

doesn't have a feasibility study to help any other country but Ukraine. Again, I will reiterate: Ukraine is not the United States of America.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. SPARTZ). The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chair, I will begin by injecting some facts into this discussion.

We debated this measure in the Armed Services Committee. The amendment was adopted to extend the feasibility study from the U.S. Center of Excellence at Walter Reed Hospital, which was created by the NDAA in 2009, to help maybe advise the Ukrainians in terms of setting up their own center of excellence within their own country to treat victims of traumatic brain injury and also other horrible injuries that are happening in real time.

There were drone attacks on Kyiv last night where four Ukrainians were injured severely, and when committee members had a chance to actually vote on this, the amendment was adopted 49-10, which was actually the largest bipartisan vote of the entire markup for this year's NDAA.

I want to be clear: This does not establish a center of excellence in Ukraine. It basically talks about the feasibility of advising healthcare officials within Ukraine in terms of best practices from the over decade of experience that we have at Walter Reed, which has helped thousands of U.S. veterans who suffered TBI in the Middle East.

I applaud the gentlewoman's constituent, who is doing great work. Some of those individuals do it on their own, in terms of setting up their own services, but there is no question that this center has provided great direct healthcare for people suffering from this wound of war. It has also helped create best practices as we have learned more about this type of injury because of the hard experience that took place in Iraq and Afghanistan.

□ 1545

There are probably, as calculated now, well over 100,000 Ukrainians who are wounded and suffering injuries, civilians in most cases, from indiscriminate bombing by Russia, who is conducting an illegal, unprovoked invasion of Ukraine. This is the ultimate, in terms of humanitarian assistance to victims of war, to victims of aggression, using, again, the well-honed skills and healthcare expertise of our country to help an ally who is fighting the fight in terms of protecting their democratic self-rule from an invasion by Russia.

We had very strong bipartisan support to support this effort. I hope that we will vote in a resounding fashion for political reasons, for military reasons, and for just simple decency to help people who have suffered injuries.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Madam Chair, in Ukraine, since day one of this war, attacks have been aimed at civilian structures, hospitals, energy infrastructure, and urban centers. In the battlefield, Russia has brutally murdered prisoners of war as their Wagnerites occupied Ukraine's towns and territory.

Allied military sources say that Russia has landmined Ukrainian territory at an unprecedented rate, making it one of the largest minefields in the world. These minefields in war zones and in agricultural areas will likely cause civilian death and require billions of dollars to safely remove in the coming years. The World Bank estimated the cost to be at \$37.6 billion.

Ukraine is paying for their freedom with their lives as we speak, but the mental, emotional, familial, and social scars will be there for generations to come. Ukrainian citizens are living through a nightmare because of their push toward democracy during the Revolution of Dignity in 2014.

This amendment prohibits a feasibility study on centers for treatment of traumatic brain injuries to improve the lives of individuals affected by traumatic brain injury experienced in Ukraine as a result of Russian aggression and to improve the lives of the family members of such an individual.

Honestly, we should be funding centers across the world because that is a better expression of democracy than what is often exhibited.

This amendment is callous, and America and our partners' support of Ukraine's fight for freedom is better than that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has the only time remaining.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Connecticut has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chair, again, really quickly, I would just note that this builds on an amendment which was adopted in last year's NDAA to establish a partnership between the DOD and Ukraine. Again, that is still sort of working its way through the system.

Again, this is really about trying to explore the value of the Center of Excellence for TBI, which, again, I think, is something that all of us should support just for simple decency reasons.

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

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

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

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Ms. GREENE of Georgia) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Deirdre Kelly, one of his secretaries.

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BENTZ). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 118-142.

Mr. DAVIDSON. 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 C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. __. REPORT AND STRATEGY FOR UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT IN UKRAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, shall develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a strategy for United States involvement in Ukraine.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall contain the following elements:

(1) A strategy stating the explicit United States national interest at stake with respect to the conflict in Ukraine, including an annex of specific objectives and benchmarks to measure the success or failure of continued United States involvement with respect to Ukraine.

(2) A plan detailing a diplomatic pathway, including any personnel involved in diplomatic communications, by which the United States can facilitate a negotiated cessation of hostilities in Ukraine.

(3) An assessment of the costs to the United States and to Ukraine if the conflict is allowed to continue for an additional 1 year, 5 years, or 10 years.

(c) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) BRIEFING.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the submission of the report required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees, and other Members of Congress that wish to participate, a briefing on the United States strategy with respect to Ukraine and plans for the implementation of such strategy.

(e) LIMITATION ON FUNDS.—None of the amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for Ukraine until the report required by subsection (a) is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees.

(f) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

- (1) the congressional defense committees; and
- (2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 583, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, my amendment simply requires a mission statement from the National Command Authority.

We used to insist on a mission and an exit strategy before we committed to wars. Make no mistake, this is a proxy war in Ukraine. Russians have unjustly invaded their neighbor, and Ukrainians are rightly defending their country.

The first thing the administration did was offer President Zelenskyy a ride. He said, in a very inspiring response: I don't need a ride. I need ammunition.

Who couldn't be inspired by that?

Before we spent \$113 billion, we should have expected a mission. We still don't have a defined mission. Whether it is in public or in a classified setting is fine with this amendment, but it should be required. We should have done it up front, we should have done it subsequently, but we should at least do it now.

Before we spend this other \$300 billion that is in this National Defense Authorization Act, we should require what every E-5 and above is able to draft. It is the least we can expect out of our National Command Authority.

When we commit to something, the Nation should commit to it, not just our military and not just our checkbook, an open checkbook. Without a mission, we can't hold anyone accountable for failure, and we can't properly claim mission accomplished. We must have a mission.

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment. I could support it but for the limitation clause, which is meant to cut support for Ukraine. Like all of these amendments, this is meant to undermine our support for Ukraine. I simply oppose it and urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, this amendment requires a mission. We have asked nicely, we have asked persistently, and they have given us no response, so there has to be consequences.

We figure \$300 million out of \$113 billion is a small price. It is enough to get their attention, hopefully. Who knows?

They can't account for billions of dollars at the Pentagon. Instead of holding them accountable for it, even firing anybody, we are giving them even more money.

Now, I couldn't be more pro-military. I enlisted in the Army. I got the chance to go to our Nation's military academy. I came back as an Army infantry officer, served in the Ranger regiment. I love this country with a soldier's passion.

We have got to put our country first. If we are going to spend money, we should at least demand a mission, and \$300 million is small change.

