotism.

In 1948, many Americans agreed that racial segregation in the Armed Forces was right, but history shows all of us today that they were wrong. Former Defense Secretary Gates said: "No aspect of Black Americans' quest for justice and equality under the law has been nobler than what has been called the 'fight for the right to fight.'"

My 30 years in the Army leads me to believe that all Americans who want to serve and who can meet our standards should be given the right to fight. My deep belief is shared by General Dunford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who reiterated that very belief to me just 2 days ago.

We have an obligation to allow transgender Americans the right to

fight for our Nation. We cannot, Mr. Speaker, settle for this discriminatory policy.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS).

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. KENNEDY for his leadership on this issue and the members and staff on the House Armed Services Committee for helping bring this important resolution to the House floor.

I served in the Navy during the time of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Too many were forced to live their lives in secret, unable to be true to themselves. In 2016, transgender servicemembers were allowed to serve openly in the United States military, individuals like Lieutenant Commander Blake Dremann, who is still currently on Active Duty and who has deployed 11 times.

During his testimony in the Military Personnel Subcommittee, he stated that his transition meant that he was no longer compartmentalizing parts of his life. He also stated that his decision to transition made him a better officer and a better leader. He has proven it by receiving the Navy Batchelder Award, which is given to Navy top Supply Corps officers.

My support for Lieutenant Commander Dremann and all our transgender servicemembers is unequivocal. They have shown tremendous courage, and it is why I fight for inclusion and equality for the LGBTQ community.

The President's policy is taking not only our military, but our country, backwards. It is unnecessary, and it is purely a discriminatory action against a group of individuals who want to do nothing more than serve their country.

It is a disgusting attack on a community that he once swore to protect. He is attacking servicemembers who have already proven their ability to meet strategic needs and who pose no risk to unit cohesion or military readiness.

As far as I am concerned, any person who has the courage, spirit, and commitment to serve our country in uniform when so many choose not to should be allowed to do so.

I will vote to pass this resolution, and unlike the President, I will continue to advocate for and protect our LGBTQ community. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of this resolution and denounce the President's hateful policy toward our servicemembers.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and in opposition to the administration's ban on openly transgender individuals in the armed services.

Throughout history, each time we expand who may join the armed services to better reflect the diversity of our Nation, the same tired and disproven arguments are brought back: that any individual within a new group, regardless of their ability, is unfit to serve and that they will disrupt unit cohesion. We heard these arguments with respect to Black and Latino men; women; and gays, lesbians, and bisexuals.

But we know that is simply untrue. There are no issues with transgender individuals serving in our military. You don't have to take my word for it. The service chiefs of all five branches of our military have testified that there have been zero instances of transgender servicemembers hurting cohesion or readiness since the ban was first lifted.

The conservative obsession with targeting and attacking transgender individuals in all areas of American life is cruel and immoral. It is astonishing that, after years of "support our troops" demagoguery from my colleagues across the aisle, they would choose to turn their backs on Active-Duty servicemembers and vote to specifically deny them medically prescribed care.

After 2½ years of transgender servicemembers serving with no issues, there is one reason and one reason alone for this administration to be bringing back a ban on transgender servicemembers: to force a bigoted agenda on the military that they cannot force on the rest of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, much of the history of this country is the history of expanding our understanding of whom the Declaration of Independence meant when it said that all men are created equal. It didn't mean, in 1776, Black men; it certainly didn't mean women; it didn't mean Native Americans; and it didn't mean LGBTQ people. We have come to the point where we understand, at least aspirationally, it means all of those things.

This resolution gives us a choice:

Do we join the march? Do we continue the march to expand the meaning of the Declaration of Independence to declare equality for everyone regardless of specific characteristics, or do we join that dreary procession of slavers, confederates, racists, and misogynists who have dragged this country through the mud and have besmirched the ideals of the Declaration of Independence?

