

the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent Resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to honor the late Senator Lindsey O. Graham.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 118-144, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of the following individuals to be members of the Commission to Study the Potential Transfer of the Weitzman National Museum of American Jewish History to the Smithsonian Institution:

Tevi Troy of Maryland.

Dara Horn of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2027

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. KING-HINDS). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in part A of House Report 119-755.

Ms. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. CODIFICATION OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 14183.

Executive Order 14183 (90 Fed Reg. 8757; relating to Prioritizing Military Excellence and Readiness) shall have the force and effect of law.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1438, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of America's brave men and women in uniform to ensure America's warriors have the tools and environment they need to defend our Nation.

Shortly after taking his second oath of office, President Trump acted to protect our servicemembers. He signed an executive order prioritizing military excellence and readiness to prevent radical transgenders from serving in the United States military.

My amendment codifies this executive order, ensuring the integrity of America's great Armed Forces is not jeopardized.

Gender dysphoria was considered a mental disorder by psychologists for decades until 2019. Even the leftist World Health Organization listed it as a mental illness in the international classification of diseases.

According to the Williams Institute, 81 percent of transgender adults have seriously contemplated suicide. That is 15 times higher than the general population. Forty-two percent of

transgender adults have attempted suicide, and 56 percent have harmed themselves. People with gender dysphoria are a danger to themselves and others.

The United States military possesses the most powerful weapons known to man. We are the largest Air Force and Navy in the world, with nuclear weapons, artillery, and a host of other weapons with immense destructive capacity.

□ 1920

Every day we trust our brave men and women in uniform to protect us and to use these weapons that we possess responsibly for the defense of America.

We the people have placed our faith and trust in our Armed Forces, and they have placed their faith in this Congress to make responsible policy.

The United States of America cannot allow mentally ill individuals to possess and operate these weapons, and this Congress cannot allow transgenders to jeopardize the safety and readiness of our Armed Forces.

My amendment protects America's servicemembers, ensures force readiness, and prevents dangerous individuals from accessing destructive weapons. No other severely mentally ill person would ever be allowed in the Armed Forces, and this Congress should not make any exception for gender dysphoria. The risk to the American people and our Armed Forces is simply too great.

Secretary Hegseth has often highlighted the need to restore the warrior ethos in the Department of War. After the Armed Forces endured 4 years of waste, fraud, and abuse under the Biden administration, President Trump and Secretary Hegseth have restored the United States military to greatness.

Keeping weapons out of the hands of dangerous, mentally ill individuals is a critical step in maintaining this warrior ethos.

I am proud to support the President in ensuring the United States Armed Forces remains the finest military in the world.

My amendment to codify the President's executive order ensures servicemembers are of sound mind, body, and discipline, and no future administration can rescind these protections for America's heroes.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, this amendment would codify President Trump's executive order banning transgender Americans from serving in the United States military.

Since that order came down, the military branches have forced out Americans who have served their country bravely and honorably, leaving en-

tire professional careers behind and gaps in the units and chains of command they once held together.

This amendment would codify that exclusion into law. There are no grounds to exclude trans people from the military except for hatred, prejudice, and bigotry. There is no evidence that having transgender troops negatively impacts military readiness.

Our military is strongest when every qualified servicemember is able to serve. Who are we as a country when strong, qualified, patriotic candidates who want to serve their country are turned away simply because of ignorant legislating?

The American people want Congress to support our servicemembers, not waste time rooting out the ones they want to use as political pawns.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, since a member of this committee did not reserve the time, I reserve my right to close at this time.

I would just say if gender dysphoria isn't a mental illness, then why do 42 percent of those who identify as transgender attempt suicide?

We don't hand nuclear weapons and fighter jets to people in that kind of crisis. We shouldn't start now. We should be helping these people in real ways rather than handing them weapons of destruction.

This is a very serious issue that we should address right now. No other severe mental disorder gets a waiver into the United States military. Schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, major depression, they are all disqualifying. Gender dysphoria is no different, except politicians changed the label.

My amendment treats it exactly the same. Madam Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. I now recognize the gentleman—

Ms. BOEBERT. No. I closed.

The Acting Chair. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Ms. BOEBERT. That was not a member who claimed time from this committee. He was not able to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Ms. BOEBERT. And he doesn't get any time to close.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is now recognized.

Ms. BOEBERT. He has no time remaining, Madam Chair.

He is not a member of the committee, and he claimed time in opposition. You didn't, sir.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman has used up all of her time.