In fact, before this bill could even make it through the Senate, before appropriations could even come up, they could draft a mission. They could draft a mission today, and they probably have it. The trouble is, they have three or four versions of the mission.

The mission to make sure this war doesn't spread to a NATO ally would be a just cause, but it is not clear that is what they are trying to do. They are not pursuing any kind of peace negotiation.

The mission to require no Russians in Ukraine could be a just cause, but that is very different than a mission that says no Russians in Ukraine including Crimea. Each of those are radically different resource allocations.

I want to know, if we are going to give resources, what mission are you asking me to fund?

Here is the really radical one. Victoria Nuland from the State Department says that our mission is regime change in Russia, including war crimes tribunals for Vladimir Putin. Now, if that is our mission, we don't have resources for that fight. That would require us to be in the fight. That is fundamentally a declaration of war. That is an unlimited war of regime change, a war of aggression by the United States because we have not been attacked.

Now, make no mistake, we are using a proxy. But isn't a proxy meant to facilitate a broader war with Russia? Unless we demand that mission, how do we hold them accountable for not growing it and expanding it? We must demand a mission.

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chair, sometimes the devil is in the reading. The amendment sounds good, but at the end of the day, it cuts support.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, indeed, there should be a strategy of U.S. support to defeat war criminal Putin, and it should be clarified.

Sadly, we are in a worldwide conflict that we did not start. It was Putin, on February the 24, 2021, that invaded Ukraine. This began an active conflict and a worldwide competition that we

are having, and that is with authoritarians, with Putin in control of the Russian Federation and abusing the people of Russia.

We have the authoritarians of Beijing, the Chinese Communist Party threatening the people of Taiwan. Clearly, we also have the regime in Tehran that pledges death to America, death to Israel, the vaporization of the people of Israel.

This is a worldwide conflict that needs to be addressed. We should have a strategy, and that is why I have introduced legislation, bipartisan, H. Res. 332, to define victory as restoration of Ukraine's 1991 internationally recognized borders. This is territory integrity for the people of Ukraine, NATO membership, as agreed to with the 2008 Bucharest Declaration, and justice and accountability for war crimes committed by Putin's murderous invaders.

The Biden administration, sadly, has not been clear with Congress. We can be clear because we have got to stand together. War criminal Putin needs to know that his violations of nine different agreements is simply not going to be allowed or recognized, that we should have, in the tradition of Ronald Reagan, peace through strength.

Mr. Chair, I urge that we have bipartisan support to encourage the President to clarify the American strategy for Ukrainian victory, which is peace through strength.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, the gentleman from South Carolina talks about war criminal Putin. That makes me think he supports regime change in Russia, because that is what it would take to prosecute Vladimir Putin for war crimes.

Now, I am not saying that he is not a war criminal. I am not saying anything he has done is just. It is not. The question is: Is that really the mission that we are trying to fund?

The sequence is ready, aim, fire for a reason. It is not ready, fire, aim. It is not too late to pull back and do the rational thing here and commit to a mission so that we can be accountable, and we can hold this administration accountable, our military commanders accountable, and, frankly, our weak State Department accountable for actually accomplishing a mission.

Hopefully, they succeed, and we can say: Well done. Mission accomplished. But they don't want to be accountable for the mission. That is why they worked so hard to oppose this rational standard that was always the cause. Post-Vietnam, we learned we commit to a mission, and we commit to an exit strategy. We abandon it at our peril. We are less free, less safe, and more burdened by debt because of it. We have to demand a mission.

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

□ 1600

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it is one of the great myths of this situation that we don't have a mission.

The Biden administration has laid out a very, very clear plan, as I said at the outset, and that plan is to do everything we can to help preserve a sovereign democratic Ukraine without going to war with Russia. That is the administration's plan, and they have made it clear over and over and over again.

There are a lot of different people that have different opinions. This amendment does not ask for JOE WILSON's plan. This amendment asks for the White House—the administration's plan, which we already have. If you want to get JOE's plan, he is sitting right there, and I suggest you ask him.

The administration has a very clear mission. That mission doesn't have anything to do with regime change or trying Vladimir Putin. These are all things to discuss. The mission in this conflict and the reason we are supporting Ukraine is to preserve a sovereign democratic Ukraine, which means helping them take back as much of their territory that they can. How much they can take back is hard to say.

We are supporting them and because we supported them, there is a sovereign democratic Ukraine. We are also at the same time having conversations with Ukraine and trying to have conversations with Russia about getting to the peace table. Right now Vladimir Putin isn't willing to do that. He wants to destroy Ukraine. We are helping Ukraine protect themselves. The mission is clear.

Using this excuse of a report to cut off the funds for the mission is not the right approach. You can disagree with the mission if you want. I understand that. It is a democracy, and we can have that conversation, but let's please stop saying that there isn't clarity.

There is absolute clarity. President Biden, Jake Sullivan, Chairman Milley, and Secretary Austin have said over and over and over again that we are helping Ukraine defend itself so we can preserve a sovereign democratic Ukraine and stop Russia from wiping them off the map. That is the mission.

Thus far, it has been successful. We want to help them retake more territory.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

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

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, 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 Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 118-142.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 1224.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 583, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge the adoption of my amendment to ensure that President Biden's lend-lease authority regarding Ukraine is subject to the same requirements under the Arms Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act as loans to every other country.

These requirements would not block or do not block any of the current support that our government is providing to Ukraine but would mitigate the risk that the Biden administration or, for that matter, any administration abuses its lend-lease authorities in the future.

The requirements include that the loan is made for a fixed period of time, up to 5 years, and the borrower agrees to repay us all the costs we incur by lending our equipment, such as money to repair or to replace damaged equipment.

Loans have agreements for repayment. Without the requirement that loans have a defined term and a repayment agreement, without those terms it is not a loan. It is a grant or a gift. Funding Ukraine is under the purview of Congress, not the executive branch.

He can simply call it a loan and never require repayment or reimbursement, or he could extend the terms out indefinitely or request repayment in something else like Monopoly money—and I say that in jest.

Other requirements under the Arms Export Control Act include that the President determine that there are compelling foreign policy or national security reasons to lend the equipment rather than actually just selling it, and he considers any impact the loan may have on our national technology and industrial base.

Surely, none of us want the President to lend equipment if he doesn't believe we have a compelling national interest to be involved, or without consideration of the impact on our industrial base.

Finally, it requires that the President provide detailed reports to the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees when he exercises the lend-lease authorities, which is a very reasonable requirement consistent with basic congressional oversight.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of my amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, which would eliminate the important extension of lend-lease authority for Ukraine included in the underlying bill.