That is our choice today. Let's take the right one.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution expressing opposition to President Trump's decision to ban transgender individuals from serving in the Armed Forces. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution, and I thank my friend, Mr. KENNEDY, for his extraordinary leadership on this issue.

The President's decision in 2017 to prohibit transgender individuals from military service is disgraceful and wrong. Not only is the decision based on ignorance and bigotry, but the evidence shows there is absolutely no need for this discriminatory policy.

America has the strongest and most effective military in the history of the world, and that is because of the brave individuals who serve in uniform. Excluding an entire group of highly qualified and skilled individuals from service undermines our national security.

In 2016, the Obama administration removed the ban on transgender individuals after thoroughly and carefully studying how it would impact the military and military readiness. A year later, President Trump announced he would resume prohibiting transgender individuals from serving in a tweet and didn't even bother to tell his Secretary of Defense about it.

The National Center for Transgender Equality estimates that over 15,000 trans people are currently serving in the military. In 2016, a study by RAND Corporation found that service by transgender individuals does not adversely affect readiness, and, in fact, many military leaders have acknowledged that the ban will degrade military readiness.

This cruel ban seeks to force transgender members of our military back into the closet or out of service. It is a policy that is not based on any factor or any careful deliberation, but merely an attempt to score points with the hard right faction of his political base. By doing this, the President is hurting our military, making our country less safe, and making our country less just.

Transgender individuals who serve our country in the Armed Forces are American heroes. They deserve our thanks, and they deserve more than to be used as a political prop by their Commander in Chief. We as a country are better than this.

Mr. Speaker, quite simply, it is un-American and immoral to deny transgender individuals who want to serve our country in uniform the right to do so simply because of who they are, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH for his leadership and for yielding time.

I also want to recognize Congressman KENNEDY for his tremendous leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 124, rejecting the President's discriminatory ban on openly transgender servicemembers in the military.

Transgender servicemembers have served with honor and distinction in the defense of our country for decades, yet President Trump announced on Twitter that transgender servicemembers would no longer be allowed to serve, despite the fact that many military leaders concluded that being transgender does not impact our readiness. President Trump's own Chief of Staff said he hadn't received any reports of problems with unit cohesion or morale regarding transgender servicemembers.

The President's cowardly ban makes it clear that prejudice, not patriotism, guides his decisions.

As the daughter of a career military officer who served in a segregated military, I know what it is like for our country to betray our American values. As a person of faith, I was taught to treat everyone equally. As an African American woman, I will fight discrimination wherever it surfaces.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member managing this bill, and I thank Mr. KENNEDY for his insight.

We are reminded that we have nothing to fear but fear itself. Franklin Delano Roosevelt offered those great words on the precipice of World War II, the victory with the United States troops standing side by side, some of them African Americans who lived and served in the uniform but in a segregated way. But their blood was the same, and they shared their blood in the same way; they died in the same way.

Do we want victory or defeat?

Let me be very clear. Allowing transgender to serve and brushing them out is a travesty.

Do you realize that it is clear that the RAND report found that healthcare coverage for transgender military personnel would increase the military total account by less than zero?

In addition, when all of this was banned by the Obama administration, we recognized it is honored, the sacrifices of selfless transgender servicemembers who have endured exclusion,

silence, and persecution due to discriminatory policies and attitudes against LGBT and military personnel such as Don't Ask, Don't Tell, which was rightfully struck down under the Obama administration.

We must be against these destructive practices.

Do we want victory or defeat?

There is nothing to fear but fear itself.

Support this resolution to stand with those who want to serve and die for their country.

I rise in support of H. Res. 124.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 26, 2017, the fears of the LGBTQ community were confirmed.

In an unexpected move that immediately sent shockwaves through the media and LGBTQ+ community, the President tweeted Wednesday morning that "the United States Government will not accept or allow Transgender individuals to serve in any capacity in the U.S. Military."

Scores of individuals, civil rights groups, and military personnel on all sides of the political spectrum unanimously condemned the President's announcement as an intolerant and irrational violation of the sacred right of Transgender Americans to valiantly serve their country.