Ms. BOEBERT. My time, my right to close, and I closed.

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 4 minutes remaining.

Ms. BOEBERT. There are no further arguments on this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Could you please tell her what the rules are?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 4 minutes.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I yield 90 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS), my colleague.

Ms. JACOBS. Madam Chair, it seems like my colleague on the other side of the aisle has just as little understanding of parliamentary procedure as she has understanding of military readiness.

This amendment is a waste of time. The trans military already exists. This executive order is already in effect. So what does this amendment actually do? It makes discrimination permanent.

RAND and the Pentagon have already studied this. They concluded that allowing trans Americans to serve openly doesn't hurt unit cohesion, operational effectiveness, or readiness. Commanders said it made their force stronger.

Do you know what actually hurts readiness? Kicking out trans servicemembers despite their stellar performance and discharging people we have spent time, money, and resources training because of who they are, not how they performed. That costs money. That hurts readiness.

Secretary Hegseth loves talking about the importance of meritocracy in the military, but kicking out qualified people because he doesn't like their identity is the exact opposite of meritocracy.

If you are really cynical and think that trans people only serve to get their healthcare paid for, you would be wrong. The Pentagon spent 6,400 times more on trans servicemembers' career development than on their healthcare.

One of the trans servicemembers I met told me that their most costly procedure was for their shoulder reconstruction after being injured in the line of duty. For the record, shoulder reconstruction has nothing to do with being trans.

Here is the double standard at the heart of this amendment. Hormone therapy is standard, evidence-based care. They just made a whole new policy about it.

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

Ms. JACOBS. The same medical treatment can't strengthen readiness for a cisgender man and hurt readiness when a trans servicemember needs it.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SORENSEN).

Mr. SORENSEN. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to Representative BOEBERT's amendment.

I am proud to live in an Army town, and I am the only LGBTQ person to serve on the House Committee on Armed Services.

I find it outrageous that this Commander in Chief and his loyalists want

to kick true Americans out of the military for a reason that does not pertain to a person's capability as an effective soldier, sailor, airman, or marine—all because they think there is something inferior or less than if you are trans.

We know what happens in our country when we lose the most qualified members. We saw it during Don't Ask Don't Tell. LGBTQ servicemembers are critical and essential to our Armed Forces.

When any American is called to serve our country, there should be no requirements other than can you do the job and exceed the expectation.

I really don't understand how you can justify this. On one side, hiring should only be by merit, but then on the other side of your mouth, you only want harmful restrictions on those who are highly qualified for the work.

One of the greatest things about being American is being one of many.

In 250 years, we know the value of our country is marked by the service and the sacrifices of those who came before.

Playing politics isn't just cruel because it discriminates. It is cruel because it puts other servicemembers at risk.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment because all Americans who serve should be able to serve with dignity, respect, and our Nation's thanks.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1930

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, let me conclude by saying that trans servicemembers are honorable. Trans servicemembers are truthful. Trans members are disciplined. Trans members are heroic. Trans members have sacrificed for our country. They are physically and mentally fit to serve and have made America safer.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. BOEBERT).

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Madam Chair, I thank our esteemed ranking member for his leadership.

I am here to speak in strong opposition to the entire bill, but I do have to

say: To see folks who have never worn the uniform on this House floor try to fight culture-war BS when we are in the middle of an actual war is a grave, grave disservice to those in uniform.

My opposition to this bill is deeply personal. It is personal to me. Having served 27 months in combat in Iraq, I watched us double down on a losing strategy year after year while my friends and fellow soldiers, many of whose names are on this memorial bracelet I wear, fought and died.

It is personal to the now 18 families who lost their loved ones in this reckless war in Iran—sons, daughters, husbands, wives, somebody's whole world. It is personal to the hundreds more wounded, many carrying injuries that will last their entire lives from this war.

It is personal to the American people, people who are working hard, doing everything that they are asked, while watching the cost of their gas, their groceries, and their utility bills skyrocket; watching the President and Hegseth spend over \$100 billion of their hard-earned taxpayer dollars while they continue to flail and fail.

Now they are trying to ask for another \$1.5 trillion of my constituents'—our constituents' taxpayer dollars to double down on this reckless, ill-conceived war.

This is a straight-up betrayal from a President, by the way, who promised to end wars, not start wars; a President who has never spent a single day in uniform but is more than willing to send other people's kids to fight in his wars; a President who is now blatantly disregarding the widely held will of the American people and the bipartisan view of this Congress as recognizing the successful passage of a War Powers Resolution by escalating this war rather than winding it down. We can't let that happen.