As Ukraine continues its counter-offensive against Russia's brutal, unprovoked war of aggression, we must continue doing everything we can with our allies and partners in support; not just for the future of Ukraine and its people, but for democracies and free people across the world opposing brutal autocrats like Putin.

The lend-lease authority this bill extends is one of the many tools the administration has at its disposal to support Ukraine in its courageous efforts with critical weapons and defense capabilities.

This authority is one which has bipartisan support, not just in committee by virtue of the extension being included in the bill, but by way of bicameral, bipartisan passage in strong support roughly 10 months ago. It was a Republican bill led by Senator JOHN CORNYN, S. 3522, which provided for lend-lease authority for Ukraine that passed by an overwhelming bipartisan margin, 417-10 in favor, including nearly 200 Republicans.

I call on Members to recognize the importance of ensuring Ukraine has the tools and capabilities it needs to defend itself, defeat Russia, and preserve its independence and sovereignty.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I believe in freedom. I believe in liberty. I believe in the right for a country to defend itself. I also believe in accountability. These are taxpayer dollars being used overseas. We have an authority, and we have a responsibility as Congress to oversee these dollars.

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I regret I have to oppose my colleague from Tennessee's amendment. I believe it is in our national security interest that Ukraine remains independent. If they fall, what happens next? What does the bully do next?

He threatens the Baltics. He has already called them renegade states. That is a threat. You stop a bully when he is pushing you around. That is what Putin is doing. He invaded a country one-fourth the size of Russia in population. They cannot win without our help. It is not Americans doing the

fighting, it is Ukrainians doing the fighting, but they cannot prevail without our material support.

Thus far, we have provided about 5 percent of what our military budget equates to. For 5 percent, half of Russia's tanks have been destroyed and almost 200,000 Russians have been killed while they are invading the Ukrainians.

We have spent this money in a way that is helping our national interests prevail, and it is helping Ukraine survive. It will prevent what I believe is the next phase, if we stop him here, which is the Baltics or Poland.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend that my colleagues vote against this amendment.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, while Members of Congress have diverse views on the conflict in Ukraine and the appropriate role of the United States, which we have talked about a lot when considering this bill, I hope we can broadly agree that Congress must exercise its responsibility to guide and oversee the use of our taxpayer dollars and our defense equipment.

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it is so important with lend-lease that we make every effort to provide the people of Ukraine, who are fighting so valiantly with equipment. Many of us thought that they simply couldn't resist, but they are. They are resisting because they are getting the equipment. The quickest way to get the equipment is through lend-lease.

I am very grateful that last year, as has already been identified, we voted here in Congress 417-10 to provide for the Ukraine Democracy Defense Lend-Lease Act. It provides for great accountability.

Ironically, I have actually seen success of lend-lease. I was in St. Petersburg, Russia, to place a wreath at the world's largest open cemetery for the victims of the siege of Leningrad. The only reason that the Russians were successful in stopping Hitler was because the equipment was provided by the United States through lend-lease. It is now ironic that we need to be providing lend-lease equipment to Ukraine to stop war criminal Putin.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate that we are not saying that the lend-lease program can't be utilized, we are simply asking that Congress has the ability to set forth terms as is our responsibility.

We have an obligation to the American taxpayer to have accountability for these dollars. It is lend-lease; it is not a gift. If it is a gift, we should authorize it, but it is not. It is either lend-lease or it is not.

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, first of all, we haven't actually used the lend-lease provision yet, so there is nothing to exercise oversight on. It is not clear whether or not it will be used.

Mr. Chairman, I want to address the larger issue which has been raised, and that is the idea that there is a lack of accountability for the funds going to Ukraine. Number one, that is a big Russian-Putin propaganda talking point; and, two, completely wrong. It has been investigated by the IG and a bunch of other folks and determined that that is not happening.

These weapons are going precisely where they are supposed to be going. We know this because if they weren't, Ukraine would have lost a long time ago. They are under attack from a military roughly five times the size of theirs that is much more well-armed and much more well-equipped.

In order to defend themselves, they have to effectively use the support that the United States, and again, 53 other nations are providing to them. They have been effectively using that, which is how they have been able to retake some of the territory that Russia took from them a year and a half ago and protect the rest of the country that Putin was trying to take.

Let's not buy into this myth that somehow this money is being wasted and is not proper oversight. There is a legitimate argument to be had about what you feel about the importance of Ukraine, but it is not based on this money being wasted.

The money has been incredibly effectively used. That is why Ukraine has been able to defend itself. Again, I believe we should help Ukraine defend itself, which is what we are doing. As with all the other amendments along these lines, I urge opposition to this one.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the robust debate. I want to emphasize under the lend-lease program there are terms set forth. This is something that we owe the American people. It is something that we would expect if it is utilized for other countries.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, 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 Tennessee will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 26 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 118-142.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer amendment No. 27.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 1639.

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

SEC. 16. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR SUSTAINMENT OF B83-1 BOMBS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2024 or any fiscal year thereafter for the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy may be obligated or expended for the sustainment of the B83-1 bomb.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 583, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

□ 1615

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the Rules Committee permitting this to be in order to be discussed. These are important issues, and we don't often spend time on the floor discussing them.

In my career, I have worked to contain nuclear weapons, their danger and cost. Many of these weapons we cannot afford and cannot afford to use. Unfortunately, we continue to spend hundreds of billions of dollars on weapons that pose serious risk to safety and physical security.

We have an opportunity this afternoon to take a small but significant step prohibiting the use of funds for the B83-1 bomb.

This amendment reflects the conclusion of the 2022 Nuclear Posture Review, which, unfortunately, was not reflected in the majority report.

The B83 was added to the nuclear arsenal 30 years ago and has dramatically diminished utility.

Remember, Mr. Chair, we are on a trajectory to spend over \$1.7 trillion in the next 30 years on nuclear weapons, most of which are no longer necessary for our security. Eliminating support for the B83 will save \$1.5 billion over that period at no risk at all to our security.

As Everett Dirksen once famously said: "A billion here and a billion

there, and pretty soon you are talking about real money.”

Here is a chance to make a long-overdue reform at no cost to our national security and save some real money.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, this amendment would remove a section in the bill relating to the B83 nuclear gravity bomb and prohibit any funding for B83 sustainment.