In his tweets, the President claimed that "our military . . . cannot be burdened with the tremendous medical costs and disruption that transgender in the military would entail."

This statement directly contradicts the wealth of rigorous evidence indicating the exact opposite:

According to a 2016 study by the RAND Corporation, allowing transgender individuals to serve openly in the military poses "little to no impact on unit cohesion, operational effectiveness, or readiness."

Furthermore, RAND found that health care coverage for transgender military personnel would increase the U.S. military's total annual health care expenditures by a mere 0.04 to 0.13-percent.

The President's illogical ban on transgender military personnel reverses a previous policy set forth by Former Defense Secretary Ash Carter in June, 2016 that allowed transgender troops to serve openly.

This policy under Obama was a significant step forward that made our armed services more inclusive.

It honored the sacrifices of selfless transgender service members who have endured exclusion, silence, and persecution due to discriminatory policies and attitudes against LGBTQ+ military personnel such as "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," which was rightfully struck down under the Obama administration.

Numerous advocacy groups that focus on LGBTQ+ service members and veterans organizations have decried the President's transgender ban announcement and criticized the hypocrisy and poor leadership of the White House.

Officials at OutServe, which provides legal assistance to LGBTQ+ troops and recruits, said Trump's "pseudo-policy-by-twitter" demonstrated "blatant disregard for transgender service members."

The group then turned the President's hateful rhetoric back on itself: "The disruptive burden to the military comes from indecision in a

White House which itself is not focused on victory if it's targeting service members.

The readiness, effectiveness, and lethality of the Armed Services comes from the commitment of our troops—not the vagaries and bigotry of exclusionary policies."

The Palm Center, an advocacy group for transgender service members, denounced the President's comments as "creating a worse version of don't ask, don't tell" policy.

Vote Vets, an organization dedicated to opening U.S. military services to diverse Americans, correctly assessed that "removing [transgender service members] weakens our country and our military."

There are approximately 15,000 transgender service members currently serving in the U.S. military.

The President's announcement offers no clarity on the status of these troops who continue to serve their country with honor, dignity, and excellence.

However, if the President's expression of intent to "not accept or allow Transgender individuals to serve" entails the removal of these service members from the ranks of the U.S. military—this can only be understood as a direct violation of the rights and principles laid down in the Constitution.

Angela Davis once said, "If they come for me in the morning, they will come for you in the night."

Americans of all races, ethnicities, origins, sexual preferences, and gender identities must realize that the reverse is also true: If the President comes for them in the morning, he will come for me in the night.

To the brave transgender individuals who have served, currently serve, or dream of serving in the military: I recognize your commitment to protecting this nation with your very lives.

I oppose the President's unlawful agenda of discrimination. I will not stop until your sacrifices are regarded as equal under the law of the United States.

To all members of the transgender community: I stand with you. I am fighting for you. I will not allow your rights to be stripped away by bigoted men who have lost sight of what it means to be American. That is why I support H. Res. 124.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair whether the gentleman from Washington, the chairman, has any further speakers other than himself.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I am prepared to close at this time, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the current House leadership seems rather consumed by Presidential tweets. As a matter of fact, just a few moments ago, the Speaker of the House, herself, was one of those Members who had to be reminded that it is a violation of the rules of the House to disparage the character of the President.

I guess we could do this every day. The President could tweet, and we would have a sense of Congress to comment on it, and the President would tweet. But generally, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a higher and better purpose for this House to work on the

problems that confront the American people.

As I mentioned a few moments ago, this is a messaging bill. It changes no law. It changes no policy. It could also be done down in the House radio-television correspondents' gallery. Somebody could give a speech, and there could be a press conference. It would have the same effect as having this resolution on the floor.

I don't have the time to correct all of the misstatements in the resolution or that have been made on the floor today. I will say this, Mr. Speaker: If we are going to do messaging, then my primary message is that every individual who serves our Nation in the military is entitled to respect and our appreciation—every single individual—and I am among those who are very impressed, by the way, by the transgender individuals who testified in front of our Military Personnel Subcommittee just a few weeks ago.