On behalf of all of our constituents, on behalf of the American people, we have to stop throwing good money after bad. We have to stop repeating the mistakes of the forever wars that my generation fought and served in.

That is why I have been fighting to include my No Funds for Iran War Act in this NDAA, to make sure we don't spend a single penny more on this reckless forever war in the Middle East; to make sure we are investing here at home to lower housing costs, lower grocery costs, lower utility costs, and lower healthcare costs. That is what the American people want. That is what I am fighting for, and that is what my colleagues here are fighting for.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chair, since the majority has refused to include my provision in this bill, I do plan to offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the text of my amendment.

At the end of subtitle A of title XVII, insert the following:

SEC. 17. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FORCE IN OR AGAINST IRAN.

(a) **PROHIBITION ON FUNDING.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2027 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for any use of military force in or against Iran unless Congress has—

- (1) declared war on Iran; or
- (2) enacted specific statutory authorization for such use of military force after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply to a use of military force that is consistent with section 2(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541(c)) or that may be necessary to defend the United States or an ally or partner of the United States from imminent attack, provided that the President complies fully with the requirements of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(b)) with respect to any such use of military force.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chair, truly, especially to my colleagues of both parties who have worn the uniform of this country, it is foundational and enshrined in our Constitution that it is this body that has say, not a single, unitary executive, to send us to war.

This legislation is common sense and bipartisan. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. MACE

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BABIN). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part A of House Report 119-755.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 7. PROHIBITION ON COVERAGE OF GENDER-RELATED MEDICAL TREATMENT UNDER TRICARE.

(a) **TRICARE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1076f the following new section:

“§ 1076g. TRICARE program: prohibition on coverage and furnishment gender-related medical treatment

“(a) **PROHIBITION.**—Except as provided by subsection (b), medical care under section 1076 of this title with respect to members of the armed forces and dependents of such members does not include gender-related medical treatment, and the Secretary of Defense may not furnish any such treatment.

“(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to medical treatment provided for purposes of treating—

“(1) a disorder of sex development, diagnosed by a physician after such physician has determined through genetic or biochemical testing that such minor does not have normal sex chromosome structure, sex steroid hormone production, or sex steroid hormone action;

“(2) irresolvably ambiguous biological sex characteristics of such minor, including the presence of—

“(A) 46 XX chromosomes with virilization;

“(B) 46 XY chromosomes with undervirilization; or

“(C) both ovarian and testicular tissue; or

“(3) an infection, injury, disease, or disorder caused or exacerbated by gender-related medical treatment.

“(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘female’ means an individual who naturally has, had, will have, or would have, but for a developmental or genetic anomaly or historical accident, the reproductive system that at some point produces, transports, and utilizes eggs for fertilization.

“(2) The term ‘gender’—

“(A) means—

“(i) males, females, or the natural differences between males and females, unless such term is otherwise specified or used alone (rather than with or as an adjective modifying other words); and

“(ii) is a synonym for sex; and

“(B) does not mean gender identity, experienced gender, gender expression, or gender roles.

“(3) The term ‘gender-related medical treatment’ means—

“(A) with respect to a female individual, medical treatments provided for purposes of addressing the perception of such individual that the gender or sex of such individual is not female, including—

“(i) surgical procedures, including—

“(I) vaginectomy;

“(II) hysterectomy;

“(III) oophorectomy;

“(IV) reconstruction of the urethra;

“(V) metoidioplasty;

“(VI) phalloplasty;

“(VII) salpingo-oophorectomy;

“(VIII) scrotoplasty;

“(IX) implantation of erection or testicular prostheses;

“(X) subcutaneous mastectomy;

“(XI) vocal cord surgery;

“(XII) pectoral implants; and

“(XIII) penile transplantation;

“(ii) exogenous doses of testosterone or other androgens; and

“(iii) puberty blockers, including—

“(I) GnRH agonists; and

“(II) synthetic drugs that suppress the production of estrogen and progesterone or delay or suppress pubertal development in female individuals; and

“(B) with respect to a male individual, medical treatments provided for purposes of addressing the perception of such individual that the gender or sex of such individual is not male, including—

“(i) surgical procedures, including—

“(I) penectomy;

“(II) orchiectomy;

“(III) vaginoplasty;

“(IV) clitoroplasty;

“(V) vulvoplasty;

“(VI) augmentation mammoplasty;

“(VII) facial feminization surgery;

“(VIII) vocal cord surgery;

“(IX) chondrolaryngoplasty;

“(X) gluteal augmentation; and

“(XI) uterine transplantation;

“(ii) exogenous doses of estrogen; and

“(iii) puberty blockers, including—

“(I) GnRH agonists; and

“(II) synthetic drugs that suppress the production of testosterone or delay or suppress pubertal development in male individuals.