The B83 is the last megaton-class nuclear weapon in our arsenal. It exists to destroy deeply buried targets. China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran are putting some of the things they value most underground, covered in steel and concrete. The B83 is currently our only way of getting to those targets.

When the Biden administration proposed to begin retiring the B83 last year, we asked: How are you going to replace them?

They didn't have an answer. So, Democrats and Republicans agreed on a provision in the FY 2023 NDAA that allowed the Department to retire up to 25 percent of those bombs but prohibited any further retirements until the Department completed the study on how to replace that capability.

As of this date, the Biden Pentagon is still studying the problem, and we are not any closer to the B83 replacement.

The language included in our bill repeats the bipartisan compromise struck in last year's NDAA—nothing more and nothing less.

I also note this amendment would prohibit all sustaining funding to the B83. Not even the Biden administration thinks this is a good idea. Stockpile sustainment includes the safety and surveillance activities necessary to keep nuclear weapons safe and secure.

There is no exception in this amendment to allow for those activities to continue. Completely cutting off funds is irresponsible.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chair, we are in the midst of a major overhaul of our nuclear weapons system. It is a vast project and extraordinarily expensive, and in that process of reviewing and modifying our nuclear weapons system, this particular bomb becomes one of the items that is not necessary going forward.

It basically has two uses. That is to wipe out a very large city with one bomb—this is a super-megaton bomb—or to somehow go after deeply buried and entrenched targets, and it is not particularly useful for that. Therefore,

the Nuclear Posture Review has determined that this bomb should be retired.

The amendment before us today allows for the continuation of the program to set about doing two things: one, retiring the 83-1; and two, figuring out a more suitable weapon to go after deeply entrenched targets. Therefore, this amendment is of use.

Mr. Chair, I urge the passage of the amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), my friend and colleague from the Armed Services Committee and the chair of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee.

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

Mr. Chair, I agree with my colleagues and share the chairman's concerns about the safety risks with this amendment.

I recognize that some of my colleagues believe we don't need the B83 and want to retire it, but regardless of how they feel about it, I hope my colleagues can appreciate that completely cutting off funds for a nuclear system all at once is dangerous.

These weapons were built many decades ago, and their components are aging. That is why we are modernizing our deterrent. Yet, we need to do ongoing safety and surveillance monitoring to ensure they remain safe and secure, and that requires ongoing funding.

Defunding a nuclear weapon may sound like a good talking point, but it is a reckless policy. Even the Biden administration understands that. They are not proposing to cut off funding, but that is exactly what this amendment would do.

Mr. Chair, I urge all my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I respectfully disagree with my colleagues. This is a weapon whose time has passed.

It can only be delivered by the B-2 bomber, which is aging out. It cannot be delivered by a B-52 or a B-21. This antiquated weaponry is not enhancing our defense. It is an example of weaponry that really has outlived its usefulness.

These are serious issues. We are looking at trying to contain government spending. Some of my colleagues were willing to actually risk the global economy to make their point and grind things to a halt.

This isn't low-hanging fruit. This is literally picking the fruit up off the ground.

The security review, I think, is clear. This has outlived its usefulness. We have to start somewhere.

The \$1.7 trillion that we have in the pipeline for nuclear modernization is, to be charitable, overkill. We need to start someplace. We ought to start with dealing with the B83 consistent with the national security review.

Mr. Chair, I urge approval of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. STRONG), who is an outstanding freshman member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. STRONG. Mr. Chair, I also rise in opposition to the amendment.

Chair ROGERS is exactly right. I want to emphasize one of the points that he made.

The language in the bill that this amendment is proposing to strike is effectively the same language Congress agreed to last year. As the chair said, this is a commonsense provision that extends a restriction Congress passed on a bipartisan basis last year.

The administration wants to retire a nuclear weapon, and we are saying to tell us how they are going to replace the capability before they retire it.

That is a responsible policy, and I strongly oppose the amendment striking this provision.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I believe this amendment is bad policy. Not even the Biden administration is proposing to zero out this funding. It would also be dangerous from a safety point of view.

Mr. Chair, I urge all Members to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. 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 Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in House Report 118-142.

Ms. TLAIB. 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:

Strike section 1638.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 583, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I would like to begin by thanking Ranking Member SMITH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and their staffs for working with us on this critically important amendment and for their leadership throughout this NDAA process.

As we know, Mr. Chair, with war criminals threatening to use nuclear weapons and serious tensions along NATO's eastern border and in the South China Sea, today's world is being redefined by escalating tensions between major nuclear powers.

We don't have to look far back in history to see the danger here. The Cold War was full of near misses and numerous crises that could have gotten out of control and ended in nuclear war.

We are now entering a period of dangerous nuclear competition. As such, we must remember one of the key lessons that the Cold War taught us about nukes: We must preserve the ability to quickly step back from the brink and clearly signal de-escalation when necessary.

Unfortunately, the current draft of the NDAA includes a provision that prohibits our country from doing just that. Specifically, this dangerous provision makes it impossible for our country to reduce our stockpiles of intercontinental ballistic missiles, ICBMs, for any reason, with no exceptions.

This inflexible policy was created and implemented by lawmakers in promotion of economic considerations and not national security priorities, Mr. Chair. Making national security decisions with the potential to end humanity based on so-called economic considerations is simply ridiculous. It is dangerous.

While we preserve this insanely expensive weapon that is obsolete, many children in my district go to schools without clean drinking water.

Maintaining this incredibly large stockpile of these weapons isn't even necessary in maintaining a credible deterrent. The U.K., France, India, and China all have very credible nuclear deterrents with much smaller stockpiles, Mr. Chair.

The shortsighted policy places serious and concerning restraints on the President of the United States, the United States Congress, and the Department of Defense's ability to consider and modify the role ICBMs play in our nuclear arsenal and our national defense, and it unnecessarily wastes taxpayer dollars in the process.

Preserving our ability to reduce our nuclear stockpiles proved key to reducing tensions, Mr. Chair, and achieving commonsense, planet-saving arms control agreements during the Cold War.

Just as we have the ability to increase our nuclear defense in times of crisis, we must have the ability to reduce our nuclear forces when it is in our interest.

To be clear, Mr. Chair, this amendment does not change the size of our nuclear forces. It merely allows for reasonable consideration and debate in the future.

Mr. Chair, as the mother of two who dreams of a world where our children and families are freed from threat and fear of nuclear war, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. This amendment would strike a provision in

the bill that prohibits the Nation's ICBM fleet from falling below its current size of 400.