But on the substance of this issue, I believe the principle for the Department of Defense is that any eligible individual who can meet the high standards for military service without special accommodation should be permitted to serve.

□ 1015

Any eligible individual who can meet the standard without special accommodation should be permitted to serve.

I think that is the standard. That is not exactly what we have been talking about today, but that is the standard, and it should be the standard.

There may be some differences about what a special accommodation is, about various medical diagnoses and conditions. I understand that. But the standard is, if you meet the standard without special accommodation you should be permitted to serve.

And those who serve deserve our respect and our appreciation. That is the point. But that is not really the point of this resolution.

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

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

Let's remember one important point. There was no problem. This was not an issue. It was not talked about until the President decided that, in his words, he wanted to ban transgender people from serving in the military.

I hope that is not engaging in personalities. It is simply saying what he said and did. He sent out a tweet saying we should ban people who are transgender. Then the military has had to backfill that tweet with a policy. I feel bad for the members of the military who have had to do that, who have had to waste their time for the last year trying to accommodate the ignorance and bigotry of this presidential policy.

There was no problem. Every single service chief testified there is no impact on unit cohesion. We weren't talking about that until the President de-

cided that he wanted to discriminate against transgender people.

I think the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee is 100 percent correct. Every eligible person who can perform the duties should be allowed to serve.

This policy violates that principle in a whole bunch of different ways, but I will simply mention two.

Even if you have already transitioned, even if you have already gone through all of the healthcare needs and have fully transitioned to a new gender, this policy says you will not be allowed to serve if you are transgender.

That means that fully qualified people—not ones who have potential future surgery or anything—are being banned from serving.

It also says, if you are serving now, you cannot be who you are. And this is where the ignorance comes in.

Wow. What do you mean?

You have got to be the gender you were born in.

That is not the way it works. That is ignorance talking. This policy saying that, No, sorry, you have to be in your "biological sex" means you have to deny who you are. And that will also ban people from serving who are otherwise 100 percent qualified.

Without question, trans men and women who are fully qualified to serve in the military will be banned by this policy.

We have already seen the other two arguments: Well, the healthcare costs will go up.

No, they won't. The stats, the evidence, the facts show that transgender people have no greater healthcare costs than the average person serving in the military.

And the unit cohesion argument is an absolute joke. This debate, this policy, prompted by the President, inserting discrimination where it did not belong, is the only thing that has caused any of this issue.

As General Milley said: zero evidence of any unit cohesion issue.

So, let's be 100 percent clear here. This policy is based on ignorance and bigotry.

And why are we doing it on the House floor instead of down in some press conference somewhere? Because the vote of this House matters more than just the individual words of a few Members.

I, as a Member of the United States House and as a citizen of the United States of America, want my Congress to go on record that we will not stand for ignorance and bigotry in our military or anywhere else.

A vote of this House makes it clear just how wrongheaded this policy is. And make no mistake about it, this is not the military that wanted this. The President drove it, and he is causing problems that do not need to be caused. We should reject this policy.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. 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, this 15-minute vote on adoption of H. Res. 124 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 185, answered "present" 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—238