“(4) The term ‘male’ means an individual who naturally has, had, will have, or would have, but for a developmental or genetic anomaly or historical accident, the reproductive system that at some point produces, transports, and utilizes sperm for fertilization.

“(5) The term ‘sex’ means the biological determination as to whether an individual is male or female.

“(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to entitle an individual to medical care under this chapter

for which they are not otherwise entitled to under this chapter.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Such chapter is further amended as follows:

(1) In section 1077(b), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) Treatment prohibited under section 1076g of this title with respect to members of the armed forces and dependents of such members.”.

(2) In section 1079(a)(20), by striking “that could result in sterilization”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1438, the gentleman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chair, let me be clear. There are two biological sexes: male and female. They are assigned at conception and cannot be changed. Biology doesn't care how many hormones someone pumps into their bodies or how they mutilate their bodies. Biological reality cannot be changed by medical intervention.

In the Fiscal Year 2025 NDAA, Congress prohibited TRICARE from covering medical interventions to treat gender dysphoria, which would result in the sterilization of children. This was an important step, but there is more to be done.

This language failed to prohibit the Department of War from chemically and surgically mutilating our servicemembers and their children and performing a number of sick procedures on our kids.

This amendment would prohibit the Department of War from covering or furnishing any chemical or surgical mutilation procedures through TRICARE—not one dime for cross-sex hormones, not one dime for taxpayer-funded puberty blockers, not one dime for taxpayer-funded surgeries, all in the name of gender-affirming care and this crazy gender woke ideology.

The Federal Government and, particularly, the Department of War should not be in the business of funding the chemical and surgical mutilation of our citizens. This is not healthcare. It is the butchering of healthy bodies, and American taxpayers should never pay for it.

Not only do these disgusting trans chemical, trans surgical interventions often cause permanent infertility, sterility, and sexual dysfunction, but they can actually increase depression, anxiety, and suicidal ideation. They can cause cancer among those on whom these medical procedures are performed.

This amendment restores common sense to military healthcare. It aligns the Department of War with the growing international medical consensus that these interventions, particularly for children, are extremely harmful.

This amendment ensures that Defense health dollars are spent on advancing the health of our servicemembers and their families, not undermining it, and certainly not on advancing an ideology based on delusion. We

pay for our warfighters to mutilate the enemy, not to mutilate themselves.

Mr. Chair, I urge all Members to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. This amendment bans gender-affirming care for servicemembers and their dependents under TRICARE.

Recently, the Secretary of Defense just came out in support of gender-affirming care for our male servicemembers by providing the testosterone testing and treatment for those who need it.

The DOD Secretary and Republicans have already canceled health coverage for less than 1 percent of the population within the Department of Defense. The Secretary is currently kicking out transgender servicemembers, and now this cruel amendment is targeting dependents of servicemembers who are receiving hormone therapy and mental health counseling for gender dysphoria.

Dependents not receiving adequate healthcare is a factor pushing people to separate from the military. This culture war ideology amendment can result in a readiness gap issue.

I strongly oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1940

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chair, testosterone treatment for men serving in our military isn't gender-affirming care. We want the most masculine, the most muscular, the toughest warfighters in the world because they are in the trenches. They are doing combat. They are the ones who are putting their lives on the line.

The idea that chopping someone's penis off is risking military readiness is ludicrous. We are talking about mentally ill men that think having a menstrual cycle means bleeding out of your rectum. That is how crazy and insane this conversation is.

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

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Once again, my Republican colleagues are moving forward with a sweeping ban on necessary healthcare, including mental health care for children.

This isn't about cost. This isn't about force readiness. In fact, this amendment will harm our military's force readiness.

This amendment will force servicemembers out of the military either for their own sake or for the sake of their children since this amendment bans mental health care for trans children.

There are and will be trans children born to military households. That is a fact. What parent would choose staying in their job if that means denying their child access to mental health care?

This amendment makes it impossible for the military to retain servicemembers with trans children. This is an inhumane, wasteful, regressive amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Ms. MACE. If you think your kid is trans and you are the parent, your kid needs to be taken out of your household. It is insane to think—you are hearing these stories this week in the news how somebody's 2-year-old knew that, when they were born a girl, they are actually a boy and all this craziness.