In 2014, the Obama administration decided to reduce the ICBM fleet to 400 missiles to comply with the New START Treaty. Ever since 2016, the Congress has included provisions in the defense authorization bill to effectively prohibit any further reduction.

The reason is simple. Nuclear threats are growing. In fact, just this year, the commander of U.S. Strategic Command notified Congress that China now possesses more ICBM launchers than the United States.

Now is not the time to be considering cuts to our ICBM fleet, which remains central to our deterrent.

I want to quote former Vice Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff John Hyten, whom many of us know and respect. When asked specifically about reducing the ICBM force, he replied: "I don't understand how, with the threats that we face today, which are growing, not shrinking, we would make a decision today as a nation to lessen our overall strategic deterrent. That makes no sense to me, and my best military advice is that we do not do that."

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

□ 1630

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, just to be clear, this amendment does not change the size of our nuclear forces. It merely allows for reasonable consideration and debate in the future, especially around de-escalation. Again, our history shows during the Cold War, it was critical.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my good colleague.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentlewoman's tenacity and her leadership on this issue.

We have more than we need to have a credible deterrent; more than we need. This small but important amendment would allow the military leadership to evaluate how to evolve the needs.

The land-based nuclear ICBMs are far in excess of what we need, and we have been seeing scandal in the papers in terms of the management of them, drug use, cheating on tests, and they are not necessary for our security. There is no security benefit in this sort of redundancy.

We ought to at least be able to examine the path going forward. Locking into 400 permanently is lunacy, it is expensive, and it is dangerous, as anybody who has read, for example, Eric Schlosser's book, "Command and Control," to see how close we have come to nuclear disaster with this stockpile.

The record is not very rosy. We at least ought to allow our military leadership to evaluate what we need to do going forward.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I also rise in strong opposition to this amendment. The chairman is right. Now is not the time to open the door to cutting the ICBM fleet.

China's ICBM forces are rapidly expanding, and Russia's nuclear forces, the largest in the world, continue to grow, as well. In the face of these growing threats, we need to strengthen our deterrent, not weaken it.

Our ICBM forces continue to play a vital role in deterrence as the most responsive leg of our nuclear triad.

Unlike submarines and bombers, land-based ICBMs are always ready to execute Presidential orders and provide the day-to-day, 24/7 deterrent that our Nation relies on. They have prevented nuclear attack for 60 years.

If you ever want to see nuclear proliferation in this world, start cutting our nuclear forces. All the countries that rely on us will attempt to secure their own nuclear capability. They will have no other choice. That would destabilize the world.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Michigan has 45 seconds remaining.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to be clear with my colleagues. This amendment gives our government more options that could avoid our world ending in nuclear war. It is that simple. It doesn't reduce. It doesn't increase. It literally allows for real consideration and debate and allows the President of the United States and the Department of Defense to make those decisions.

It is a commonsense amendment. Really, I think it is incredibly important, especially, again, at a time of watching what is going on in our world right now and what happened during the Cold War. It is important for us to be able to de-escalate when needed, for us to be able to again make more thoughtful decisions, not based on this kind of scare tactic of let's do more, let's get this out there and everything without actually considering some of the really important factors that are around these very dangerous, again, world-ending weapons that we have that could end in nuclear war in our world.

It is very, very important, again, for all my colleagues to understand: This is not about reducing. This is about actually having more options.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON), an outstanding member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chair, I stand in strong opposition to this bill, as someone who had nuclear command and

control authorities when I was a general officer in the Air Force, as someone who knows that nuclear and strategic deterrence is job number one for our military.

Today, China is building a nuclear force to match ours and is more modernized. Russia has a nuclear force today that matches ours in numbers and is more modernized. This is not the time to reduce.

Former STRATCOM Commander Admiral Richard said the Chinese nuclear expansion is breathtaking, and it is. Today is the day that we have to modernize our forces, not talk about reducing them or cutting them down.

I also point out that our ICBM force offers the highest rates of readiness and alert capabilities. Once they are put in, they are the cheapest to operate.

Mr. Chair, I urge defeat of this amendment. Our country cannot afford it. Strategic deterrence can't afford it. Nuclear deterrence can't afford it.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, this amendment will strike common-sense provisions that have been consistent policies since 2016.

Mr. Chair, I urge Members to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. TLAIB. 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 Michigan will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 29 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in House Report 118-142.

Mr. ROY. 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:

Page 531, after line 11, insert the following:
(c) PROHIBITION ON ESTABLISHMENT OF SIMILAR POSITIONS.—No Federal funds may be obligated or expended to establish a position within the Department of Defense that is the same as or substantially similar to—

(1) the position of Chief Diversity Officer, as described in section 147 of title 10, United States Code, as such section was in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) the position of Senior Advisor for Diversity and Inclusion, as described in section 913(b) of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283; 10 U.S.C. 147 note), as such section was in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 583, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, the House Armed Services Committee adopted an amendment to repeal the statutory requirement that the Department of Defense have a chief diversity officer, a senior adviser for diversity and inclusion. I applaud that. It is a good thing. That is getting rid of the requirement. I also believe that we should prohibit the ability of the Department of Defense to have said position.

My amendment No. 30 seeks to amend section 904 to prohibit Federal funds from being used to establish anything similar or any position that is comparable to the chief diversity officer or senior adviser of diversity and inclusion.

People say, well, why is that? The fact of the matter is we have a situation right now where we are not even able to pay the kinds of bonuses that are necessary.

We are not able to pay to retain our men and women in uniform. The Air Force has been having budgetary problems, and we have got positions that are being put out there, for example, that will pay \$183,500, multiple positions scattered all over the country in the name of diversity.

The fact is the United States military is one of the few institutions where the skills of the men or women on either side of you could mean the difference between life and death.

The Department of Defense should be focused on one thing only: securing the defense of the Nation. It is not in our national security interests to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars for diversity training that continues to try and divvy us up by race.

That is the opposite of the direction we should be going, and in fact, it sows constant division into the Department of Defense.

Does a person's race or skin color help them overcome hostile forces? Does it allow us to win the next battle? Do rainbow bullets and flags scare away folks?

Yet, that is what we are spending our time on, and we can't even pay our men and women in uniform. Literally, the Air Force is saying sorry, we can't give you bonuses right now because they have mismanaged their budget, and they are having to spend money on positions like this.

China and our other enemies do not care about feelings. Why are we funding divisive programs and divisive positions rather than positions focused on advancing and training the strongest and best military in the world?

That is the purpose of the amendment. It is great that this bill eliminates the statutory requirement that we have such a position, but we ought to end this divvying us up by race.