Adams	Engel	Lewis
Aguilar	Escobar	Lieu, Ted
Allred	Eshoo	Lipinski
Axne	Espallat	Loeb sack
Barragán	Evans	Lofgren
Bass	Finkenauer	Lowenthal
Beatty	Fitzpatrick	Lowe y
Bera	Fletcher	Lujan
Beyer	Foster	Luria
Bishop (GA)	Frankel	Lynch
Blumenauer	Fudge	Malinowski
Blunt Rochester	Gabbard	Maloney,
Bonamici	Gallego	Carolyn B.
Boyle, Brendan	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean
F.	Garcia (IL)	Matsui
Brindisi	Garcia (TX)	McAdams
Brown (MD)	Golden	McBath
Brownley (CA)	Gomez	McCollum
Bustos	Gonzalez (TX)	McEachin
Butterfield	Gottheimer	McGovern
Carbajal	Green (TX)	McNerney
Cárdenas	Grijalva	Meeks
Carson (IN)	Haaland	Meng
Cartwright	Harder (CA)	Moore
Case	Hastings	Morrelle
Casten (IL)	Hayes	Moulton
Castor (FL)	Heck	Mucarsel-Powell
Castro (TX)	Higgins (NY)	Murphy
Chu, Judy	Hill (CA)	Nadler
Cicilline	Himes	Napolitano
Cisneros	Hollingsworth	Neal
Clark (MA)	Horn, Kendra S.	Neguse
Clarke (NY)	Horsford	Norcross
Clay	Houlihan	O'Halleran
Cleaver	Hoyer	Ocasio-Cortez
Clyburn	Huffman	Omar
Cohen	Hurd (TX)	Pallone
Connolly	Jackson Lee	Panetta
Cooper	Jayapal	Pappas
Correa	Jeffries	Pascarell
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Courtney	Johnson (TX)	Pelosi
Cox (CA)	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Craig	Katko	Peters
Crist	Keating	Peterson
Crow	Kelly (IL)	Phillips
Cuellar	Kennedy	Pingree
Cummings	Khanna	Pocan
Cunningham	Kildee	Porter
Davids (KS)	Kilmer	Pressley
Davis (CA)	Kim	Price (NC)
Davis, Danny K.	Kind	Quigley
Dean	Kirkpatrick	Raskin
DeFazio	Krishnamoorthi	Reed
DeGette	Kuster (NH)	Rice (NY)
DeLauro	Lamb	Richmond
DelBene	Langevin	Rose (NY)
Delgado	Larsen (WA)	Rouda
Demings	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Ruiz
Deutch	Lawson (FL)	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Lee (CA)	Rush
Doggett	Lee (NV)	Sánchez
Doyle, Michael	Levin (CA)	Sarbanes
F.	Levin (MI)	Scanlon

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto

Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan

Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—185

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Buchoon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden

Gosar
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moonen (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson

Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Brown (MD)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—8

Abraham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart

Granger
Palazzo
Ryan

Veasey
Wilson (SC)

□ 1047

Messrs. MEADOWS and GONZALEZ of Ohio changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because I was in my District with the Vice-President. I support anyone willing and capable of serving in the U.S. armed forces, including transgender individuals. If I had been present, I would have voted “yea” for H. Res. 124.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, due to unforeseen circumstances on Thursday, March 28, 2019, I was not present to cast my vote on the question of Agreeing to H. Res. 124, a resolution expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals. I agree in the strongest terms with the resolution’s denunciation of the ban, and had I been present my vote would have been yea on rollcall 135.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 179, answered “present” 1, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—216

Adams
Aderholt
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Bacon
Baird
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brown (MD)
Budd
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cooper
Courtney
Crist
Curtis
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean

DeGette
DeBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Evans
Finkenauer
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Haaland
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating

Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyne B.
McBath
McCarthy
McClintock
McColum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pascarelli
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Richmond
Rodgers (WA)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford

Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shalala
Sherman
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steil
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)

NAYS—179

Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Axne
Balderson
Bera
Biggs
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Buchoon
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cisneros
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Correa
Costa
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fudge
Fulcher
Gallagher

Gibbs
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moonen (WV)
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin

Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Peterson
Porter
Posey
Reed
Rice (NY)
Riggleman
Roby
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Ruiz
Scalise
Schrader
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sewell (AL)
Sherrill
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spano
Steube
Stevens
Suozi
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Walberg
Walden
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Young
Zeldin

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Tonko

NOT VOTING—35

Abraham
Babin
Brownley (CA)
Collins (GA)
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart

Gabbard
Gaetz
Gohmert
Granger
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Grothman

Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Lamb
Marchant
Marshall
Palazzo
Peters