Children have creative imaginations. They imagine that they might be a monkey. That doesn't mean you feed them bananas and leave them in a jungle because they think they are Curious George. It is insane.

This is a mental health crisis. Anyone who is mentally ill should not be serving in our military, and they absolutely should not be serving in combat.

Every dollar spent by the Department of War on chemical and surgical sex change procedures is a dollar not spent on preparing the readiness of America's warfighter.

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

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS).

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, I don't believe that 435 Members of Congress should play pretend doctor and try to decide the medical care of servicemembers or their children that we have never met. In fact, even the physicians in this body know that there is a legal and ethical standard: that a doctor has to establish a patient-physician relationship, like an evaluation or an exam before prescribing care. None of us should be overriding the actual doctors who decide what kind of care is and isn't necessary.

For the record, every major medical association in this country, representing over 1.3 million American doctors, recognizes that trans healthcare and gender-affirming care is safe, effective, and medically necessary.

Prescribing any kind of care, whether it is puberty blockers or hormones or anything else, doesn't happen on a whim. It is after a rigorous, deliberate, multi-step physical and psychological evaluation by doctors.

Here is the worst part about all this, the double standard at the heart of this amendment: Gender-affirming care is standard evidence-based care. In fact, the military relies on it for cisgender troops: troops with thyroid conditions, low testosterone, or other hormone needs. They just made a whole new policy about it.

My colleague literally said: It is to make sure someone is more masculine.

Making someone who is masculine more masculine is literally the definition of affirming one's gender with gender-affirming care.

The same medical treatment can't strengthen readiness for a cis man and hurt readiness when a trans servicemember or our military families need it.

A blanket ban on healthcare is a cruel punishment for kids. Denying them mental health care and therapy is especially disgusting when they are more likely to feel alone and isolated because of the vitriol they hear from people in this very body, people in power like my colleagues.

We are better than this. Our troops are better than this. Our troops deserve better than this.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chair, you just heard it from California: cis man. I don't even know what a cis man is. That sounds ridiculous.

Talking about pretend doctors, I think we had a pretend doctor testify on the Hill this week. The president of a prestigious university could not testify that only women can give birth to babies. Someone who is supposed to be training medical physicians and medical doctors here in the United States couldn't say under oath, in Congress, that only women can give birth to babies. I don't think you can trust medical doctors that say being tranny is a thing.

Treating somebody's low T or thyroid, if they are a man, that seems like a natural, biological thing, but not for a woman. If you give a woman a ton of testosterone, it erodes the lining of her bladder. She eventually becomes incontinent. The other hormones are going to eventually give her breast cancer.

It is just a crazy ideology. We need to follow actual science, follow biology, and not these doctors and universities that are training medical doctors, that are making millions and millions of dollars by keeping people on prescriptions, on medicines that drive them crazy, to shoot up schools, churches, and synagogues. All these tranny shootings, all these mass shootings, it is actually insane. They should not be serving in the military.

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

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Chair, gender dysphoria is real. It is a real diagnosis, and there is a treatment for it. Yet, our colleagues want to deny them.

Both in this debate and in the previous debate, my colleagues have said gender dysphoria is a mental health issue, and it needs to be treated. Yet, they want to deny individuals, the dependents—family members of our servicemembers and those servicemembers—the treatment required in order to help and support them.

I have a friend, because of this Nation's policies, who is being forced—is leaving this country so that her daughter can go get the treatment that she can get in another country.

This policy, this amendment, is cruel. It is meant to just basically root

out a whole people that exist. You want to deny their existence. That is unfortunate, and it is cruel.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE).

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

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. MACE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part A of House Report 119-755.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON MALE PARTICIPATION IN FEMALE SPORTS AT DODEA SCHOOLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that no school operated by the Department of Defense Education Activity permits a person enrolled at such school whose sex is male to participate in an athletic program or activity that is designated for females.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit any school operated by the Department of Defense Education Activity from permitting males to train or practice with an athletic program or activity that is designated for females so long as no female is deprived of a roster spot on a team or sport, opportunity to participate in a practice or competition, or any other benefit that accompanies participating in the athletic program or activity.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “athletic programs and activities” includes all programs or activities that are provided conditional upon participation with any athletic team.

(2) The term “female” refers to an individual who naturally has, had, will have, or would have, but for a developmental or genetic anomaly or historical accident, the reproductive system that at some point produces, transports, and uses eggs for fertilization.