It is, in the words of the Chief Justice, a sordid business to divvy us up by race rather than to ensure that we have the best trained and finest fighting force in the world.

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment. My Republican colleagues continue to argue against this so-called woke-ism in the military.

I ask my colleagues: Can they define what being woke is? According to the Florida Governor's own legal team, it is defined as "the belief there are systemic injustices in American society and the need to address them."

Mr. Chair, I have news for my colleagues. We need to be woke. We have decades and centuries of injustices and inequities heaped upon women, the LGBTQ+ community, Black and Latino, Native American and Asian, and so many other populations in our Nation.

Mr. Chair, while the Republicans and their friends across the country try to ban books and erase our history from school textbooks, we are fighting to defend the truth and our history.

Yes, I am woke, and more of my colleagues need to be woke.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The fact is these positions are consuming precious dollars that our Air Force can't even use currently to pay their own personnel. Many in the military are struggling to even find a way to pay the bonuses for our current personnel and can't even meet their own recruiting needs right now, falling woefully short in all of their recruiting needs.

The fact is we are struggling in recruiting, in significant part, because we are turning the Department of Defense into a social engineering experiment wrapped in a uniform. That is the truth.

Instead of focusing on killing people and blowing stuff up and having the finest fighting force in the world, we are focused on dividing people up by race. That is what we are doing.

If you look at all of the training materials at the Air Force Academy, the training materials at West Point, the training materials at the Naval Academy, they are chock-full of this, spending time on that, and it is driving people away from wanting to serve.

It is driving people of all races away from wanting to serve because we are focusing on race and division rather than unifying our United States military behind the flag of the United States.

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the whip of the Democratic Party.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chair, ever since the minutemen gathered in Lexington, America's Armed Forces have been guardians of freedom.

Generations of heroes have signed up for a singular cause: preserving liberty for all. Regardless of party or politics, the House has come together every year to put our national security and our military families first—until now.

This year, the MAGA majority is using our national defense bill to get one step closer to the only thing they really care about, a nationwide abortion ban.

Mr. Chair, Americans are already paying the price for Republicans' extremism; Americans like Amanda Zarowski who rushed to the hospital last year after suffering a miscarriage.

Amanda needed an abortion procedure to prevent a deadly infection, but her doctor sent her home, banned under Texas law from providing the care she needed.

So she waited, mourning her daughter that she had lost, until she went into septic shock, ended up in the ICU for 3 days, and almost lost her life.

Now MAGA Republicans are aiming the same dangerous extremism at our troops. They want the same control over the health, body, and lives of America's servicemembers and their families.

That is not freedom. That is not patriotism. That is not national security. That is tyranny.

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I want to answer the most important question: What does this have to do with national security? It has to do with unit cohesion and with recruitment.

Interestingly, the survey data shows that almost three times as many people say they are worried about joining the military because of their concerns about discrimination as say that they are worried about the military being too woke.

That is the point of this. The training is to make sure there is unit cohesion, number one, and number two, that we can recruit from the entire country.

It really comes down to whether or not you believe that we have a history of discrimination against people of color, the LGBTQ community, and women.

If you think that that just didn't happen and we don't have to worry about it, then I guess this approach makes sense, but the history of our country tells a very different story.

We need to address this in order to make sure that if you are a woman, if you are a Black person, if you are trans or gay, the military is going to give you a fair shake.

Let me remind everybody here. Just 13 years ago, we finally allowed gay people to serve in the military. Every single Republican voted against that. Every single one.

Do we really think that our national security would be stronger if we drove all the gay people out of the military? We need all the resources, all the talents from this country, and regrettably, we haven't always done that. In what is shown, we need to address these issues.

Now, the Republicans exaggerate this. They act like this is all we do in recruitment. I have spent a lot of time with a lot of military people. This is not all we do in training the military. It is something that needs to be done to meet our recruitment goals.

□ 1645

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, in closing, a recent story indicated: Servicemembers forced to pay back signing bonuses after being removed after COVID vaccine. They see it as a kick in the face.

The Air Force delays bonuses. Higher-than-projected personnel costs are driving a shortfall in FY 2023 military personnel appropriation. Meanwhile, we have jobs and notices under the chief diversity officer and myriad other positions at \$183,500. Why?

Why can't we get it right? Why can't we do the right thing and use the dollars that we have appropriated to fund the men and women in uniform to do their job? That is the question.

The fact is what we are doing is we are funding things like a professor at the Air Force Academy posting about her desire to make students learn how to "identify the structural racism and inequality that has been endemic in American history."

A West Point slide obtained by FOIA stated that: "White people and people of color live radically different structured lives, and that in order to understand racial inequality, it is first necessary to address Whiteness." That is what we are paying for rather than paying for men and women to defend this country.

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues insist that government should run more like a business, yet they are focused on creating divisions in the military instead of following the same practices as our best defense companies—companies like Lockheed Martin, Boeing, and Raytheon—who all have a chief diversity officer role or equivalent.

We are in the middle of a recruitment crisis. Mr. Chairman, instead of championing programs that will make it more enticing for underrepresented Americans to join the service, they are instead trying to make it more difficult for our military recruitment efforts to be successful.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this ill-advised amendment. Let's put our servicemembers, our national security, and their needs ahead of this amendment that does nothing but divide our country, divide our military. Let's continue to have strength in our military, and that strength comes from the diversity of our servicemembers.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

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

Mr. ROY. 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in House Report 118-142.

Mr. ROY. 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 F of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 6. PROHIBITION ON AUTHORIZING FEDERAL FUNDS FOR DODEA FOR RACE-BASED THEORIES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—No Federal funds shall be authorized for the Department of Defense Education Activity to promote race-based theories described in subsection (b) or compel teachers or students to affirm, adhere to, adopt, or process beliefs in a manner that violates title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

(b) RACE-BASED THEORIES DESCRIBED.—The race-based theories described in this subsection are the following:

(1) Any race is inherently superior or inferior to any other race, color, or national origin.

(2) The United States is a fundamentally racist country.

(3) The Declaration of Independence or Constitution of the United States are fundamentally racist documents.

(4) An individual's moral character or worth is determined by the individual's race, color, or national origin.

(5) An individual, by virtue of the individual's race, is inherently racist or oppressive, whether consciously or unconsciously.

(6) An individual, because of the individual's race, bears responsibility for the actions committed by other members of the individual's race, color, or national origin.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) PROTECTED SPEECH NOT RESTRICTED.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to restrict the speech of a student, teacher, or any other individual outside of a school setting.