(3) The term “male” refers to an individual who naturally has, had, will have, or would have, but for a developmental or genetic anomaly or historical accident, the reproductive system that at some point produces, transports, and uses sperm for fertilization.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1438, the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Carolina.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chair, women and girls have fought for so long to have equal opportunities in education and athletics. As the first female graduate

of the Citadel's Corps of Cadets, no one understands this more than I do.

Unfortunately, these rights are now under attack. Over 900 medals have been stolen from women and girls by biological males. This flies in the face of common sense and our most basic notions of fairness and women's rights.

Even if some of my colleagues are too afraid to say it, every person in this room knows that men and women are biologically distinct. This truth has been obvious to every civilization in the history of mankind. Yet, mediocre male athletes are forcing their way into little girls' locker rooms and onto their courts and fields. Women and girls are being robbed of athletic opportunities. Make no mistake, this is misogyny masquerading as progress.

This amendment would prohibit biological males from participating in schools administered by the Department of Defense Education Activity.

DoDEA schools serve the children of our warfighters, and they should not have to worry about their little girls having their private spaces invaded, having their accomplishments and opportunities stolen from them, and being injured competing against men.

□ 1950

We have seen countless women's volleyball teams across the country forfeit instead of having to face biological men and risk the same physical injuries experienced by Payton McNabb.

In Massachusetts in 2023, a female field hockey player had her teeth knocked out by a biological male during a game.

In 2024, a high school women's basketball team was forced to forfeit after a 6-foot bearded male athlete injured three of their players, leaving girls in pain and injury on the court.

These are the predictable consequences of a policy which dresses up biological ignorance as compassion.

I urge all Members to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, it is unfortunate that, once again, I am here fighting with my colleague from South Carolina to prevent her from injecting culture wars into our military.

Let's clear up a few things. This amendment isn't about the Olympics. It isn't about the World Cup. It isn't even about college-level athletics. It is about discriminating against kids in preschool, from preschool to high school, whose parents are serving this country.

These are kids who are trying to find a place where they fit in and belong, and this amendment makes them a political and physical target.

Military kids change schools frequently due to their parents' careers.

They have mastered the art of saying good-bye to their new friends, their home, their routine because they do it so often.

They have missed birthdays and holidays and milestones with their parent when they are deployed, and sometimes they have to grow up too soon, taking on additional responsibilities when one parent is away.

We should be doing everything we can to make sure that these kids get to be kids. However, this amendment does the opposite. It politicizes kids who just want to play on a soccer team with their friends.

My colleague talks a lot about men forcing their way into girls' locker rooms. Well, this amendment actually is about forcing men into girls' locker rooms. It actually makes young girls more vulnerable to the likes of Larry Nassar, who would celebrate a policy like this because it makes it easier to victimize little girls.

Think about it: Actual predators will be happy about this amendment. It could force any girl, especially tall, muscular, or more masculine-presenting girls to have to undergo invasive exams to prove that they are a girl. It could require girls of all ages to answer personal questions about their bodies and physical development to adults they may not know.

I remember being a girl growing up, and as comfortable as I may be now talking about my period with all of you, that would be my worst nightmare in middle school, but that is the experience we would be forcing on millions of little girls around the country; not just trans girls, all girls. Talk about an invasion of little girls' privacy.

At the end of the day, what is this really accomplishing? The number of trans girls in DODEA schools competing in sports is incredibly small. I bet the author of this amendment doesn't even know of any. This isn't a crisis, but my colleague is pretending it is to score political points.

The parents of these military kids serve so we can have debates in this Chamber. The least we can do is not make their kids the collateral damage in culture war fights.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “no,” and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chair, trans girls aren't real girls. Trans women aren't real women. Cis women, nobody knows what that is. It is not actually a thing.

There are significant physical, biological differences between men and women. Biological men generally have greater muscle mass, bone density, cardiovascular capacity, physical strength than women, and the risk of physical injury is real.

The irony and the hypocrisy to say that banning biological men from girls' locker rooms and sports makes them less safe is ludicrous. It is actually the trans women that are going into prisons or going into schools, going into locker rooms, going into bathrooms.

The LGBTQ-plus-plus-plus whatever it is, queer, these are the people that are putting women at risk. They are raping them in our prisons. They are assaulting them at schools, in the locker rooms, in the bathrooms. This is the kind of thing that we don't want our very masculine, high-T warfighter having to worry about his little girl when he is out there killing the real bad guys. We want to keep them safe.