(2) ACCESS TO MATERIALS FOR THE PURPOSE OF RESEARCH OR INDEPENDENT STUDY.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent an individual from accessing materials that advocate theories described in subsection (b) for the purpose of research or independent study.

(3) CONTEXTUAL EDUCATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent a school from stating theories described in subsection (b) or assigning materials that advocate such theories for educational purposes in contexts that make it clear the school does not sponsor, approve, or endorse such theories or materials.

(d) PROMOTE DEFINED.—In this section, the term "promote", when used with respect to a race-based theory described in subsection (b), means—

(1) to include such theories or materials that advocate such theories in curricula, reading lists, seminars, workshops, trainings, or other educational or professional settings in a manner that could reasonably give rise to the appearance of official sponsorship, approval, or endorsement;

(2) to contract with, hire, or otherwise engage speakers, consultants, diversity trainers, and other persons for the purpose of advocating such theories;

(3) to compel students to profess a belief in such theories; or

(4) to segregate students or other individuals by race in any setting, including in educational or training sessions.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 583, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, the Department of Defense Education Activity, an agency under the Department of Defense, runs 160 schools on military bases across the globe, serving more than 69,000 children of military personnel.

The amendment that I am offering would prohibit the Department of Defense schools, DODEA, from using funds to promote or compel teachers to adhere to critical race theory.

Specifically, this is what I on the floor was accused of offering as being racist by the ranking member of the Rules Committee a little bit earlier, but I was not on the floor to have the words stricken.

Here is what the language is in the amendment—compel teachers to adhere to critical race theory, specifically the idea that:

“(1) Any race is inherently superior or inferior to any other race, color, or national origin.

“(2) The United States is a fundamentally racist country.

“(3) The Declaration of Independence or Constitution of the United States are fundamentally racist documents.

“(4) An individual’s moral character or worth is determined by the individual’s race, color, or national origin.

“(5) An individual, by virtue of the individual’s race, is inherently racist or oppressive, whether consciously or unconsciously.

“(6) An individual, because of the individual’s race, bears responsibility for the actions committed by other members of the individual’s race, color, or national origin.”

Instead of working to empower parents, our education system is using critical race theory outside of the Department of Defense, but in this case inside the Department of Defense, to turn schools into a propaganda machine dedicated to raising students up that judge one another by race and hate our country’s founding principles.

Teaching kids to hate the country they live in, to view their fellow citizens as enemies because of the color of their skin is wrong. It is anti-American, and it is societal suicide.

Critical race theory is an anti-American ideology that seeks to pick win-

ners and losers based on skin color. We are seeing a large-scale effort to impose this tyranny over the minds of men and our children through taxpayer-funded indoctrination of this ideology.

I believe we must preserve the foundational American truth that people are valuable regardless of their skin color and prevent critical race theory from being used to divvy us up by race further.

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

Mrs. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mrs. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote “no” on amendment No. 31, which is an attempt to sanitize the American history taught by the Department of Defense Education Activities.

I rise as the first Black woman elected to this body from Virginia, who grew up listening to my parents and grandparents tell stories of their lives in the Jim Crow South and its impact on their lives, families, and communities.

I rise as someone born and raised in the birthplace of American democracy and the birthplace of American slavery; the home of the father of our country, the first Commander in Chief of the Army, the first President of the United States, who is watching this debate right now on the wall, who owned and enslaved human beings; the home of Thomas Jefferson, who also owned enslaved human beings, but wrote the resounding words of the Declaration of Independence 247 years ago that we celebrated last week: Ideals that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Unfortunately, he did not mean me.

I am from the home of the architect of the Constitution, which 13 years later, starts with the words: “We the people.”

It did not include me.

Instead, the Constitution counted my enslaved ancestors as three-fifths of a person and did not grant us American citizenship until ratification of the 14th Amendment.

For nearly 350 years, slavery and Jim Crow created inequity in our communities that still exists today, and the laws that struck down Jim Crow were not a magic wand that erased those impacts.

As more and more people who lived during Jim Crow are dying, we need to tell their stories. We need to teach the good, the bad, and the ugly of our history to show how it shaped us as a nation so that we can heal from it.

This amendment teaches a delusional and irresponsible history.

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, an article written by the spouse of a member of our

military in The Federalist and the mother of a former Department of Defense education student talked about the training that she discovered when she dove into what their students were being taught.

She saw that there would be an equity and access summit for teachers and administrators. She said: Knowing that equity means different things to different people, I wanted to get a sense of what it meant, and I was floored.

They released a video of summit clips in which a principal talks about a student who felt like he had done something wrong because he is a young, White male. The teacher said she didn’t know what to tell him, but she seemed pleased with the breakthrough. Perhaps she was just following the lead of DODEA’s diversity, equity, and inclusion chief, Kelisa Wing, who is currently under investigation or at that time was under investigation by DOD for a history of disparaging comments toward White people.

The fact here is, the sordid business of divvying us up by race is what we are trying to move past, and having our Department of Defense schools teaching the children of our men and women in uniform to focus on race and the divvying us up by race is inherently wrong and undermines the future cohesion of not just the military but the country. The purpose here is to say that we don’t need our Department of Defense schools to be engaged in this indoctrination.

I heard earlier the questions here about all these stats about how this improves all of our recruiting. If that is so, why is our recruiting in the toilet? It is in the toilet because if you talk to recruits, they are sick of it. They don’t like the indoctrination. Their friends listen to it, and they say: “I don’t want any part of it.”

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

Mrs. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment and associate myself with the very powerful statement made by my colleague from Virginia, it is just part of a very extreme agenda that is threatening to hijack the Nation’s annual defense bill, which usually passes in a bipartisan way.

One of the core things they are trying to do through the NDAA, make no mistake, is to further their agenda to ban abortion on a nationwide basis, and I am here to sound the clarion call. They are going to be trying this week after week through the next few months.

The Jackson amendment, amendment No. 5, which we will be voting on in a few minutes, is a direct threat to the health and well-being of our servicemembers and their loved ones. If that amendment were to pass, it would put abortion access even further out of

reach for our servicemembers, in particular, for the over 2 million people who are stationed in States where they have little to no access to abortion.

Even more appalling, this amendment would force a servicemember who was raped by one of her own colleagues or superiors to travel at their own expense to terminate a resulting pregnancy.

Our servicemembers fight for our country every day. As lawmakers, we should be prepared to fight to protect their freedoms, not voting to take their freedoms away.

Mr. Chair, I urge objection to this amendment, the Jackson No. 5 amendment, and all of these extreme amendments which are taking us away from the critical functions we should be providing.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, in closing, we are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Life. I can't help but notice the focus of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle of terminating life.

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

Mrs. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, what this amendment before us says, it says you cannot teach that the Constitution is a racist document.

As Mrs. MCCLELLAN pointed out, the Constitution says that Black people are three-fifths of a person. The problem here is that we are not allowing with this amendment to have an honest discussion. Within the military, within society as a whole, you can't have a functioning unit, a functioning institution if you don't understand this history properly.

This amendment requires us to literally whitewash history. If you are a Black person thinking about serving in the military, and you know that is the military you are walking into, you are going to be worried about it.

What DEI does is it gives an opportunity to assure people that they will be treated equally, assurance that they are needed precisely because of amendments like this.

Our country has a rich and complicated history. A lot of it is very good, but we need to be honest about what it is if we are going to recruit from the diverse population that we need to recruit from.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

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

Mr. ROY. 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 Texas will be postponed.

□ 1700

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 118-142 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment no. 27 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment no. 28 by Ms. TLAIB of Michigan.

Amendment no. 5 by Mr. JACKSON of Texas.

Amendment no. 10 by Mr. ROSENDALE of Montana.

Amendment no. 20 by Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina.

Amendment no. 21 by Ms. GREENE of Georgia.

Amendment no. 22 by Mr. GAETZ of Florida.

Amendment no. 23 by Ms. GREENE of Georgia.

Amendment no. 24 by Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

Amendment no. 25 by Mr. OGLES of Tennessee.

Amendment no. 30 by Mr. ROY of Texas.

Amendment no. 31 by Mr. ROY of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 27, printed in House Report 118-142 offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 217, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

AYES—198

Adams	Boyle (PA)	Casas
Aguilar	Brown	Casten
Allred	Brownley	Castro (FL)
Auchincloss	Buck	Castro (TX)
Balint	Budzinski	Cherfilus-
Beatty	Bush	McCormick
Bera	Caraveo	Chu
Beyer	Carbajal	Clark (MA)
Blumenauer	Cardenas	Clarke (NY)
Blunt Rochester	Carson	Cleaver
Bonamici	Carter (LA)	Clyburn
Bowman	Cartwright	Cohen

Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Ramirez
Correa	Khanna	Raskin
Courtney	Kildee	Ross
Craig	Kilmer	Ruiz
Crockett	Kim (NJ)	Ruppersberger
Crow	Krishnamoorthi	Sablan
Cuellar	Kuster	Salinas
Dauids (KS)	Landsman	Sánchez
Davis (IL)	Larsen (WA)	Santos
Davis (NC)	Larson (CT)	Sarbames
Dean (PA)	Lee (CA)	Scanlon
DeGette	Lee (PA)	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Leger Fernandez	Schiff
DelBene	Levin	Schneider
DeSaulnier	Lieu	Scholten
Dingell	Lofgren	Schrier
Doggett	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Escobar	Magaziner	Scott, David
Espallat	Manning	Sewell
Fletcher	Massie	Sherman
Foster	Matsui	Sherrill
Foushee	McBath	Slotkin
Frankel, Lois	McClellan	Smith (WA)
Frost	McCollum	Sorensen
Garamendi	McGarvey	Soto
Garcia (IL)	McGovern	Spanberger
Garcia (TX)	Meeks	Stansbury
Garcia, Robert	Menendez	Stanton
Golden (ME)	Meng	Stevens
Goldman (NY)	Mfume	Strickland
Gomez	Moore (WI)	Swalwell
Gonzalez,	Morelle	Sykes
Vicente	Mirvan	Takano
Green, Al (TX)	Mullin	Thanedar
Grijalva	Nadler	Thompson (CA)
Harder (CA)	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
Hayes	Neal	Titus
Higgins (NY)	Neguse	Tlaib
Himes	Norcross	Tokuda
Horsford	Norton	Tonko
Houlahan	Pallone	Torres (CA)
Hoyer	Panetta	Torres (NY)
Hoyle (OR)	Pappas	Trahan
Huffman	Pascrell	Trone
Ivey	Payne	Underwood
Jackson (IL)	Pelosi	Vargas
Jackson (NC)	Peters	Vasquez
Jackson Lee	Pettersen	Veasey
Jacobs	Phillips	Velázquez
Jayapal	Pingree	Waters
Jeffries	Plaskett	Watson Coleman
Johnson (GA)	Pocan	Wild
Kamlager-Dove	Porter	Williams (GA)
Kaptur	Pressley	Wilson (FL)
Keating	Quigley	

NOES—217

Aderholt	Crenshaw	Griffith
Alford	Curtis	Grothman
Allen	D'Esposito	Guest
Amodei	Davidson	Guthrie
Arrington	De La Cruz	Hageman
Babin	Deluzio	Harris
Bacon	DesJarlais	Harshbarger
Baird	Diaz-Balart	Hern
Balderson	Donalds	Higgins (LA)
Banks	Duarte	Hill
Bean (FL)	Dunn (FL)	Hinson
Bentz	Edwards	Houchin
Bergman	Ellzey	Hudson
Biggs	Emmer	Huizenga
Bilirakis	Estes	Hunt
Bishop (GA)	Ezell	Issa
Bishop (NC)	Fallon	Jackson (TX)
Boebert	Feenstra	James
Bost	Ferguson	Johnson (LA)
Brecheen	Finstad	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Fischbach	Johnson (SD)
Bucshon	Fitzgerald	Jordan
Burchett	Fitzpatrick	Joyce (PA)
Burgess	Fleischmann	Kean (NJ)
Burlison	Flood	Kelly (MS)
Calvert	Fox	Kiggans (VA)
Carey	Fry	Kiley
Carl	Fulcher	Kustoff
Carter (GA)	Gaetz	LaHood
Carter (TX)	Gallagher	LaLota
Case	Garbarino	LaMalfa
Chavez-DeRemer	Garcia, Mike	Lamborn
Ciscomani	Gimenez	Langworthy
Cline	Gonzales, Tony	Latta
Cloud	Good (VA)	LaTurner
Clyde	Gooden (TX)	Lawler
Cole	Gosar	Lee (FL)
Collins	Gottheimer	Lee (NV)
Comer	Granger	Lesko
Costa	Graves (LA)	Letlow
Crane	Graves (MO)	Loudermilk
Crawford	Green (TN)	Luetkemeyer