As a survivor, I know what the vulnerabilities are for women in private spaces and how vulnerable we are at all ages. This bill would protect the little girls of our warfighters across the country.

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

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment's language opens the door to invasive, degrading, and humiliating physical examinations of children, children who simply want to play softball or join a basketball team. That is creepy.

This amendment would require the Department of Defense Education Activities schools to determine eligibility for girls' sports teams based on a girl's reproductive system. This amendment will empower child predators.

We can have a nuanced conversation about eligibility rules for elite sports teams, but this amendment is a one-size-fits-all approach that dictates the same rules for a kindergartner wanting to play soccer as a 12th grader participating in competitive basketball. It does so in the most dangerous way, by opening young girls to invasive exams.

Our communities thrive when every child, including trans children, can be part of a team, learn sportsmanship, and challenge themselves. They falter when we write exclusion into our laws.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chair, I would encourage my colleagues on the left side of the aisle to read Martina Navratilova's X account today, talking about how confirming she was a woman was not invasive. It was a simple cheek swab. This is the fear politics of the left, and that says a lot about how far they have gone.

To say that trans kids just want to be on a team with our little girls, if there is a tranny on a team with our daughters, they need to be kicked right off. If they are in a locker room with our girls, they need to be kicked right out.

We have seen some really crazy stories of grown men with beards shaving at the sink with little girls in towels in the corner of the locker room scared to death and vulnerable to sexual predators. We all know the tranny thing really is about sexual gratification. Sexual attraction to being dressed as a woman has nothing to do with them thinking that they are a woman.

In fact, they are mocking being a woman. They are mocking our femi-

ninity, and they are mocking the rights that we fought for for hundreds and hundreds of years. It has not been long since women actually got the right to vote. There are still ceilings to be broken in this country. It is not going to be done by some mentally ill man in a skirt.

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

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, my colleague says that we are just fear-mongering about what these bans would actually mean, but we have actually already seen how trans sports bans have been used to target all girls.

A high school athletic association secretly investigated a female athlete without telling her or her parents to see if she was trans. She was not.

The same association had investigated other complaints, receiving them because "an athlete doesn't look feminine enough," and none of those allegations that the students were trans were verified to be true.

In another incident, a Utah State school board member falsely suggested in 2024 that a high school basketball athlete was trans, subjecting her to relentless harassment and bullying, including threats of violence.

In Florida, a school investigated a trans student's participation in girls' sports, and investigators repeatedly asked other individuals, all children, to describe how the student appeared in various stages of undress.

If this does not disturb you about how our young girls will be treated in sports, then you are clearly not paying any attention. Let's be clear: Trans girls and trans women are much more likely—four times more likely than Cis people to be the victims of violent crime, not the perpetrator.

Let's also be clear about something. The author of this amendment has led her own investigations that have failed, trying to prevent our colleagues from being able to use the restroom.

She is talking about the right to vote. Her side of the aisle is literally pushing to take away a woman's right to vote because of the SAVE Act, and Secretary Hegseth doesn't think women should have the right to vote or serve in the military. This is absurd. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2000

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE).

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

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentlewoman from South Carolina will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 22 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. MCDOWELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part A of House Report 119-755.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. PILOT PROGRAM ON EXPANDED EDUCATIONAL CHOICE FOR FAMILIES OF FULL-TIME, ACTIVE-DUTY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program under which the Secretary provides financial assistance to a full-time, active duty member of the Armed Forces in the United States to support the choices of the member for the education of a dependent of the member, including financial assistance for costs of the dependent associated with—

(1) attending a private elementary or secondary school, a faith-based school, or a public charter school;

(2) providing educational training aids to a home-schooled student; or

(3) other costs as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the pilot program under this section are—

(1) to evaluate the demand, feasibility, and scalability of expanded educational choice for dependents of members of the Armed Forces; and

(2) to assess the impact of the pilot program on military and family readiness.

(c) DURATION OF PROGRAM.—The authority of the Secretary of Defense to carry out the pilot program under this section shall terminate after the 2030-2031 school year.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "dependent" means a minor individual—

(A) who has not completed secondary school; and

(B) who is the child, stepchild, adopted child, ward, or spouse of a sponsor, or who is a resident in the household of a sponsor who stands in loco parentis to such individual and who receives one-half or more of their support from such sponsor.

(2) The term "home-schooled student" has the meaning given such term in section 2164(1)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The term "United States" has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1438, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCDOWELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCDOWELL. Mr. Chair, today I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 8800. My amendment would authorize the Secretary of War to establish a school choice pilot program for members of the Armed Forces.

Over the past 5 years the number of States that have chosen to prioritize education freedom for parents has skyrocketed. On this issue, Americans

have spoken. Parents must have a bigger say in their children's education.

Despite overwhelming support, many military families are barred from participating in school choice initiatives because they are either stationed in States without school choice or they are located in one State but domiciled in another.

This amendment would authorize the War Secretary to establish a school choice pilot program for full-time Active-Duty military members.

Mr. Chair, there is no reason why parents who are dedicating their lives in service to our country should not have the same rights as other parents to decide where their kids go to school. This honors a provision in the Department's budget request.

Mr. Chair, I urge all my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee and the Education Committee, I represent a military district with about 7,000 sailors and officers. Many of those children use local schools which the Federal Government partially reimburses through the Impact Aid Program.

The notion that we are going to start a new program—and really this program is about who pays. It is about funding vouchers. It is not really whether or not military families have a choice in terms of whether they themselves want to go to a parochial school or to a private school. That is not the point. The point that we are talking about here is, again, that this is going to put a stress on the Pentagon's budget, who already, as I said, underfunds Impact Aid and DoDEA schools. If you look at the President's budget that came over, Mr. Chair, there was actually a cut to Impact Aid in terms of what was sent over.

We are going to be in a fight over at the Appropriations Committee to restore funding. Again, as someone who represents a district with public schools that are proudly in the business of offering education for K-12 students, this, again, is just going to be another pressure, external pressure, in terms of reducing what, in fact, these communities really deserve, which is to have the military fully compensate an item that families really depend on in terms of making sure whether they are deployed or whether when they are on base they are getting education and that the local community is not taking an unfair hit in terms of paying for those services.

Again, this amendment would generate a new cost to the Pentagon's budget in terms of DoDEA funding and Impact Aid funding who, again, today are not actually up to the levels that

fully paid for those services. For that purpose, I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chair, all this bill does is establish a pilot program so that parents serving in our military have the same rights as other parents to decide where their children go to school.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a voucher program, and vouchers cost money. That is really the issue that I think the proponent really didn't, in my opinion, adequately address.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. TOKUDA).

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chair, we all want the same thing for our military families. While our servicemembers carry out the mission to protect and defend our Nation, we have a duty to care for the loved ones whom they leave behind. For families with school-aged children, that means investing in safe, stable, high-quality schools where every child can learn, grow, and thrive.

This amendment does the opposite. It creates a new, unfunded voucher program that diverts taxpayer dollars to private, including religious, schools instead of strengthening the public schools that educate most of our military-connected children.

This year, taxpayers are investing \$3.6 billion in DoDEA schools, but the majority of military-connected students attend local public schools, which receive just \$70 million in Impact Aid, even though they lose local property tax revenue because of nearby military installations. These schools welcome military children every time new orders arrive, helping them navigate new classrooms, new communities, and the challenges of constant moves and deployments.

If Congress is prepared to invest more in military children's education, and I fully support that, we should be investing where most of them are already learning: our public schools.

This amendment also falls short for families raising children with disabilities. Public schools are legally required to identify students with disabilities and provide the services and accommodations they need. Private schools are not. They may lack specialized staff or refuse to admit a child altogether.

Unlike public schools, private schools are not required to follow the same Federal civil rights protections. Taxpayer dollars could fund schools that discriminate in admissions based on disability, religion, sex, sexual orientation, and other characteristics.

A voucher is not a real choice if a school can simply turn a child away.

Our military families deserve better. Let's strengthen the schools they rely

on, fully support DoDEA and public schools through Impact Aid and ensure every military child has access to a well-funded, accountable education.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Connecticut has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, I think Congresswoman TOKUDA did a very nice job in terms of laying out the reality of what is actually going on in communities where military installations and military bases exist. Those are tax exempt properties where the communities are, again, more than glad to educate the children of military servicemembers. They have to find a way to finance the cost of that education. Unfortunately, the existing programs in place today, DoDEA and Impact Aid, fall short in terms of making sure that those communities are fairly reimbursed.

Mr. Chair, we are not in a place where there should even be a discussion about starting new funding programs for education paid for by the taxpayer until we keep the promise to those communities that we are going to reimburse the cost of educating military schoolchildren.

For that reason, Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote from all our colleagues, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McDOWELL).

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 27 will not be offered.

□ 2010

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McDOWELL) having assumed the chair, Mr. BABIN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8800) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2027 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair